DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP REPRISE FOR LATIN AMERICA: DEMOCRATIC TRANSITIONS IN LATIN AMERICA CODEBOOK, 1946-2023[1]

Codebook Version 2.0

Lorena G. Barberia,[2] Kelly Senters[3] and George Avelino[4]

A. Introduction

This Democracy and Dictatorship Reprise for Latin America (DDRLA) dataset provides updated coding of regime type and introduces measures for initial elections and democratic transitions for 19 countries in Latin America. Our main aim is to update and expand the Democracy-Dictatorship data by Cheibub et al. (*Public Choice*, 143, 67–101, 2010), initially introduced by Alvarez et al. (*Studies in Comparative International Development*, 31(2), 3–36, 1996) dataset for Latin American countries by updating the data for the 2008 to 2023 period and adding two additional features. First, we add a variable to measure initial elections, which we consider an important feature of transitions to democracy. Second, we include two new, self-created indicators of transitions, which we define as alternations within democratic regimes of incumbents to opposition parties.

The dataset is in the country-year format and covers the period from 1946 to 2023. The countries included in the dataset are Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela, and Uruguay.

B. Variables

The DDRLA revises and extends Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010)'s "Democracy and Dictatorship (DD)" dataset. We maintain all the variables included in their original DD dataset and adhere to the coding rules outlined in their codebook. We encourage readers to reference their document for a complete explanation of the variables they (and we) consider.

Additionally, the DDRLA introduces five new variables to measure initial elections, and democratic transitions. In what follows, we introduce these variables and include a cursory description of each.

firstelecyr

[1] The authors thank Natalia de Paula Moreira, Ingrid Castro, Victor Shin, Maria Leticia Claro and Davi F. Veronese for their excellent research assistance on this project. George Avelino and Lorena Barberia acknowledge grant support from Fapesp (2019/27645-8).
[2] Departamento de Ciência Política, Universidade de São Paulo, Av. Prof. Luciano Gualberto, 315, 2º andar sala 2047, São Paulo, Brazil. Tel. +55.11.3091.3754. E-mail and corresponding author: lorenabarberia@usp.br.
[3] United States Air Force Academy, El Paso County, Colorado, USA.
[4] Centro de Política e Economia do Setor Público, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Rua Itapeva, 286, 10º andar, São Paulo, Brazil. Tel. +55.11.3799.3228. E-mail: George.Avelino@fgv.br.

First election in country-year
0. No first election
1. First election

tddemoc1
Country-year one-turnover transition indicator
0. Not in transition per Huntington's one-turnover test (one alternation in power)
1. In transition per Huntington's one-turnover test (one alteration in power)

tddemoc2
Country-year one- or two-turnover transition indicator
0. Not in transition per Huntington's one- or two-turnover test (one or two alternations in power)
1. In transition per either Huntington's one or two-turnover test (one or two alternations in power)

preselec
Presidential election in country-year
0. Presidential election does not occur
1. Presidential election occurs

legelec
Legislative election in country-year
0. Legislative election does not occur
1. Legislative election occurs

exselec
Mode of effective executive selection:
1. Direct election (election of the effective executive by popular vote or the election of committed delegates for the purpose of executive selection)
2. Indirect election (selection of the effective executive by an elected assembly or by an elected but uncommitted electoral college)
3. Nonelective (any means of executive selection not involving a direct or indirect mandate from an electorate)

legselec
Mode of legislative selection:
0. No legislature exists (includes cases in which there is a constituent assembly without ordinary legislative powers)
1. Non-elective legislature (examples include the selection of legislators by the effective executive, or on the basis of heredity or ascription)
2. Elective (legislators, or members of the lower house in a bicameral system, are selected by means of either direct or indirect popular election)

closed
Status of legislature
0. Legislature is closed

1. Legislature is appointed
2. Legislature is elected

dejure
Legal status of parties
0. All parties legally banned
1. Legally single party state
2. Multiple parties legally allowed

defacto
Existence of parties
0 = No parties
1 = One party
2 = Multiple parties

defacto2
Existence of parties outside of regime front
0. No parties
1. One party or multiple parties, but they belong to regime front
2. Multiple parties

lparty
Parties within the legislature
0. Either no legislature or all members of the legislature are nonpartisan
1. Legislature with only members from the regime party
2. Legislature with multiple parties

type2
1.Cases excluded from the set of democracies uniquely because they violate the "alternation" rule;
0. otherwise.
In the DD codebook, Cheibub et al (2010) explain:

> "*These are the cases that would be classified as democratic if the only criteria for democracy were multiparty (direct or indirect) executive and legislative elections. This, however, as discussed in Przeworski et al (2000:23-29) and in Cheibub, Vreeland and Gandhi (2009), is not sufficient to identify democracies. In the set of regimes that hold multiparty elections, some do it only because they know the opposition cannot win and others because the opposition would not be allowed to assume office if it won. The difficulty is that in many cases there is no historical evidence to allow the observer to distinguish these cases. Thus, it is possible that we might identify as a democracy a case that is a real dictatorship, or as a dictatorship a case that is a real democracy. The alternation rule, as well as the present variable, identifies the cases for which we do not have sufficient information to decide, according to our rules, whether the country is a democracy or not.*
>
> *Note on the type2 name: A type I error is a false positive and a type II error is a false negative. In the original project for which this variable was created, dictatorships were coded 1 (positive) and democracies 0 (negative). The variable was named to indicate that*

we had made a decision to avoid type II errors by coding as dictatorships cases that might have been a democracy (thus committing type I errors). In the current context, we think of democracy as the positive outcome and dictatorship as the negative outcome. We should, therefore, rename the variable type1 error since we decided to coded possible democracies (real 1s) as dictatorships (real 0s). In the end, it does not matter."

incumbent
Consolidation of incumbent advantage.
1. the regime year qualifies as a democratic regime; and,
2. sometime during its current tenure in office the incumbents (person, party, military hierarchy) unconstitutionally closed the lower house of the national legislature and rewrote the rules in their favor.

In the DD codebook, Cheibub et al (2010) explain:
"The rationale for this variable is discussed in Przeworski et al. (2000:20-22). We expand the action that characterizes consolidation of incumbent advantage to include cases in which the incumbent was first elected in multiparty elections but, for whatever reasons, the incumbent's term was extended, and subsequent elections were postponed (e.g., Angola as of December 31, 2008)."

As part of the criteria for assessing incumbent advantage, we also classify years as 2 when incumbents write a new constitution that leads to changes in electoral rules including the extension or removal of term limits.

democracy
Dummy variable coded 1 if the regime qualifies as democratic. The conditions for this variable are the following:
democracy=1 if
exselec <2 (and)
legselec=2 (and) closed=2 (and)
dejure=2 (and) defacto=2 (and) defacto2=2 (and) lparty=2 (and)
type2=0 (and)
incumb=0

C. Coding Democracy

The main aim of the Democracy and Dictatorship Reprise for Latin America (DDRLA) dataset is to update the dichotomous indicator of political regimes. Democratic political regimes take on a value of 1 if and only if the following four rules are fulfilled:

(i) the chief executive is elected;
(ii) the legislature is elected;
(iii) there is more than one party competing in elections; and,
(iv) an alternation under identical electoral rules has taken place (alternation rule).

If any of these rules are violated, the regime is classified as an autocracy.

Our operationalization of political regimes builds on the seminal works of Schumpeter (1942) and Sartori (1987) and reflects a minimalist definition of democracy. Schumpeter (1942) and Sartori (1987) consider a democratic regime to be one in which the executive and the legislature are both chosen in "contested elections." Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub, and Limongi (2000) as well as Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010) extend this conception to also require multi-party competition and an alternation in political power. We follow the definition of alternation of Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010) who explain that these are elections which are held regularly, but in which the incumbent always wins. In other words, these are elections that are not ceded to political opponents. The DDRLA political regime indicator builds on the coding developed by Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub and Limongi (2000) and updated by Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010). Specifically, it revises and extends Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland's (2010) "Democracy and Dictatorship (DD)" database that covers the 1946-2008 time period to 2023 building on the rules developed by Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub and Limongi (2000).

We identified discrepancies in political regime coding across the various sources we use to check the initial DD coding and inform our update. To broach these inconsistencies, we adopt a procedural approach. We review datasets that are based on the minimalist criterion of democracy. These include: the original DD, Przeworski's(2013) Political Institutions and Political Events (PIPE) dataset, and the Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy (LIED) developed by Skaaning, Gerring and Bartusevičius (2015). We then examine the Bjoernskov-Rode Regime Data (version 4.3) which updates the DD from 2008 to 2023. As alternative measures, we consult the Boix, Miller, and Rosato (2013), Mainwaring and Perez-Liñan (2013), Polity V and VDEM measures.

In contrast to the DD and ACLP minimalist definition, the BMR indicator does not require an "alternation rule" to be satisfied to code a country as democratic, but it does require "free and fair" elections, a criterion that is not in the DD rules. MPL define a democracy as a regime 1) that sponsors free and fair competitive elections for the legislature and executive; 2) that allows for inclusive adult citizenship; 3) that protects civil and political rights; and 4) in which the elected governments really govern and the military is under civilian control. We only identify those countries that by MPL criteria can be considered fully democratic (e.g. a score of 2 for regime).

