Cross-National Research on USAID's Democracy and Governance Programs - Codebook (Phase II)

Steven Finkel, University of Pittsburgh
Andrew Green, USAID
Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, University of Pittsburgh
Mitchell Seligson, Vanderbilt University
C. Neal Tate, Vanderbilt University

Background to the Dataset 1
1. Measures of USAID Activity 2
  1.1. Democracy and Governance Assistance 3
  1.2. Other (Non-DG) Sectors 6
  1.3. Sources and Composition of Funding 8
  1.4. Regional Programs 10
  1.5. Sub-Regional Programs 14
  1.6. Yearly Appropriations 18
2. Measures of Democratic Development 20
  2.1. General Democracy and Governance 20
  2.2. Elections and Electoral Processes 24
  2.3. Rule of Law 30
  2.4. Civil Society 47
  2.5. Governance 51
3. Additional Independent Variables 57
  3.1. Other Donor Agencies 57
  3.2. Development 60
  3.3. Economic Performance 62
  3.4. Population and Social Indicators 64
  3.5. Economic Dependence 67
  3.6. Political History and Institutions 68
  3.7. International Factors 77
4. Level 2 Predictors (Constant within Countries) 82
  4.1. History of Democracy 82
  4.2. State Failure and International Factors 83
  4.3. Social and Economic Predictors 84
  4.4. U.S. Policy Priority Indicators 87
  4.5. Political Culture 89
  4.6. USAID Presence 93
5. Country Codes and ID Variables 104
6. Appendices 108
  6.1. Countries and Regions 108
  6.2. Protocol for Cases of State Fragmentation and Unification 116
  6.3. Transformations of AID Variables 118
  6.4. Imputation Models 119
  6.5. Sources and References 120

Background to the Dataset

This dataset was developed for the second phase of the research project "Cross-National Research on USAID's Democracy and Governance Programs." The study analyzed the impact of USAID's democracy and governance programs using a world-wide sample of 165 countries in 1990-2003 (Phase I) and in 1990-2004 (Phase II). The first phase of the study was conducted between January and November of 2005 under a USAID-funded subgrant from the Association Liaison Office (ALO). The second phase of the study, covering more years and including more variables, was completed during 2006-2007. The reports for both phases are available on line in the website for the project: http://www.pitt.edu/~politics/democracy/democracy.html

The dataset contains 2,866 observations (corresponding to 195 countries in 1990-2004) and 540 variables. Only 165 countries were included in the analysis conducted for the project—the remaining 30 countries were advanced industrial democracies treated as "ineligible" for democracy assistance (see Section 5 of this Codebook). However, those countries were included in this dataset to facilitate research on related subjects.

Two hundred and eleven items in the dataset measure USAID assistance in different ways (see Sections 1 and 4.6 in the Codebook, and Appendix 6.3). This information was compiled from an activity-level database developed by John Richter and Andrew Green, and later extended by David Black, Mark Billera, and other collaborators at USAID. The database contains 44,958 entries at the activity level for all USAID sectors. Each entry reports the purpose of the activity, the total amount appropriated in current dollars, and the recipient country. We aggregated the activity-level data at the country-year level and converted the amounts to millions of constant (2000) dollars. Foreign assistance was disaggregated into eight sectors: Democracy and Governance (DG), Agriculture and Economic Growth, Education, Environment, Health, Humanitarian Assistance, Human Rights (the non-DG components, such as anti-trafficking and assistance to victims of torture), and Conflict Management and Mitigation. Within the DG sector, we identified four sub-sectors (Elections, Rule of Law, Civil Society, and Governance); and two sub-sub-sectors (Human Rights, which is part of Rule of Law, and Mass Media, which is part of Civil Society). See Section 1 for more details on the definition of sectors and sub-sectors. Because funds appropriated during any given year may be spent the following year, our key measures reflect two-year running means (see Sections 1.1 through 1.5; for yearly data not averaged over two-years, see Section 1.6).

The remaining items identify other sources of development assistance and provide multiple measures of democratic development, as well as additional control variables (all collected from secondary sources). The dataset comprises two types of variables: time-varying factors (Sections 1-3), and country-level characteristics (Section 4). Variables in the first group (e.g., investment in democracy assistance or annual GDP growth) display variation across countries and within countries over time, while items in the second group (e.g., the size of the country) vary across countries but basically remain stable over time.

1. Measures of USAID Activity

AID	**Total USAID investment (all sectors)**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in the country for all sectors, in Millions of 2000 US dollars (average for the last two years). AID = AID100+AID000
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average (y, y-1)
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	The decision to use two-year running means reflects the fact that the Green-Richter database reported actual appropriations, but disbursements may have occurred in the year following the appropriation. Dates refer to fiscal years (e.g., 1990 covers Oct. 1, 1989 to Sept. 30, 1990). Constant dollars were estimated using the World Bank's GDP deflator. Only USAID programs (Agency="us_aid" in the original database) were included. For yearly totals (not two-year means) see section 1.6. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

OBL	**New USAID Appropriations During Year (all sectors)**
Definition:	Dichotomous indicator coded 1 if the country was recipient of USAID appropriations during the year, 0 otherwise.
Scale:	0 (No actual appropriations for the fiscal year) 1 (Recipient)
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Variable is *not* based on two-year averages. Years coded as zero may still show positive values for AID (carry-over funds from previous year).

1.1. Democracy and Governance Assistance

AID100 **Total Democracy and Governance (DG)**

Definition: Total USAID investment for all Democracy and Governance programs. AID100=AID110+AID120+AID130+AID140

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. Only USAID programs (Agency=us_aid in the original database) were included. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

OBL100 **New USAID DG Appropriations During Year**

Definition: Dichotomous indicator coded 1 if the country was recipient of new USAID Democracy and Governance funds during the year, 0 otherwise (based on country-level appropriations).

Scale: 0 (No actual appropriations for the fiscal year) 1 (Recipient)

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Variable is *not* based on two-year averages. Years coded as zero may still show positive values for AID100 (carry-over funds from previous year).

AID110 **DG - Elections and Political Processes**

Definition: USAID investment in Electoral Assistance and Political Party Support programs.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=EPP)

Notes: Average actual appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID120 **DG - Rule of Law**

Definition: USAID investment in programs to strengthen Human Rights and Legal and Judicial Development.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=RoL)

Notes: Average actual appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID121	**DG - Human Rights (Segment of Rule of Law)**
Definition:	USAID investment in activities to strengthen awareness and compliance with human rights. (Part of the Rule of Law sub-sector)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewEACode=DGHR)
Notes:	Average actual appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID122	**DG - Rule of Law (Other than Human Rights)**
Definition:	AID120-AID121
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=RoL)
Notes:	Basically corresponds to judicial development programs. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID130	**DG - Civil Society**
Definition:	USAID investment in activities to strengthen non-governmental organizations (including civic groups, professional associations, and labor unions).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=CivSoc)
Notes:	Average actual appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID131	**DG – Mass Media (Segment of Civil Society)**
Definition:	USAID investment in activities to strengthen the independent media (also counted as part of AID130).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewEACode=DGME)
Notes:	Average actual appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID132	**DG - Civil Society (Non-Media)**
Definition:	AID130-AID131.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=CivSoc)
Notes:	Average actual appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID140	**DG - Governance**
Definition:	USAID investment on other areas of governance, including government transparency and anti-corruption, decentralization, and civil-military relations.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=GGovc)
Notes:	Average actual appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

1.2. Other (Non-DG) Sectors

AID000	**Total Investment in Other Sectors (Non-DG)**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in Non-Democracy and Governance Sectors. AID000=AID200+AID300+AID400+AID500+AID600+AID700+AID800
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. Only USAID programs (Agency="us_aid" in the original database) were included. For transformations of this variable, see Appendix 6.3.

AID200	**Non-DG - Agriculture and Economic Growth**
Definition:	USAID investment in Agriculture and Economic Growth programs (including trade, poverty reduction, market promotion, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Agriculture," "Other Growth, "Poverty Reduct.," "Private Mkts")
Notes:	This is a large category. (On average 39% of total investment, compared to 17% for DG programs).

AID300	**Non-DG - Education**
Definition:	USAID investment in educational programs (adult literacy, basic education, higher education).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Adult Literacy," "Basic Ed," "Higher Ed")
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year.

AID400	**Non-DG - Environment**
Definition:	USAID investment in programs regarding biodiversity, energy, natural resource management, global climate change, and other forms of environmental protection.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Biodiversity," "Energy," "GCC," "NRM," "Other Env," "Urb/PP")
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year.

AID500	**Non-DG - Health**
Definition:	USAID investment in health programs (child survival, HIV/AIDS, infectious diseases, maternal health, population issues, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Child Survival," "HIV/AIDS," "Inf Diseases," "Maternal Health," "Other Health," "Population," "Other Family Planning")
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year.

AID600	**Non-DG - Humanitarian Assistance**
Definition:	USAID investment in humanitarian assistance (disaster assistance, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Humanit Asst" and "OTI")
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year

AID700	**Non-DG - Human Rights**
Definition:	USAID investment in Human Rights programs outside of the DG (rule of law) sector (e.g., programs against trafficking in persons).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Human Rights")
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year.

AID800	**Non-DG - Conflict Management and Mitigation**
Definition:	USAID investment in activities to promote conflict resolution and management.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="CMM")
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year.

1.3. Sources and Composition of Funding

PDAAID **Development Assistance as Percentage of total USAID investment**

Definition: Percentage of country-level funds invested by USAID that belonged to USAID's budget ("Development Assistance"), as opposed to the State Department's budget or other Congressionally-created funding sources.

Scale: Percentage of AID

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Fund="DA")

Notes: If there is no USAID presence in a country, value is set to missing.

PDADG **Development Assistance as Percentage of total DG funds**

Definition: Percentage of country-level invested in Democracy and Governance programs that belonged to USAID's budget, as opposed to the State Department's budget or other Congressionally-created funding sources.

Scale: Percentage of AID100

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Fund="DA")

Notes: If no funds were allocated to any DG programs, value is set to missing.

PDANDG **Development Assistance as Percentage of Non-DG funds**

Definition: Percentage of country-level funds invested in Non-DG programs that belonged to USAID's budget, as opposed to the State Department's budget or other Congressionally-created funding sources.

Scale: Percentage of AID000

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Fund="DA")

Notes: If all funds were allocated to DG programs, value is set to missing.

PDGAID **DG Programs as Percentage of total USAID investment**

Definition: Percentage of total country-level appropriations devoted to Democracy and Governance programs. PDGAID=AID100/AID*100

Scale: Percentage of AID

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: If there is no USAID presence in a country, value is set to missing.

P110 **Portfolio: Elections as Percentage of total DG funds**

Definition: Percentage of country-level DG funds invested in Elections and Political Processes.

Scale: P110=AID110/AID100*100

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: If no DG funds were allocated to the country, value is arbitrarily set to zero.

P120	**Portfolio: Rule of Law as Percentage of total DG funds**
Definition:	Percentage of country-level DG funds invested in Rule of Law programs.
Scale:	P120=AID120/AID100*100
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	If no DG funds were allocated to the country, value is arbitrarily set to zero.

P121	**Portfolio: Human Rights as Percentage of total DG funds**
Definition:	Percentage of country-level DG funds invested in Human Rights programs.
Scale:	P121=AID121/AID100*100
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	AID121 is already contained in AID120, therefore P121≤P120
	If no DG funds were allocated to the country, value is arbitrarily set to zero.

P130	**Portfolio: Civil Society as Percentage of total DG funds**
Definition:	Percentage of country-level DG funds invested in Civil Society programs.
Scale:	P130=AID130/AID100*100
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	If no DG funds were allocated to the country, value is arbitrarily set to zero.

P131	**Portfolio: Media as Percentage of total DG funds**
Definition:	Percentage of country-level DG funds invested in Free Media programs.
Scale:	P131=AID131/AID100*100
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	AID131 is already contained in AID130, therefore P131≤P130
	If no DG funds were allocated to the country, value is arbitrarily set to zero.

P140	**Portfolio: Governance as Percentage of total DG funds**
Definition:	Percentage of country-level DG funds invested in Civil Society programs.
Scale:	P140=AID140/AID100*100
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	If no DG funds were allocated to the country, value is arbitrarily set to zero.

1.4. Regional Programs

RAID100	**Regional Programs in Democracy and Governance (DG)**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in region-wide Democracy and Governance programs. Regional programs make a common pool of funds available to all countries in a particular region. RAID100=RAID110+RAID120+RAID130+RAID140
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Amounts vary across regions and not across countries. Regions are defined according to USAID programs. (See list of regions in Appendix 6.1)

RAID110	**Regional DG - Elections and Political Processes**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide Electoral Assistance and Political Party Support programs.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=EPP)
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID120	**Regional DG - Rule of Law**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide programs to strengthen Human Rights and Legal and Judicial Development.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=RoL)
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID121	**Regional DG - RL - Human Rights**
Definition:	USAID investment in regional-wide activities to strengthen awareness and compliance with human rights. (Mostly part of the Rule of Law sub-sector)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewEACode=DGHR)
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID130	**Regional DG - Civil Society**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide activities to strengthen non-governmental organizations (including civic groups, professional associations, and labor unions).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	Data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=CivSoc)
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID140	**Regional DG – Governance**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide governance programs, including government transparency and anti-corruption, decentralization, and civil-military relations.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=GGovc)
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID000	**Total Regional Investment in Other Sectors (Non-DG)**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in region-wide programs for other sectors. RAID000=RAID200+RAID300+RAID400+RAID500+RAID600+ +RAID700+RAID800
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID200	**Regional Non-DG - Agriculture and Economic Growth**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide Agriculture and Economic Growth programs (including trade, poverty reduction, market promotion, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Agriculture," "Other Growth, "Poverty Reduct.," "Private Mkts")
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID300	**Regional Non-DG - Education**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide educational programs (adult literacy, basic education, higher education).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Adult Literacy," "Basic Ed," "Higher Ed")
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID400	**Regional Non-DG - Environment**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide programs regarding biodiversity, energy, natural resource management, global climate change, and other forms of environmental protection.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	Data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Biodiversity," "Energy," "GCC," "NRM," "Other Env," "Urb/PP")
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID500	**Regional Non-DG - Health**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide health programs (child survival, HIV/AIDS, infectious diseases, maternal health, population issues, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Child Survival," "HIV/AIDS," "Inf Diseases," "Maternal Health," "Other Health," "Population," "Other Family Planning")
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID600	**Regional Non-DG - Humanitarian Assistance**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide humanitarian assistance (disasters, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Humanit Asst" and "OTI")
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID700	**Regional Non-DG - Human Rights**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide Human Rights programs outside of the DG (rule of law) sector (e.g., programs against trafficking in persons).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Human Rights")
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

RAID800	**Regional Non-DG - Conflict Management and Mitigation**
Definition:	USAID investment in region-wide activities to promote conflict resolution and management.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="CMM")
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

NR	**Number of Countries in the Region**
Definition:	Total number of countries considered to be part of the region (including those that do not receive USAID funds but are potentially eligible).
Scale:	N
Source:	Relevant geographic regions are determined by USAID offices and programs. UN standard geographic regions were adjusted to classify countries not included in USAID programs.
Notes:	See list of regions in Appendix 6.1.

1.5. Sub-Regional Programs

SAID100	**Subregional Programs in Democracy and Governance (DG)**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in subregional Democracy and Governance programs. Subregional programs make a common pool of funds available to all countries in a particular geographic area (smaller than a region). SAID100=SAID110+SAID120+SAID130+SAID140
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Amounts vary across sub-regions and not across countries. See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID110	**Subregional DG - Elections and Political Processes**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional programs for Electoral Assistance and Political Party Support.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=EPP)
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID120	**Subregional DG - Rule of Law**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional programs to strengthen Human Rights and Legal and Judicial Development.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=RoL)
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID121	**Subregional DG - RL - Human Rights**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional activities to strengthen awareness and compliance with human rights. (Mostly part of the Rule of Law sub-sector)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	Data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewEACode=DGHR)
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID130	**Subregional DG - Civil Society**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional programs to strengthen non-governmental organizations (including civic groups, professional associations, and labor unions).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=CivSoc)
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID140	**Subregional DG – Governance**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional governance programs, including government transparency and anti-corruption, decentralization, and civil-military relations.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector=GGovc)
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID000	**Total Subregional Investment in Other Sectors (Non-DG)**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in region-wide programs for other sectors. SAID000=SAID200+SAID300+SAID400+SAID500+SAID600+ +SAID700+SAID800
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID200	**Subregional Non-DG - Agriculture and Economic Growth**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional Agriculture and Economic Growth programs (including trade, poverty reduction, market promotion, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Agriculture," "Other Growth, "Poverty Reduct.," "Private Mkts")
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID300	**Subregional Non-DG - Education**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional educational programs (adult literacy, basic education, higher education).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Adult Literacy," "Basic Ed," "Higher Ed")
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID400	**Subregional Non-DG - Environment**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional programs on environmental protection.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Biodiversity," "Energy," "GCC," "NRM," "Other Env," "Urb/PP")
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID500	**Subregional Non-DG - Health**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional health programs (child survival, HIV/AIDS, infectious diseases, maternal health, population issues, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Child Survival," "HIV/AIDS," "Inf Diseases," "Maternal Health," "Other Health," "Population," "Other Family Planning")
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID600	**Subregional Non-DG - Humanitarian Assistance**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional humanitarian assistance (disasters, etc.)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Humanit Asst" and "OTI")
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID700	**Subregional Non-DG - Human Rights**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional Human Rights programs outside of the DG (rule of law) sector (e.g., programs against trafficking in persons).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="Human Rights")
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

SAID800	**Subregional Non-DG - Conflict Management and Mitigation**
Definition:	USAID investment in subregional activities to promote conflict resolution.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (NewSubsector="CMM")
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

NS	**Number of Countries in the Sub-Region**
Definition:	Total number of countries considered to be part of the sub-region (including those that do not receive USAID funds but are potentially eligible).
Scale:	N
Source:	Relevant geographic sub-regions are determined by USAID offices and programs. UN standard geographic sub-regions were used to classify countries not included in USAID programs.
Notes:	See list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1.

RSAID100	**Regional and Sub-Regional Funding "Available" for Democracy and Governance Programs.**
Definition:	Funds available for DG programs at the regional or sub-regional level for the average country in a given geographic area. RSAID100=(RAID100/NR)+(SAID100/NS)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average.
Source:	See components above.
Notes:	Values are constant for all countries in the same sub-region (see list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1). **RSAID1G** is grand-mean centered variable. For additional transformations of RSAID1 see Appendix 6.3.

RSAID000	**Regional and Sub-Regional Funding "Available" for Non-Democracy and Governance Programs.**
Definition:	Funds available for Non-DG programs at the regional or sub-regional level for the average country in a given geographic area. RSAID000=(RAID000/NR)+(SAID000/NS)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average.
Source:	See components above.
Notes:	Values are constant for all countries in the same sub-region (see list of sub-regions in Appendix 6.1). **RSAID0G** is grand-mean centered variable. For additional transformations of RSAID0 see Appendix 6.3.

1.6. Yearly Appropriations

AK100	**Total Democracy and Governance (Actual Yearly Appropriations)**
Definition:	Total USAID investment for all Democracy and Governance programs. AK100=AK110+AK120+AK130+AK140
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Values represent yearly appropriations, not two-year averages.

AK110	**DG - Elections and Political Processes (Actual Yearly Appropriations)**
Definition:	USAID investment in Electoral Assistance and Political Party Support programs.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=EPP)
Notes:	Values represent yearly appropriations, not two-year averages

AK120	**DG - Rule of Law (Actual Yearly Appropriations)**
Definition:	USAID investment in programs to strengthen Human Rights and Legal and Judicial Development.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=RoL)
Notes:	Values represent yearly appropriations, not two-year averages

AK121	**DG - Human Rights (Actual Yearly Appropriations)**
Definition:	USAID investment in activities to strengthen awareness and compliance with human rights. (Part of the Rule of Law sub-sector)
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewEACode=DGHR)
Notes:	Values represent yearly appropriations, not two-year averages

AK130	**DG - Civil Society (Actual Yearly Appropriations)**
Definition:	USAID investment in activities to strengthen non-governmental organizations (including civic groups, professional associations, and labor unions).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=CivSoc)
Notes:	Values represent yearly appropriations, not two-year averages

AK131	**DG – Mass Media (Actual Yearly Appropriations)**
Definition:	USAID investment in activities to strengthen the independent media (also counted as part of AK130).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewEACode=DGME)
Notes:	Values represent yearly appropriations, not two-year averages

AK140	**DG – Governance (Actual Yearly Appropriations)**
Definition:	USAID investment on other areas of governance, including government transparency and anti-corruption, decentralization, and civil-military relations.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green (Funds are identified in the USAID database by code NewSubsector=GGovc)
Notes:	Values represent yearly appropriations, not two-year averages

Note: On transformations of AID variables (lags, centered values, etc.) see Appendix 6.3

2. Measures of Democratic Development

2.1. General Democracy and Governance

DG01 **Combined Polity IV Score (Revised version)**

Definition: A general measure of democratization, the combined Polity score is computed by subtracting the autocracy (0-10) score from the democracy (0-10) score. These scores reflect the competitiveness and openness of executive recruitment, the competitiveness and regulation of political participation, and the constraints on the chief executive. (For definitions of these components, see Marshall and Jaggers 2002).

Scale: +10 (strongly democratic) to -10 (strongly autocratic)

Source: POLITY2 item (Marshall, Jaggers, and Gurr 2005)

Notes: Revised Polity scores (POLITY2 item) recode transitional "standardized authority scores" (i.e., -66, -77, and -88) to conventional polity values in the -10–10 range. Regime transitions (-88) are linearly prorated across the span of the transition; cases of foreign intervention (-66) are treated as system missing; and cases of "interregnum" or anarchy (-77), are converted to a "neutral" score of 0 (Marshall and Jaggers 2002, 15-16). Variable **DG01I** had other missing values imputed using the EM model in Appendix 6.4

DG02 **Freedom House Index**

Definition: Based on a checklist, Freedom House rates the presence of political rights (see EL01 below) and civil liberties (RL01) in 192 countries. Scores for the two variables range from 1 to 7, with 7 being the lowest level of freedoms in each case (Freedom House 2004b). Following the standard procedure, we combined the two scores into a single index of liberal democracy:

$$DG02 = 15 - (EL01+RL01).$$

Scale: 1-13 (with 1 representing the lowest and 13 the highest level of freedoms).