We also reviewed Nohlen (2005), Payne et. al (2007) and specific recent country studies which are cited in the detailed country coding decisions below.

Moving forward, we abbreviate the reference of these sources as follows:

Boix, Miller and Rosato (2022): BMR
Bormann and Golder Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World (2022): BG
Bjoernskov-Rode Regime Data (version 4.3, 2022): BR
Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland's (2010) "Democracy and Dictatorship": DD
Cheibub, Limongi and Przeworski (2023): CLP
Coppedge et al. (2023): VDEM

Hyde and Marinov (2021): NELDA
Mainwaring and Perez-Liñan's (2013): MPL
Nohlen (2005): NOH
Przeworski's Political Institutions and Political Events (Przeworski 2013): PIPE
Skaaning, Svend-Erik(2021): Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy (LIED)

It is worth noting that we consulted both Bjoernskov-Rode Regime Data (version 4.3)(2020) and Bormann and Golder Democratic Electoral Systems (DES) Data (2022)(version 4.1). Still, the DDRLA rules, which identify recent reversions to authoritarian regimes in Latin America (e.g., Bolivia, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Venezuela), were not available. For example, the DES data does not include the type 2 variable in the data set. Since these datasets do not publish all of the DD variables, we are unable to verify the reasons for the difference in the classification of regimes for specific countries and years with our dataset.

Building on the emphasis of Przeworski (2013) who emphasizes the variable alternation to classify elections that resulted in a peaceful transfer of office between parties, we emphasize the alternation in power criterion and classify countries that exhibit all democratic tendencies other than an alternation in political power as type II cases for specific years into the DD dataset. As Cheibub, Gandhi, and Vreeland (2010) explain, type II cases are those in which: "The incumbents will have or already have held office continuously by virtue of elections for more than two terms or have held office without being elected for any duration of their current tenure in office, and until today or until the time when they were overthrown they had not lost an election."

In the DDRLA, we refine our understanding of type II cases in the Latin American region. In our data, type II cases include the Dominican Republic during Balaguer's rule from 1966 to 1977, Bolivia during Morales's rule from 2006 to 2021, Ecuador during Correa and his successor's rule from 2007 to 2021, Nicaragua during Ortega's rule from 2007 to the present, and Venezuela since Chavez's assumption of power in 1999 to the present.

Due to incumbent consolidation of power, resulting in a lack of alternation of political power, we classify these regimes as authoritarian. However, it is important to highlight that we only classify the political regimes over which these leaders presided as authoritarian beginning in the year of their inauguration; we classify the first elections that brought these leaders to power as democratic as the rules in place in these elections were not manipulated to guarantee their victories. For example, we classify the December 2005 election of Evo Morales in Bolivia as having occurred under democratic rule. However, we consider the period following his 2006 inauguration to be authoritarian. The Bolivian case is different from the Peruvian type II case in the sense that we classify the year corresponding with Alberto Fujimori's first election in 1990 and the period of his rule as authoritarian. In this case, the year of Fujimori's election coincides with the year of inauguration. As a result, we code the period from 1990 to 2000 in Peru as authoritarian.

D. Coding Elections and Initial (First) Elections

As emphasized in the discussion of the DDRLA political regime indicator, elections and the adherence to democratic electoral practices are instrumental to classifying political regimes as democratic.

In this codebook, we document the dates corresponding with all democratic presidential and legislative elections between 1946-2021 in the nineteen Latin American countries studied. We consider elections to be democratic either if they occur in democratic country-years or if they are responsible for electing presidents or legislators who take office in democratic country-years. The DDRLA includes election indicator variables informed by the documented dates.

We obtain election dates from the information reported in Nohlen (2005) and election results from reports by Przeworski (2013), Baker (2018) and the Election Guide (International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) 2023).

Initial (or first) elections are a special subtype of democratic elections that [oftentimes] mark transitions between authoritarian and democratic political regimes.[5] They take place in authoritarian regime years (given that at least part of the year is governed by a non-democratically elected ruler) and are responsible for determining the first democratic government to succeed an authoritarian regime. Put differently, initial elections are presidential elections in which power is transferred from an authoritarian regime to a civilian leader (Przeworski and Cheibub 1999). We code these separately from democratic elections with an initial election indicator in the dataset.

In the period that we cover, some countries have had more than one first election. Three countries transitioned from an authoritarian regime to a democratic regime without a first election. These include Costa Rica, Bolivia, and Panama. The reasons for the absence of first elections in these countries are entirely different, and we detail these in the country-specific regime coding descriptions that follow this introduction.

First, elections necessarily take place in country-years classified as authoritarian. This is because we interpret country-years as democratic if and only if a democratically elected leader governs for the entire year. This means that if a non-democratically elected leader governs a country for any proportion of the year, we consider it authoritarian. Additionally, we interpret the inauguration of democratically elected initial election winners as pivotal moments marking the onset of democratic regimes. If the inauguration of democratically elected leaders takes place in the year succeeding the initial elections, this further justifies the coding of the initial election year as authoritarian. For example, we code Chile's 1989 election (resulting in the transfer of power from Augusto Pinochet to Patricio Aylwin) as an initial election. However, because a non-democratically elected leader governed for part of 1989 and because Aylwin was not formally inaugurated until the following year, the political regime in the year corresponding with the initial election is authoritarian.

[5] Latin American democratic transitions can, but rarely, take place in the absence of initial elections.

E. Coding Democratic Transitions

As previously discussed, first elections can serve the purpose of marking political regime transitions from authoritarian to democratic regimes. Alongside of first election variables, the DDRLA also explicitly introduces a theoretically-guided coding of democratic transitions.

Our transition coding in the DDRLA, like our regime coding, interprets the inauguration of the first democratically-elected presidents succeeding authoritarian rulers as pivotal moments sparking the onset of political regime transitions. Put differently, we conceive of democratic transitions as beginning in the year of the inauguration of the first democratic government installed following a period of authoritarian rule. We posit that democratic transitions endure until *either* one or two turnovers of political power occur. This rule is informed by Huntington (1991)'s defense of the two-turnover test as an unambiguous measure of the resilience of democracy. We rely on country studies, election results; and references including Nohlen (2005) and Przeworski's (2013) Political Institutions and Political Events strong alternation in political power variable to code democratic transitions.

It should be noted that the view that alternations of power are fundamental components of democratic political regimes is echoed in many of the referential works aimed at identifying how to distinguish political regimes including the scholars who developed the minimalist criterion of democracy, but the DD does not use the turnover to identify the dynamics of the democratic transition. This is emphasized and inspired in Huntington (1991).

Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub, and Limongi (2000) emphasize that a democratic regime is one in which "those who govern are selected through contested elections," which are repeated elections characterized by "ex-ante uncertainty" and "ex-post irreversibility" (pp. 15-16). Cheibub, Gandhi, and Vreeland (2010) emphasize:

> "An alternation in power takes place when the incumbent occupying the chief executive office is replaced through elections that were organized under the same rules as the ones that brought him to office. The alternation issue becomes relevant only in the cases where the first three rules apply (70)."

This is echoed in Przeworski (2013) who uses the SALTREL rule to identify alternations of political power following elections. This characteristic has been emphasized by other scholars coding democratic regimes, such as Hyde and Marinov (2012). However, it is explicitly excluded by BMR.

Thus, we attempt to use the alternation rule which we understand is at the core of the Democracy–Dictatorship (DD)—or Alvarez–Cheibub–Limongi–Przeworski (ACLP) minimalist definition of democratic political regimes to understand whether incumbents lose power through elections and willingly relinquish power to the winner in the early

transition to democracy. We thus document the alternations in power that take place in each of the nineteen Latin American countries considered in our study.

F. COUNTRIES

In this section, we provide detailed information on the coding decisions that we made for each country and note the references that we consulted to inform our decisions.

A. ARGENTINA

Initial Election (1): 1946

Democracy (1): 1947-1954

Following a military coup in 1943, the military junta announces general elections in 1946. In 1946, Juan Domingo Perón is elected President. Perón was the labor minister of the military junta that assumed power in 1943. According to the original DD dataset, Argentina was democratic in 1946. However, BMR classify Argentina as authoritarian in 1946 and MPL classifies Argentina as a semi-democracy. However, Ferrero (1976) argues that the military junta was divided and the Farrell-Perón alliance support elections over the rival military faction headed by Ramirez. We, like the DD interpret the 1946 Argentine elections as democratic. Therefore, we code this 1946 election as a first election.

Perón works to fuse the political parties that supported his election in 1946, and also amended the Argentine Constitution in 1949. Women were enfranchised and voted for the first time in this election.

In the general elections of 1951 (Przeworski 2013; Nohlen 2005), there was major political conflict during the elections, but political parties were not banned. Most parties abstained from the Senate and Congressional elections. The LIED, MPL and BMR disagree with the DD coding and suggests that Argentina is authoritarian in 1951.