Source: PR and CL items (Freedom House 2005)

Notes: The periodicity of Freedom House reports was uneven in the 1980s. As a rule, we assumed that scores reflected the situation of a country in the year prior to the publication of the report. The only exception was 1982: scores for 1982 were computed as the average of scores in the reports covering January 1981-August 1982, and August 1982-November 1983. Variable **DG02I** had missing values imputed using the EM model in Appendix 6.4

DG03	**Vanhanen Index**
Definition:	Vanhanen's index of democratization is created by multiplying the competition (EL02) and the participation (EL03) variables and then dividing the outcome by 100.
Scale:	0-100 (where 0 means least democratic).
Source:	Q[y]_3 (Vanhanen 2003)
Notes:	

DG04	**"Free" Status (Freedom House)**
Definition:	Country is rated as "Free" (i.e., with a combined score lower than 3) by Freedom House that year.
Scale:	0 (Not Free or Partially Free), 1 (Free)
Source:	Status item (Freedom House 2005)
Notes:	

DG05	**Democracy Status (Polity)**
Definition:	Countries with a combined Polity score greater than 5.
Scale:	0 (DG01<6), 1 (DG01>5)
Source:	DG01
Notes:	

DG06	**Trichotomous Freedom House Scale**
Definition:	"Each pair of political rights and civil liberties ratings is averaged to determine an overall status of 'Free,' 'Partly Free,' or 'Not Free.' Those 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 House 2004b)
Scale:	1. Not Free 2. Partially Free 3. Free
Source:	See EL01 and RL01 (Freedom House 2005)
Notes:	Equivalent coding in terms of DG02 scale is: 1-4 NF; 5-9 PF; 10-13 F Variable **DG06L** indicates lag (t-1)

DG07 **Democratic Accountability (ICRG)**

Definition: "This is a measure of how responsive a government is to its people, on the basis that the less responsive it is, the more likely it is that the government will fall, peacefully in a democratic society, but possibly violently in a non-democratic one. The points in this component are awarded on the basis of the type of governance enjoyed by the country in question" (ICRG 2006). Five types of governance reflect the existence of free and fair elections, a legitimate political party system, government terms limits, a balance of power, political competition, and personal liberties.

Scale: 0-6, where scores map into types of governance as follows:

0.0-2.5 – Autarchies. (Leadership of the state by a group or single person, without being subject to any franchise).

3.0-3.5 – De-facto one party states. (The government has served more than two successive terms, and the political system is distorted to ensure domination by a particular group).

4.0 – De-jure one party states. (Only one governing party and lack of any legally recognized political opposition. ICRG considers those systems less volatile than *de-facto* one-party states).

4.5 – Dominated democracies. (The elected government has served more than two successive terms).

5.0-6.0 – Alternating democracies. (Regular alternation in power, free and fair elections, more than one political party and viable opposition, check and balances, independent judiciary, personal liberties).

Source: Item *Democratic Accountability* (ICRG 2006).

Notes: This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). ICRG collects information from a network of between 75 and 125 country specialists on a quarterly basis. The reports are checked by country and regional managers, and subjective information is then translated into the scale (Christopher McKee, personal communication, December 15, 2006). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without permission of the authors.

DG08 **ACLP Classification of Political Regimes**

Definition: Classification of political regimes developed by Przeworski et al. (2000). A country is considered democratic if (1) the chief executive is elected; (2) the legislature is elected; (3) more than one party competes in elections; and (4) there is alternation of the ruling party in power (Przeworski et al. 2000, 14-30). All other cases are treated as dictatorships.

Scale: 0 Democracy; 1 Dictatorship

Source: Item *Regime* in the Cheibub-Ghandi dataset (Cheibub and Ghandi 2004)

Notes: Przeworski et al data were extended by Cheibub and Ghandi to 2002. We updated (following their rules) the information until 2004.

DG09 **Cheibub-Ghandi Classification of Political Regimes**

Definition: Based on the ACLP dichotomous measure of democracy, Cheibub and Ghandi developed a nominal measure of regime type including three types of democracy and three types of dictatorship. According to this classification, democracies "in which governments cannot be removed by the assembly are presidential. Systems in which they can, are either parliamentary (when only the assembly is allowed to remove the government) or mixed (when both the assembly and the elected president can remove the government)" (Cheibub and Ghandi 2004, 14). Non-democracies are coded as monarchies when the effective head of the government is a monarch (and there is hereditary succession), as military when the head of the government is a current or former military officer, and as civilian otherwise.

Scale: 0. Parliamentary Democracy
1. Mixed Democracy
2. Presidential Democracy
3. Civilian Dictatorship
4. Military Dictatorship
5. Monarchy

Source: Item HINST in the Cheibub-Ghandi dataset (Cheibub and Ghandi 2004)

Notes: We updated the information for 2002-2004.

DG10 **Transitions to Democracy**

Definition: Dichotomous variable coded as 1 in years when the country moved from dictatorship to democracy, 0 otherwise.

Scale: 0 No transition; 1 Transition to democracy

Source: Coding was based on DG08

Notes:

DG11 **Years since Transition to Democracy (up to 7)**

Definition: Number of years since the last transition to democracy took place. (Time count stops after year 7, and variable returns to 0).

Scale: Number of years (up to seven) since the last transition to democracy

Source: Coding was based on DG08

Notes: A value of 0 indicates that no transition to democracy took place in the last seven years, irrespective of the existing type of regime.

2.2. Elections and Electoral Processes

EL01 **Political Rights (Freedom House)**

Definition: Based on a twelve-item checklist, Freedom House rates the presence of political rights in 192 countries. The checklist deals with three major issues: transparency of the electoral process; political pluralism and participation; and government transparency and accountability. Lowest scores reflect better conditions. "Countries and territories that receive a rating of 1 for political rights come closest to the ideals suggested by the checklist questions, beginning with free and fair elections. Those who are elected rule, there are competitive parties or other political groupings, and the opposition plays an important role and has actual power. Minority groups have reasonable self-government or can participate in the government…" (For the actual checklist, see Freedom House 2004b)

Scale: 1-7 (with 1 representing the highest and 7 the lowest level of rights).

Source: PR item (Freedom House 2005)

Notes: Disaggregated scores for checklist are never supplied by Freedom House.

EL02 **Index of Electoral Competition (Vanhanen)**

Definition: "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. Depending on their importance, either parliamentary or presidential elections are used in the calculation of the variable, or both elections are used, with weights" (Vanhanen 2003).

Scale: 0-100 (where 0 means that ruling party "won" one hundred percent of the votes).

Source: Q[y]_1 (Vanhanen 2003)

Notes: Coding favors multiparty parliamentary systems. If there are no elections, score is set at zero.

EL03 **Index of Participation (Vanhanen)**

Definition: "The political participation variable portrays the voting turnout in each election, and is calculated as the percentage of the total population who actually voted in the election. (…) National referendums raise the variable value by five percent and state referendums by one percent for the year they are held. Referendums can increase the degree of participation at maximum by 30 percent a year. The value of the combined degree of participation cannot be higher than 70 percent, even in cases where the sum of participation and referendums would be higher than 70" (Vanhanen 2003).

Scale: 0-100 (where 0 means that no elections are held or that a trivial minority is allowed to cast a vote).

Source: Q[y]_2 (Vanhanen 2003)

Notes: Compulsory vote may affect turnout (numerator); age composition of the population may affect denominator. Index seems to capture gender exclusion.

EL04 **Legislative Index of Electoral Competitiveness (DPI)**

Definition: Measures pluralism in the composition of the legislative body (Keefer 2005, 14-15).

Scale:
1. No legislature
2. Unelected legislature
3. Elected, one candidate
4. One party, multiple candidates
5. Multiple parties are legal but only one party won seats
6. Multiple parties won seats but the largest party received more than 75 percent of the seats.
7. The largest party got less than 75 percent of the seats

Source: LIEC item (Beck et al. 2005)

Notes: Similar index available for the executive branch (presumably regarding votes)

EL05 **Electoral Fraud and Intimidation (DPI)**

Definition: Captures electoral irregularities in the form of fraud or intimidation (if they were serious enough to affect the outcome of elections). Fraud is coded if allegations were backed by international observers but *also* if the opposition just claimed that fraudulent elections occurred. In any year, coding refers to most recent election (Keefer 2005, 17).

Scale: 0. Elections were fair *or* there was no fraud because opposition was banned.
1. Opposition was legal but suppressed through fraud or intimidation.

Source: FRAUD item (Beck et al. 2005)

Notes: A score of 0 may mean that fraud does not exist either because the last election was fair, or because opposition parties are legally banned.

EL06 **Political Discrimination of Minorities (MAR)**

Definition: Captures "the role of public policy and social practice in maintaining or redressing political inequalities" among communal groups in the country (Davenport 2003, 36-37). The Minorities at Risk project codes discrimination policies against specific groups. Values for countries during particular years represent the average score across all groups.

Scale:
0. No discrimination.
1. Neglect/Remedial policies: Substantial under representation of some minorities in political office and/or participation due to historical neglect or restrictions. Explicit public policies are designed to protect or improve the group's political status.
2. Neglect/No remedial policies: Substantial under representation due to historical neglect or restrictions. No social practice of deliberate exclusion. No formal exclusion. No evidence of protective or remedial public policies.
3. Social exclusion/Neutral policy: Substantial under representation due to prevailing social practice by dominant groups. Formal public policies toward the group are neutral or, if positive, inadequate to offset discriminatory policies.
4. Exclusion/Repressive policy: Public policies substantially restrict the group's political participation by comparison with other groups.

Source: POLDIS item (Minorities at Risk Project 2004)

Notes: Values represent mean for all minority groups, thus the variable behaves as a continuous scale. Missing data for a large proportion of observations (about 50 percent is coded as -99 "No basis for judgment").

EL07 **Restrictions on Voting Rights for Minorities (MAR)**

Definition: Captures restrictions on voting rights against specific groups in the country (Davenport 2003, 37-38). The Minorities at Risk project codes voting discrimination policies at the group level. Values for countries during particular years represent the average score for all groups.

Scale:
0. Not restricted
1. Voting moderately restricted
2. Voting prohibited

Source: POLIC5 item (Minorities at Risk Project 2004)

Notes: Values represent mean for all minority groups, thus the variable behaves as a continuous scale. Missing data for a large proportion of observations (about 50 percent is coded as -99 "No basis for judgment").

EL08	**Women's Political Rights (CIRI)**
Definition:	"Women's political rights include (…) the right to vote, the right to run for political office, the right to hold elected and appointed government positions, the right to join political parties, and the right to petition government officials" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 32).
Scale:	0. Laws overtly restrict the participation of women in the political process. 1. Equality is guaranteed by law, but significant limitations in practice: Women hold less than five percent of seats in the national legislature and other high ranking positions. 2. 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. Equality 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.
Source:	(Cingranelli and Richards 2006)
Notes:	Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Section 3: Respect for Political Rights).

EL09	**Registered Voters as Percentage of VAP (IDEA)**
Definition:	Citizens registered to vote for the last election as a share of the estimated population of voting age (VAP).
Scale:	0-100 (%)
Source:	(International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance 2004)
Notes:	

EL10	**Voter Turnout as Percentage of VAP (IDEA)**
Definition:	Citizens who voted in the last election as a share of the estimated population of voting age (VAP).
Scale:	0-100 (%)
Source:	(International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance 2004)
Notes:	Figures average last presidential and parliamentary elections (if non-concurrent).

EL11 **Right of Suffrage (Paxton, Bollen, Lee, and Kim)**

Definition: Estimate of the "percentage of the adult population (twenty or older) who are eligible to vote in a given year. (…) The formal or constitutional statement of franchise is not taken as meaningful unless the population actually has the opportunity to vote" (Paxton et al. 2003, 94-95)

Scale: 0-100 (where 0 means full exclusion and 100, universal franchise). A score of zero is given if the executive and legislative branches were not elected, or if there have not been any elections for 8 years.

Source: Appendix B (Paxton et al. 2003)

Notes: For the 1990s, bimodal distribution with 14 percent of the valid observations (n=240) with values of 0 (no elections) and 85 percent (n=1452) with values greater than 90%.

EL12 **Competitiveness of Participation (Polity IV)**

Definition: "Extent to which alternative preferences for policy and leadership can be pursued in the political arena" (Marshall and Jaggers 2002, 25).

Scale:
1. Repressed: No significant opposition is permitted.
2. Suppressed: The regime limits the forms and extent of opposition by excluding substantial social groups or parties from participation.
3. Factional: Polities with parochial or ethnic-based political factions (lack common, secular, or cross-cutting agendas).
4. Transitional: From Restricted or Factional patterns to fully Competitive patterns, or vice versa.
5. Competitive: Secular political groups regularly compete for political influence at the national level; ruling parties regularly transfer power to competing groups.
0. *Not Applicable*. No structured patterns of competition. Neither enduring political organizations nor controls on political activity. Intermittent factions may form around leaders, ethnic or clan groups, etc.

Source: (Marshall, Jaggers, and Gurr 2004)

Notes: Category 0 applied to 21 observations (0.9%); we treated them as missing.

EL13 **Legislative Weight of the Opposition Parties (DPI)**

Definition: Herfindahl index of opposition parties (the sum of the squared seat shares of all opposition parties in the legislature). Blank if there is no parliament, if opposition party seats are unknown, or if there are no opposition parties in the legislature (Keefer 2005, 10).

Scale: 0-1 (where 0 means that opposition has no seats and 1 that a single opposition party controls all the seats in the legislature)

Source: HERFOPP item (Beck et al. 2005)

Notes:

EL14 **Legislative Effectiveness (Banks)**

Definition: Ordinal scale indicating the relative leverage of the legislature (if any) in the political process.

Scale: 0. No legislature exists.
1. Ineffective. Legislature is a "rubber stamp;" turmoil makes the implementation of legislation impossible; or the executive prevents the legislature's exercise of its functions.
2. Partially Effective. The executive outweighs, but does not completely dominate the legislature.
3. Effective. Typically includes substantial legislative authority over taxation and spending, and the power to override executive vetoes.

Source: S22F4 item (Banks 2004)

Notes: "It may be noted that the data in field S19F3 are substantively similar to the data in field S22F4. The two data sets are not, however, identical. They were initially coded at different times and incorporated into the file as components of different sub-files. Nonetheless, it is anticipated that the contents of field S19F3 of this segment will, at some future date, be deleted for reason of redundancy" (Banks 2005, 15).

EL15 **Index of Free and Fair Elections**

Definition: Aggregate index reflecting the degree of respect for free and fair electoral procedures. Scores are based on a factor analysis of items EL02, EL04, EL08, EL12, DG07.

Scale: T score for factor analysis: a value of 50 represents the performance of the average country-year in our sample. Scores approaching 100 indicate high respect for free speech; scores approaching 0 indicate low press freedom.

Source: See entries for components.

Notes: Index includes most reliable measures with wide coverage; does not reflect levels of participation (e.g., EL03, EL09, EL10). The definition of the index was modified from Phase 1 of the project, eliminating EL01 to avoid overlap with Freedom House scores, and adding ICRG information (DG07). Variable **EL15G** is the item centered at its grand mean. **EL15L** is the item lagged (t-1) and **EL15Z** is lagged *and* grand mean deviated.

2.3. Rule of Law

2.3.1. General Measures

RL01 **Civil Liberties (Freedom House)**

Definition: Based on a fifteen-item checklist, Freedom House rates the presence of civil liberties in 192 countries. The checklist deals with four issues: freedom of expression and belief; rights of association; rule of law; and personal autonomy and individual rights. Lowest scores reflect better conditions. "Countries and territories that receive a rating of 1 come closest to the ideals expressed in the civil liberties checklist, including freedom of expression, assembly, association, education, and religion. They are distinguished by an established and generally equitable system of rule of law. Countries and territories with this rating enjoy free economic activity and tend to strive for equality of opportunity" (for the checklist, see Freedom House 2004b)

Scale: 1-7 (with 1 representing the highest and 7 the lowest level of liberties).

Source: CL item (Freedom House 2005)

Notes: Disaggregated scores for checklist are never supplied by Freedom House.

RL02 **Freedom of the Press - Ordinal (Freedom House)**

Definition: Freedom House measures (threats to) press freedoms in 192 countries. The index comprises three dimensions: the legal environment (constitutional rights; media regulations, etc.); the political environment (harassment, official censorship and self-censorship); and the economic environment (media ownership; concentration; manipulation of advertising, etc.).

Scale: 1. Not Free; 2. Partly Free; 3. Free

Source: (Freedom House 2004c)

Notes: For 1979-1992, only a trichotomous scale (Free; Partly Free; Not Free) is available.

RL03 **Freedom of the Press - Interval (Freedom House)**

Definition: Freedom House measures (threats to) press freedoms in 192 countries. The index comprises three dimensions: the legal environment (constitutional rights; media regulations, etc.); the political environment (harassment, official censorship and self-censorship); and the economic environment (media ownership; concentration; manipulation of advertising, etc.).

Scale: 0-100 ("Countries scoring 0 to 30 are regarded as having 'Free' media, 31 to 60, 'Partly Free' media, and 61 to 100, 'Not Free' media").

Source: (Freedom House 2004c)

Notes: Interval measure starts in 1993. For 1979-1992, only the trichotomous scale (RL02) is available.

RL04 **Freedom of Speech and Press (CIRI)**

Definition: "Indicates the extent to which freedoms of speech and press are affected by government censorship, including ownership of media outlets" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 16). Includes radio, TV, Internet, and news agencies.

Scale:
0. Complete government censorship and/or ownership of the media. Denies citizens freedom of speech, and does not allow the printing or broadcasting media to express opposing views that challenge the policies of the existing government.
1. Some government censorship. Government places some restrictions yet does allow limited rights to freedom of speech and the press.
2. No government censorship. Freedom to speak freely and to print opposing opinions without the fear of prosecution.

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec.2, Subsection A).

RL05 **Respect for Women's Social Rights (CIRI)**

Definition: "Women's social rights include (…) the rights to equal inheritance; to enter into marriage on a basis of equality with men; to travel abroad; to obtain a passport; to confer citizenship to children or a husband; to initiate a divorce; to own, acquire, manage, and retain property brought into marriage; to participate in social, cultural, and community activities; to an education; to choose a residence; freedom from female genital mutilation; and freedom from forced sterilization" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 40).

Scale:
0. No social rights for women under law. The government tolerates a high level of discrimination against women.
1. Some social rights for women under law. In practice, the government does not enforce these laws effectively and tolerates a moderate level of discrimination against women.
2. Social rights for women under law. The government enforces these laws effectively, but it still tolerates a low level of discrimination against women.
3. All or nearly all of women's social rights are guaranteed by law. The government enforces these laws, tolerating almost no discrimination against women.

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 5).

RL06 **Equal Legal Protection for Minorities (MAR)**

Definition: Captures unequal protection of legal rights for different groups in the country (Davenport 2003, 30). The Minorities at Risk project codes how specific groups compare to the dominant group in the country. Values for countries during particular years represent the average score for all groups.

Scale: 0. No differential across groups in terms of legal protection
1. Some indeterminate differential
2. Significant differential

Source: POLDIFX6 item (Minorities at Risk Project 2004)

Notes: Values represent mean for all minority groups, thus the variable behaves as a continuous scale. Missing data for 51% of the observations (-99 "No basis for judgment" n=1137).

RL07 **Rights in Judicial Proceedings for Minorities (MAR)**

Definition: Captures unequal treatment in judicial proceedings for members of different groups (Davenport 2003, 37). The Minorities at Risk project codes how members of specific groups are treated. Values for countries during particular years represent the average score for all groups in the dataset.

Scale: 0. Rights in judicial proceedings are not restricted for any group
1. Rights in judicial proceedings moderately restricted
2. Rights in judicial proceedings are restricted

Source: POLIC3 item (Minorities at Risk Project 2004)

Notes: Values represent mean for all minority groups, thus the variable behaves as a continuous scale. Missing data for a large proportion of observations (about 50 percent is coded as -99 "No basis for judgment").

RL08 **Political or Extrajudicial Killings (CIRI)**

Definition: "Extrajudicial killings are killings by government officials without due process of law. These killings may result from the deliberate, illegal, and excessive use of lethal force by the police, security forces, or other agents of the state whether against criminal suspects, detainees, prisoners, or others. (…) A victim of politically motivated killing is someone who was killed by a government or its agents as a result of his or her involvement in political activities or for supporting the political actions of opposition movements against the existing government" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 8).

Scale: 0. Frequent political or extrajudicial killings (50 or more during the year, or described by sources as "gross," "widespread," "systematic," etc.)
1. Occasional political or extrajudicial killings (1 to 49 episodes per year)
2. Have not occurred

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 1, subsections A and C), and Amnesty International reports.

RL09 **Disappearances (CIRI)**

Definition: "Disappearances are cases in which people have disappeared, political motivation appears likely, and the victims (the disappeared) have not been found. In most instances, disappearances occur because of a victim's ethnicity, religion, or race or because of the victim's political involvement or knowledge of information sensitive to authorities" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 10).

Scale: 0. Frequent disappearances (50 or more during the year, or described by sources as "gross," "widespread," "systematic," etc.)
1. Occasional disappearances (1 to 49 episodes per year)
2. Have not occurred

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 1, subsection B), and Amnesty International reports.

RL10 **Torture and other Cruel, Inhumane, or Degrading Treatment (CIRI)**

Definition: "Torture refers to the purposeful inflicting of extreme pain, whether mental or physical, by government officials or by private individuals at the instigation of government officials. Torture includes the use of physical and other force by police and prison guards that is cruel, inhuman, or degrading" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 12).

Scale: 0. Frequent cases of torture (50 or more during the year, or described by sources as "gross," "widespread," "systematic," etc.)
1. Occasional torture (1 to 49 episodes per year)
2. Have not occurred

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 1, subsection C), and Amnesty International reports.

RL11 **Political Imprisonment (CIRI)**

Definition: "Political imprisonment refers to the incarceration of people by government officials because of their speech; their non-violent opposition to government policies or leaders; their religious beliefs; their non- violent religious practices including proselytizing; or their membership in a group, including an ethnic or racial group" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 14).

Scale: 0. Many political prisoners (50 or more during the year, or described by sources as "extensive," "widespread," "systematic," etc.)
1. Few political prisoners (1 to 49 episodes per year)
2. Have not occurred

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 1, subsections D and E), and Amnesty International reports.

RL12 **Political Terror Scale (Gibney)**

Definition: Captures the extent of political repression in 179 countries since 1980.

Scale:
1. Countries under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their view; torture is rare or exceptional. Political murders are extremely rare.
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.
3. There is extensive political imprisonment, or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without a trial, for political views is accepted.
4. The practices of level 3 are expanded to larger numbers. 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.
5. The terrors of level 4 have been 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.

Source: Items *a* (score based on Amnesty International reports) and *s* (score based on State Department reports) (Gibney 2005)

Notes: Values reflect average of items *a* and *s*. Separate components are preserved in the dataset under variable labels **RL12A** (Amnesty) and **RL12S** (State).

RL13 **Rule of Law (World Bank Institute)**

Definition: This index combines multiple 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" (Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2003; Kaufmann, Kraay, and Zoido-Lobatón 1999). Estimations for the overall project are based on 37 sources from 31 different organizations.

Scale: Z score for the Unobserved Component Model (UCM). Virtually all scores lie between -2.5 and 2.5 (higher scores correspond to better outcomes).

Source: Governance Matters project. Estimate point for "rule of law"(Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2005).

Notes: Estimates available only for 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004.

RL14 **Freedom of Expression (MAR)**

Definition: Captures restrictions to the right of free expression affecting specific groups in the country (Davenport 2003, 37). The Minorities at Risk project codes censorship policies at the group level. Values for countries during particular years represent the average score for all groups.

Scale: 0. Not restricted
1. Free expression moderately restricted
2. Free expression prohibited

Source: POLIC1 item (Minorities at Risk Project 2004)

Notes: Values represent mean for all minority groups, thus the variable behaves as a continuous scale. Missing data for a large proportion of observations (about 50 percent is coded as -99 "No basis for judgment").

RL15 **Index of Respect for Human Integrity**

Definition: Aggregate index reflecting the degree of respect for human integrity. Scores are based on a factor analysis of items reflecting gross human rights violations (RL08, RL09, RL10, RL11, and RL12).

Scale: T score for factor analysis (mean=50, s.d.=10). A value of 50 represents the performance of the average country-year in our sample. Scores approaching 100 indicate high respect for human rights; scores approaching 0 indicate low respect for human integrity.

Source: See entries for RL08, RL09, RL10, RL11, and RL12

Notes: **RL15G** is item centered at its grand mean (only for eligible countries), **RL15L** is item lagged (t-1) **RL15Z** is lagged and grand-mean centered.

RL16 **Index of Freedom of the Press**

Definition: Aggregate index reflecting the degree of respect for free speech and freedom of the press. Scores are based on a factor analysis of items RL02, RL03, RL04, and RL14.

Scale: T score for factor analysis: a value of 50 represents the performance of the average country-year in our sample. Scores approaching 100 indicate high respect for free speech; scores approaching 0 indicate low press freedom.

Source: See entries for RL02, RL03, RL04, and RL14

Notes: RL03 and RL14 were inverted before computing factor scores, so that negative values indicate less freedom. **RL16G** is item centered at its grand mean (only for eligible countries), **RL16L** is item lagged (t-1) **RL16Z** is lagged and grand-mean centered.

RL17 **Law and Order Index (ICRG)**

Definition: This index estimates "the degree to which the citizens of the country are willing to accept the established institutions to make and implement laws and adjudicate disputes" (Henisz 2006). It combines two sub-components. "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" (ICRG 2006).

Scale: Each sub-component ranges from 0 to 3, creating a combined scale that ranges from 0 to 6. The higher the score, the stronger law and order.

Source: *Law & Order* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item is a component of the ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). ICRG collects information from a network of between 75 and 125 country specialists on a quarterly basis. Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization.

RL18 **Judicial Independence (POLCON)**

Definition: Independent judiciary refers to the joint existence of at least a score of 3 in POLITY executive constraints variable (XCONST) and of at least 4 in ICRG Law & Order indicator (Henisz 2006).

Scale: 0. Non independent judiciary; Independent judiciary

Source: Item J (Henisz 2006)

Notes:

RL19 **Judicial Independence (Keith and Tate)**

Definition: This variable documents the level of independence in the Judiciary, as reported by the *Annual Human Rights Reports* of the Department of State (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor).

Scale:
0. Non-Independent Judiciary: The judiciary is described as non-independent; as having significant levels of executive influence or interference, or as having high levels of corruption.
1. Somewhat Independent Judiciary: The judiciary is described as somewhat independent, with pressure from the executive branch "at times," or with occasional reports of corruption.
2. Independent Judiciary: The judiciary is described as "generally independent" or as independent in practice with no mention of corruption or outside influences.

Source: *Annual Human Rights Reports* of the U.S. Department of State (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor)

Notes: **RL19B** is equivalent variable coded by Cingranelli and Richards. **RL19G** is the Keith and Tate item centered at grand mean (for eligible countries).

2.3.2. Constitutional Provisions Protecting Political Freedoms and Rights

RL20 **Freedom of Speech (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions concerning freedom of speech.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL21 **Freedom of Association (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions regarding freedom of association.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL22 **Freedom of Assembly (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions protecting the freedom of assembly.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL23 **Freedom of the Press (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions concerning the freedom of press.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL24 **Freedom of Religion (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions protecting religious freedom.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL25 **Freedom to Strike (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions concerning freedom to go on strike.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL26 **Fair Trial (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: Existence of constitutional provisions guaranteeing a fair trial.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL27 **Writ of Habeas Corpus (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: Reflects any constitutional requirement that the government presents evidence before a judge or a magistrate in order to hold a prisoner, and that it makes the charges against the prisoner known.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL28 **Public Trial (Constitutional Right)**

Definition: Existence of constitutional provisions guaranteeing a public trial.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL29 **Constitutional Ban against Torture or Cruel or Unusual Punishment**

Definition: Existence of constitutional provisions banning torture or inhumane treatment.

Scale:
0. Not mentioned in the constitution
1. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution but with exceptions or qualifications, such as a public interest clause
2. Explicitly guaranteed or mentioned in the constitution

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

2.3.3. Constitutional Provisions Protecting Judicial Independence

RL30 **Guaranteed Terms for Judges (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutionally guaranteed terms of office for judges (regardless of whether they are appointed or elected), and restrictive criteria for the removal of judges.

Scale:
0. Constitution does not provide for guaranteed terms for the judiciary
1. Constitution provides for guaranteed terms for the judiciary somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution provides for guaranteed terms for the judiciary fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL31 **Judicial Decisions are Final (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that the decisions of judges are not subject to any revision outside any regular appeals procedure as provided by law.

Scale:
0. Constitution does not ensure that judicial decisions are final
1. Constitution declares that judicial decisions are final somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution provides that judicial decisions are final fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL32 **Exclusive Judicial Authority (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that the courts have exclusive authority to decide on issues of their own competence as defined by law -- their decisions are to be made without any restrictions, improper influences, inducements, pressures, threats or interference, direct or indirect, from any quarter or for any reason.

Scale:
0. Constitution does not provide for the exclusive authority of the judiciary
1. Constitution provides for the exclusive authority of the judiciary somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution provides for the exclusive authority of the judiciary fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL33 **No Exceptional Courts (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that the courts have jurisdiction over all issues of a judicial nature and that civilians are to be tried by ordinary courts or tribunals instead of military or exceptional courts.

Scale:
-1. Constitution specifically allows civilians to be tried in military courts or explicitly allow the formation of exceptional courts
0. Constitution does not specify a ban on exceptional courts
1. Constitution provides for a ban on exceptional courts somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution provides for a ban on exceptional courts fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL34 **Fiscal Autonomy of the Judiciary (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that the salaries and/or the budgets of the courts are protected from reduction by the other branches

Scale:
0. Constitution does not provide for fiscal autonomy of the judiciary
1. Constitution provides for fiscal autonomy of the judiciary somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution provides for fiscal autonomy of the judiciary fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL35 **Separation of Powers (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that the courts are housed in a separate branch from the executive and the legislative powers.

Scale:
0. Constitution does not provide for separation of powers
1. Constitution provides for separation of powers somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution provides for separation of powers fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes: The term "separation of powers" does not refer to strict separation of the Executive and Legislative branches, as in presidential systems.

RL36 **Enumerated Qualifications for Judges (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that the selection and career of judges should be based on merit: qualifications, integrity, ability and efficiency

Scale:
0. Constitution does not enumerate qualifications for the judiciary
1. Constitution enumerates qualifications for the judiciary somewhat or vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution enumerates qualifications for the judiciary fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL37 **Judicial Review (Constitutional Provisions)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions allowing for judicial or constitutional review of legislative and executive decisions.

Scale:
-1. Constitution gives the power of constitutional review to another branch of government such as the executive or the legislature
0. Constitution does not provide for judicial (constitutional) review
1. constitution provides for judicial review somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. constitution provides for judicial review fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL38 **Hierarchical Judicial System (Constitutional Provision)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that the courts are structured in multiple layers with the highest-level court exercising final control/review of lower court decisions.

Scale:
0. Constitution does not provide for a hierarchical judicial system
1. Constitution provides for a hierarchical judicial system somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully
2. Constitution provides for a hierarchical judicial system fully and explicitly

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

2.3.4. Regulation of States of Emergency

RL40 **Legislative Declaration of State of Emergency (Constitution)**

Definition: Documents whether the procedure for declaring a state of emergency is constitutionally defined, giving primary responsibility to the legislature.

Scale:
-1. Constitution explicitly gives the executive branch the power to declare a state of emergency with no role for the legislature or the courts
0. Constitution does not mention who has the power to declare emergency
1. Constitution provides that states of emergency (declared by the executive) are explicitly subject to confirmation by the legislature
2. Constitution explicitly gives responsibility for declaring the state of emergency to the legislative branch

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971)

Notes:

RL41 **Duration of State of Emergency (Constitution)**

Definition: Existence of provisions regulating the duration of the state of emergency.

Scale:
0. Constitution does not mention duration or extension process for states of emergency
1. Constitution specifies either the duration of the state of emergency or that legislative approval is required but not both
2. Constitution specifies that the duration of the emergency is for a set time period and that extensions are subject to legislative approval

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

RL42 **Executive Cannot Dissolve Legislature (Constitution)**

Definition: Existence of constitutional provisions limiting the dissolution of the Legislature during a state of emergency

Scale:
-1. Constitution automatically suspends the legislature during a state of emergency or gives the executive explicit power to do so
0. Constitution makes no mention of dissolving the legislature during states of emergency
1. Constitution has a vague provision for a legislative session, but no explicit prevention from dissolving the legislature (i.e. it may say that the legislature can prolong the length of sessions or can reconvene)
2. Constitution states that the legislature may not be dissolved during the emergency or that it meets "by right".

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes: This variable does not reflect normal dissolution procedures under parliamentary systems.

RL43 **Non-Derogable Rights (Constitution)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of constitutional provisions stating that some rights may not be derogated

Scale: 0. Constitution includes no clause stating that certain rights or freedoms cannot be revoked during states of emergency
1. Constitution gives a list of non-derogable rights, or states that certain rights or freedoms cannot be revoked during states of emergency

Source: Primary data source is *Constitutions of Countries of the World* (Blaustein and Flanz 1971--)

Notes:

2.3.5. Composite Indices

RL50 **Fair Trial/Procedure Index**

Definition: First Principal Component Factor Score for factor analysis of RL26 (Fair Trial Constitutional Right), RL27 (Wirt of Habeas Corpus Constitutional Right), RL28 (Public Trial Constitutional Right) and RL29 (Ban against Torture).

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL26-RL29

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

RL51 **Formal Judicial Independence Index**

Definition: First Principal Component Factor Score for factor analysis of RL30 (Guaranteed Judges' Terms Constitutional Provision), RL31 (Judicial Decisions Final Constitutional Provision), RL32 (Exclusive Judicial Authority Constitutional Provision) RL35 (Separation of Powers Constitutional Provision), RL36 (Enumerated Judicial Qualifications Constitutional Provision), RL37 (Judicial Review Constitutional Provision), and RL38 (Hierarchical Judicial System Constitutional Provision).

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL30, RL31, RL32, RL35, RL36, RL37, and RL38

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

RL52 **Basic Freedoms Index**

Definition: First Principal Component Factor Score for factor analysis of R20 (Freedom of Speech Constitutional Right), RL21 (Freedom of Association Constitutional Right), and RL22 (Freedom of Assembly) RL23 (Freedom of Press Constitutional Right), and RL24 (Freedom of Religion Constitutional Right).

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL20-RL24

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

RL53V1 **State of Emergency (Varimax, Factor 1)**

Definition: First Varimax Rotated Factor Score for factor analysis of R40 (Legislative Declaration of State of Emergency Constitutional Provision), RL41 (Duration Limits State of Emergency Constitutional Provision), RL42 (Executive Cannot Dissolve Legislature Constitutional Provision), and RL43 (Non-Derogable Rights in State of Emergency Constitutional Provision).

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL40-RL43

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

RL53V2 **State of Emergency (Varimax, Factor 2)**

Definition: Second Varimax Rotated Factor Score for R40, RL41, RL42, and RL43.

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL40-RL43

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

RL53P1 **State of Emergency (Principal Components, Factor 1)**

Definition: First Principal Components Factor Score for factor analysis of R40 (Legislative Declaration of State of Emergency Constitutional Provision), RL41 (Duration Limits State of Emergency Constitutional Provision), RL42 (Executive Cannot Dissolve Legislature Constitutional Provision), and RL43 (Non-Derogable Rights in State of Emergency Constitutional Provision).

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL40-RL43

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

RL53P2 **State of Emergency (Principal Components, Factor 2)**

Definition: Second Principal Components Factor Score for R40, RL41, RL42, and RL43.

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL40-RL43

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

RL54 **State of Emergency (Principal Components)**

Definition: First Principal Component Factor Score for factor analysis of RL41 (Duration Limits State of Emergency Constitutional Provision), RL42 (Executive Cannot Dissolve Legislature Constitutional Provision), and RL43 (Non-Derogable Riights in State of Emergency Constitutional Provision).

Scale: Factor score with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1

Source: See entries for RL41-RL43

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

2.4. Civil Society

CS01 **Restrictions on the Organization of Minorities (MAR)**

Definition: Captures restrictions to free organization against members of different communal groups (Davenport 2003, 37). The Minorities at Risk project codes to what extent members of specific groups are prevented from organizing. Aggregate values for country-years represent the average score for all groups in the dataset.

Scale:
0. Right to organize is not restricted for any group
1. Right to organize is moderately restricted
2. Organization is prohibited

Source: POLIC4 item (Minorities at Risk Project 2004)

Notes: Values represent mean for all minority groups, thus the variable behaves as a continuous scale. Missing data for a large proportion of observations (about 50 percent is coded as -99 "No basis for judgment").

CS02 **Freedom of Assembly and Association (CIRI)**

Definition: "Right of citizens to assembly freely and to associate with other persons in political parties, trade unions, cultural organizations, or other special-interest groups. This variable evaluates the extent to which the freedoms of assembly and association are subject to actual governmental limitations or restrictions (as opposed to strictly legal protections)" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 21).

Scale:
0. Government routinely denies or severely restricts all citizens' freedom of assembly and association or restricts this right for a significant number of citizens based on their gender, race, religion, or other criteria (e.g., countries that legally bar women from participating in public assemblies).
1. Government places some restrictions on assembly and association for all citizens, or severely restricts or denies these rights to particular groups. (Sources describe respect for rights of assembly and association as "limited," "restricted," or "partial"). An example of a moderate restriction is the denial of permits to outlawed groups (e.g., neo-nazis).
2. Virtually unrestricted and freely enjoyed by practically all citizens.

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 2, subsection B).

CS03 **Non-Profit Sector (Green)**

Definition: The Non-Profit Sector index reflects four conditions for the operation of civil society: (a) the diversity of organizational types (associations, foundations, etc.); (b) the ease of registration (reasonable cost, lack of administrative discretion, existence of appeal process); (c) the nature of the NGOs economic context (favorable tax concessions, ability to engage in unrelated economic activities); and (d) their ability to act politically (lack of bans on advocacy and lobbying) (Green 2004).

Scale: 0-4 (where 4 means that all four favorable conditions are present)

Source: NPS item (Data collected by Andrew Green)

Notes: Data is available only for Eastern Europe, former Soviet Republics, and Mongolia (1991-2001).

CS04 **Religious Freedom (CIRI)**

Definition: This dummy "indicates the extent to which the freedom of citizens to exercise and practice their religious beliefs is subject to actual government restrictions. Citizens of whatever religious belief should be able to worship free from government interference" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 21).

Scale:
0. Restrictions on religious practices (citizens are prohibited from proselytizing; clergy prohibited from advocating political views; government harassment of religious groups; forced conversions or restrictions on conversion; stringent laws for religious minorities; imposition of religious education in public schools).
1. No restrictions on religion.

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 2, subsection B).

CS05 **Respect for Workers' Rights (CIRI)**

Definition: "The 1984 Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) agreement of the World Trade Organization (…) states that internationally recognized worker rights include: (A) the right of association; (B) the right to organize and bargain collectively; (C) a prohibition on the use of any form of forced or compulsory labor; (D) a minimum age for the employment of children; and (E) acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health " (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 28).

Scale:
0. Workers' rights severely restricted. Government does not protect the rights of private workers to freedom of association (restricts unions from political activity, fails to act in the face of employer discrimination or specific attacks against unions) or does not protect their right to bargain collectively (including private workers' right to strike).
1. Workers' rights somewhat restricted. Government protects rights to association and collective bargaining but there are still significant violations of worker rights (public employees not allowed full freedom of association or bargaining; forced or compulsory labor; child labor; discrimination in hiring or treatment; no minimum wage; one union allowed per sector if union is independent from the government).
2. Workers' rights fully protected. Governments that protect the exercise of these rights and have no other significant violations of worker rights.

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports: Sections 2 (1981-85), 5 (1986-87), and 6 (1988-2003).

CS06 **Freedom of Movement (CIRI)**

Definition: "The freedom to travel within one's country and to leave and return to one's country is a right. There are governments that do not allow citizens to travel within their own country of birth or that restrict the movement of certain groups based on political or religious grounds. There are countries that do not allow citizens to leave. There are countries where even if one is allowed to leave there are restrictions on the duration of stay abroad. Citizens can lose their property and other assets if they leave for a very long time; some citizens have to get permission to leave; and others, when they leave, are not allowed to return or if they are allowed to return the government makes this very difficult" (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 19).

Scale:
0. Restrictions on free movement for all citizens or for a significant number based on their ethnicity, gender, race, religion, political convictions, or group membership.
1. Generally unrestricted freedom to travel within and outside the country.

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sec. 2, subsection D).

CS07 **Respect for Women's Economic Rights (CIRI)**

Definition: Women's economic rights include equal pay for equal work; free choice of profession; the right to gainful employment without male consent; equality in hiring and promotion; job security (maternity leave, unemployment benefits, no arbitrary firing); non-discrimination by employers; the right to be free from sexual harassment; the right to work at night; the right to work in occupations classified as dangerous; the right to work in the military and the police force (Cingranelli and Richards 2004, 35).

Scale:
0. No economic rights for women under law. The government tolerates a high level of discrimination against women.
1. Some economic rights for women under law. In practice, the government does not enforce these laws effectively and tolerates a moderate level of discrimination against women.
2. Some economic rights for women under law. The government enforces these laws effectively, but it still tolerates a low level of discrimination against women.
3. Women's economic rights are guaranteed by law. The government enforces these laws, tolerating almost no discrimination against women.

Source: (Cingranelli and Richards 2006)

Notes: Coding based on U.S. State Department reports (Sections 5 and 6).

CS08 **Index of Conditions for Civil Society**

Definition: Aggregate index reflecting the conditions for the operation of civil society. Scores are based on a factor analysis of items CS01, CS02, CS04, CS05, CS06, and CS07.

Scale: T score for factor analysis: a value of 50 represents the performance of the average country-year in our sample. Scores approaching 100 indicate an independent civil society; scores approaching 0 indicate low autonomy of civil society.

Source: See entries for CS01, CS02, CS04, CS05, CS06, and CS07

Notes: **CS08G** is item centered at its grand mean (only for eligible countries); **CS08L** is item lagged (t-1); **CS08Z** is item centered and lagged.

2.5. Governance

GV01 **Corruption Perceptions Index (Transparency International)**

Definition: CPI reflects the "perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, academics and risk analysts." It ranks "countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials and politicians. It is a composite index, drawing on 17 different polls and surveys from 13 independent institutions carried out among business people and country analysts, including surveys of residents, both local and expatriate" (Transparency International 2003, 6)

Scale: 0 (highly corrupt) to 10 (highly clean)

Source: CPI item (Transparency International 2005)

Notes: Available since 1995, uneven coverage.

GV02 **Election of Municipal Governments (DPI)**

Definition: Variable indicates whether municipal governments are locally elected. If there are multiple levels of sub-national government, lowest level was considered the "municipal" level (Keefer 2005, 20).

Scale: 0. Neither local executive nor local legislature are locally elected.
1. Executive is appointed, legislature is elected.
2. Municipal executive and legislature are both locally elected.

Source: MUNI item (Beck et al. 2005).

Notes: Keefer reports that 58 percent of the observations are missing values (Keefer 2005, 20).

GV03 **Election of State/Provincial Governments (DPI)**

Definition: Variable indicates whether state or provincial governments are locally elected. If there are multiple levels of sub-national government, highest level was considered the "state" level. Indirectly elected state governments are considered "locally elected" if appointed by directly elected state-level bodies, but not if appointed by elected municipal bodies (Keefer 2005, 20).

Scale: 0. Neither local executive nor local legislature are locally elected.
1. Executive is appointed, legislature is elected.
2. State executive and legislature are both locally elected.

Source: STATE item (Beck et al. 2005).

Notes: Keefer reports that 34 percent of the observations are missing values (Keefer 2005, 20).

GV04	**Sub-National Expenditures as Percentage of Total Expenditures (WB)**
Definition:	Expenditures of state and local governments over total government expenditures (including central government). Original data comes from the International Monetary Fund's Government Finance Statistics (GFS).
Scale:	0-100 (Percentage of total expenditures for all levels of government).
Source:	ExpShare item (World Bank 2004)
Notes:	There is a large number of missing values (presumably due to gaps in GFS)
GV05	**Sub-National Expenditures Financed by Transfers (WB)**
Definition:	Also called "Vertical Imbalance," this measure reflects the degree to which sub-national (local and state) governments rely on central government revenues to support their expenditures. Variable reflects intergovernmental transfers as a share of the total sub-national expenditures.
Scale:	0-100 (Percentage of sub-national expenditures financed by transfers).
Source:	VIM item (World Bank 2004)
Notes:	There is a large number of missing values (presumably due to gaps in GFS)
GV06	**Sub-National Revenues as Percentage of GDP (WB)**
Definition:	Total revenue (taxes and others) for local and state governments as a share of the GDP.
Scale:	0-100 (Percentage of sub-national revenues over gross domestic product).
Source:	RevGDP item (World Bank 2004)
Notes:	There is a large number of missing values (presumably due to gaps in GFS)
GV07	**Government Effectiveness (World Bank Institute)**
Definition:	This index combines multiple indicators (37 sources from 31 different organizations) to reflect "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" (Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2003; Kaufmann, Kraay, and Zoido-Lobatón 1999).
Scale:	Z score for the Unobserved Component Model (UCM). Virtually all scores lie between -2.5 and 2.5 (higher scores correspond to better outcomes).
Source:	Governance Matters project. Point estimates for "government effectiveness" (Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2005).
Notes:	Estimates available only for 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004.

GV08 **Regulatory Quality (World Bank Institute)**

Definition: The index of regulatory quality summarizes multiple indicators of substantive policy content, including "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" (Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2003; Kaufmann, Kraay, and Zoido-Lobatón 1999).

Scale: Z score for the Unobserved Component Model (UCM). Virtually all scores lie between -2.5 and 2.5 (higher scores correspond to better outcomes).

Source: Governance Matters project. Point estimates for "regulatory quality"(Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2005).

Notes: Estimates available only for 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004.

GV09 **Control of Corruption (World Bank Institute)**

Definition: This index combines multiple "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" (Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2003; Kaufmann, Kraay, and Zoido-Lobatón 1999).

Scale: Z score for the Unobserved Component Model (UCM). Virtually all scores lie between -2.5 and 2.5 (higher scores correspond to better outcomes).

Source: Governance Matters project. Point estimates for "control of corruption"(Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2005).

Notes: Estimates available only for 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004.