Authoritarian Regime (1): 1955-1958

President Juan Perón was overthrown in 1955, resulting in rule by a military junta until the 1958 election. MPL state, "In Argentina from 1955 to 1966, certain electoral outcomes were ruled out a priori because the military proscribed the party that enjoyed most popular support." Nohlen also intimates this in his description of Perón becoming more authoritarian over time.

Democratic Regime (2): 1959-1961

Arturo Frondizi wins the 1958 elections. He is sworn into office. Both DD and BMR view Argentina as democratic in that year. BMR indicate that this year marked the beginning of a democratic transition, and MPL indicate that this year marked the beginning of a transition to semi-democracy. MPL classify elections in this year to be partially free and

fair. However, Nohlen describes that Peronism was banned and prohibited from participating in the 1958 election, only the UCRI and UCRP competed. Because the political party was banned from competing, the dejure/defacto criteria of DD are not satisfied, thus, 1958 cannot be considered a first election. Therefore, we do not classify the Argentine election in 1958 as a first election.

Frondizi is coerced to resign by the military on March 29, 1962. BMR considers the regime democratic from 1958 to 1965 except for 1962.

Moreover, before the first chance at a turnover, Argentina reverted to authoritarianism (per DD, MPL, and BMR criteria). Therefore, there was no turnover after this election.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1962

Democracy (3): 1963-1965

No first election.

After the military deposed Arturo Frondizi in 1962, elections were held in the following year.

Both the DD and BMR interpret Argentina as democratic in 1963. BMR indicate that this year marked the beginning of a democratic transition. MPL classifies Argentina as a semi-democracy in 1963 and indicates that this year marked the beginning of a transition to semi-democracy. MPL classify elections in this year to be partially free and fair.

Nohlen claims that the Peronists were banned from competing in the 1963 election. Because the Peronist party was banned from competing the dejure/defacto criteria of DD are not satisfied, thus, 1963 cannot be considered to be a first election. Therefore, we do not classify the Argentine election in 1963 as a first election.

Moreover, before the first chance at a turnover, Argentina reverted to authoritarianism (per DD, MPL, and BMR criteria). Therefore, there was no turnover after the 1963 election.

Authoritarian Rule (3): 1966-1973

Initial Election (2): 1973

Democracy (4): 1974-1975

DD, BMR, and MPL all classify 1973 as a year marking a democratic transition. MPL marks the elections this year as completely free and fair. There are two presidential elections in March and September of 1973. However, unlike other sources, we do not code 1973 as a democratic year because a non-democratically elected government was in power prior to the inauguration of Héctor Cámpora on May 25, 1973. We code the election of Peron in 1973 as a first election. However, before the first chance at a turnover, Argentina

reverted to authoritarianism (per DD, BMR, and MPL criteria). Therefore, there was no turnover after this first election.

Authoritarian Rule (4): 1976-1983

Initial Election (3): 1983

Democracy (5): 1984-present

Each of the data sources consulted consider Argentina to have been democratic in 1983, and there is no glaring evidence suggesting that elections were anti-democratic in 1983. Thus, we code the elections taking place in this year as initial elections. However, because the victor of this democratic election – Raúl Alfonsín – does not assume office until December 10, 1983, we do not code 1983 as a democratic year. We code this Argentine democratic stint as beginning in 1984.

1st Turnover: With the end of Alfonsin's term (07/1989) when Carlos Menem assumes power (turnover).

2nd Turnover: With the end of Menem's 2nd term (12/1999) when Fernando de la Rúa assumes power (turnover)

Presidential Elections in Democratic Regimes: 2/1946, 11/1951, 7/1963, 9/1973, 5/1989, 5/1995, 10/1999, 4/2003, 10/2007, 10/2011, 10/2015, 10/2019, 10/2023

Legislative Elections: 02/1946, 03/1948, 11/1951, 04/1954, 02/1958, 03/1960, 03/1962, 07/1963, 03/1965, 03/1973, 11/1985, 09/1987, 05/1989, 08/1991 - 12/1991, 12/1993, 05/1995, 10/1997, 08/1999 – 09/1999 – 10/1999, 10/2001, 04/2003 – 08/2003 – 09/2003 – 10/2003 – 11/2003,10/2005, 10/2007, 06/2009, 10/2011, 10/2013, 10/2015, 10/2017, 10/2019, 10/2021, 10/2023

Initial Elections:2/1946, 9/1973, 10/1983

B. BOLIVIA

The 1952 revolution that ended in the de facto government by the MNR from 1952 to 1964 is not considered to be a democratic regime in the DD. It should be noted this is a matter of dispute for scholars of democratization in Latin America as the revolution transferred power to Paz Estenssoro, who was the candidate elected in 1950 who was prevented from assuming office. This same situation is repeated in the 1980 election of Siles Zuazo (see in 1980-82 coding for Bolivia). However, Nohlen et al explain that "As for the 1951 election, it became clear that the MNR would be victorious shortly after the ballots had been closed. As a result, even before all votes had been counted, the then incumbent government resigned in favor of a military junta in order to prevent a so-called communist take-over. The following turmoil ended with the defeat of the army and the collapse of the old system in 1952." Since the election results were not observed, the revolution and the inauguration of the assumed victor is not recognized in the DD as a competitive election.

Authoritarian rule (1):1946-1981.

No first election. Lidia Gueiler is elected president by the country's congress in 1979 until June 1980.

There was a brief democratic experience in 1979, but it does not last a complete year in government. This "democratization" attempt was coded in DD and was corroborated by BMR and MPL. However, there was a quick reversion back to authoritarianism.

Nohlen describes this election, as well as others that took place in the decade, as "semi-competitive, fraudulent, and solely aimed at legitimizing the military government" (Nohlen 2005, 125). Therefore, we do not consider this 1979 election to be a first election.

Initial Election (1): 6/1980

Democracy (1): 1982-2005

Siles Zuazo (UDP) won the presidential election held in 06/1980, but he was prevented from taking office. Thus, we do not consider the 1980 election to be a first election. He finally assumes office on 10/1982.

DD, BMR, and MPL consider the first democratic year in this Bolivian democratic stint to have occurred in 1982.

The election rules were specified in Article 90 of the Bolivian Constitution. McClintock (2018) explains that until "2009, Bolivia's election rule was that if no candidate tallied 50%, the president was selected by the legislature from among the top two or three finishers. (Before 1990, it was the top three, but after citizens' dismay at the previous selection of the third- place finisher, it was changed to the top two.)"

1st Turnover: With the end of Siles Suazo's (MORE) term and the inauguration of Victor Paz Estenssoro (A-MNR) in 08/1985. Former allies, these two politicians became subsequent rivals.

2nd Turnover: With the end of Victor Paz Estenssoro's (A-MNR) term and the inauguration of Jaime Paz Zamora's (MIR) term in 08/1989.

Authoritarian rule (3): 2006-2020.

Bolivia adopted a new constitution in 2009. The election rules are specified in Article 166 (Elkins and Ginsburg 2022). The Supreme Court agreed with President Evo Morale's claim that the first term did not count because it was under a different constitution. Thus, Morales was able to run for a third term in 2014 despite the presidential two-term limit in the country's 2009 constitution (Escobari and Hoover 2024). We therefore code Bolivia as an authoritarian regime from 2006 onwards when Evo Morales begins his presidency. Beginning with the inauguration of Evo Morales in 2006 and

continuing in every subsequent year of his ongoing presidential tenure, the political regime variable takes on a value of 0 using the type 2 rule of DD.

Initial Election (2): 10/2020

Democracy (3): 2021-present.

Luis Arce of the Movement for Socialism (MAS) party was elected president in 2020. The results of the election superseded the disputed results of the October 2019 elections, which were annulled during a prolonged political crisis.

Presidential Elections: 7/1979, 7/1985, 5/1989, 6/1993, 6/1997, 6/2002, 12/2005, 10/2020

Legislative Elections: 07/1979, 07/1985, 05/1989, 06/1993, 06/1997, 07/2002, 12/2005, 10/2020

Initial Elections:6/1980, 10/2020

C. BRAZIL

Initial Election (1): 12/1945

Democracy (1): 1946-1963

Both BMR and MPL suggest that the year 1946 marked the start of a democratic transition in Brazil. Nohlen also refers to the period starting in this year as a democratic transition. MPL classify the elections of the prior year in December 1945 as free and fair. This would be the first election for this Brazilian democratic stint, but it starts prior to our coding. In the following election, in 1950, there was an alternation in power.

1st Turnover: When Eurico Dutra's (PSD) term ends and power is transitioned to Getúlio Vargas (PTB) on January 31, 1950.

2nd Turnover: When Getúlio Vargas's (PTB) term ends and power is transitioned to Juscelino Kubitschek (PSD) on January 31, 1956.

Authoritarian rule (1): 1964-1985. A military coup overthrows democratic rule in the country.

Initial Election (2): 1/1985

Democracy (2): 1986-present.

All sources considered (DD, BMR, MPL) concede that this stint of Brazilian democracy commenced in 1985. However, unlike other sources, we do not code 1985 as a democratic year because a non-democratically elected government was in power prior to the

inauguration of Tancredo Neves (March 15, 1985) and, later, the inauguration of José Sarney on April 21, 1985.