GV10 **Political Constraints Index III (POLCON)**

Definition: This index estimates "the feasibility of policy change (the extent to which a change in the preferences of any actor may lead to a change in government policy)" (Henisz 2002, 363). Values closer to one represent more constraints, and values closer to zero, greater Executive discretion. The baseline value for the index is the average probability of policy deadlock (measured as 1 minus the winset of the status-quo) in a hypothetical one-dimensional policy space, assuming that all players (the executive and the houses of the legislature) are independent, and that their preferences (and the status-quo) are located in this policy space following a uniform distribution. (For instance, with two players, the average probability of policy deadlock is 2/3). This baseline value is adjusted in each case to reflect Executive control of other branches of government (e.g., the legislature is not counted as independent if the Polity IV Executive Constraints index is lower than 3) and legislative fractionalization. Fractionalization weights in favor of the baseline value--adding to legislative constraints--when the party controlling the executive branch is the largest in the legislature, but against the baseline value--reducing the weight of existing legislative checks--when the ruling party is a minority.

Scale: Ranges from 0 to 4/5. A value of 0 indicates that the legislature is completely aligned with the Executive; a value of .8 indicates that the two chambers are completely independent.

Source: Item POLCON III (Henisz 2006)

Notes:

GV11 **Political Constraints Index V (POLCON)**

Definition: Political Constraint Index V is akin to POLCON III, but it incorporates two additional veto points: the judiciary and the sub-national entities (Henisz 2000). Values closer to one represent more constraints, and values closer to zero, greater Executive discretion. The baseline value for the index is the average probability of policy deadlock in a hypothetical one-dimensional policy space, assuming that all players (the executive, the legislature, the judiciary, and the sub-national governments) are independent, and that their preferences (and the status-quo) are located in this policy space following a uniform distribution. This baseline value is adjusted in each case to reflect Executive control (e.g., the judiciary is not counted as independent if the Polity IV Executive Constraints index is lower than 3), and legislative fractionalization (which weights in favor of the baseline value when the party controlling the executive branch is the largest in the legislature, but against when the ruling party is a minority).

Scale: Ranges from 0 to 19/21 (where 0 indicates that veto players are completely aligned and .905 that they are completely independent).

Source: POLCON V (Henisz 2006)

Notes:

GV12 **Independent Sub-National Entities (POLCON)**

Definition: Sub-national entities are the states, the provinces, the regions etc. The independence of these sub-national entities is measured in relation to whether or not these entities can impose substantive constraints on the national fiscal policy (Henisz 2006).

Scale:
0. Non independent sub-national entities
1. Independent sub-national entities can impose substantive constraints on the national fiscal policy.

Source: Item F (Henisz 2006)

Notes: Henisz uses the term "sub-federal" entities. Data was collected from *The Political Handbook of the World* and *The Statesmen's Yearbook* (no clear coding rules are offered in the POLCON codebook).

GV13 **Conditions for Investment (ICRG)**

Definition: The index measures investment risk resulting from government policies or government inefficiencies. It aggregates three subcomponents: 1) contract viability/expropriation, which refers to an action taken by the government to seize property or assets of the foreign investor without full compensation; 2) profits repatriation, and 3) payment delays to foreign credits due to policies, economic conditions or international financial conditions (ICRG 2006).

Scale: Each subcomponent ranges from 0 to 4, thus creating a combined scale that ranges from 0 to 12 (with 0 representing Very High Risk and 12 representing Very Low Risk)

Source: Item *Investment Profile* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). ICRG collects information from a network of between 75 and 125 country specialists on a quarterly basis. The reports are checked by country and regional managers, and subjective information is then translated into the scale (Christopher McKee, personal communication, December 15, 2006). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization.

GV14 **Transparency (ICRG)**

Definition: This is a measure of "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" (ICRG 2006). "In assessing the corruption risk, it is observed how long a government has been in power continuously. Lower levels of corruption are assigned to those countries in which a government has been in place for less than five years. An intermediate rating indicates a country whose government has been in office for more than ten years and where a large number of officials are appointed rather than elected. The lowest ratings are usually given to one-party states or autarchies" (ICRG 2001).

Scale: 0-6 (the higher the value, the lower the level of corruption)

Source: Item *Corruption* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization

GV15 **Bureaucratic Quality (ICRG)**

Definition: This measure indicates the "strength and quality of the bureaucracy". Strong bureaucracies tend "to be somewhat autonomous from political pressure and to have an established mechanism for recruitment and training." In weak bureaucracies "a change in government tends to be traumatic in terms of policy formulation and day-to-day administrative functions" (ICRG 2006).

Scale: 0-4 (with 0 representing very low bureaucratic quality and 4 representing very high bureaucratic quality).

Source: Item *Bureaucratic Quality* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item was designed to be an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without permission.

GV16 **Index of Good Governance**

Definition: Aggregate index reflecting the quality of governance. Scores are based on a factor analysis of items reflecting government transparency and efficient administration (GV01, GV13, GV14, GV15).

Scale: T score for factor analysis (mean=50, s.d.=10). A value of 50 represents the performance of the average country-year in our sample. Scores approaching 100 indicate better governance.

Source: See entries for GV01, GV13, GV14, GV15.

Notes: Item **GV16G** is grand-mean centered (for eligible countries only); **GV16L** is item lagged (t-1); item **GV16Z** is centered and lagged.

3. Additional Independent Variables

3.1. Other Donor Agencies

ODA01 **Official Development Assistance and Official Aid**

Definition: "Net official development assistance consists of disbursements of loans made on concessional terms (net of repayments of principal) and grants by official agencies of the members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), by multilateral institutions, and by non-DAC countries to promote economic development and welfare in countries and territories in part I of the DAC list of recipients. It includes loans with a grant element of at least 25 percent (calculated at a rate of discount of 10 percent). Net official aid refers to aid flows (net of repayments) from official donors to countries and territories in part II of the DAC list of recipients: more advanced countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the countries of the former Soviet Union, and certain advanced developing countries and territories. Official aid is provided under terms and conditions similar to those for ODA. Data are in current U.S. dollars" (World Bank 2006).

Scale: Millions of current US dollars (net)

Source: Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Geographical Distribution of Financial Flows to Aid Recipients and Development Cooperation Report. Item DT.ODA.ALLD.CD (World Bank 2006)

Notes: Note that net assistance after repayments can be negative (60 observations in the database have negative values). Values include US assistance. Advanced developing countries display missing values rather than zeros.

ODA02 **Aid as Percentage of Central Government Expenditures**

Definition: ODA01 as percentage of central government spending. "Aid includes both official development assistance (ODA) and official aid. Ratios are computed using values in U.S. dollars converted at official exchange rates" (World Bank 2006).

Scale: Percentage (values may occasionally be negative; values greater than 100% were truncated).

Source: Item DT.ODA.ALLD.XP.ZS (World Bank 2006).

Notes: The series presents multiple problems, including: (1) A large number of missing values (non-missing N=990); (2) 36 observations with ratios greater than 100% (the extreme cases being ECU 1989-94, with an average of 14,351% and ZAR 1998-2001, with an average of 2,022%). To avoid these evident coding errors, all 36 observations were recoded to missing; (3) 25 observations with negative values ranging between -2.09% and -0.04% (presumably because repayments exceeded inflows).

ODA03	**Bilateral Non-US assistance (in Millions of USD, All Sectors)**
Definition:	Official development assistance provided by countries other than the United States to the particular country.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	International Development Statistics online, Database on Annual Aggregates, Table 3A, Item 305 (OECD - Development Assistance Committee 2006b).
Notes:	Figures exclude multilateral assistance. For transformations of this variable (sub-indices G, L, Z, P, D, PG, DG), see Appendix 6.3.

AIDNED	**DG – National Endowment for Democracy Funding**
Definition:	Funds directed by the National Endowment for Democracy to particular countries (all programs).
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average (y, y-1)
Source:	U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants (Greenbook), item "National Endowment for Democracy, Department of State" (USAID 2006)
Notes:	Average appropriations for current and previous fiscal year. For transformations of this variable (sub-indices G, L, Z, P, D, PG, DG), see Appendix 6.3.

AID_2	**U.S. Development Assistance Not Channeled Through USAID or NED**
Definition:	Total U.S. development assistance (all sectors) not channeled through USAID or NED programs. Estimated as the difference between total Economic Assistance (loans and grants reported by the Greenbook) and total AID and NED funding.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average (y, y-1)
Source:	Yearly appropriations for AID and NED (see sources for AID and AIDNED), and total Economic Assistance (USAID 2006).
Notes:	If yearly totals for AID plus NED were greater than loans and grants reported by Greenbook, value was set to 0. For transformations of this variable (sub-indices G, L, Z, P, D, PG, DG), see Appendix 6.3.

ODA100 **Bilateral Non-US Democracy Assistance (OECD-CRS)**

Definition: Democracy and governance funds invested by countries other than the United States. Funds were included when the donor country was not the U.S. and when the OECD marked funds as directed towards "Participatory development and good governance" (PD/GG marker) or towards "Government and civil society" (DAC-5 code 150).

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average (y, y-1)

Source: Item usd_amount, selected according to criteria described below (OECD 2006)

Notes: Funds were included if the donor was an individual country (not a multilateral agency) and if *donorcode*<>302 and (*PDGG*>0 or (*purposecode*>15100 and *purposecode*<15200)) (OECD - Development Assistance Committee 2006a). Item **ODA100G** is centered at its grand-mean (only for eligible countries).

ODA000 **Bilateral Non-Democracy Assistance (OECD-CRS)**

Definition: Official development assistance (non-DG) invested by countries other than the United States. Funds were included when the donor country was not the U.S. and when the OECD *did not* mark funds as directed towards "Participatory development and good governance" or "Government and civil society."

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars, two-year average (y, y-1)

Source: Item usd_amount, selected according to criteria described below (OECD 2006)

Notes: Funds were included if the donor was an individual country (not a multilateral agency) and if *donorcode*<>302 and (*PDGG*=0 and (*purposecode*<15100 or *purposecode*>15200)) (OECD - Development Assistance Committee 2006a). Item **ODA000G** is centered at its grand-mean (only for eligible countries).

3.2. Development

DEV01 **Gross Domestic Product (Current US dollars)**

Definition: "GDP at purchaser's prices 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. Data are in current U.S. dollars. Dollar figures for GDP are converted from domestic currencies using single year official exchange rates. For a few countries where the official exchange rate does not reflect the rate effectively applied to actual foreign exchange transactions, an alternative conversion factor is used" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Millions of current US dollars

Source: Item NY.GDP.MKTP.CD, rescaled (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

DEV02 **Gross Domestic Product (Constant 2000 US dollars)**

Definition: "GDP at purchaser's prices 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. Data are in constant 2000 U.S. dollars. Dollar figures for GDP are converted from domestic currencies using 2000 official exchange rates. For a few countries where the official exchange rate does not reflect the rate effectively applied to actual foreign exchange transactions, an alternative conversion factor is used" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Millions of 2000 US dollars

Source: Item NY.GDP.MKTP.KD, rescaled (World Bank 2006)

Notes: For item **DEV02I**, missing values were imputed using additional GDP data from Penn World Tables and the CIA Factbook.

DEV03 **Gross Domestic Product per capita (2000 US dollars)**

Definition: "GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. 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. Data are in constant U.S. dollars" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Thousands of 2000 US dollars per capita

Source: Item NY.GDP.PCAP.KD, rescaled (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

DEV04	**Gross Domestic Product per capita, PPP (2000 US dollars)**
Definition:	"GDP per capita based on purchasing power parity (PPP). PPP GDP is gross domestic product converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar has in the United States. GDP at purchaser's prices 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. Data are in constant 2000 international dollars" (World Bank 2005).
Scale:	Purchasing Power Parities, thousands of 2000 US dollars
Source:	Item NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.KD, rescaled (World Bank 2006)
Notes:	

DEV05	**Telephone Lines PTI**
Definition:	"Telephone mainlines are telephone lines connecting a customer's equipment to the public switched telephone network. Data are presented per 1,000 people for the entire country" (World Bank 2005).
Scale:	Mainlines per Thousand Inhabitants
Source:	International Telecommunication Union - Item IT.MLT.MAIN.P3 (World Bank 2006)
Notes:	Wide coverage.

3.3. Economic Performance

PRF01 **Annual Growth in GDP Per Capita**

Definition: "Annual percentage growth rate of GDP per capita based on constant local currency. GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. GDP at purchaser's prices 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" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Annual percent change (based on constant figures in 2000 US dollars).

Source: Item NY.GDP.PCAP.KD.ZG (World Bank 2006)

Notes: In item **PRF01I**, missing values were imputed using the imputation model in Appendix 6.4. Item **PRF01IG** is grand-mean centered (for eligible countries only).

PRF02 **Inflation, Consumer Price Index**

Definition: "Inflation as measured by the consumer price index reflects the annual percentage change in the cost to the average consumer of acquiring a fixed basket of goods and services that may be fixed or changed at specified intervals, such as yearly. The Laspeyres formula is generally used" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Annual percent change in consumer price index.

Source: Item FP.CPI.TOTL.ZG (World Bank 2006)

Notes: Three observations (COG 1997, LSO 1997, RWA 1994) displayed negative values (i.e., deflation) of -100%. Since inflation estimations based on GDP deflator (PRF04) yielded positive values between 5% and 17% for these same cases, it was assumed that the scores reflected coding problems and observations were recoded as missing. Missing values in item **PRF02I** were imputed using model in Appendix 6.4. Item **PRF02IG** is grand-mean centered (for eligible countries only).

PRF03 **GDP Deflator**

Definition: "The GDP implicit deflator is the ratio of GDP in current local currency to GDP in constant local currency" (World Bank 2006) .

Scale: Index (base year varies by country).

Source: Item NY.GDP.DEFL.ZS (World Bank 2005)

Notes:

PRF04 **Inflation, GDP Deflator**

Definition: "Inflation as measured by the annual growth rate of the GDP implicit deflator shows the rate of price change in the economy as a whole" (World Bank 2005). PRF04=(PRF03(t)/PRF03(t-1)-1)*100

Scale: Annual percent change in GDP deflator.

Source: Computed from item NY.GDP.DEFL.KD.ZS (World Bank 2005)

Notes: Correlation with consumer price inflation (PRF02) is .987

PRF05 **Gross Private Capital Flows**

Definition: "Gross private capital flows are the sum of the absolute values of direct, portfolio, and other investment inflows and outflows recorded in the balance of payments financial account, excluding changes in the assets and liabilities of monetary authorities and general government. The indicator is calculated as a ratio to GDP in U.S. dollars" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Flows as percentage of GDP

Source: Item BG.KAC.FNEI.GD.ZS (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

3.4. Population and Social Indicators

SOC01 **Population**

Definition: "Total population is based on 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" (World Bank 2005). Figures represent the average of population estimates presented by the World Bank and by Banks.

Scale: Thousands

Source: Items SP.POP.TOTL rescaled (World Bank 2006) and S02F3 (Banks 2004).

Notes: World Bank and Banks figures are very close, but several countries covered by Banks are not covered by the World Bank (although Banks does not include the West Bank and Gaza).

SOC02 **Rural Population (%)**

Definition: "Rural population is calculated as the difference between the total population and the urban population. (…) The data on urban population shares used to estimate rural population come from the United Nations, World Urbanization Prospects" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of total population

Source: Item SP.RUR.TOTL.ZS (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

SOC03 **Literacy**

Definition: "Adult literacy rate is the percentage of people ages 15 and above who can, with understanding, read and write a short, simple statement on their everyday life" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of the population of age 15 and over.

Source: UNESCO Institute for Statistics - Item SE.ADT.LITR.ZS (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

SOC04 **Female Literacy**

Definition: Percentage of female population of age 15 and over who can read and write a "simple statement on their everyday life."

Scale: Percentage of the female population of age 15 and over.

Source: UNESCO Institute for Statistics - Item SE.ADT.LITR.FE.ZS (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

SOC05 **Infant Mortality**

Definition: Number of infants dying before reaching one year of age, per every thousand births in a given year.

Scale: Deaths per thousand live births

Source: Item SP.DYN.IMRT.IN (World Bank 2006). World Bank estimates are based on data from the United Nations and UNICEF, State of the World's Children.

Notes:

SOC06 **Income Distribution (Share of top 20%)**

Definition: Percentage share of income that accrues to the top 20 % of the population.

Scale: Percentage

Source: Item SI.DST.05TH.20, averaged. World Bank estimates are based on household surveys conducted by governments and WB country departments. Data for high-income economies are from the Luxembourg Income Study database (World Bank 2006).

Notes: Data are scattered. Available figures for the period 1989-2004 were averaged and assumed to be constant for each country (thus, item is equivalent to L222).

SOC07 **Unemployment**

Definition: "Share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment differ by country" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of the labor force

Source: Item SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS (World Bank 2006), based on International Labor Organization, Key Indicators of the Labor Market database.

Notes:

SOC08 **Military Personnel (as Percentage of Labor Force)**

Definition: "Armed forces personnel refer to active duty military personnel, including paramilitary forces if those forces resemble regular units in their organization, equipment, training, or mission. Labor force comprises all people who meet the International Labor Organization's definition of the economically active population" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of the labor force

Source: Item MS.MIL.TOTL.TF.ZS (World Bank 2006), based on U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Verification and Compliance.

Notes: World Bank indicates that "Data for some countries are based on partial or uncertain data or rough estimates."

SOC09 **Religious Fractionalization**

Definition: Index of religious fragmentation: $1 - \sum^{n}_{i=1} p_i^2$, where p_i denotes the population share for each of the n religious denominations in the country.

Scale: 0 (perfect religious homogeneity) to ~1 (extreme religious fragmentation).

Source: SOC09 is an average of the Annett and Fearon indices of religious fractionalization, both measured using the same formula (Annett 2001; Fearon 2003; Fearon and Laitin 2003).

Notes: Although Annett presents figures by decade and Fearon has yearly time series (1945-99), the figures display virtually no variance over time. The two sources present very similar scores, but some countries are covered by one author and not by the other. Some 18 microstates are not covered by any of the two sources.

SOC10 **Ethnic Fractionalization**

Definition: Index of ethnolinguistic fractionalization: $1 - \sum^{n}_{i=1} p_i^2$, where p_i denotes the population share for each of the n ethnic groups in the country.

Scale: 0 (perfect homogeneity) to ~1 (extreme ethnic fractionalization).

Source: SOC10 is an average of the Annett and the two Fearon indices of ethnolinguistic fractionalization, all measured using the above formula. Fearon estimated one index based on the figures of the *Atlas Narodov Mira* and another one using the CIA's *World Factbook* and other sources (Annett 2001; Fearon 2003; Fearon and Laitin 2003).

Notes: Although Annett presents figures by decade and Fearon has yearly time series (1945-99), the figures display no variance over time. Some 20 microstates are not covered by any source.

SOC11 **Socio-Economic Conditions (ICRG)**

Definition: "This is an assessment of the socioeconomic pressures at work in society that could constrain government action or fuel social dissatisfaction" (ICRG 2006). The measure is an index that combines three sub-components: 1) unemployment; 2) consumer confidence; and 3) poverty.

Scale: Each subcomponent ranges from 0 to 4, thus creating a combined scale that ranges from 0 to 12 (the higher the score, the lower the existence of socioeconomic pressures).

Source: Item *Socioeconomic Conditions* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: Socioeconomic conditions cover a broad spectrum of factors ranging from infant mortality and medical provision to housing and interest rates. Within this range, different factors may have different weight in different societies (factors with the greatest political impact are taken into account). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization.

3.5. Economic Dependence

DEP01 **Merchandise Exports**

Definition: "Merchandise exports show the f.o.b. value of goods provided to the rest of the world valued in U.S. dollars" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Millions of current US dollars

Source: Item TX.VAL.MRCH.CD.WT, rescaled (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

DEP02 **Merchandise Exports as Percentage of GDP**

Definition: DEP02=DEP01/DEV01*100

Scale: Ratio (Percentage)

Source: See components above.

Notes:

DEP03 **Agricultural Raw Materials (Percentage of Merchandise Exports)**

Definition: "Agricultural raw materials comprise SITC section 2 (crude materials except fuels) excluding divisions 22, 27 (crude fertilizers and minerals excluding coal, petroleum, and precious stones), and 28 (metalliferous ores and scrap)" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of DEP01

Source: Item TX.VAL.AGRI.ZS.UN (World Bank 2006).

Notes:

DEP04 **Fuel Exports (Percentage of Merchandise Exports)**

Definition: Oil and mineral fuels as percentage of merchandise exports. "Fuels comprise SITC section 3 (mineral fuels)" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of DEP01

Source: Item TX.VAL.FUEL.ZS.UN (World Bank 2006), based on United Nations' COMTRADE database.

Notes:

DEP05 **Ores and Metal Exports (Percentage of Merchandise Exports)**

Definition: Mineral (metal) exports as percentage of total merchandise exports. "Ores and metals comprise the commodities in SITC sections 27 (crude fertilizer, minerals nes); 28 (metalliferous ores, scrap); and 68 (non-ferrous metals)" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of DEP01

Source: Item TX.VAL.MMTL.ZS.UN (World Bank 2006)

Notes:

3.6. Political History and Institutions

3.6.1. Cross-National Time-Series Dataset (Banks)

POL01 **Number of Coups d'Etat (Last three decades)**

Definition: Number of coups d'etat observed in the three decades prior to the year under observation. Coups are "extraconstitutional or forced changes in the top government elite and/or its effective control of the nation's power structure in a given year. The term coup includes, but is not exhausted by, the term 'successful revolution'. Unsuccessful coups are not counted" (Banks 2005).

Scale: N

Source: Item S21F1, aggregated over a thirty-year span (Banks 2004)

Notes:

POL02 **Number of Legislative Elections (Last three decades)**

Definition: Number of elections for the lower house observed in the three decades prior to the year under observation.

Scale: N

Source: Item S22F6, aggregated over a thirty-year span (Banks 2004)

Notes: Fairness of the election is not assessed by Banks.

POL03 **Type of Executive**

Definition: Head of government is "the individual who exercises primary influence in the shaping of most major decisions affecting the nation's internal and external affairs. The other category may refer to a situation in which the individual in question (such as the party first secretary in a Communist regime) holds no formal governmental post, or to one in which no truly effective national executive can be said to exist" (Banks 2005).

Scale:
1. Monarch
2. President
3. Premier
4. Military
5. Other

Source: Item S21F5 (Banks 2004)

Notes:

POL04 **Presence of Guerrilla Warfare**

Definition: Indicates the presence of "any armed activity, sabotage, or bombings carried on by independent bands of citizens or irregular forces and aimed at the overthrow of the present regime" (Banks 2005).

Scale: 0 (No guerrilla activity) 1 (Guerrilla Warfare)

Source: Item S17F3 (Banks 2004)

Notes:

POL05 **Index of Social and Political Conflict (Banks)**

Definition: Banks' index summarizes eight forms of conflict (each form originally coded as a yearly event count based on The New York Times). "The weighted conflict index is calculated in the following manner: Multiply the value of the number of Assassinations by 24, General Strikes by 43, Guerrilla Warfare by 46, Government Crises by 48, Purges by 86, Riots by 102, Revolutions by 148, Anti-Government Demonstrations by 200." The aggregate value is divided by 8 (Banks 2005).

Scale: Actual range is from 0 to 770

Source: Item S18F2 (Banks 2004). Disaggregated event counts correspond to variables S17f1 to S18f1 in the dataset.