The 1985 election was an indirect election, but it is widely recognized as democratic as the military junta did not control the outcome. We consider the 1985 election as the first election.

1st Turnover: When José Sarney's term ends and power is transferred to Fernando Collor de Mello on March 15, 1990.

2nd Turnover: When Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva Lula's term begins on January 1, 2003 (Itamar Franco supported Fernando Henrique Cardoso (PSDB)'s election and FHC was his economic minister).

Presidential Elections: 10/1950, 10/1955, 10/1960, 1/1985, 11/1989, 10/1994, 10/1998, 10/2002, 10/2006, 10/2010, 10/2014, 10/2018, 10/2022

Legislative Elections: 01/1947, 10/1950, 10/1954, 10/1958, 10/1962, 11/1986, 10/1990, 10/1994, 10/1998, 10/2002, 10/2006, 10/2010, 10/2014, 10/2018, 10/2022

First Election: [12/1945], 1/1985

D. CHILE

Democracy (1): Prior to 1946 -1972

After the 1931 election, President Montero resigns. There are new elections in 1932. The precise year in which the Chilean democratic stint containing 1946 (the first year considered in our research) commenced is debated. Nohlen affirms "In 1932 a new period of government began, originating in competitive elections." BMR codes this stint as beginning in 1934, and MPL codes it as beginning in 1932. Regardless, both dates refer to an earlier period than the scope of our work. Thus, no first election is coded in this dataset.

1st Turnover: 1938 (prior to onset of dataset) - When power transitioned from Arturo Alessandri of the Liberal Party to Pedro Cerda of the Radical Party.

2nd Turnover: 1952 - When power transitioned from Gabriel González Videla of the Radical Party to Carlos Ibáñez del Campo of the Independent Party on November 3, 1952.

Authoritarian rule (1): 1973-1989.

Authoritarian Transition: Since the military defeat in the national plebiscite of 10/1988

Democracy (2): 1990-present.

Initial Election (1): 1989

The DD, BMR, and MPL consider democracy to have returned to Chile in 1990. We consider the elections that took place the year prior to be first elections responsible for selecting the fist democratic government to succeed authoritarian rule.

1st Turnover: When power is transferred from Michele Bachelet of the Socialist Party to Sebastián Piñera of the National Renewal Party with Piñera's inauguration on March 11, 2010.

2nd Turnover: 2013 - When power is transferred from Sebastián Piñera of the National Renewal Party to Michelle Bachelet of the Socialist Party with Bachelet's inauguration on March 11, 2014.

Presidential Elections: 9/1946, 9/1952, 9/1958, 9/1964, 9/1970, 12/1989, 12/1993, 12/1999, 12/2005, 12/2009, 11/2013, 11/2017, 11/2021

Legislative elections: 03/1949, 03/1953, 03/1957, 03/1961, 03/1965, 03/1969, 12/1989, 12/1993, 12/1997, 12/2001, 12/2005, 12/2009, 11/2013, 11/2017, 11/2021

First Election: 12/1989

E. COLOMBIA

Democracy (1): Prior to 1946-1949

Initial Elections:Would have taken place prior to period considered in study. Nohlen asserts that the the domination of the Conservative Party ends in 1930. There is a 1936 constitutional reform within the framework of the República Liberal that established universal and direct suffrage for presidential and house of representatives' elections (direct election to the senate was introduced in 1945). But Nohlen claims that the victory of the Conservative Party in 1946 elections, which resulted in an alternation in presidency coincided with a worsening of the traditional political violence.

BMR code Colombia's first experience with democracy as lasting from 1937 to 1947. MPL characterize Colombia as only semi-democratic during this time period (and, in fact, prior to this period and after 1958, which both DD and BMR consider to be democratic). Insofar as Colombia is, in fact, democratic beginning in 1937, the 1938 elections would be the first elections held under the regime. The Partido Liberal wins the 1938 and 1942 elections.

1st Turnover: When power was transferred from Eduardo Santos of the Liberal Party to Mariano Pérez of the Conservative Party and Pérez was inaugurated on August 6, 1946.

No 2nd Turnover. Before a second turnover occurred, Colombia reverted to authoritarianism.

Authoritarian rule (1): 1949-1957.
Initial Election (1): 1958

Democracy (2): 1959-present

Both DD and BMR consider Colombia's return to democracy to have occurred in 1958. Accompanying this return to democratic was a pact, National Front, between the Liberal and Conservative parties, approved by Colombian voters in a referendum. This required the two major political parties to alternate power for a fixed period of time. Because both parties adhered to these terms and ceded power to their opponent, this period is conceived of as democratic. However, we consider the year in which the first election took place, 1958, to be authoritarian because a non-democratically elected leader held office for a portion of the year.

1st Turnover: 1962 – When power is transitioned from Alberto Camargo of the Liberal Party to Guillermo Valencia of the Conservative Party and Valencia is inaugurated on August 7, 1962.

2nd Turnover: 1966 – When power is transitioned from Guillermo Valencia of the Conservative Party to Carlos Restrepo of the Liberal Party and Restrepo is inaugurated on August 7, 1966.

Presidential Elections: 5/1946, 5/1958, 5/1962, 5/1966, 4/1970, 4/1974, 4/1978, 5/1982, 5/1986, 5/1990, 6/1994, 6/1998, 5/2002, 5/2006, 5/2010, 5/2014, 5/2018, 5/2022

Legislative Elections: 03/1958, 03/1960, 03/1962, 03/1964, 03/1966, 03/1968, 04/1970, 04/1974, 02/1978, 03/1982, 03/1986, 03/1990, 03/1994, 03/1998, 03/2002, 03/2006, 03/2010, 03/2014, 3/2018, 3/2022

First Election: 5/1958

G. COSTA RICA

Democracy (1): Prior to 1946-1948

Initial Elections:If occurred, would be prior to the start of the period considered in our analysis.

At the beginning of our DDRLA dataset (1946), Costa Rica is considered to be democratic. According to MPL, this democratic regime begins in 1928 (before which, MPL consider the country to be semi-democratic). It is worthy of note that BMR do not consider the regime to be democratic in 1946 nor in the years leading up to it. Following MPL coding, there would be no first elections (if we were coding back earlier) because the regime classification changed to democratic without elections.

1st Turnover: None. The National Republican party won every election in Costa Rica beginning in 1932 until 1948. In 1948, the National Union won the election. However, the results were annulled.

There was no 2nd Turnover because the regime became authoritarian.

Authoritarian rule (1): 1948-1949

Initial Election (1): 10/1949

Democracy (2): 1950-present.

Both the DD and BMR consider this Costa Rican democratic stint to have started in 1949. MPL consider the regime to have been semi-democratic in this year (as well as in the subsequent few years) before becoming completely democratic in 1953. While we consider DD and BMR's coding as a signal of the democratic nature of the 1949 elections, we do not consider 1949 to be democratic because a non-democratically elected government governed for a portion of the year.

1st Turnover: 1953 – Power transitioned from the National Unity Party to José Figueres of the National Liberation Party. Figueres was inaugurated on November 8, 1953.

2nd Turnover: 1958 – Power transitioned from José Figueres of the National Liberation Party to Mario Jiménez of the National Union Party. Jiménez was inaugurated on May 8, 1958.

Presidential Elections: 10/1949, 7/1953, 2/1958, 2/1962, 2/1966, 2/1970, 2/1974, 2/1978, 2/1982, 2/1986, 2/1990, 2/1994, 2/1998, 2/2002, 2/2006, 2/2010, 2/2014, 2/2018, 2/2022

Legislative Elections: 10/1949, 07/1953, 02/1958, 02/1962, 02/1966, 02/1970, 02/1970, 02/1978, 02/1982, 02/1986, 02/1990, 02/1994, 02/1998, 02/2006, 02/2006, 02/2010, 02/2014, 2/2018, 2/2022

Initial Election: 10/1949

H. CUBA

Democracy (1): (1941)-1951

Any first election that would have occurred would have occurred prior to the onset of the time period covered in our dataset. Therefore, no first election is coded. This is because the initial election is in 1940 when Fulgencio Batista wins the election. Nohlen et al report that a new constitution was enacted and Grau San Martín's opposition party, Partido Revolucionario Cubano (Auténtico) (PRC(A); Cuban Revolutionary Party, Authentic) is again permitted to return to political life. BMR consider the regime to have been democratic as of 1940, and MPL consider the regime to have been semi-democratic starting in 1940. Per PIPE's coding, the first transition in this democratic period in Cuban history took place in 1941. However, after inauguration, Fulgencio Batista suspends the 1940 Constitution and revoked most political liberties, including the right to strike after his election victory in 1940.

Nohlen asserts that the 1944 elections were democratic. Ramón Grau San Martín wins the presidential election running under the Auténtico-Republican Alliance banner in 1944 over Batista's handpicked successor, Carlos Saladrigas Zayas and is sworn into office. Carlos Prío Socarrás of the Auténtico-Republican Alliance banner wins the 1948 elections. An alternation in power did not occur prior to the country's authoritarian reversion.