Notes: Banks does not provide a rationale for the weights. West Bank and Gaza (not in Banks dataset) were assigned the values for Israel. For 19 countries with missing data in 1991 (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan) we imputed the scores for the new country in 1992. Item **POL05G** is grand-mean centered.

3.6.2. Sources of Perceived Threats to Incumbent Political Leaders

POL11 **Organized Nonviolent Protest (Keith & Tate)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of organized nonviolent protests directed at the regime occurred during the period.

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: Coding is based on country essays published annually by the *Europa World Yearbook* (London: Routledge). When the *Europa Yearbook* accounts were deficient, information was supplemented with the annual *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices* published by the U.S. State Department and with the *Political Handbook of the World* (Washington: CQ Press).

Notes:

POL12 **Organized Nonviolent Rebellion (Keith & Tate)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of organized nonviolent protests directed at *removing or overthrowing* the regime occurred during the period

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: *Europa World Yearbook* (London: Routledge), plus *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices* (U.S. State Department) and *Political Handbook of the World* (Washington: CQ Press).

Notes:

POL13 **Organized Violent Rebellion (Keith & Tate)**

Definition: This variable documents the existence of organized violent efforts directed removing or overthrowing the regime occurred during the period.

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: *Europa World Yearbook* (London: Routledge), plus *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices* (U.S. State Department) and *Political Handbook of the World* (Washington: CQ Press).

Notes:

POL14 **Civil War (Keith & Tate)**

Definition: This variable documents the occurrence of civil wars, following Small and Singer's guidelines: 1) "the government, as the central authority in a country, must be involved as a direct participant in the war" and 2) "there must be effective resistance, that is, either both sides must be 'organized for violent conflict" or "the weaker side, although initially unprepared [must be] able to inflict upon the stronger opponents at least five percent of the number of fatalities is sustains."

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: PRIO/Uppsala *Armed Conflict Data Set* (UCDP and PRIO 2006).

Notes:

POL15 **Armed Conflict (PRIO)**

Definition: This variable documents armed conflicts, including international wars, civil wars, internal armed conflicts with foreign intervention, and foreign interventions against local non-state actors. The Uppsala Conflict Data Program defines armed conflict as: "a contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths."

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: PRIO/Uppsala *Armed Conflict Data Set* (UCDP and PRIO 2006).

Notes:

POL16 **Post-Conflict Settings (5 Years)**

Definition: This variable adopts a value of one in the five years after the end of a conflict (as defined by the PRIO dataset), zero otherwise.

Scale: 0. No post-conflict; 1. Post-conflict.

Source: PRIO/Uppsala *Armed Conflict Data Set* (UCDP and PRIO 2006).

Notes: Variable **POL16B** identifies post-conflict settings using a time counter (1 for the first year, 2 for the second year, etc.) up to five years. POL16 and POL16B were coded using the "location" data in the PRIO dataset. PRIO's rules will identify a post-conflict setting even for countries that did not fight in their own territory.

POL17 **U.S. Military Intervention (PRIO)**

Definition: This variable indicates whether the United States was a primary or secondary party in an armed conflict. By secondary party PRIO means that the country's troops actively support one side of the conflict.

Scale: 0. No U.S. intervention; 1. U.S. military intervention

Source: PRIO/Uppsala *Armed Conflict Data Set* (UCDP and PRIO 2006).

Notes:

POL18 **Threat/Protest Index**

Definition: First Principal Component Factor Score for factor analysis of POL11 (Nonviolent Protest), POL12 (Nonviolent Rebellion), and POL 13 (Violent Rebellion).

Scale: Factor scores with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.

Source: See POL11, POL12, POL13

Notes: Computed using default values on SPSS factor analysis procedure.

3.6.3. Political Instability Task Force Data

POL21 **Ethnic Wars (PITF)**

Definition: "Ethnic wars are episodes of violent conflict between governments and national, ethnic, religious, or other communal minorities (who) seek major changes in their status. (…) Rioting and warfare between rival communal groups is not coded as ethnic warfare unless it involves conflict over political power or government policy" (Marshall, Gurr, and Harff 2001)

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: Ethnic War Problem Set (Political Instability Task Force 2006)

Notes: There are the two criteria for including an ethnic or revolutionary war event in the PITF dataset: "each party must mobilize 1000 or more people (armed agents, demonstrators, troops), and (…) there must be at least 1000 direct conflict-related deaths over the full course of the armed conflict and at least one year when the annual conflict-related death toll exceeds 100 fatalities."

POL22 **Revolutionary Wars (PITF)**

Definition: "Revolutionary wars are episodes of violent conflict between governments and politically organized groups (political challengers) that seek to overthrow the central government, to replace its leaders, or to seize power in one region. Conflicts must include substantial use of violence by one or both parties to qualify as wars" (Marshall, Gurr, and Harff 2001)

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: Revolutionary War Problem Set (Political Instability Task Force 2006)

Notes: "Politically organized groups may include revolutionary and reform movements, political parties, student and labor organizations, and elements of the armed forces and the regime itself. If the challenging group represents a national, ethnic, or other communal minority, the conflict is analyzed as an ethnic war".

POL23 **Genocide and Politicide Events (PITF)**

Definition: "Genocide and politicide events involve the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents or in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities that result in the deaths of a substantial portion of a communal group or politicized non-communal group. In genocides the victimized groups are defined primarily in terms of their communal (ethnolinguistic, religious) characteristics. In politicides, by contrast, groups are defined primarily in terms of their political opposition to the regime and dominant groups" (Marshall, Gurr, and Harff 2001)

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: Genocide and Politicide Problem Set (Political Instability Task Force 2006)

Notes:

POL24 **Adverse Regime Changes (PITF)**

Definition: "Adverse regime changes" are defined by the PITF as major, adverse shifts in patterns of governance, including democratic breakdowns, revolutions, violent episodes of secession, and the collapse of central government authority. Abrupt transitions from dictatorship to democracy are coded by PITF as "democratic transitions" and therefore are not reflected by this variable.

Scale: 0. No; 1. Yes

Source: Adverse Regime Change Problem Set (Political Instability Task Force 2006)

Notes: The main criterion used to identify adverse regime changes is the record of a six or more point drop in the value of a state's POLITY index score over a period of three years or less.

POL25 **State Failure Indicator**

Definition: Maximum value for POL21, POL22, POL23, and POL24.

Scale: 0. No state failure
1. Some form of state failure

Source: Problem Sets (Political Instability Task Force 2006)

Notes:

3.6.4. International Country Risk Guide Data

POL31 **Government Stability (ICRG)**

Definition: This item measures "the government's ability to carry out its declared program(s) and its ability to stay in office." This index combines three sub-components: 1) government unity; 2) legislative strength, and 3) popular support (ICRG 2006). "The ranking depends on the type of governance, the cohesion of the government and governing party or parties, the closeness of the next election, the government's command of the legislature, and popular approval of government policies" (ICRG 2001).

Scale: Each subcomponent ranges from 0 to 4, thus creating a combined scale that ranges from 0 to 12 (with 0 representing very low government stability and 12 representing very high government stability)

Source: Item *Government Stability* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). ICRG collects information from a network of between 75 and 125 country specialists on a quarterly basis. The reports are checked by country and regional managers, and subjective information is then translated into the scale (Christopher McKee, personal communication, December 15, 2006). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization

POL32 **Internal Conflict (ICRG)**

Definition: It measures "the level of political violence and its actual or potential impact on governance." This index combines three sub-components: 1) civil war or coup threat; 2) terrorism and political violence; and 3) civil disorder. "The highest rating is given to those countries where there is no armed opposition to the government and the government does not indulge in arbitrary violence, direct or indirect, against its people. The lowest rating is given to a country embroiled in an ongoing civil war" (ICRG 2001). Intermediate ratings are given to countries in which there are threats of kidnapping, or where organized groups perpetuate sporadic or sustained acts of violence in a particular locality or region.

Scale: Each subcomponent ranges from 0 to 4, thus creating a combined scale that ranges from 0 to 12 (with 0 representing Very High Risk and 12 representing Very Low Risk)

Source: Item *Internal Conflict* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization

POL33 **External Conflict (ICRG)**

Definition: "The external conflict measure is an assessment of the risk to both the incumbent government and inward investment. It ranges from trade restrictions and embargoes, whether imposed by a single country, a group of countries, or the whole international community, through geopolitical dispute, armed threats, exchanges of fire on borders, border incursions, foreign-supported insurgency, and full-scale warfare"(ICRG 2001, 25). The index combines three sub-components: 1) war; 2) cross-border conflict, 3) and foreign pressures (ICRG 2006).

Scale: Each subcomponent ranges from 0 to 4, thus creating a combined scale that ranges from 0 to 12 (with 0 representing Very High Risk and 12 representing Very Low Risk).

Source: Item *External Conflict* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item was designed to be an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization

POL34 **Military in Politics (ICRG)**

Definition: This measure indicates the degree of military participation in politics. This participation is greater when there is an internal or external threat; a threat of military take-over; a military overthrow of the actual government; or when a military regime is in place.

Scale: 0-6 (the higher the value, the lower the military participation in politics).

Source: Item *External Conflict* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: One indication of military strength is when defense budget is increased at the expense of other budget allocation (ICRG 2001). This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). ICRG collects information from a network of between 75 and 125 country specialists on a quarterly basis. The reports are checked by country and regional managers, and subjective information is then translated into the scale (Christopher McKee, personal communication, December 15, 2006). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission of the organization.

POL35 **Religious Tensions (ICRG)**

Definition: "Religious tensions may stem from the domination of society and/or governance by a single religious group that seeks to replace civil law by religious law and to exclude other religions from the political and/or social process; the desire of a single religious group to dominate governance; the suppression of religious freedom; the desire of a religious group to express its own identity, separate from the country as a whole. The risk involved in these situations ranges from inexperienced people imposing inappropriate policies through civil dissent to civil war" (ICRG 2006).

Scale: 0-6; scores can be interpreted as follows:

0.0-2.5 – Highly disruptive religious tensions.
3.0-3.5 – Disruptive religious tensions.
4.0 – Moderate religious tensions.
4.5 – Low religious tensions.
5.0-6.0 – Very low religious tensions.

Source: Item *Religious Tensions* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). ICRG collects information from a network of between 75 and 125 country specialists on a quarterly basis. The reports are checked by country and regional managers, and subjective information is then translated into the scale (Christopher McKee, personal communication, December 15, 2006). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without permission.

POL36 **Ethnic Tensions (ICRG)**

Definition: A measure that indicates "the degree of tension within a country attributable to racial, nationality, or language divisions." Lower ratings are given to countries where racial and nationality tensions are high because opposing groups are intolerant and unwilling to compromise. Higher ratings are given to countries where tensions are minimal, even if they exist.

Scale: 0-6; scores can be interpreted as follows:

0.0-2.5 – Highly disruptive ethnic tensions.
3.0-3.5 – Disruptive ethnic tensions.
4.0 – Moderate ethnic tensions.
4.5 – Low ethnic tensions.
5.0-6.0 – Very low ethnic tensions.

Source: Item *Ethnic Tensions* (ICRG 2006)

Notes: This item is an additive component of the overall ICRG country-risk score (Erb, Harvey, and Viskanta 1996; ICRG 2001). Please note that ICRG data is copyright-protected. Do not use without the permission.

3.7. International Factors

DIF01 **Level of Democracy in the International System**

Definition: Average Freedom House (DG02) score for all countries in the sample (excluding the country in question) during the previous year.

Scale: 1 (authoritarian) to 13 (democratic)

Source: DG02 averaged for all units at t-1

Notes: Estimation includes all independent states, not only countries "eligible" for official development assistance.

DIF02 **Level of Democracy in the Region**

Definition: Average Freedom House (DG02) score for all countries in the region (excluding the country in question) during the previous year.

Scale: 1 (authoritarian) to 13 (democratic)

Source: DG02 averaged for all units at t-1

Notes: We employed USAID-defined regions. See list of regions in Appendix 6.1. Estimation includes all independent states, not only countries "eligible" for official development assistance. **DIF02G** is grand-mean centered.

DIF03 **Pending Application for European Union Membership**

Definition: Dichotomous variable coded 1 if the country has applied for EU membership, and 0 if the country has not applied or it is already a member.

Scale: 0 Applicant 1 Non-applicant/Member

Source: Coded based on several sources (European Union 2005; European Union Center 2005; Mattli and Plümper 2002)

Notes:

DIF04 **Democracy Among Neighbors (Freedom House)**

Definition: Average Freedom House (DG02) score for all neighboring countries during the previous year. Neighboring countries are defined as those with land contiguity to the country in question, or with contiguous territorial waters.

Scale: 1 (authoritarian) to 13 (democratic)

Source: DG02 averaged for all neighboring units at t-1

Notes: We employed data from EUGene to identify contiguity. Contiguous territorial waters were defined as water distances within 24 nautical miles. (For isolated islands with no contiguous waters, "neighbors" were arbitrarily defined as the five countries with the closest capitals).

DIF05 **Democracy Among Neighbors (Polity)**

Definition: Average Polity score (DG01) for all neighboring countries during the previous year. Neighboring countries are defined as those with land contiguity to the country in question, or with contiguous territorial waters.

Scale: -10 (authoritarian) to 10 (democratic)

Source: DG01 averaged for all neighboring units at t-1

Notes: We employed data from EUGene to identify contiguity. Contiguous territorial waters were defined as water distances within 24 nautical miles. (For isolated islands with no contiguous waters, "neighbors" were arbitrarily defined as the five countries with the closest capitals).

DIF06 **Brinks-Coppedge Measure of Diffusion**

Definition: Difference between the average Freedom House score in any given "neighborhood" and the country in question (lagged for the previous year):

$$DIF06_{it}=DIF04_{it-1}-DG02_{it-1}$$

Scale: 1 (authoritarian) to 13 (democratic)

Source: (Based on Brinks and Coppedge 2006)

Notes: In contrast to Brinks and Coppedge, we employed data from EUGene to identify contiguity. Contiguous territorial waters were defined as within 24 nautical miles (for isolated islands with no contiguous waters, "neighbors" were arbitrarily defined as the five countries with the closest capitals).

DIF07 **Democratic Diffusion – Spatial Lags (Freedom House)**

Definition: Average Freedom House score (DG02) for all countries in the world (excluding the one in question) during the previous year, with the values of DG02 weighted by the distance between capitals (countries closer to the country in question are weighted more heavily, based on the inverse of the distance). Let d_{ij} denote the distance between the capitals of countries i and j, the formula to compute the spatial lags for country i a time t is:

$$DIF07_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left(\frac{d_{ij}^{-1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} d_{ij}^{-1}} \right) \times DG02_{jt-1}$$

Scale: 1 (authoritarian) to 13 (democratic)

Source: DG02

Notes: We employed data from EUGene to identify distance between capitals (measured in miles). Weights add up to 1.0 for each country-year. Item **DIF07G** is grand-mean centered (eligible countries only).

DIF08 **Democratic Diffusion – Spatial Lags (Polity)**

Definition: Average Polity score (DG01) for all countries in the world (excluding the country in question) during the previous year, with values of DG01 weighted by the distance between capitals. Countries closer to the country in question are weighted more heavily, based on the inverse of the distance. Let d_{ij} denote the distance between the capitals of two countries i and j, the formula to compute the spatial lags for country i a time t is is:

$$DIF08_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left(\frac{d_{ij}^{-1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} d_{ij}^{-1}} \right) \times DG01_{jt-1}$$

Scale: -10 (authoritarian) to 10 (democratic)

Source: DG01

Notes: We employed data from EUGene to identify distance between capitals (measured in miles). Weights add up to 1.0 for each country-year.

FPP01 **Military Assistance Priority**

Definition: Percentage of global U.S. security assistance allocated to a particular country during the fiscal year. Security assistance is defined as comprising military assistance and counter-narcotics grants.

Scale: Percentage of all security assistance obligated in year.

Source: Calculation based on items "Military Assistance Loans and Grants" and "Other Economic Assistance - Narcotics Grants" (USAID 2005).

Notes: Countries with largest shares are Israel (49% in 1995), Egypt (34% in 1998), and Iraq (23% in 2004). Item **FPP01G** is grand-mean centered.

FPP02 **U.S. Foreign Policy Priority Indicator, 1990-2003**

Definition: Dichotomous indicator coded 1 if a country represented a U.S. foreign policy priority during a particular year, 0 otherwise. The coding is based on the level of U.S. foreign assistance targeted to each country, measured on a per capita basis. Assistance was classified into five (non-exclusive) areas: military and counter-narcotics, economic, USAID programs, food aid, and the total for all areas. A country was classified as priority if it was at least one standard deviation above the mean *and* was among the top five recipients in any category during a particular year or among the top fifteen recipients in two or more categories.

Scale: 0 (not a priority), 1 (priority)

Source: Data compiled by Andrew Green.

Notes: Item is available only for 1990-2003 (not after 2003)

FPP03 **USAID Mission Closed in the 1990s**

Definition: Indicator coded 1 if a country had a USAID mission and it was closed in the 1990s. A value of 1 indicates the years after the mission was closed.

Scale: 0 (country did not have a mission in the 1990s, or it had one but it remained open), 1 (existing mission was closed)

Source: Data compiled by Andrew Green.

Notes: Some missions may have been closed but the country still received funds (for remaining programs, through regional offices, etc.). See OBL100 and OBL000 to identify new appropriations.

FPP04 **U.S. Foreign Policy Priority (State Department)**

Definition: This variable counts the number of times that a Secretary or Assistant Secretary of State was mentioned in relation to (i.e. in the same sentence with) a particular country by the New York Times in any given year.

Scale: Count of references, by year (1990-2004)

Source: Data from *The New York Times*, compiled from Lexis-Nexis database (http://www.library.pitt.edu/articles/database_info/academic_universe.html)

Notes: Search protocol: "[Country] w/s secretary of state". Item **FPP04G** is grand-mean centered (only for eligible countries).

MEM01 **IGO Membership, 1990-2000 (Russett/O'Neal)**

Definition: Number of International Governmental Organizations of which a country is a member. Data come from the statistical yearbooks published by the Union of International Associations (UIA).

Scale: Number of organizations

Source: Landman (2005, see Appendix b, pp. 177-180). This series was provided to Todd Landman by Bruce Russett of Yale University and were used in Russett and O'Neal (2001). Available at http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~todd/interests.htm

Notes: Original data is available only at 15-year intervals. Item **MEM01I** is the linear interpolation computed by Landman (which ends in 2000). **MEM01IG** indicates same variable centered at grand-mean.

MEM02 **IGO Membership, 1990-2004**

Definition: Number of International Governmental Organizations of which a country is a member, with linear interpolation of missing years through 2000, and years 2001-2004 imputed by adding the average of the last year-to-year increase over the last four years to last year to create the current year.

Scale: Number of organizations (predicted values)

Source: See entry for MEM01

Notes: **MEM02G** indicates same variable centered at grand-mean.

MEM03 **IGO Membership, 1990-2004 (Natural Logarithm)**

Definition: Number of International Governmental Organizations of which a country is a member (natural logarithm).

Scale: ln(MEM02)

Source: See entries for MEM01 and MEM02

Notes: **MEM03G** indicates same variable centered at grand-mean.

MEM04 **International Non-Governmental Organizations, 1990-2000**

Definition: Number of International Non-Governmental Organizations with a registered office in each country. Data come from the statistical yearbooks published by the Union of International Associations (UIA).

Scale: Number of organizations

Source: Landman (2005, see Appendix b, pp. 177-180). This series was created by Landman and Gemma Mackman from the UIA sources. Available at http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~todd/interests.htm

Notes: Original data is available only at 15-year intervals. Item **MEM04I** is the linear interpolation computed by Landman (which ends in 2000). **MEM04IG** indicates same variable centered at grand-mean.

MEM05 **International Non-Governmental Organizations, 1990-2004**

Definition: Number of International Non-Governmental Organizations with a registered office in each country, with linear interpolation of missing years through 2000, and years 2001-2004 imputed by adding the average of the last year-to-year increase over the last four years to last year to compute the current year.

Scale: Number of organizations (predicted values)

Source: See entry for MEM04

Notes: **MEM05G** indicates same variable centered at grand-mean.

MEM06 **INGOs, 1990-2004 (Natural Logarithm)**

Definition: Number of International Non-Governmental Organizations with a registered office in each country (natural logarithm).

Scale: ln(MEM05)

Source: See entries for MEM04 and MEM05

Notes: **MEM06G** indicates same variable centered at grand-mean.

4. Level 2 Predictors (Constant within Countries)

4.1. History of Democracy (L2 01 - L2 10)

L201 **Average Freedom House Index 1972-1989**

Definition: Average combined Freedom House score (DG02), 1972-1989.

Scale: 1-13 (where 1 is least democratic and 13 is most democratic)

Source: DG02 (Freedom House 2004a)

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries). See appendix 6.2 for treatment of divided and unified countries.

L202 **Proportion of "Free" Years, 1972-2004 (Freedom House)**

Definition: Proportion of years between 1972 and 2004 that the country was rated as "Free" by Freedom House.

Scale: 0-1

Source: PR and CL items (Freedom House 2004a)

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries). In contrast to POL02, this indicator is sensitive to the age of the country.

L203 **Years Rated "Free" 1972-1989 (Freedom House)**

Definition: Number of years between 1972 and 1989 that the country was rated as "Free" by Freedom House.

Scale: N

Source: PR and CL items (Freedom House 2004a)

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries). **L203G** is centered at grand-mean (for eligible countries only).

L204 **Democracy Stock, 1900-1989**

Definition: Sum of Polity IV scores between 1900 (or year of independence) and 1989.

Scale: -10 (authoritarian) to 10 (democratic).

Source: POLITY2 item (Marshall, Jaggers, and Gurr 2004)

Notes: Long-term, level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries).

L205 **Average Vanhanen Score, 1900-1989**

Definition: Average Vanhanen democracy index between 1900 (or year of independence) and 1989.

Scale: 0 (authoritarian) to 100 (democratic).

Source: DG03

Notes: Long-term, level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries).

4.2. State Failure and International Factors (L2 02 - L2 19)

L210 **Years Under Foreign Intervention, 1960-1989**

Definition: Number of years between 1960 and 1989 that the country was under foreign occupation (i.e., coded as -66 in the Polity dataset).

Scale: N (years)

Source: POLITY item (Marshall, Jaggers, and Gurr 2004)

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries)

L211 **Years of Political Anarchy, 1960-1989**

Definition: Number of years between 1960 and 1989 that the country was in a situation of regime anarchy or uncertain rule (i.e., coded as -77 in the Polity dataset).

Scale: N (years)

Source: POLITY item (Marshall, Jaggers, and Gurr 2004)

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries)

L212 **State Failure Indicator, 1960-1989**

Definition: Number of years between 1960 and 1989 that the country suffered political anarchy *or* foreign intervention.

Scale: N (years)

Source: POLITY item (Marshall, Jaggers, and Gurr 2004)

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries). Micro-states coding based on historical sources. Item **L212G** is grand-mean centered.

L213 **Former British Colony**

Definition: Dichotomous indicator (coded 1 if country was a British colony).

Scale: 0-1

Source: (Bernhard, Reenock, and Nordstrom 2004; Teorell and Hadenius 2004)

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries). Item **L213G** is grand-mean centered.

L214 **European Union Application**

Definition: Dichotomous indicator coded 1 if the country applied for EU membership at any point between 1990 and 2004.

Scale: 0-1

Source: DIF03 (maximum value for 1990-2003).

Notes: Level 2 predictor (i.e., constant within countries). Item **L214G** is grand-mean centered.

4.3. Social and Economic Predictors (L2 20 - L2 29)

L220 **Average Population, 1990-2004**

Definition: "Total population is based on 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" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Thousands

Source: SOC01

Notes: Item **L220G** is grand-mean centered (for eligible countries only).

L221 **Income per capita, PPP (CIA)**

Definition: "GDP on a purchasing power parity basis divided by population as of 1 July for the same year (…) The PPP method involves the use of standardized international dollar price weights, which are applied to the quantities of final goods and services produced in a given economy. (…) Whereas PPP estimates for OECD countries are quite reliable, PPP estimates for developing countries are often rough approximations" (Central Intelligence Agency 2005)

Scale: Thousands of US dollars per capita (Purchasing Power Parities)

Source: CIA World Factbook, 2000-05
http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/index.html

Notes: Values reflect average of CIA data for 2000-2005. This indicator correlates at .95 with L227 (World Bank data) but it offers broader coverage (195 countries vs. 177 in WDI). Figure for Czechoslovakia was taken from the 1992 Factbook and adjusted to 2000 dollars using the BEA deflator (http://www.bea gov/bea/dn/home/gdp.htm). Item **L221G** is grand-mean centered (for eligible countries only).

L222 **Income Distribution (Share of top 20%) 1990-2004**

Definition: Percentage of income that accrues to the top 20 percent of the population.

Scale: Percentage (Average for the whole period)

Source: SOC06 (World Bank Data)

Notes: This variable is equivalent to SOC06. In item **L222I** missing values were imputed using the procedure described in Appendix 6.4. Item **L222IG** is grand-mean centered (for eligible countries only).

L223 **Size of the Country (Banks)**

Definition: Land area of the country measured in squared kilometers.

Scale: Thousands of square kilometers.

Source: S02F1 item, averaged for 1990-2003 (Banks 2004)

Notes: Unscaled entries for microstates (those marked in the original Banks dataset as "<") were re-scaled to thousands of square kilometers. **L223G** is grand-mean centered.

L224 **Religious Fragmentation (1960-2003)**

Definition: Average index of religious fractionalization for 1960-2003

Scale: 0 (perfect religious homogeneity) to ~1 (extreme religious fragmentation)

Source: SOC09

Notes: See details for SOC09 above. Values for 20 microstates were imputed based on sub-regional mean and country size.

L225 **Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization (1960-2003)**

Definition: Average index of ethno-linguistic fractionalization for 1960-2003

Scale: 0 (perfect ethnic homogeneity) to 1 (extreme ethnic fragmentation)

Source: SOC10

Notes: See details for SOC10 above. Values for 20 microstates were imputed based on sub-regional mean and country size. **L225G** is grand-mean centered.

L226 **Urban Population, 1990-2004 (%)**

Definition: Percentage of the population living in urban centers. "Urban population is the share of the total population living in areas defined as urban in each country" according to the United Nations World Urbanization Prospects (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Percentage of total population (average 1990-2004)

Source: Item SP.RUR.TOTL.ZS (World Bank 2006)

Notes: Item SP.RUR.TOTL.ZS is equivalent to 100% minus Rural Population, thus this variable was estimated based on SOC02. **L226G** is grand-mean centered.

L227 **Average GDP per capita (2000 US dollars), 1990-2004**

Definition: "GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. 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. Data are in constant U.S. dollars" (World Bank 2005).

Scale: Thousands of 2000 US dollars per capita

Source: DEV03

Notes:

L228 **Human Development Index**

Definition: "The Human Development Index (HDI) measures the average achievements in a country in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living." To construct the HDI, UNDP collects information on life expectancy at birth, adult literacy, combined gross primary, secondary, and tertiary enrolment ratios, and real GDP per capita (PPP$). The index is constructed in three steps: (1) adult literacy and combined gross enrolments are combined into a single index of educational attainment (with literacy representing two-thirds of the measure); (2) all indicators are re-calibrated to vary between 0 and 1; and (3) the HDI is computed as simple average of the life expectancy index, educational attainment index, and adjusted GDP index.

Scale: 0-1, where 1 indicates high human development.

Source: Human Development Report 2004 (hdr.undp.org/2004/)

Notes: Value indicates the earlier score of the Human Development Index available for the country (among years 1990, 1995, and 2000). Information for missing years was imputed using additional indicators of literacy, income per capita, and regional effects. **L228G** is grand-mean centered.

4.4. U.S. Foreign Policy Priority Indicators (L2 30 – L2 39)

L230 **Proximity to U.S. Foreign Policy, 1946-1989 (Gartzke)**

Definition: This index reflects the degree of agreement between the U.S. and the position adopted by each country in the United Nations General Assembly between 1946 and 1989. Scores are based on General Assembly votes, and were computed using the *S* index of portfolio similarity (Signorino and Ritter 1999).

Scale: -1 to 1, where -1 means disagreement with U.S. foreign policy in every UN vote, and 1 means complete alignment with U.S. foreign policy (Gartzke 2006a).

Source: Item S2un (Gartzke 2006b). Yearly scores averaged for 1946-1989.

Notes: Gartzke's original dataset provides distance between all country dyads. We focused on distance to U.S. policy only.

L231A **Proximity to G. H. Bush Administration's Foreign Policy (Gartzke)**

Definition: This index reflects the degree of agreement between the G. H. Bush administration and each country in the United Nations General Assembly between 1989 and 1992, using the *S* index of portfolio similarity (Signorino and Ritter 1999).

Scale: -1 to 1, where -1 means complete disagreement with U.S. foreign policy and 1 means complete alignment (Gartzke 2006a).

Source: Item S2un (Gartzke 2006b). Yearly scores averaged for 1989-92.

Notes:

L231B **Proximity to First Clinton Administration's Foreign Policy (Gartzke)**

Definition: Reflects the degree of agreement between the first Clinton administration and each country in the United Nations General Assembly between 1993 and 1996, using the *S* index of portfolio similarity (Signorino and Ritter 1999).

Scale: -1 to 1, where -1 means complete disagreement with U.S. foreign policy and 1 means complete alignment (Gartzke 2006a).

Source: Item S2un (Gartzke 2006b). Yearly scores averaged for 1993-96.

Notes:

L231C	**Proximity to Second Clinton Administration's Foreign Policy (Gartzke)**
Definition:	Reflects the degree of agreement between the second Clinton administration and each country in the United Nations General Assembly between 1997 and 2000, using the *S* index of portfolio similarity (Signorino and Ritter 1999).
Scale:	-1 to 1, where -1 means complete disagreement with U.S. foreign policy and 1 means complete alignment (Gartzke 2006a).
Source:	Item S2un (Gartzke 2006b). Yearly scores averaged for 1997-2000.
Notes:	

L233	**Proximity to U.S. Foreign Policy, 1990-2002 (Gartzke)**
Definition:	Reflects the degree of agreement between the U.S. and each country in the United Nations General Assembly between 1990 and 2002, using the *S* index of portfolio similarity (Signorino and Ritter 1999).
Scale:	-1 to 1, where -1 means complete disagreement with U.S. foreign policy and 1 means complete alignment (Gartzke 2006a).
Source:	Item S2un (Gartzke 2006b). Yearly scores averaged for 1990-2002.
Notes:	Gartzke's dataset provides no scores beyond 2002.

L234	**Military Assistance Priority, 1990-2004**
Definition:	Average percentage of global U.S. security assistance allocated to a particular country during fiscal years 1990-2004. Security assistance is defined as comprising military assistance and counter-narcotics grants.
Scale:	Percentage of all security assistance obligated (14-year average).
Source:	Calculation based on items "Military Assistance Loans and Grants" and "Other Economic Assistance - Narcotics Grants" (USAID 2005).
Notes:	Average of FPP01

4.5. Political Culture (L2 40 - L2 49)

L240 **Interpersonal Trust (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?"

Scale: Ranges from 0 (Need to be very careful) to 1 (Most people can be trusted)

Source: Items A165 in the World Values Survey, SCTRUST in the Afrobarometer (wave 1), and Q024 in the Asian Barometer.

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L240G** is grand-mean centered.

L241 **Support for Democracy (Survey data)**

Definition: Average level of agreement with the statement: "Democracy may have problems but it's better than any other form of government."

Scale: 0 (strongly disagree) to 100 (strongly agree), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items E123 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale), and ING4 in LAPOP (7-point scale).

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L241G** is grand-mean centered.

L242 **Satisfaction with Democracy (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "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?"

Scale: 0 (not at all satisfied) to 100 (very satisfied), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items E110 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale), PN4 in LAPOP (4-point scale), Q40 in the Afrobarometer (4-point scale), and Q098 in the Asian Barometer (4-point scale).

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L242G** is grand-mean centered.

L243 **Interest in Politics (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "How interested would you say you are in politics?"

Scale: 0 (not at all interested) to 100 (very interested), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items E023 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale), POL1 in LAPOP (4-point scale), Q27 in the Afrobarometer (3-point scale), and Q056 in the Asian Barometer (4-point scale).

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L243G** is grand-mean centered.

L244 **National Pride (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "How proud are you to be [Nationality]?"

Scale: 0 (not at all proud) to 100 (very proud), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items G006 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale), B43 in LAPOP (7-point scale), and NIDPRD in the Afrobarometer (wave 1, 5-point scale).

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L244G** is grand-mean centered.

L245 **Life Satisfaction (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? Please use this card to help with your answer."

Scale: 0 (dissatisfied) to 100 (very satisfied), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items A170 in the World Values Survey (10-point scale), and LS3 in LAPOP (4-point scale).

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L245G** is grand-mean centered.

L246 **Happiness (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "Taking all things together, would you say you are: very happy, quite happy, not very happy, or not at all happy?"

Scale: 0 (not at all happy) to 100 (very happy), recoded from original scales.

Source: Item A008 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale).

Notes: When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. Item **L246G** is grand-mean centered.

L247 **Trust in Government (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "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? The government."

Scale: 0 (none at all) to 100 (a great deal), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items E079 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale), B14 in LAPOP (7-point scale), Q43A in the Afrobarometer (wave 2, 4-point scale), and Q008 in the Asian Barometer (4-point scale),

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L247G** is grand-mean centered.

L248 **Trust in the Justice System (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "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? The justice system."

Scale: 0 (none at all) to 100 (a great deal), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items E085 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale), B10A in LAPOP (7-point scale), Q43J in the Afrobarometer (wave 2, 4-point scale), and Q007 in the Asian Barometer (4-point scale),

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L248G** is grand-mean centered.

L249 **Trust in Parliament (Survey data)**

Definition: Average response to the question: "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? Parliament."

Scale: 0 (none at all) to 100 (a great deal), recoded from original scales.

Source: Items E075 in the World Values Survey (4-point scale), B13 in LAPOP (7-point scale), Q43B in the Afrobarometer (wave 2, 4-point scale), and Q010 in the Asian Barometer (4-point scale),

Notes: The main source for the data set is the World Values Survey (WVS). When the WVS had more than one data point for a given country, we took the mean of all waves. For countries not covered by WVS, we used other sources if an equivalent item was available (the most recent year). Item **L249G** is grand-mean centered.

L2C1 **Institutional Trust (Survey Data)**

Definition: Average of scores for Trust in the Government, trust in the Justice System, and trust in Parliament. The survey questions read: "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?"

Scale: 0 (none at all) to 100 (a great deal)

Source: Items L247, L248, and L249

Notes: Values are un-weighted averages of available scores for the three items.

L2C2 **Satisfaction (Survey Data)**

Definition: Average of scores for Satisfaction with Democracy, Life Satisfaction, and Happiness.

Scale: 0 (not at all satisfied) to 100 (very satisfied)

Source: Items L242, L245, and L246

Notes: Values are un-weighted averages of available scores for the three items.

L2C3 **Social Engagement (Survey Data)**

Definition: Average of scores for Interpersonal trust, Interest in politics, and National pride (inverted).

Scale: 0 (none at all) to 100 (a great deal)

Source: Items L240, L243, and L244

Notes: Values are un-weighted averages of the available scores for the three items. L240 was re-scaled to range between 0 and 100, and L244 was inverted (as 100-L244) to denote cosmopolitan attitudes.

4.6. USAID Presence (L2 000 - L2 999)

L2100	**Total AID for Democracy and Governance Programs, 1990-2004**
Definition:	Total USAID investment for all Democracy and Governance programs during 1990-2003.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2REC	**Recipient of Democracy and Governance Funds, 1990-2004**
Definition:	Dichotomous indicator coded 1 if the country received DG funds at any point between 1990 and 2003.
Scale:	0 (Never recipient), 1 (Recipient)
Source:	OBL100
Notes:	The equivalent indicator for all forms of USAID assistance is ELIG1.

L2000	**Total AID for Non-Democracy and Governance Programs, 1990-2004**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in other sectors, 1990-2003.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2PDA	**Development Assistance as Percentage of total USAID Investment**
Definition:	Average percentage of country-level funds that belonged to USAID's budget ("Development Assistance"), as opposed to the State Department's budget or other Congressionally-created funding sources.
Scale:	Percentage of AID (yearly average for the period)
Source:	PDAAID
Notes:	If there is no USAID presence in a country, value is set to missing.

L2100A	**Total AID for Democracy and Governance Programs, 1990-1992**
Definition:	Total USAID investment for all Democracy and Governance programs during the last three years of the Bush administration.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2000A **Total AID for Non-Democracy and Governance Programs, 1990-1992**

Definition: Total USAID investment in other sectors during the last three years of the Bush administration.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2100A **Total AID for Democracy and Governance Programs, 1993-1996**

Definition: Total USAID investment for all DG programs during the first Clinton administration.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2000B **Total AID for Non-Democracy and Governance Programs, 1993-1996**

Definition: Total USAID investment in Non-DG sectors during the first Clinton administration.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2100C **Total AID for Democracy and Governance Programs, 1997-2000**

Definition: Total USAID investment for all Democracy and Governance programs during the second Clinton administration.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2000C **Total AID for Non-Democracy and Governance Programs, 1997-2000**

Definition: Investment in Non-DG sectors during the second Clinton administration.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2100D **Total AID for Democracy and Governance Programs, 2001-2004**

Definition: Total USAID investment for all DG programs during 2001-2004.

Scale: Millions of constant 2000 US dollars

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2000D	**Total AID for Non-Democracy and Governance Programs, 2001-2004**
Definition:	Total USAID investment in Non-DG sectors during 2001-2004.
Scale:	Millions of constant 2000 US dollars
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	Aggregation reflects total appropriations, not two-year means.

L2999A	**Total U.S. Aid 1946-1989**
Definition:	Total U.S. official development assistance and official aid for 1946-1989.
Scale:	Millions of 2000 US dollars (Net transfers).
Source:	U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants (Greenbook) (USAID 2006)
Notes:	Current dollars converted to 2000 dollars using the World Bank's GDP deflator. Countries created after 1989 reflect experience of the root state. **L2999AG** is grand-mean centered (eligible countries only).

L2999B	**Prior U.S. Aid 1946-1989**
Definition:	Dichotomous variable indicating U.S. official development assistance or official aid during 1946-1989.
Scale:	0 (never received U.S. assistance) 1 (some assistance)
Source:	Based on L2999a
Notes:	

L2T100	**Patterns of Investment: DG, 1990-2004**
Definition:	This measure indicates overall investment pattern in the DG sector over the course of four U.S. administrations (G. H. Bush, 1990-1992; Clinton I, 1993-1996; Clinton II, 1997-2000; G. W. Bush I, 2001-2004). Yearly investment (not two-year means) was aggregated into four data points corresponding to the average appropriations at the country level for each administration. Patterns indicate the trend based on the four points.
Scale:	1. 'Ascending' (consistently increasing) 2. 'Volatile Ascending' (fluctuating but generally increasing) 3. 'Volatile' (fluctuating investment) 4. 'Volatile Descending' (fluctuating but generally decreasing) 5. 'Descending' (consistently decreasing) 6. 'Concave' (inverted U shape) 7. 'U-Shaped' (decrease followed by increase) 8. 'Sporadic' (investment during only one administration) 9. 'Non-Recipient' (country never received DG aid) 0. 'Unknown' (e.g., country is missing for all but one administration)
Source:	USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes:	A significant change (ascending or descending) was defined as a 5% change with respect to the previous year.

L2T110 **Patterns of Investment: Elections, 1990-2004**

Definition: This measure indicates overall investment pattern in Elections over the course of four U.S. administrations (G. H. Bush, 1990-1992; Clinton I, 1993-1996; Clinton II, 1997-2000; G. W. Bush I, 2001-2004). Yearly investment was aggregated into four data points corresponding to the average appropriations at the country level for each administration.

Scale:
1. 'Ascending' (consistently increasing)
2. 'Volatile Ascending' (fluctuating but generally increasing)
3. 'Volatile' (fluctuating investment)
4. 'Volatile Descending' (fluctuating but generally decreasing)
5. 'Descending' (consistently decreasing)
6. 'Concave' (inverted U shape)
7. 'U-Shaped' (decrease followed by increase)
8. 'Sporadic' (investment during only one administration)
9. 'Non-Recipient' (country never received DG aid)
10. 'No Aid for Sector' (country never received DG aid in sub-sector)
0. 'Unknown' (e.g., country is missing for all but one administration)

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: A significant change (ascending or descending) was defined as a 5% change with respect to the previous year.

L2T120 **Patterns of Investment: Rule of Law, 1990-2004**

Definition: This measure indicates overall investment pattern in Rule of Law over the course of four U.S. administrations (G. H. Bush, 1990-1992; Clinton I, 1993-1996; Clinton II, 1997-2000; G. W. Bush I, 2001-2004). Yearly investment (not two-year means) was aggregated into four data points corresponding to the average appropriations at the country level for each administration. Patterns indicate the trend based on the four points.

Scale:
1. 'Ascending' (consistently increasing)
2. 'Volatile Ascending' (fluctuating but generally increasing)
3. 'Volatile' (fluctuating investment)
4. 'Volatile Descending' (fluctuating but generally decreasing)
5. 'Descending' (consistently decreasing)
6. 'Concave' (inverted U shape)
7. 'U-Shaped' (decrease followed by increase)
8. 'Sporadic' (investment during only one administration)
9. 'Non-Recipient' (country never received DG aid)
10. 'No Aid for Sector' (country never received DG aid in sub-sector)
0. 'Unknown' (e.g., country is missing for all but one administration)

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: A significant change (ascending or descending) was defined as a 5% change with respect to the previous year.

L2T121 **Patterns of Investment: Human Rights, 1990-2004**

Definition: This measure indicates overall investment pattern in Rule of Law over the course of four U.S. administrations (G. H. Bush, 1990-1992; Clinton I, 1993-1996; Clinton II, 1997-2000; G. W. Bush I, 2001-2004). Yearly investment (not two-year means) was aggregated into four data points corresponding to the average appropriations at the country level for each administration. Patterns indicate the trend based on the four points.

Scale:
1. 'Ascending' (consistently increasing)
2. 'Volatile Ascending' (fluctuating but generally increasing)
3. 'Volatile' (fluctuating investment)
4. 'Volatile Descending' (fluctuating but generally decreasing)
5. 'Descending' (consistently decreasing)
6. 'Concave' (inverted U shape)
7. 'U-Shaped' (decrease followed by increase)
8. 'Sporadic' (investment during only one administration)
9. 'Non-Recipient' (country never received DG aid)
10. 'No Aid for Sector' (country never received aid in this sub-sub-sector)
0. 'Unknown' (e.g., country is missing for all but one administration)

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: A significant change (ascending or descending) was defined as a 5% change with respect to the previous year.

L2T130 **Patterns of Investment: Civil Society, 1990-2004**

Definition: This measure indicates overall investment pattern in Civil Society over the course of four U.S. administrations (G. H. Bush, 1990-1992; Clinton I, 1993-1996; Clinton II, 1997-2000; G. W. Bush I, 2001-2004). Yearly investment (not two-year means) was aggregated into four data points corresponding to the average appropriations at the country level for each administration. Patterns indicate the trend based on the four points.

Scale:
1. 'Ascending' (consistently increasing)
2. 'Volatile Ascending' (fluctuating but generally increasing)
3. 'Volatile' (fluctuating investment)
4. 'Volatile Descending' (fluctuating but generally decreasing)
5. 'Descending' (consistently decreasing)
6. 'Concave' (inverted U shape)
7. 'U-Shaped' (decrease followed by increase)
8. 'Sporadic' (investment during only one administration)
9. 'Non-Recipient' (country never received DG aid)
10. 'No Aid for Sector' (country never received DG aid in sub-sector)
0. 'Unknown' (e.g., country is missing for all but one administration)

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: A significant change (ascending or descending) was defined as a 5% change with respect to the previous year.

L2T131 **Patterns of Investment: Mass Media, 1990-2004**

Definition: This measure indicates overall investment pattern in Civil Society over the course of four U.S. administrations (G. H. Bush, 1990-1992; Clinton I, 1993-1996; Clinton II, 1997-2000; G. W. Bush I, 2001-2004). Yearly investment (not two-year means) was aggregated into four data points corresponding to the average appropriations at the country level for each administration. Patterns indicate the trend based on the four points.

Scale:
1. 'Ascending' (consistently increasing)
2. 'Volatile Ascending' (fluctuating but generally increasing)
3. 'Volatile' (fluctuating investment)
4. 'Volatile Descending' (fluctuating but generally decreasing)
5. 'Descending' (consistently decreasing)
6. 'Concave' (inverted U shape)
7. 'U-Shaped' (decrease followed by increase)
8. 'Sporadic' (investment during only one administration)
9. 'Non-Recipient' (country never received DG aid)
10. 'No Aid for Sector' (country never received aid in this sub-sub-sector)
0. 'Unknown' (e.g., country is missing for all but one administration)

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: A significant change (ascending or descending) was defined as a 5% change with respect to the previous year.

L2T140 **Patterns of Investment: Governance, 1990-2004**

Definition: This measure indicates overall investment pattern in Governance over the course of four U.S. administrations (G. H. Bush, 1990-1992; Clinton I, 1993-1996; Clinton II, 1997-2000; G. W. Bush I, 2001-2004). Yearly investment (not two-year means) was aggregated into four data points corresponding to the average appropriations at the country level for each administration. Patterns indicate the trend based on the four points.

Scale:
1. 'Ascending' (consistently increasing)
2. 'Volatile Ascending' (fluctuating but generally increasing)
3. 'Volatile' (fluctuating investment)
4. 'Volatile Descending' (fluctuating but generally decreasing)
5. 'Descending' (consistently decreasing)
6. 'Concave' (inverted U shape)
7. 'U-Shaped' (decrease followed by increase)
8. 'Sporadic' (investment during only one administration)
9. 'Non-Recipient' (country never received DG aid)
10. 'No Aid for Sector' (country never received DG aid in sub-sector)
0. 'Unknown' (e.g., country is missing for all but one administration)

Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: A significant change (ascending or descending) was defined as a 5% change with respect to the previous year.