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1952-present

Elections were scheduled for 1952, but former president Fulgencio Batista seized power in a military coup three months before the elections.

Initial Election (1): 1940

Presidential Elections: 6/1948

Legislative Elections: 6/1946, 6/1948, 6/1950

I. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Authoritarian Rule (1): Pre-1946-1978

Initial Election (1): 12/1962

Nohlen et al explain that after the fall of both Trujillo's successor, Joaquín Balaguer, and General Echevarría, the country experienced a brief period of political liberation in 1962. Free and secret national elections were held in 1962. Juan Bosch is elected. There is a coup d'état in 1963. Because a coup occurred in the same year of the inauguration of the elected president, democracy does not actually take root.

DD and BMR consider the Dominican Republic to have become democratic beginning in 1966. MPL, by contrast, does not consider it to be democratic beginning in 1978. In this case, we agree with MPL and overturn DD's coding decision. We describe our justification below.

Balaguer served three consecutive terms 1966-1970, 1970-1974, and 1974-1978. Per the original DD criteria, this is clearly a situation in which power was consolidated in the incumbent and an alternation in power did not take place. Although the period is coded as democratic in the DD, we alter this coding. We consider 1966 to be a democratic election, but democracy does not endure as Balaguer is inaugurated in this same year. As in the case of the type II coding, our rule is to err on the side of caution. If a year is authoritarian for any part, we consider the whole year to be authoritarian.

Initial Election (2): 1978

Democracy (1): 1979-1985

Per Nohlen, free and competitive elections were held in 1978. However, because a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the victor, we code 1978 as authoritarian. Afterwards, Salvador Blanco of the incumbent PRD party wins in 1982. Therefore, there is no first turnover.

Nohlen suggests that the following five elections (up until 1994) were very problematic and there were widespread accusations of fraud. According to Nohlen, the 1994 elections were also branded fraudulent and Balaguer's victory was questioned. MLP also classify the Dominican Republic as authoritarian from 1994-1995. Balaguer agreed to a shorter 2-year term and signed the *Pacto por la Democracia*. Elections were held in 1996, two years earlier than the regularly scheduled elections.

Alternation: There is no alternation in political power as the first transition from Salvador Blanco to Joaquin Balaguer in 1986 is classified an authoritarian year due to consolidation of incumbent power and a lack of subsequent alternation in political power (violating the Type II rule).

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1986-1996

Per Nohlen, Balaguer is elected and inaugurated in 1986. He wins again in 1990 and yet again in 1994. This neglect of term limits is undemocratic.

Initial Election (3): 5/1996

Democracy (2): 1997 to the present

Because a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of Leonel Fernández, we code 1996 as an authoritarian year.

First Turnover: With the transfer of power from Leonel Fernández of the PLD to Hipólito Mejía of the PRD in 2000 and with Mejía's inauguration on August 16, 2000.

Second Turnover: With the transfer of power from Hipólito Mejía of the PRD to Leonel Fernández of the PLD in 2004 and with Fernández's inauguration on August 16, 2004.

Presidential Elections: 5/1982, 5/2000, 5/2004, 5/2008, 5/2012, 5/2016, 5/2020

Legislative Elections: 05/1978, 05/1982, 05/1998, 05/2002, 05/2006, 05/2010, 05/2016, 7/2020

Initial Elections: 12/1962, 5/1978, 5/1996

J. ECUADOR

Democracy (1): pre-1946-1946

As a result of the Revolución del 28 de mayo, a provisional government formed by the Conservative, Communist and Socialist parties proclaims José María Velasco Ibarra interim president in 1944. Ibarra suffers a military coup by his defense minister and flees the country in 1947.

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1947

Initial Election (1): 1948

Democracy (2): 1949-1962

BMR, and MLP all consider 1948 to be the first democratic year in the period analyzed. PIPE also suggests that 1948 is the year in which there is a democratic transition. However, because the electoral victor, Galo Plaza Lasso, was not inaugurated until September 1, 1948, we code the entire year as authoritarian.

1st Turnover: Power transitioned from Galo Plaza Lasso of the MCDN (elected in 1948 in victory against the PC) to José María Velasco Ibarra of the FNV/ARNE. José María Velasco Ibarra was inaugurated on September 1, 1952.

2nd Turnover: Power Transitioned from José María Velasco Ibarra of the FNV/ARNE to Camilo Ponce Enríquez of the People's Alliance, a coalition of the Conservative Party, the Social Christian Party and Ecuadorian Nationalist Revolutionary Action in 1956.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1963-1978

Initial Election (2): 7/1978

Democracy (3): 1979- 1999

The first round of the initial elections is held in July 1978. Jaime Roldós Aguilera enters office. He is killed, and his vice-president succeeds him to end his term.

1st Turnover: When Osvaldo Hurtado from the Center-Left coalition gives power to the rightist Social Christian León Febres Cordero and Cordero is inaugurated on August 10, 1984.

2nd Turnover: When León Febres Cordero of the PSC transfers power to Rodrigo Borja of the ID party and Rodrigo Borja is inaugurated on August 10, 1988.

On January 21, 2000, during demonstrations in Quito by indigenous groups, the military and police refused to enforce public order. Demonstrators entered the National Assembly building and declared a three-person “junta” in charge of the country. Field-grade military officers declared their support for the concept. During a night of confusion and negotiations, President Mahuad fled the presidential palace. Vice President Gustavo Noboa took charge and Mahuad went on national television to endorse Noboa as his successor. Congress met in emergency session in Guayaquil the same day, January 22, and ratified

Noboa as President of the Republic. Noboa turned over the government on January 15, 2003, to his successor, Lucio Gutierrez, a former army colonel who first came to public attention as a member of the short-lived "junta" of January 21, 2000. Guiterrez won the first and second round vote.

DD considers Ecuador to have returned to democratic rule in 2002. BMR do not consider the regime to have returned to democracy, in this stint, until 2003. MPL does not consider Ecuador to have been completely democratic at any point post-1978. We view the transition from authoritarian to democratic rule to have taken place by way of the 2002 election. Thus, in keeping with our cautious regime coding rule, we code 2002 as authoritarian.

Authoritarian Rule (3): 2000-2002

Democracy (4): 2003-2006

Initial Election (3): 11/2002

On 20 April 2005, the Congress of Ecuador voted 60–2 to remove Gutiérrez from office and appointed Vice President Alfedo Palacio González to serve as President. After the election, power is transferred between Alfredo Palacios to Rafael Correa of the PAIS Alliance with Correa's inauguration in January 2007. Correa won the 2006 presidential election promising to reshape the political landscape by means of a new constitution. A new constitution is enacted in 2008. Correa's party wins 61 percent of the seats in the constituent assembly (Negretto 2022). Negretto (2022) explains that 2008 Ecuadorian constitution increased the power of the executive in several dimensions and allowed the president to be re-elected for one consecutive term. Rafael Correa was re-elected for a second term in the April 2009 general election under the new constitution. He was allowed to run for re-election in 2013. Thus, Correa was reelected to his third term as president. Beginning with Correa's election in 2006, our political regime variable takes on a value of 0 in every subsequent year until 2021.

Authoritarian Rule (4): 2007-2021

We consider July 2021 an initial election after the terms of Rafael Correa and Lenin Moreno from the PAIS alliance. Moreno did not seek reelection, and Guillermo Lasso of the CREO-PSC alliance was elected. Lasso invokes the Muerte Cruzada and dissolves the legislature on May 17, 2023. General elections were held in Ecuador on 20 August 2023 and Daniel Noboa is inaugurated as president in November 2023.

Initial Election (4): 2/2021

Democracy (5): 2022 - present

Presidential Elections: 6/1948, 6/1952, 6/1956, 6/1960, 4/1979, 1/1984, 1/1988, 7/1992, 7/1996, 6/1998, 11/2002. 10/2006, 2/2021, 8/2023

Legislative Election: 6/1950, 6/1952, 6/1954, 6/1956, 6/1958, 6/1960, 6/1962, 04/1979, 01/1984, 06/1986, 01/1988, 06/1990, 05/1992, 05/1994, 05/1996, 05/1998, 10/2006, 2/2021, 8/2023

Initial Elections: 6/1948, 7/1978, 11/2002, 2/2021

K. EL SALVADOR

Authoritarian Rule(1): Beginning of period considered-1983

Transition from authoritarian regime to democratic regime commenced with the election for the Constitutional Assembly in 3/1982.

Initial Election (1): 1984

Democracy (1): 1985-present

Both DD and BMR view El Salvador as democratic beginning with the inauguration of José Napoléon Duarte in 1984. MPL views El Salvador as semi-democratic in the same year. We consider this to mean that the 1984 elections were democratic, but we do not code the regime as democratic until 1985 because a non-democratically elected government governed for a portion of 1984.

1st Turnover: With the transfer of power from José Napoléon Duarte (Christian Democratic Party) to the inauguration of Alfredo Cristiani (Nationalist Republican Alliance) on June 1, 1989.

2nd Turnover: With the transfer of power from Antonio Saca (Nationalist Republican Alliance, ARENA) to Mauricio Funes (FMLN) and inauguration of Mauricio Funes on June 1, 2009.