L2R100 **Trend in USAID Investment: Total DG, 1990-2004**

Definition: Average rate of change in annual DG appropriations, divided by the average level of investment during the period. The formula employed to calculate the variable is:

$$L2R100 = \frac{15 \times \sum (AK100_t - AK100_{t-1})}{14 \times \sum AK100_t}$$

Scale: Average change in millions, as proportion of average level of investment

Source: AK100

Notes: Calculation is based on yearly appropriations, not two-year means. **L2R100G** is grand-mean centered.

L2R110 **Trend in USAID Investment: Elections, 1990-2004**

Definition: Average rate of change in annual appropriations for Elections and Political Processes, divided by the average level of investment during the period. The formula employed to calculate the variable is:

$$L2R110 = \frac{15 \times \sum (AK110_t - AK110_{t-1})}{14 \times \sum AK110_t}$$

Scale: Average change in millions, as proportion of average level of investment

Source: AK110

Notes: Calculation is based on yearly appropriations, not two-year means. **L2R110G** is grand-mean centered.

L2R120 **Trend in USAID Investment: Rule of Law, 1990-2004**

Definition: Average rate of change in annual appropriations for Rule of Law, divided by the average level of investment during the period. The formula employed to calculate the variable is:

$$L2R120 = \frac{15 \times \sum (AK120_t - AK120_{t-1})}{14 \times \sum AK120_t}$$

Scale: Average change in millions, as proportion of average level of investment

Source: AK120

Notes: Calculation is based on yearly appropriations, not two-year means. **L2R120G** is grand-mean centered.

L2R121 **Trend in USAID Investment: Human Rights, 1990-2004**

Definition: Average rate of change in annual appropriations for Human Rights, divided by the average level of investment during the period. The formula employed to calculate the variable is:

$$L2R121 = \frac{15 \times \sum (AK121_t - AK121_{t-1})}{14 \times \sum AK121_t}$$

Scale: Average change in millions, as proportion of average level of investment

Source: AK121

Notes: Calculation is based on yearly appropriations, not two-year means. **L2R121G** is grand-mean centered.

L2R130 **Trend in USAID Investment: Civil Society, 1990-2004**

Definition: Average rate of change in annual appropriations for Civil Society programs, divided by the average level of investment during the period. The formula employed to calculate the variable is:

$$L2R130 = \frac{15 \times \sum (AK130_t - AK130_{t-1})}{14 \times \sum AK130_t}$$

Scale: Average change in millions, as proportion of average level of investment

Source: AK130

Notes: Calculation is based on yearly appropriations, not two-year means. **L2R130G** is grand-mean centered.

L2R131 **Trend in USAID Investment: Free Media, 1990-2004**

Definition: Average rate of change in annual appropriations for Free Media programs, divided by the average level of investment during the period. The formula employed to calculate the variable is:

$$L2R131 = \frac{15 \times \sum (AK131_t - AK131_{t-1})}{14 \times \sum AK131_t}$$

Scale: Average change in millions, as proportion of average level of investment

Source: AK131

Notes: Calculation is based on yearly appropriations, not two-year means. **L2R131G** is grand-mean centered.

L2R140 **Trend in USAID Investment: Governance, 1990-2004**

Definition: Average rate of change in annual appropriations for Governance programs, divided by the average level of investment during the period. The formula employed to calculate the variable is:

$$L2R140 = \frac{15 \times \sum (AK140_t - AK140_{t-1})}{14 \times \sum AK140_t}$$

Scale: Average change in millions, as proportion of average level of investment

Source: AK140

Notes: Calculation is based on yearly appropriations, not two-year means. **L2R140G** is grand-mean centered.

L2V100 **Volatility in USAID Investment: Total DG, 1990-2004**

Definition: This variable reflects the volatility of USAID investment in each recipient country during the period 1990-2004. Volatility is estimated in three steps:

1) USAID investment is predicted *for each individual country* as: $AID100_t = a + b_1(YEARNUM_t) + b_2(AID100_{t-1}) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$
2) We compute the standard deviation of residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ within in each country.
3) Volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ divided by the average $AID100_t$ for the country. (This calibration of the measure corrects for the correlation between fluctuations in total spending and the gross amount of DG assistance).

Scale: Millions of 2000 dollars (expected volatility from one year to the next).

Source: Estimate based on data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: (For a similar procedure, see Lensink and Morrissey 2000). Non-recipients are defined as zero. **L2V100G** is grand-mean centered.

L2V110 **Volatility in USAID Investment: Elections, 1990-2004**

Definition: This variable reflects the volatility of USAID investment in each recipient country during the period 1990-2004. Volatility is estimated in three steps:

1) USAID investment is predicted for each individual country as: $AID110_t = a + b_1(YEARNUM_t) + b_2(AID110_{t-1}) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$
2) We compute the standard deviation of residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ within in each country.
3) Volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ divided by the average $AID110_t$ for the country.

Scale: Millions of 2000 dollars (expected volatility from one year to the next).

Source: Estimate based on data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: (For a similar procedure, see Lensink and Morrissey 2000). Non-recipients are defined as zero. **L2V110G** is grand-mean centered.

L2V120 **Volatility in USAID Investment: Rule of Law, 1990-2004**

Definition: This variable reflects the volatility of USAID investment in each recipient country during the period 1990-2004. Volatility is estimated in three steps:

1) USAID investment is predicted for each individual country as: $AID120_t=a+b_1(YEARNUM_t)+ b_2(AID120_{t-1})+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$

2) We compute the standard deviation of residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ within in each country.

3) Volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ divided by the average $AID120_t$ for the country.

Scale: Millions of 2000 dollars (expected volatility from one year to the next).

Source: Estimate based on data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: (For a similar procedure, see Lensink and Morrissey 2000). Non-recipients are defined as zero. **L2V120G** is grand-mean centered..

L2V121 **Volatility in USAID Investment: Human Rights, 1990-2004**

Definition: This variable reflects the volatility of USAID investment in each recipient country during the period 1990-2004. Volatility is estimated in three steps:

1) USAID investment is predicted for each individual country as: $AID121_t=a+b_1(YEARNUM_t)+ b_2(AID121_{t-1})+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$

2) We compute the standard deviation of residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ within in each country.

3) Volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ divided by the average $AID121_t$ for the country.

Scale: Millions of 2000 dollars (expected volatility from one year to the next).

Source: Estimate based on data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: (For a similar procedure, see Lensink and Morrissey 2000). **L2V121G** is grand-mean centered.

L2V130 **Volatility in USAID Investment: Civil Society, 1990-2004**

Definition: This variable reflects the volatility of USAID investment in each recipient country during the period 1990-2004. Volatility is estimated in three steps:

1) USAID investment is predicted for each individual country as: $AID130_t=a+b_1(YEARNUM_t)+ b_2(AID130_{t-1})+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$

2) We compute the standard deviation of residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ within in each country.

3) Volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}$ divided by the average $AID130_t$ for the country.

Scale: Millions of 2000 U.S. dollars (expected volatility from one year to the next).

Source: Estimate based on data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: (For a similar procedure, see Lensink and Morrissey 2000). **L2V130G** is grand-mean centered.

L2V131 **Volatility in USAID Investment: Media, 1990-2004**

Definition: This variable reflects the volatility of USAID investment in each recipient country during the period 1990-2004. Volatility is estimated in three steps:

1) USAID investment is predicted for each individual country as:
$AID131_t = a + b_1(YEARNUM_t) + b_2(AID131_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_t$

2) We compute the standard deviation of residuals ε_t within in each country.

3) Volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the residuals ε_t divided by the average $AID131_t$ for the country.

Scale: Millions of 2000 U.S. dollars (expected volatility from one year to the next).

Source: Estimate based on data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: (For a similar procedure, see Lensink and Morrissey 2000). **L2V131G** is grand-mean centered.

L2V140 **Volatility in USAID Investment: Governance, 1990-2004**

Definition: This variable reflects the volatility of USAID investment in each recipient country during the period 1990-2004. Volatility is estimated in three steps:

1) USAID investment is predicted for each individual country as:
$AID140_t = a + b_1(YEARNUM_t) + b_2(AID140_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_t$

2) We compute the standard deviation of residuals ε_t within in each country.

3) Volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the residuals ε_t divided by the average $AID140_t$ for the country.

Scale: Millions of 2000 U.S. dollars (expected volatility from one year to the next).

Source: Estimate based on data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green

Notes: (For a similar procedure, see Lensink and Morrissey 2000). **L2V140G** is grand-mean centered.

5. Country Codes and ID Variables

Units of analysis are country-years in the Level 1 dataset and countries in the Level 2 dataset (variables in the L2 series do not change over time).

CNAME **Country Name**
Definition: Full country name

YEAR Year Coded (fiscal year if USAID data) - Level 1
YEARNUM Year Counter (1990=1) - Level 1
ENTRY Year when the Country Entered the Sample - Level 2
Iraq2004 Dummy coded 1 for Iraq 2004, 0 for all other observations.

ELIGIBLE **"Eligibility" for USAID Foreign Assistance**
Definition: Only 165 of 195 countries were considered "eligible" for USAID Democracy and Governance programs. We did not focus on formal criteria of eligibility for foreign assistance (which are hard to pinpoint and often do not reflect underlying assumptions in USAID policy) but on functional principles. Countries were included in the analysis when they met any of the following criteria: (1) they were recipients of USAID funds at any point during 1990-2004; (2) they were classified by the World Bank as low or middle-income countries; (3) historically they were rated by Freedom House as a "partially free" or "not free" (i.e., had an average combined score equal to or greater than 3 over the period 1972-2004); or (4) they were newly independent countries (i.e., states created after 1990, typically in Eastern Europe or the former Soviet Union). Countries that failed to meet any of these criteria (i.e., those that never received funds and were high-income, "free" by Freedom House standards and independent prior to 1991) were excluded from the analysis. We considered them virtually "ineligible" for USAID Democracy and Governance programs because they were too wealthy, too democratic, and too stable.
Scale: 0 (Non-eligible, dropped from the analysis), 1 (Included in the analysis)
Source: ELIG1, ELIG2, ELIG3, ELIG4
Notes: If any of the four criteria is true, ELIGIBLE=1

ELIG1 **Eligibility Criterion 1: Received USAID funds between 1990 and 2003**
Definition: Dummy indicating if the country was in fact an aid recipient between 1990 and 2003 (ELIG1=1 if OBL=1 for any year).
Scale: 0 (Not recipient), 1 (Recipient)
Source: USAID data compiled by John Richter and Andrew Green
Notes: Level 2 variable

ELIG2 **Eligibility Criterion 2: Low or Middle Income**

Definition: Dichotomous variable indicating if the country was classified by the World Bank as low or middle-income.

Scale: 0 (High income), 1 (Low or Middle income)

Source: (World Bank 2002)

Notes: Level 2 variable

ELIG3 **Eligibility Criterion 3: "Not Free" or "Partially Free"**

Definition: Coding is based on the average Freedom House score for the period 1972-2004.

Scale: 0 (average FH score 1972-2004<3), 1 (average FH score 1972-2004>=3)

Source: Average FH score for 1972-2004 (reported in Level 2 dataset as L2FH)

Notes: Level 2 variable

ELIG4 **Eligibility Criterion 4: Newly Independent State**

Definition: States entering the "universe" after 1990 were included in the sample.

Scale: 0 (year of entry=1990), 1 (NIS)

Source: ENTRY variable

Notes: Level 2 variable. The concept of newly independent states here includes not only former Soviet states, but also few other cases (e.g., East Timor) entering the sample after 1990.

SC_WB **World Bank Country Codes (Three-Letter)**

Definition: Country ID adopted by the World Bank.

Source: (World Bank 2005)

Notes: It is a revised version of ISO Alpha-3 country codes, but it does not change over time (even if the name of the country changes) and occasionally differs from the ISO standard (e.g., in the case of Andorra). All countries in the sample have a World Bank country code. If World Development Indicators omitted the country (e.g., North Korea), ISO Alpha-3 code was adopted.

SC_ID **Unit Identification Code**

Definition: World Bank country ID followed by year (e.g., ARG1990).

SC_ISO2 **International Organization for Standardization, Two-Letter Country Codes**

Definition: ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 country codes.

Source: (International Organization for Standardization 2005)

Notes: All countries have a code, but a few codes were updated when the name of the country changed (e.g., YU to CS in 2003).

CC_COW **Correlates of War - Country Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by the COW project.

Source: http://cow2.la.psu.edu/

Notes: Microstates not covered by COW have blank entries. See **CC_E** for EUGene country codes.

CC_P4 **Polity IV - Country Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by the Polity project.

Source: (Marshall and Jaggers 2002)

Notes: An extension of the COW codes. Microstates not covered by Polity have blank entries.

CC_GW **Gleditsch and Ward - Country Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by Kristian Gleditsch and Michael Ward.

Source: (Gleditsch 2003)

Notes: An extension of the COW codes. It covers more microstates than Polity (but not every country has an ID number).

CC_G **Gartzke - Country Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by Erik Gartzke.

Source: CODEB item (Gartzke 2002)

Notes: An extension of the COW codes. It covers every state in the sample except the West Bank (and Vatican City). The codebook for Gartzke's affinity data (Gartzke and Jo 2002) makes a series of mistakes when describing the dataset's treatment of divided and re-unified states (e.g., the codebook states that Germany post 1991 is coded as 260, but the actual dataset preserves the COW convention of coding Germany post 1989 as 255). When there are disagreements, CC_G follows the actual Gartzke data and not the codebook.

CC_B **Banks Country Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by the Banks Cross-National Time-Series Data.

Source: (Banks 2004)

Notes: System covers every country except the West Bank and Gaza.

CC_UN **United Nations – Country Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by the UN Statistics Division.

Source: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49alpha.htm

Notes: Covers every country except the West Bank and Gaza. A few country codes changed after the territorial structure of the country was altered.

CC_1 **DG Project Country Codes**

Definition: ID codes specifically created for this project. Seven-digit codes indicate the Continent (first digit), the UN sub-region (digits 2-4) and the country within the sub-region (digits 5-7).

Notes: System covers every country in the sample. Code **CC_1** changes if the country's territory changes. For alternative codes, see **CC_2**, our main variable to identify countries over time (which preserves the ID even if the territory changes), and **CC_3** (and corresponding weight WCC_3) for cases of re-unification. See Appendix 6.2 on the treatment of fractured and re-unified countries.

UN_REG **United Nations – Numerical Regional Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by the UN Statistics Division.

Source: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm

Notes:

UN_SUB **United Nations – Sub-Regional Codes**

Definition: ID codes adopted by the UN Statistics Division.

Source: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm

Notes:

REGION **USAID Regional Codes**

Definition: Regional codes were attached to programs in the USAID funding database. The set of regions was similar, but not equal to the UN-defined regions. We created numerical codes for the USAID funding regions and matched them to the three-digit UN codes when it was possible. When definitions were not consistent with the UN Statistical Division, we created a four-digit code to flag the distinctive nature of the category.

Categories: 002 Africa; 009 Oceania; 021 North America (not in USAID database but in Greenbook); 142 Asia; 150 Europe; 419 Latin America and the Caribbean; 1100 Eurasia; 1200 Middle East and the Mediterranean.

Notes: Labels were attached. See classification of countries in Appendix 6.1.

SUBREG **USAID Sub-Regional Codes**

Definition: Sub-regional programs were identified in the USAID funding database. The set of sub-regions was similar, but not equal to UN sub-regions. We created codes for the sub-regions and matched them to UN codes when possible. When definitions were not consistent, we created a four-digit code to flag the distinctive nature of the category.

Notes: Categories not listed for reasons of space. Labels were attached in dataset. See classification of countries in Appendix 6.1.

6. Appendices

6.1. Countries and Regions

Standard academic criteria for the inclusion of territorial units into the "universe" of states proved to be too restrictive for our analytical purposes. For instance, the Small-Singer standard adopted by the Correlates of War project requires country membership in the United Nations, or a population of at least 500,000 and presence of diplomatic missions from two major international powers (Small and Singer 1982, 38-46). Because several countries in the USAID investment database would be excluded using the Small-Singer criteria, we considered to be part the universe all territorial units that matched two criteria: (1) they were recognized (i.e., assigned a numeric code) by the United Nations Statistical Division; and (2) were independent states (we excluded overseas territories like Martinique, islands in free association with a larger country like the Cook Islands or Puerto Rico, autonomous regions like the Aland Islands, or occupied territories like Tibet; when in doubt we adopted the "date of independence" stated by the CIA's World Factbook).

The only exception to this rule was the inclusion of the West Bank and Gaza, since it is possible that the West Bank will become an independent state in the future, it is treated as distinct territorial unit in the USAID database, and it is covered by comparative datasets (e.g., the World Bank and Penn World Tables) as a distinct entity. Even though Kosovo and Northern Ireland were also treated as distinct territorial units in the USAID database, we were unable to include them given the operational rule (these units are not recognized by the UN statistical division) and the absence of any systematic information in standard comparative datasets. Investment for Kosovo was aggregated into Serbia-Montenegro, and investment for Northern Ireland into the United Kingdom (funds directed to the UK, however, were not included in the analysis since they did not reflect programs managed by USAID—as opposed to the Department of State or other agencies) . According to these operational criteria, the universe of states was constituted by 195 territorial units between 1990 and 2004. Of these, only 165 countries were considered "eligible" for USAID Democracy and Governance programs and thus included in the analysis. (See definition of the ELIGIBLE filter above).

6.1.1. Countries included in the sample and total DG assistance

Countries that Received DG Assistance during 1990-2004

Africa: Angola ($43.1 million in 10 years), Benin ($19.4 million in 10 years), Botswana ($0.1 million in 3 years), Burkina Faso ($0.5 million in 4 years), Burundi ($26.2 million in 11 years), Cameroon ($0.1 million in 2 years), Cape Verde ($0.03 million in 1 year), Central African Republic ($0.2 million in 2 years), Congo, DR (Zaire) ($35.2 million in 10 years), Congo, Republic of ($1.0 million in 2 years), Djibouti ($0.4 million in 1 year), Eritrea ($4.7 million in 9 years), Ethiopia ($41.3 million in 13 years), Gambia ($7.8 million in 6 years), Ghana ($25.2 million in 11 years), Guinea-Bissau ($7.7 million in 6 years), Guinea ($20.2 million in 12 years), Ivory Coast ($4.9 million in 10 years), Kenya ($36.1 million in 10 years), Lesotho ($0.7 million in 4 years), Liberia ($45.6 million in 11 years), Madagascar ($13.5 million in 12 years), Malawi ($23.0 million in 12 years), Mali ($27.4 million in 12 years), Mauritania ($0.2 million in 2 years), Mozambique ($55.6 million in 14 years), Namibia ($11.8 million in 13 years), Niger ($1.7 million in 4 years), Nigeria ($81.6 million in 12 years), Rwanda ($42.6 million in 11 years), Sao Tome and Principe ($0.3 million in 1 year), Senegal ($21.8 million in 13 years), Sierra Leone ($31.0 million in 10 years), Somalia ($15.6 million in 8 years), South Africa ($273.9 million in 15 years), Sudan ($31.8 million in 4 years), Swaziland ($0.4 million in 2 years), Tanzania ($21.5 million in 12 years), Togo ($0.9 million in 4 years), Uganda ($16.8 million in 11 years), Zambia ($25.8 million in 13 years), Zimbabwe ($30.4 million in 10 years).

Asia: Afghanistan ($214.9 million in 7 years), Bangladesh ($40.1 million in 15 years), Cambodia ($97.6 million in 14 years), China ($12.9 million in 3 years), East Timor ($44.8 million in 4 years), India ($20.1 million in 8 years), Indonesia ($224.2 million in 15 years), Korea, Republic of ($0.8 million in 2 years), Malaysia ($0.3 million in 1 year), Mongolia ($28.0 million in 9 years), Myanmar (Burma) ($27.5 million in 7 years), Nepal ($23.3 million in 13 years), Pakistan ($21.5 million in 8 years), Philippines ($56.9 million in 15 years), Sri Lanka ($20.8 million in 15 years), Thailand ($4.6 million in 8 years), Vietnam ($0.2 million in 1 year).

Eurasia: Armenia ($91.6 million in 13 years), Azerbaijan ($70.4 million in 13 years), Belarus ($31.8 million in 13 years), Georgia ($92.8 million in 13 years), Kazakhstan ($98.9 million in 13 years), Kyrgyzstan ($70.4 million in 13 years), Moldova ($25.5 million in 13 years), Russian Federation ($346.7 million in 13 years), Tajikistan ($31.3 million in 13 years), Turkmenistan ($11.6 million in 13 years), Ukraine ($238.3 million in 13 years), Uzbekistan ($46.2 million in 13 years).

Europe: Albania ($95.7 million in 14 years), Bosnia-Herzegovina ($164.0 million in 12 years), Bulgaria ($113.2 million in 15 years), Croatia ($85.7 million in 13 years), Czech Republic ($2.9 million in 4 years), Czechoslovakia ($4.8 million in 3 years), Estonia ($3.2 million in 5 years), Hungary ($20.8 million in 9 years), Latvia ($6.2 million in 7 years), Lithuania ($9.7 million in 9 years), Macedonia ($73.8 million in 13 years), Poland ($79.3 million in 10 years), Romania ($78.8 million in 15 years), Serbia and Montenegro ($372.5 million in 11 years), Slovakia ($28.2 million in 9 years), Slovenia ($0.9 million in 4 years).

Latin America and the Caribbean: Belize ($1.5 million in 4 years), Bolivia ($78.6 million in 15 years), Brazil ($6.5 million in 9 years), Chile ($4.5 million in 6 years), Colombia ($101.8 million in 11 years), Costa Rica ($10.5 million in 7 years), Cuba ($29.0 million in 5 years), Dominican Republic ($55.3 million in 14 years), Ecuador ($57.1 million in 15 years), El Salvador ($188.2 million in 15 years), Guatemala ($76.0 million in 15 years), Guyana ($18.2 million in 14 years), Haiti ($237.9 million in 15 years), Honduras ($62.2 million in 15 years), Jamaica ($9.7 million in 11 years), Mexico ($50.9 million in 10 years), Nicaragua ($100.0 million in 15 years), Panama ($76.4 million in 15 years), Paraguay ($38.2 million in 10 years), Peru ($100.0 million in 15 years), Uruguay ($1.2 million in 1 year), Venezuela ($1.5 million in 2 years).

Middle East and the Mediterranean: Algeria ($3.7 million in 8 years), Bahrain ($1.3 million in 2 years), Egypt ($334.3 million in 14 years), Iraq ($523.6 million in 3 years), Jordan ($28.3 million in 5 years), Lebanon ($28.5 million in 11 years), Morocco ($3.6 million in 7 years), Oman ($0.6 million in 2 years), Qatar ($0.8 million in 1 year), Saudi Arabia ($0.4 million in 1 year), Tunisia ($11.2 million in 5 years), Turkey ($0.9 million in 4 years), West Bank and Gaza ($155.4 million in 11 years), Yemen ($6.6 million in 8 years).

Oceania: Papua New Guinea ($0.2 million in 1 year).

In addition, programs covering multiple countries involved $982.3 million in 1990-2004.

Countries in the Sample that Did Not Receive DG Assistance

Africa: Chad, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Mauritius, Seychelles.

Asia: Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Iran, Korea, DPR (N), Laos, Maldives, Singapore, Taiwan.

Europe: Portugal

Latin America and the Caribbean: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago.

Middle East and the Mediterranean: Cyprus, Israel, Kuwait, Libya, Syria, United Arab Emirates.

Oceania: Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Federated States, Nauru, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu

Countries Not Included in the Sample

Asia: Japan; **Europe:** Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Holy See (Vatican City State), Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom; **Latin America and the Caribbean:** Bahamas, Barbados **North America:** Canada (and the U.S., by definition); **Oceania:** Australia, New Zealand.

6.1.2. Definition of Regions and Sub-Regions

Region	Sub-Region		Country
Africa	South Africa	1	Angola
		2	Botswana
		3	Congo, Republic of the
		4	Comoros
		5	Lesotho
		6	Madagascar
		7	Mozambique
		8	Mauritius
		9	Malawi
		10	Namibia
		11	Swaziland
		12	South Africa
		13	Zaire / Congo
		14	Zambia
		15	Zimbabwe
	Central Africa	1	Burundi
		2	Central African Republic
		3	Cameroon
		4	Gabon
		5	Sudan
		6	Sao Tome and Principe
	West Africa	1	Benin
		2	Burkina Faso
		3	Cote d'Ivoire
		4	Cape Verde
		5	Ghana
		6	Guinea
		7	Gambia
		8	Guinea-Bissau
		9	Equatorial Guinea
		10	Liberia
		11	Mali
		12	Mauritania
		13	Niger
		14	Nigeria
		15	Senegal
		16	Sierra Leone
		17	Chad
		18	Togo
	East Africa	1	Djibouti
		2	Eritrea
		3	Ethiopia
		4	Kenya
		5	Rwanda

Region	Sub-Region		Country
		6	Somalia
		7	Seychelles
		8	Tanzania
		9	Uganda
Oceania	Australia and New Zealand	1	Australia
		2	New Zealand
	South Pacific	1	Fiji
		2	Micronesia, Federated States
		3	Kiribati
		4	Marshall Islands
		5	Nauru
		6	Palau
		7	Papua New Guinea
		8	Solomon Islands
		9	Tonga
		10	Tuvalu
		11	Vanuatu
		12	Western Samoa
North America	North America	1	Canada
		2	United States of America
Asia	South Asia and Afghanistan	1	Afghanistan
		2	Bangladesh
		3	Bhutan
		4	India
		5	Iran
		6	Sri Lanka
		7	Maldives
		8	Nepal
		9	Pakistan
	East and Southeast Asia	1	Brunei Darussalam
		2	China
		3	Indonesia
		4	Japan
		5	Cambodia
		6	Korea, Republic of
		7	Laos
		8	Myanmar (Burma)
		9	Mongolia
		10	Malaysia
		11	Philippines
		12	Korea, Dem. People's Rep (N)
		13	Singapore
		14	Thailand
		15	Timor Leste
		16	Taiwan
		17	Vietnam

Region	Sub-Region		Country
Europe	Southern Europe	1	Andorra
		2	Spain
		3	Greece
		4	Italy
		5	Malta
		6	Portugal
		7	San Marino
		8	Holy See (Vatican City State)
	Eastern Europe	1	Albania
		2	Bulgaria
		3	Bosnia-Herzegovina
		4	Czechoslovakia
		5	Czech Republic
		6	Estonia
		7	Croatia
		8	Hungary
		9	Lithuania
		10	Latvia
		11	Macedonia
		12	Poland
		13	Romania
		14	Slovakia
		15	Slovenia
		16	Yugoslavia
	Western and Northern Europe	1	Austria
		2	Belgium
		3	Switzerland
		4	Germany
		5	Denmark
		6	Finland
		7	France
		8	United Kingdom
		9	Ireland
		10	Iceland
		11	Liechtenstein
		12	Luxembourg
		13	Monaco
		14	Netherlands
		15	Norway
		16	Sweden
Latin America and the Caribbean	South America	1	Argentina
		2	Bolivia
		3	Brazil
		4	Chile
		5	Colombia
		6	Ecuador

Region	Sub-Region		Country
		7	Guyana
		8	Peru
		9	Paraguay
		10	Suriname
		11	Uruguay
		12	Venezuela
	Caribbean	1	Antigua and Barbuda
		2	Bahamas
		3	Barbados
		4	Cuba
		5	Dominica
		6	Dominican Republic
		7	Grenada
		8	Haiti
		9	Jamaica
		10	St. Kitts and Nevis
		11	Saint Lucia
		12	Trinidad and Tobago
		13	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
	Central America	1	Belize
		2	Costa Rica
		3	Guatemala
		4	Honduras
		5	Mexico
		6	Nicaragua
		7	Panama
		8	El Salvador
Eurasia	Caucasus/ Slavic	1	Armenia
		2	Azerbaijan
		3	Belarus
		4	Georgia
		5	Moldova
		6	USSR/Russian Federation
		7	Ukraine
	Central Asia	1	Kazakhstan
		2	Kyrgyzstan
		3	Tajikistan
		4	Turkmenistan
		5	Uzbekistan
Middle East and the Mediterranean	Middle East and N. Africa	1	United Arab Emirates
		2	Bahrain
		3	Algeria
		4	Egypt
		5	Iraq
		6	Jordan
		7	Kuwait

Region	Sub-Region		Country
		8	Lebanon
		9	Libya
		10	Morocco
		11	Oman
		12	Qatar
		13	Saudi Arabia
		14	Syria
		15	Tunisia
		16	Yemen
	Eastern Mediterranean	1	Cyprus
		2	Israel
		3	Turkey
		4	West Bank and Gaza

6.2. Protocol for Cases of State Fragmentation and Unification

The general problem adopts three forms: (i) secession, when a splinter state abandons the "root" country (e.g, when Eritrea separated from Ethiopia); (ii) fracture, when the root country fragments into multiple new states (e.g., Czechoslovakia); and (iii) unification (or re-unification) when two or more countries consolidate into one (e.g., Germany, Yemen)

We have addressed this problem in three different contexts: (1) when creating retrospective Level 2 variables (e.g., the historical level of democracy between 1900 and 1989), (2) when identifying Level 2 units (the countries for which latent curves were estimated), and (3) when computing short-term lags (e.g., the two-year moving average for aid).

(1) Rules for Retrospective Level 2 Variables

i-ii) For secessions and fractures, retrospective values referred to the root country (so, for instance, the history of democracy imputed to the Czech and the Slovak republics between 1918 and 1992 was in both cases the one for Czechoslovakia). When the root country was partly dismembered but it preserved some enduring identity (e.g., the Russian Federation following the collapse of the USSR, Yugoslavia after 1991, Ethopia after 1993) we considered the crippled successor state a continuation of the root country.

iii) For unifications (Germany, Yemen) retrospective values corresponded to the average score for the country partitions, weighted by the relative size of their population at the time of reunification. For instance, we assumed that the democratic experience of West Germany between 1945 and 1989 affected 79% of the population of the current Germany (or their parents) while the experience of East Germany affected the remaining 21% of the population. (In the case of foreign assistance, weights did not apply and we just aggregated the totals).

These rules were implemented using country id code CC_3 and weight WCC_3

Exceptions:
In four cases (the West Bank and Gaza pre-1994, the Marshall Islands and Micronesia pre-1986, and Palau pre-1994) the democratic experience of the "root" country (Israel, the United States) could not be assumed to be shared by the territorial unit, and thus the lack of Freedom House data for the period 1980-89 prevented a straight forward estimation of the past democratic experience of these countries (variables L201 and L203). The absence of data was related to the lack of independence of the territories, but also to late incorporation into the Freedom House list (Freedom House offered scores for Palestine since 1997, the Marshall Islands and Micronesia since 1991, and Palau since 1994). Rather than treating those cases as missing values, we adopted the following procedures:

a) For L201 (the average DG02 score for 1972-89) we imputed the mean DG02 score for the territory's geographic region during the years when the country was moving towards independence (see starting dates below) in the period 1972-89. The

assumption was that the experience of the country would have been similar to the experience of its neighbors had the country achieved independence during that period. Scores based on this procedure were in fact very close to the ones observed in the first year rated by Freedom House (see comparison below).

b) For L203 (years rated as "Free" since 1972 under Freedom House criteria), we assumed that Palestine would have not been rated free at any point during this period, that the Marshall Islands and Micronesia would have been rated free since 1979, and that Palau would have been rated free since 1981 (following the adoption of home rule in the latter three cases).

Country	L201 based on Region's Mean		DG02: first observed		L203 Years "Free" (since)	
Marshall Islands	10.7	(1979-89)	13	(1991)	11	(1979)
Micronesia	10.7	(1979-89)	13	(1991)	11	(1979)
Palau	10.6	(1981-89)	12	(1994)	9	(1981)
West Bank and Gaza	4.9	(1987-89)	4	(1997)	0	(never)

(2) Rules for Identification of Level 2 Units

i) Secessions: Splinters were treated as a new unit, while the crippled successor state was treated as a lasting unit. Thus the Russian Federation was treated as a continuation of the USSR, but Ukraine was not. Note that, according to the rules described above, retrospective Level 2 variables may display the same scores for Ukraine and for Russia, but latent curves were estimated separately for the two countries.

ii) Fractures: We treated splinter countries as new units. For instance, in the case of the former Czechoslovakia, we estimated latent curves for three countries: the Czech and Slovak republics, and the last few years of Czechoslovakia. The three units had equivalent scores for retrospective Level 2 variables (based on the history of Czechoslovakia).

iii) Re-Unifications: This was not a problem for us, since both Yemen and Germany were re-united by 1990. But as a rule the "leading" state in the re-unification process would be treated as a surviving unit (e.g., Germany would preserve the same ID code of West Germany; Yemen, of North Yemen; Viet-Nam, of North Viet-Nam, etc.).

(3) Rules for Lags

We adopted the same continuity rules applied to the identification of Level 2 units. The underlying principle was that lagged variables would be meaningful only when there was continuity in the country unit.

Rules for the identification of units and the estimation of lags were implemented using the CC_2 country id.

6.3. Transformations of AID Variables

At the end of the dataset we include a large number of transformations for the main AID variables. For exploratory purposes, USAID presence variables were transformed using four criteria:

1. Per capita figures: Actual appropriations were divided by the size of the population of the recipient country, using the formula: AID_P=AID/(SOC01/1000). Denoted by sub-index P.
2. Appropriations over GDP: Appropriations were divided by the size of the economy, using the formula AID_D=AID/(DEV02I). Denoted by sub-index D.
3. Grand-mean deviations: Appropriations were measured as deviations from the grand-mean of the variable, using the formula AID_G=AID-*m*(AID), where *m* indicates the mean for the sample of *eligible* countries. Denoted by sub-index G (not available for non-eligible countries).
4. Lagged: Appropriations were measured as the value for the previous year, that is $AID_L=AID_{t-1}$. Because AID is measured as the running mean of appropriations for the current and the previous year, the lagged version represents the mean of appropriations for the last two years. Denoted by sub-index L.
5. The four criteria were combined in several ways, including lagged *and* grand mean deviated (subindex Z); per GDP *and* grand mean deviated (subindex DG); per capita *and* lagged (subindex PL); per GDP *and* lagged (subindex DL); per GDP, lagged *and* grand mean deviated (subindex DZ); and per capita, lagged, *and* grand mean deviated (subindex PZ).

6.4. Imputation Models

Imputed Item	% Missing	EM Model
DG01I (Polity Index)	18.5	Polity IV Score (DG01)
DG02I (Freedom House Index)	1.1	Freedom House Index (DG02)
PRF01I (GDP Growth)	9.8	Coups d'état (POL01) T
PRF02I (Inflation)	20.7	Number of Legislative Elections (POL02)
L222I (Income Inequality)	34.4	Religious Fragmentation (SOC09)
		Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization (SOC10)
		GDP, current U.S. dollars (DEV01) T
		GDP per capita, 2000 U.S. dollars (DEV03) T
		GDP per capita (sub-regional mean DEV03)
		GDP per capita, 1996 U.S. dollars (PWT) S
		GDP per capita, PPP (DEV04) T
		GDP, PPP (sub-regional mean DEV04)
		Telephone Lines PTI (DEV05) T
		Growth in GDP Per Capita (PRF01)
		Growth (yearly sub-regional mean PRF01)
		Annual Growth in GDP Per Capita (PWT) S
		Inflation, Consumer Prices (PRF02) T
		Inflation, based on GDP Deflator (PRF04) T
		Inflation (yearly sub-regional mean PRF04)
		Income Distribution, Share of top 20% (SOC06) T
		Unemployment (SOC07) T
		Unemployment (sub-regional mean SOC07)
		Merchandise Exports (DEP01) T
		Exports/ GDP (sub-regional mean, DEP02)
		Population (SOC01)
		Non-US Assistance (ODA03)
		Democracy in International System (DIF01)
		Democracy in the Region (DIF02)
		Application for EU Membership (DIF03)
		FH among neighboring countries (DIF04)
		Polity among neighboring countries (DIF05)
		Diffusion - Brinks-Coppedge (DIF06)
		Diffusion - Spatial lags, FH (DIF07)
		Diffusion - Spatial lags, Polity (DIF08)
		Time trend (YEARNUM)

T Transformed during imputation to correct for truncation; S Substitutive data from Penn World Tables

6.5. Sources and References

Annett, Anthony. 2001. "Social Fractionalization, Political Instability and the Size of Government." *IMF Staff Papers* 48 (3):561-592.

Banks, Arthur. 2004. *Cross-National Time-Series Data (CNTS).* [cited 2004]. Available from www.databanks.sitehosting.net/index.htm.

Banks, Arthur. 2005. Banks' Cross-National Time-Series Data Archive: Variables and Variable Locations. Binghamton: Databanks International.

Beck, Thorsten, Philip E. Keefer, George R. Clarke, Patrich Walsh, and Alberto Groff. 2005. *Database on Political Institutions (DPI2004).* The World Bank, [cited 2006]. Available from http://econ.worldbank.org/staff/pkeefer.

Bernhard, Michael, Christopher Reenock, and Timothy Nordstrom. 2004. "The Legacy of Western Overseas Colonialism on Democratic Survival." *International Studies Quarterly* 48:225-250.

Blaustein, Albert P., and Gisbert H. Flanz. 1971. *Constitutions of the Countries of the World*. Permanent ed. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications.

Blaustein, Albert P., and Gisbert H. Flanz. 1971--. *Constitutions of the Countries of the World*. Permanent ed. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications.

Brinks, Daniel, and Michael Coppedge. 2006. "Diffusion is no Illusion - Neighbor Emulation in the Third Wave of Democracy." *Comparative Political Studies* 39 (4):463-489.

Central Intelligence Agency. 2005. *The World Factbook.* [cited May 2005]. Available from http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html.

Cheibub, José Antonio, and Jennifer Ghandi. 2004. "Classifying Political Regimes: A Six-Fold Measure of Democracies and Dictatorships." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September 2-5.

Cingranelli, David L., and David L. Richards. 2004. The Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Database: Coder Manual (Version 8.01.04). Dept. of Political Science: Binghamton University.

Cingranelli, David L., and David L. Richards. 2006. *CIRI Human Rights Project.* [cited 2006]. Available from www.humanrightsdata.com.

Davenport, Christian. 2003. Minorities at Risk - Dataset User's Manual (030703). University of Maryland: Center for International Development and Conflict Management.

Erb, Claude B., Campbell R. Harvey, and Tadas E. Viskanta. 1996. "Political Risk, Economic Risk, and Financial Risk." *Financial Analysts Journal* 52 (6):29-46.

European Union. 2005. *EUROPA - Candidate Countries.* [cited May 2005]. Available from http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/candidate.htm#cc.

European Union Center. 2005. *EU Timeline.* University System of Georgia, [cited May 2005]. Available from http://eu-center.org/Resources/EU_timeline.html.

Fearon, James D. 2003. "Ethnic and Cultural Diversity by Country." *Journal of Economic Growth* 8:195-222.

Fearon, James D. , and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97 (1):75-90.

Freedom House. 2004a. *Freedom in the World Country Ratings, 1972 through 2003.* [cited 2004]. Available from www.freedomhouse.org.

Freedom House. 2004b. *Freedom of in the World 2004 - Survey Methodology.* [cited 2004]. Available from http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2004/methodology.htm.
Freedom House. 2004c. *Freedom of the Press 2004 - Survey Methodology.* [cited 2004]. Available from www.freedomhouse.org.
Freedom House. 2005. *Freedom in the World Country Ratings, 1972 through 2004.* [cited 2005]. Available from www.freedomhouse.org.
Gartzke, Erik. 2002. *The Affinity of Nations: Similarity of State Voting Positions in the UNGA.* [cited March 2005]. Available from http://www.columbia.edu/~eg589/datasets.htm.
Gartzke, Erik. 2006a. The Affinity of Nations Index, 1946-2002 [Codebook Version 4.0]. New York: Columbia University.
Gartzke, Erik. 2006b. *The Affinity of Nations: Similarity of State Voting Positions in the UNGA.* [cited 2006]. Available from http://www.columbia.edu/~eg589/datasets.htm.
Gartzke, Erik, and Dong-Joon Jo. 2002. The Affinity of Nations Index, 1946-1996 [Codebook Version 3.0]. New York: Columbia University.
Gibney, Mark. 2005. *Political Terror Scale.* [cited 2006]. Available from http://www.unca.edu/politicalscience/images/Colloquium/faculty-staff/gibney.html.
Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede. 2003. *Modified Polity P4 Data.* (Version 1.0). [cited 2004]. Available from http://weber.ucsd.edu/~kgledits/Polity.html.
Green, Andrew T. 2004. Trends in Post-Communist Civil Societies: Nonprofits, Unions, and Information Legislation, 1991-2001. Washington, DC: USAID/DCHA, Office of Democracy & Governance.
Henisz, Witold Jerzy. 2000. "The Institutional Environment for Economic Growth." *Economics and Politics* 12 (1):1-31.
Henisz, Witold Jerzy. 2002. "The Institutional Environment for Infrastructure Investment." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 11 (2):355-389.
Henisz, Witold Jerzy. 2006. Political Constraint Index (POLCON): Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.
ICRG. 2001. *The Handbook of Country and Political Risk Analysis*. Edited by L. D. Howell: The PRS Group, Inc.
ICRG, International Country Risk Guide. 2006. *Political Risk Rating.* [cited July 2006]. Available from http://www.icrgonline.com/page.aspx?page=icrgmethods.
International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, IDEA. 2004. *Voter Turnout from 1945 to Date.* [cited 2004]. Available from www.idea.int/vt/index.cfm.
International Organization for Standardization, ISO. 2005. *English Country Names and Code Elements.* [cited March 2005]. Available from http://www.iso.ch/iso/en/prods-services/iso3166ma/02iso-3166-code-lists/list-en1.html.
Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi. 2003. Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996-2002. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi. 2005. *Governance Matters IV: Governance Indicators for 1996–2004.* May 9, 2005 [cited June 2005]. Available from http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pubs/govmatters4.html.

Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Pablo Zoido-Lobatón. 1999. "Aggregating Governance Indicators". Washington, DC: The World Bank - Policy Research Working Paper #2195.

Keefer, Philip. 2005. Database on Political Institutions: Changes and Variable Definitions. The World Bank: Development Research Group.

Landman, Todd. 2005. *Protecting Human Rights: A Comparative Study*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lensink, Robert , and Oliver Morrissey. 2000. "Aid instability as a measure of uncertainty and the positive impace of aid on growth." *The Journal of Development Studies* 36 (3):31.

Marshall, Monty G., Ted Robert Gurr, and Barbara Harff. 2001. Dataset and Coding Guidelines - Political Instability (State Failure) Problem Set: Internal Wars and Failures of Governance: Political Instability Task Force.

Marshall, Monty G., and Keith Jaggers. 2002. Polity IV Project: Dataset Users' Manual. College Park: University of Maryland.

Marshall, Monty G., Keith Jaggers, and Ted Robert Gurr. 2004. *Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2002.* [cited 2004]. Available from http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/.

Marshall, Monty G., Keith Jaggers, and Ted Robert Gurr. 2005. *Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2003.* [cited April 2005]. Available from http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/.

Mattli, Walter, and Thomas Plümper. 2002. "The Demand-Side Politics of EU Enlargement: Democracy and the Application for EU Membership." *Journal of European Public Policy* 9 (4):550-574.

Minorities at Risk Project. 2004. *MAR Data.* [cited 2004]. Available from www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/mar/.

OECD - Development Assistance Committee. 2006a. CRS Aid Activities (Creditor Reporting System) 1973-2004 - Documentation: International Development Statistics CD-ROM, 2006 Edition.

OECD - Development Assistance Committee. 2006b. DAC Online - Database on Annual Aggregates: International Development Statistics (IDS) Online.

OECD. 2006. CRS Database. International Development Statistics CD-ROM: OECD.

Paxton, Pamela, Kenneth A. Bollen, Deborah M. Lee, and Hyojoung Kim. 2003. "A Half-Century of Suffrage: New Data and a Comparative Analysis." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 38 (1):93-122.

Political Instability Task Force. 2006. *Internal Wars and Failures of Governance, 1955-2005.* [cited June 2006]. Available from http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/pitf/pitfpset.htm.

Przeworski, Adam, Michael E. Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development. Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russett, Bruce, and John O'Neal. 2001. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Orgaznizations*. New York:: W.W. Norton.

Signorino, Curtis S., and Jeffrey M. Ritter. 1999. "Tau-b or Nor Tau-b: Measuring the Similarity of Foreign Policy Positions." *International Studies Quarterly* 43 (1):115-144.

Small, Melvin, and J. David Singer. 1982. *Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816-1980*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Teorell, Jan, and Axel Hadenius. 2004. "Global and Regional Determinants of Democratization: Taking Stock of the Large-N Evidence." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2-5.

Transparency International. 2003. Corruption Perceptions Index 2003. Berlin: Transparency International Secretariat.

Transparency International. 2005. *Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI).* [cited 2006]. Available from http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi.

UCDP, Uppsala Conflict Data Program, and International Peace Research Institute PRIO. 2006. Uppsala/PRIO Armed Conflicts Dataset. Oslo: PRIO/UCDP.

USAID, United States Agency for International Development. 2005. *U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants (Greenbook).* [cited May 2005]. Available from http://qesdb.cdie.org/gbk/home.html.

USAID, United States Agency for International Development. 2006. *U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants (Greenbook).* [cited August 2006]. Available from http://qesdb.cdie.org/gbk/query_historical.html.

Vanhanen, Tatu. 2003. *Measures of Democracy 1810-2002.* Finnish Social Science Data Archive, [cited 2004]. Available from http://www.fsd.uta.fi/english/data/catalogue/FSD1289/.

World Bank, The. 2002. *World Development Report 2002. Building Institutions for Markets.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

World Bank, The. 2004. *Fiscal Decentralization Indicators.* [cited 2004]. Available from http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/decentralization/fiscalindicators.htm.

World Bank, The. 2005. *World Development Indicators On-Line.* [cited February 2005]. Available from http://devdata.worldbank.org/dataonline/.

World Bank, The. 2006. *World Development Indicators On-Line.* [cited July 2006]. Available from http://devdata.worldbank.org/dataonline/.