Presidential Elections: 3/1984, 3/1989, 4/1994, 3/1999, 3/2004, 3/2009, 2/2014, 2/2019

Legislative Elections: 03/1985, 03/1988, 03/1991, 03/1994, 03/1997, 03/2000, 03/2003, 03/2006, 01/2009, 03/2012, 03/2015, 2/2018, 2/2021

Initial Elections: 3/1984

L. GUATEMALA

Initial Election: [12/1944]

Democracy (1): (1945)-1953.

Nohlen asserts that "Ubico, the 'last caudillo'," was deposed by a coalition of diverse social forces in 1944. Following Ubico's downfall, so-called Guatemalan Revolution headed by the Frente Unido de Partidos Arevalistas (FUPA; United Front of Arevalista Parties) revolts against manipulated elections. In 1944, Juan José Arévalo,
won the first free presidential elections. DD considers the country to be democratic in 1946, the first year of its dataset), the first election for this regime would have taken place in 1944. However, this is prior to the period covered in our data.

1st Turnover: None. Nohlen describes that the transfer of power from Juan José Arévalo Bermejo (FUPA) to Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán (Frente Electoral) was of Arevalo's successor. Arbenz was Arevalos' Minister of Defense.

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1954-1958

Initial Election (1): 1/1958

Democracy (2): 1959-1962

DD and BMR consider the regime to be democratic during these years, but MPL do not. The 1958 election is a first election.

There was no transition of power before the country returned to being authoritarian in 1963.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1963-1966

Initial Election (2): 3/1966

Democracy (3): 1967-1970

DD codes Guatemala as democratic from 1966-1970. BMR codes Guatemala as democratic from 1966-1981. MPL does not code this period to be democratic. We view this as a signal that the 1966 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1966 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor.

1st Turnover: Power was transitioned from Julio César Méndez Montenegro (PR) (elected in 1966) to Carlos Manuel Arana Osorio (MLN/PID) with Carlos Manuel Arana Osorio's inauguration on July 1, 1970.

There was no second turnover prior to a reversion to authoritarian rule.

Authoritarian Rule (4): 1970-1985

Authoritarian transition commenced in 08/1983 with the removal of General Rios Montt by Gen. Mejia. The authoritarian government announces a political opening.

Initial Election (3): 11/1985

Democracy (4): 1986-present

The contemporary democratic period commences in 1986 with the inauguration of Vinicio Cerezo's term whom Nohlen, et. al. recognize as the first constitutionally elected president in 20 years. Both DD and BMR recognize 1986 as the first year in this Guatemalan democratic stint. MPL recognizes Guatemala as a semi-democracy in this year.

1st Turnover: When power is transferred from Christian Democrat Vinicio Cerezo (DCG) to the conservative Jorge Antonio Serrano Elias (MAS) (inaugurated on January 14, 1991).

2nd Turnover: When power is transferred from Jorge Antonio Serrano Elias (MAS) to Ramiro de Leon Carpio of the Unity of the National Centre (UCN). Ramiro de Leon Carpio is inaugurated as president on June 6, 1993 in parliamentary elections following Jorge Antonio Serrano Elias's self-coup attempt in 1992.

Presidential Elections: 11/1950, 1/1958, 3/1966, 3/1970, 11/1985, 11/1990, 11/1995, 11/1999, 11/2003, 9/2007, 9/2011, 9/2015, 6/2019, 6/2023

Legislative Elections: 01/1947, 11/1948, 12/1950, 01/1953, 01/1958, 12/1959, 12/1961, 03/1966, 03/1970, 11/1985, 11/1990, 08/1994, 12/1995, 11/1999, 11/2003, 09/2007, 11/2011, 09/2015, 6/2019, 6/2023

Initial Elections: [12/1944], 1/1958, 3/1966, 11/1985

M. HONDURAS

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1946-1957

Initial Election (1): 1957

Democracy (1): 1958-1962

There is a first election by a constituent assembly in December 1957. We adopt the same coding as a similar case –the Brazilian 1985 election. Cameron (1983) explains that president Ramón Villeda Morales was elected by a Constituent Assembly. There were Constituent Assembly elections in 1957. These appointed to serve as Ramón Villeda as President and to oversee the transition to democratic. The Constituent Assembly appointed itself to the status of a National Congress with a six-year term. DD and BMR consider Honduras to be democratic during this period. MPL consider the country to be semi-democratic.

There was no turnover. Prior to a turnover taking place, the political regime in the country reverted to authoritarianism.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1963-1970.

In October 1963, conservative military officers preempted constitutional elections and deposed Villeda in a bloody coup. These officers exiled PLH members and governed under General Oswaldo López until 1970.

Initial Election (2): 3/1971

Democracy (2): Did not take root.

DD and BMR characterize Honduras as democratic in 1971, and MPL considers the country to be semi-democratic in this year. We view this as a signal that the 1971 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1971 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor. Because a coup occurred in the same year of the inauguration of the elected president, democracy does not actually take root.

There was no turnover. Prior to a turnover taking place, the political regime in the country reverted to authoritarianism.

Authoritarian Rule (3): 1972-1981

Initial Election (3): 1981

Democracy (3): 1982-2008

The 1981 general elections resulted in the election of Roberto Suazo Cordova (Liberal Party). His inauguration in January 1982 signaled the onset of a democratic transition.

Both DD and BMR code this Honduran democratic stint as commencing in 1982. MPL considers Honduras to have become semi-democratic in this same year.

1st Turnover: With the inauguration of Rafael Leonardo Callejas's (PN) term on January 27, 1990.

2nd Turnover: With the inauguration of Carlos Roberto Reina's (PL) term on January 27, 1994.

There has also been a reversion to authoritarianism in Honduras since 2009, the first new year considered in our update. This recession was triggered by a coup staged by Honduran politicians and military officers that was, allegedly, motivated by a desire to quell then-President Manuel Zelaya's goal of manipulating political institutions to permit his reelection (Llanos and Marsteintredet 2010). This coup resulted in a non-elective executive selection. The election that followed in November of 2009 was conducted using rules that differed from those that brought the previous incumbent to office, and although multiple parties were permitted to compete, Zelaya's Liberal party was not permitted to compete. For these reasons, we characterize the 2009 election-year and the presidential term of Porfirio Lobo Sosa of the National Party from 2010 to 2013 as authoritarian. As the National Party again won the 2013 elections, we classify Honduras as authoritarian.

BMR only codes 2009 as authoritarian, but then considers the regime as democratic until 2017.

Authoritarian Rule (4): 2009-2021

Initial Election (4): 11/2021

In 2021, Xiomara Castro, from the Freedom and Refoundation Party, won a presidential election against Nasry Asfura, candidate from the incumbent National Party, and successfully took office in 2022. This shift in power characterizes a transition to democracy and a first election.

Democracy (4): 2022 - present

Presidential Elections: 11/1985, 11/1989, 11/1993, 11/1997, 11/2001, 11/2005, 11/2021

Legislative Elections: 11/1985, 11/1989, 11/1993, 11/1997, 11/2001, 11/2005, 11/2021

Initial Elections: 12/1957, 3/1971, 11/1981, 11/2021

N. MEXICO

Authoritarian Rule (1): Prior to 1946-1999

Democracy(1): 2001-present.

Initial Election (1): 7/2000

All sources considered (DD, BMR, and MPL) conider Mexico to have become democratic in 2000. We view this as a signal that the 2000 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 2000 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor.

1st Turnover: When power was transitioned from Felipe Calderón (PAN) to Enrique Peña Nieto (PRI) and Peña Nieto was inaugurated on December 1, 2012.

2nd Turnover: When power was transferred from Enrique Peña Nieto (PRI) to Manuel Lopez Obrador (PRD) on December 1, 2018.

Presidential Elections: 7/2000, 7/2006, 7/2012, 7/2018

Legislative Elections: 7/2000, 7/2003, 7/2006, 7/2009, 7/2012, 6/2015, 7/2018, 7/2021

Initial Election: 7/2000

O. NICARAGUA

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1946-1984

Initial Election (1): 11/1984

Democracy (1): 1985-2006

DD and BMR consider Nicaragua to have become democratic in 1984. MPL considers the regime to have become semi-democratic in the same year. While
Daniel Ortega was elected as President of Nicaragua in the 1984 elections, he was not inaugurated until January 10, 1985. This means that all or part of both 1984 and 1985 were governed by non-democratically elected governments. Therefore, we do not code Nicaragua to be democratic until 1986. This said, we consider the 1984 elections to have been democratic elections. In this case, we override the DD coding.

1st Turnover: With the transfer of power from Daniel Ortega (FSLN) to Violeta Barrios de Chamorro (UNO –PLC included) and Violeta Barrios de Chamorro's inauguration on April 25, 1990.

2nd Turnover: With the transfer of power from Violeta Barrios de Chamorro (UNO to Arnoldo Alemán Lacayo (Liberal Alliance, AL led by the Partido Liberal Constitucionalista (PLC)) and Arnoldo Alemán Lacayo's inauguration on January 10, 1997.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 2007-present.

In the case of Nicaragua, we code every year following Daniel Ortega's election in 2006 as authoritarian. This is because the Ortega Administration begins to limit the number of parties in 2008 and removes limits on re-election in the 2014 constitution (McConnell 2020; Thaler 2017). The modification of election rules to extend Ortega's rule beyond two terms clearly qualifies this case as a type II case. Additionally, two years after the disbanding of term limits, Eduardo Montealegre (the leader of Nicaragua's PLI opposition party) was banned from competing in that year's election. Other parties in coalition with the PLI were also stripped of their legal status in 2016. This stifling of political competition further justifies our authoritarian political regime coding in the country. BMR only code Nicaragua as authoritarian from 2017 to 2020.

Presidential Elections: 11/1984, 2/1990, 10/1996, 11/2001, 11/2006

Legislative Elections: 11/1984, 2/1990, 10/1996, 11/2001, 11/2006

Initial Election: 11/1984

P. PANAMA

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1946-1948

Initial Election (1): 5/1948

There is a fraudelent election, and initially Diaz is declared President. One year later, there is a recount and Arnulfo Arias is declared President.

Democracy (1): 1949-1950

Nohlen et al write "Under this [1946] constitution only the political parties were allowed to present candidates. Despite the constitutional regulations, the elections during the following two decades could still not be described as free or competitive. Only the results of the 1964 elections were accepted by all the contestants, most of whom belonged to the different liberal currents. DD codes democracy as existing in 1949 and 1950 in Panama. However, there is a coup'd'etat to depose the Vice-President who assumes power after President Arosamena's death in 1949. BMR consider Panama to be democratic in 1950, but not in 1949. MPL do not consider the country to be democratic in either year. There is no turnover, and Panama reverts to authoritarianism afterwards. We therefore correct the DD coding.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1951-1952

Initial Election (2): 5/1952

Democracy (2): 1953-1967

DD and BMR code Panama as democratic from 1952-1967. MPL consider Panama to be authoritarian until 1956. They code Panama as democratic from 1956-1962 and as semi-democratic from 1963-1967. The 1952 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1952 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor. Democracy begins the year after.

1st Turnover: Power is transitioned from José Antonio Remón Cantera of the CPN (elected in 1952 and again in 1956) to Roberto Chiari of UNO and Roberto Chiari is inaugurated on October 1, 1960.

2nd Turnover: There is no second turnover before Panama reverts to authoritarian.

Authoritarian Rule (3): 1968-1990

Initial Elections (3): 5/1989

Democracy (3): 1991-present

DD codes this democratic stint in Panama as beginning in 1989. However, BMR do not consider Panama to be democratic until 1991. MPL does not provide further assistance in adjudicating between the years proffered by these two coding rules: It considers Panama to become partially democratic in 1990. Panama held a general election in May 1989. The

election was annulled before voting was completed. Endara was inaugurated as the new president of Panama during the U.S. invasion seven months after the election. We do not adopt the original DD coding, but instead consider this an authoritarian year in alignment with BMR. By-elections were held for the nine seats of the Legislative Assembly that could not be filled for the May 1989 general elections in 1991. The opposition PRD party gained power in the legislature as a result.

1st Turnover: 1994 – When power is transferred from Guillermo Endara (Moral Vanguard of the Fatherland) to Ernesto Pérez Balladares of the Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD) and Ernesto Pérez Balladares is inaugurated on September 1, 1994.

2nd Turnover: 1999 - When power is transferred from Ernesto Pérez Balladres of the Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD) to Mireya Moscoso (AUDD) and Mireya Moscoso is inaugurated on September 1, 1999.

Presidential Elections: 5/1952, 5/1956, 5/1960, 5/1964, 5/1994, 5/1999, 5/2004, 5/2009, 5/2014, 5/2019

Legislative Elections: 05/1994, 05/1999, 05/2004, 05/2009, 05/2014, 5/2019

Initial Elections: 5/1948, 5/1952, 5/1989

Q. PARAGUAY

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1946- 1989

Initial Election (1): 1989

After the fall of 33 years of Stroessner's rule with the coup lead by Andres Rodrigues.

Democracy (1): 1990-present

DD views Paraguay as democratic as of 1989. The1989 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1989 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor. BMR do not consider Paraguay to be democratic until 2003. MPL, like DD, also interpret pro-democratic movement (they consider the regime to be semi-democratic) in 1989.

1st Turnover: 2008 – When power is transferred from Nicanor Duarte Frutos (Colorado) to Fernando Lugo (Christian Democrat) and Lugo assumed office on August 15, 2008.

2nd Turnover: 2013 – When power is transferred from Fernando Lugo (Christian Democrat) to Horacio Cartes (Colorado) and Cartes assumed office on August 15, 2013.

Presidential Elections: 5/1989, 5/1993, 5/1998, 4/2003, 4/2008, 4/2013, 4/2018, 4/2023

Legislative Elections: 05/1989, 05/1993, 05/1998, 04/2003, 04/2008, 04/2013, 4/2018, 4/2023

Initial Election: 5/1989

R. PERU

Initial Election: [6/1945]

Democracy (1): 1946-1947

In 1944, APRA formed the National Democratic Front political coalition electing José Luis Bustamante y Rivero in 1945. Nohlen cites José Luis Bustamante y Rivero's government from 1945 to 1948 as first democratic government preceding period ruled by oligarchic parties. DD characterizes Peru as democratic in 1946, the first year of the dataset. BMR do not conceive of Peru as democratic in the 1946-1947 period, and MPL conceive of Peru as semi-democratic during this period.

There is no turnover, and the regime becomes authoritarian in 1948 when there is a coup.

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1948-1955

Initial Election (1): 1956

Democracy (2): 1957-1961

The 1956 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1956 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor. DD and BMR code Peru as democratic from 1956-1961, MPL code Peru as semi-democratic during this period.

There are no turnovers prior to authoritarian reversion.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1962

Initial Election (2): 6/1963

Democracy (3): 1964-1967

The 1963 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1963 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor. Peru is considered to become democratic in 1963 by DD, MPL, and BMR.

There are no turnovers prior to authoritarian reversion.

Authoritarian Rule (3): 1968-1980

Initial Election (3): 5/1980

Democracy (4): 1981-1989

DD, BMR, and MPL Peru to have transitioned to democracy in 1980.

The 1980 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1980 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor.

1st Turnover: 1985 – Power is transferred from Fernando Belaúnde Terry (APRA) to Alan Garcia (Partido Aprista Peruano**)** and Garcia is inaugurated on July 28, 1985.

There is no second turnover before a reversion to authoritarianism.

Authoritarian Rule(4): 1990-2000

Fujimori staged *coup d'etat* on 5 April 1992.

A democratic transition began in 2000 with Fujimori's resignation (which coded as entirely authoritarian given Alvarez et. al. rules).

Fujimori resigned in 11/2000, and the power is given to the president of Peruvian Congress Valentín Paniágua until elections in May and June of 2001. At that time, Alejandro Toledo (Perú Posible) is elected.

Initial Election (4): 4/2001
Democracy (5): 2002-present

DD and BMR consider Peru to become democratic, once again, in 2001. MPL marks 2001 as the first fully-democratic year (following a period of semi-democracy). The 2001 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 2001 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor.

In recent years, there have been presidential crises, but the rules of the Constitution and Congress have responded to impede autocratic coups by the executive in two episodes. After Kuczynski resigned from the presidency on 23 March 2018, following a successful impeachment vote and days before a probable conviction vote, his vice-president, Martín Vizcarra, assumed office. He dissolved the Congress on September 30, 2019. Congress impeached Vizcarra for the first time. Congressional elections were held in January 2020. Vizcarra was impeached for a second time in November 2020. The President of Congress and opposition leader Manuel Merino succeeded Vizcarra as President of Peru the following day. In the following election, Pedro Castillo was elected. However, he attempted a self-coup and was impeached by Congress. He was succeeded by First Vice President Dina Boluarte.

1st Turnover (2): 7/2006 – Power is transitioned from Alejandro Toledo (Possible Peru) to Alan García (APRA). García was sworn in as President of the Republic for the second time on July 28, 2006.

2nd Turnover: 2011- Alan García (APRA) transfers power to Ollanta Humala Tasso of the Peruvian Nationalist Party, and Ollanta Humala Tasso is inaugurated on July 28, 2011.

Presidential Elections: 6/1956, 6/1963, 5/1980, 4/1985, 4/2006, 4/2011, 4/2016, 4/2021

Legislative Elections: 07/1956, 05/1980, 04/1985, 04/2001, 04/2006, 04/2011, 04/2016, 1/2020, 4/2021

Initial Elections: 6/1956, 6/1963, 5/1980, 4/2001

S. URUGUAY

Initial Election: 11/1942
Democracy (1): (1943)-1972

First elections take place in Uruguay in 1942. This is prior to the start of our dataset. BMR and PIPE consider Uruguay to become democratic in 1942, MPL considers Uruguay to become democratic in 1943. DD considers Uruguay to be democratic beginning with 1946, the first year covered in the data. However, there is never an alternation in power before the regime becomes authoritarian again. Rather, the Colorado Party wins every election. This means that the country remains in transition. This is confirmed by PIPE.

Between 1971-1973 the democratic regime gradually gave way to a military dictatorship until congress was dissolved in 1973.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1973-1984

Transition to democracy from authoritarianism commenced 11/1980 with a military defeat in a national plebiscite.

Initial Election (1): 11/1984

Democracy (2): 1985-present

All sources reviewed (DD, BMR, MPL) consider this Uruguayan democratic stint to have commenced with the inauguration of Julio Maria Sanguinetti (Colorado) in March 1985.

1st Turnover: Transition from Julio Maria Sanguinetti (Colorado) to Alberto Lacalle (Blanco) in 03/1990 (date Lacalle was inaugurated).

2nd Turnover: Transition from Alberto Lacalle (Blanco) to Julio Maria Sanguinetti (Colorado) in 3/1995 (date Sanguinetti was inaugurated).

Presidential Elections: 11/1946, 11/1950, 11/1954, 11/1958, 11/1962, 11/1966, 11/1971, 11/1984, 11/1989, 11/1994, 11/1999, 10/2004, 10/2009, 10/2014, 10/2019

Legislative Elections: 11/1946, 11/1950, 11/1954, 11/1958, 11/1962, 11/1966, 11/1971, 11/1984, 11/1989, 11/1994, 10/1999, 10/2004, 10/2009, 10/2014, 10/2019

First Election: [11/1942],11/1984

T. VENEZUELA

Authoritarian Rule (1): 1946-1947

DD considers Venezuela to be democratic in 1946-1947, but PIPE and BMR do not, MPL considers it to be semi-democratic. The elections are not recognized as fair elections until the 1947 election of Romulo Gallegos.

We view DD and BMR's coding as a signal that the 1947 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1947 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor.

Initial Election (1): 12/1947

There are no turnovers before the country's reversion to authoritarianism in 1948.

Authoritarian Rule (2): 1948-1958

Initial Election (2): 12/1958

Democracy (2): 1959-1998

PIPE and DD consider Venezuela to become democratic in this year. MPL and BMR consider it to become democratic in the following year.

We view DD and PIPE's coding as a signal that the 1958 elections were democratic, first elections, but we do not code 1958 as a democratic year given that a non-democratically elected government governed prior to the inauguration of the electoral victor.

1st Turnover: Power is transitioned from Raúl Leoni (AD), elected in 1958 and 1963, to Rafael Caldera (COPEI), and Caldera is inaugurated on March 11, 1969.

2nd Turnover: Power is transitioned from Rafael Caldera (COPEI), elected in 1968, to Carlos Andrés Pérez AD, and Carlos Andrés Pérez is inaugurated on February 2, 1974.

Authoritarian Rule (3): 1998-present

We code Venezuela as an authoritarian regime for every year since Hugo Chávez's inauguration to the presidency in 1999 following the 1998 election. Our coding decision departs from the Dichotomized Polity coding of the regime as democratic until 2009 as well as from the most recent release of the DD dataset for Latin America which codes Venezuela as democratic for the years of Chávez's tenure (1999-2007). Venezuela is coded as a type II. This is because in 1999, Chavez elects a Constituent Assembly (CA) that is responsible for drafting a new constitution under rules that result in his allies holding 94% of the seats (Corrales 2016, 2018). The new constitution abolished the Senate and permits referendums. Following the enactment of the 2000 constitution, "mega-elections" are held for all public positions Presidential, National Assembly, Governors, Mayors, State Legislature, Andean & Latin Parliament. Chavez is elected for a second time in 2000 under the new Constitution. We code all of Chavez's terms are coded as authoritarian. Consequently, Venezuela is considered an authoritarian since Chavez's first election in 1998, his second election in 2000 (under a new constitution), his third election in 2006, and his fourth election in 2012 as authoritarian.

Presidential Elections: 12/1963, 12/1968, 12/1973, 12/1978, 12/1983, 12/1988, 12/1993, 12/1998

Legislative Elections: 12/1963, 12/1968, 12/1973, 12/1978, 12/1983, 12/1988, 12/1993, 12/1998

Initial Elections:12/1947 and 12/1958

References

Baker, Andy. 2018. “Latin American Election Results with Party Ideology Scores. 2.0, Http://spot.colorado.edu/~bakerab/elections.html.”

Bjørnskov, Christian, and Martin Rode. 2020. “Regime Types and Regime Change: A New Dataset on Democracy, Coups, and Political Institutions.” *The Review of International Organizations* 15 (2): 531–51.

Boix, Carles, Michael Miller, and Sebastian Rosato. 2013. “A Complete Data Set of Political Regimes, 1800–2007.” *Comparative Political Studies* 46 (12): 1523–54.

Bormann, Nils-Christian, and Matt Golder. 2022. “Democratic Electoral Systems around the World, 1946–2020.” *Electoral Studies* 78 (August): 102487.

Cheibub, José A., Fernando Limongi, and Adam Przeworski. 2023. “Electing Presidents: A Hidden Facet of Democratization.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 53 (4): 476–500.

Cheibub, José Antonio, Jennifer Gandhi, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2010. “Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited.” *Public Choice* 143 (1–2): 67–101.

Coppedge, Michael, John Gerring, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Staffan I. Lindberg, Jan Teorell, David Altman, Michael Bernhard, et al. 2023. “V-Dem [Country-Year/Country-Date] Dataset V13” Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project.” https://doi.org/10.23696/vdemds23.

Corrales, J. 2016. “Can Anyone Stop the President? Power Asymmetries and Term Limits in Latin America, 1984–2016.” *Latin American Politics and Society*. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/latin-american-politics-and-society/article/can-anyone-stop-the-president-power-asymmetries-and-term-limits-in-latin-america-19842016/BCD1EE7B52CC8A80445378B909CCFA27.

———. 2018. “Fixing Democracy: Why Constitutional Change Often Fails to Enhance Democracy in Latin America.” https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YP5cDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&ots=HFxtzHZfzT&sig=NW2wHXk3UNymLwBbeutURJk-o6Y.

Elkins, Zachary, and Tom Ginsburg. 2022. “Characteristics of National Constitutions, Version 4.0.” comparativeconstitutionsproject.org.

Escobari, Diego, and Gary A. Hoover. 2024. “Late-Arriving Votes and Electoral Fraud: A Natural Experiment and Regression Discontinuity Evidence from Bolivia.” *World Development* 173 (January): 106407.

Ferrero, Roberto A. 1976. *Del fraude a la soberanía popular, 1938-1946*. Ediciones La Bastilla : [distribuidor exclusivo, Editorial Astrea.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Hyde, S. D., and N. Marinov. 2012. “Which Elections Can Be Lost?” *Political Analysis: An Annual Publication of the Methodology Section of the American Political Science Association*. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/political-analysis/article/which-elections-can-be-lost/0474B124646DF486D1FD9A8E26D31DEC.

———. 2021. “National Elections Across Democracy and Autocracy Dataset, 6.0.” 2021. https://nelda.co/.

International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES). 2023. *ElectionGuide, Http://www.electionguide.org*.

J. Mark Payne, Daniel Zovatto G., and Mercedes Mateo Díaz. 2007. *Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America*. David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies and Harvard University Press.

Llanos, Mariana, and Leiv Marsteintredet. 2010. "Ruptura y continuidad: la caída de «Mel» Zelaya en perspectiva comparada." *América Latina hoy* 55 (55): 173–97.

Mainwaring, Scott, and Aníbal Pérez-Liñán. 2013. *Democracies and Dictatorships in Latin America: Emergence, Survival, and Fall*. Cambridge University Press.

McClintock, Cynthia. 2018. *Electoral Rules and Democracy in Latin America*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

McConnell, S. A. 2020. "Nicaragua's Troubled Transition to Democracy." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-1769.

Negretto, G. L. 2022. "Tinkering with Executive Term Limits: Partisan Imbalances and Institutional Legacies in Latin America." *Democratization*. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13510347.2021.1980539.

Nohlen, Dieter. 2005. "Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook." In . New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Przeworski, Adam. 2013. "Political Institutions and Political Events (PIPE) Version 2, Https://sites.google.com/a/nyu.edu/adam-przeworski/."

Przeworski, Adam, Michael E. Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development : Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950–1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Przeworski, Adam, and Jose Antonio Cheibub. 1999. "Democracy, Elections and Accountablity for Economic Outcomes." In *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*, edited by Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1987. *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*. Chatham House Publishers.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Harper & Brothers.

Skaaning, Svend-Erik. 2021. "Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy (LIED) Dataset v6. 0." *Harvard Dataverse. Https://Doi. Org/10. 7910/DVN/WPKNIT*. https://ps.au.dk/fileadmin/Statskundskab/Billeder/Forskning/Forskningsprojekter/DEDERE/Description_of_the_LIED_dataset_v6.pdf.

Skaaning, Svend-Erik, John Gerring, and Henrikas Bartusevičius. 2015. "A Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy." *Comparative Political Studies* 48 (12): 1491–1525.

Thaler, Kai M. 2017. "Nicaragua: A Return to Caudillismo." *Journal of Democracy* 28 (2): 157–69.