

Authoritarian Regimes Data Set, version 5.0

Codebook

September, 2012

Axel Hadenius, Jan Teorell, & Michael Wahman
Department of Political Science
Lund University

Scholars who wish to use this dataset should cite the following article:
Hadenius, Axel & Jan Teorell. 2007. "Pathways from Authoritarianism",
Journal of Democracy 18(1): 143-156.

and

Wahman, Michael; Jan Teorell & Axel Hadenius. 2012. "Authoritarian Regime Types Revisited." Unpublished Manuscript.

NOTE ON VERSION 4: In this update between version 2.0 and 3.0 (October 10, 2007) version of the data, we have corrected some erroneous codings in the regime type variables for Czechoslovakia (1992), Djibouti (1992-2005), Kyrgyz Republic (1991-1994), Lesotho (1993-1997), Singapore (1972-1980), Tajikistan (1991-1994 and 2005), and Uzbekistan (1991-1993). We also updated the Polity 4 data for the year of 2005 (instead of using imputed scores), which affected the regime classification of the Philippines for that year. Between version 3.0 and 4.0 codings were adjusted for Fiji in the period 2007-2008.

Contents

- 1- Identification variables
- 2- Indices of Democracy
- 3- Regime type indicators
- 4- Historical variables and Regime duration indicators
- 5- Indicators of personalism
- 6- References

For each variable in the database n refers to the number of observed country years, N to the number of countries covered.

Country and time coverage

This data set covers the time period 1972-2010 and includes all 192 nations recognized as members of the UN except the four “micro states” of Europe (Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco and San Marino) and two “micro states” in the Pacific that are not members of the World Bank (Nauru and Tuvalu). In addition, we have included Taiwan and seven states that have dissolved or merged with other states: the USSR, Czechoslovakia, the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, East Germany, North and South Yemen, and South Vietnam. This makes a tally of 195 states. We have treated Germany as a continuation of West Germany, Vietnam as a continuation of North Vietnam, and Ethiopia as a continuation of itself before the secession of Eritrea. By contrast, we treat the Republic of Yemen, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Russian Federation as new states. In the case of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) Serbia is seen as the continuation of this state following the independence of Montenegro. Cyprus refers to the Greek part of Cyprus. Albania is treated as the same case after the independence of Kosovo. Kosovo is treated as a new case from 2009.

1. Identification variables

country

(*n*: 7991, *N*: 195)

Country name

Lists the full country name.

siffra

(*n*: 7991, *N*: 195)

Country code

Numeric country code.

cow

(*n*: 7150, *N*: 192)

Corralates of war country code.

Source: Corralates of war 2 project <http://www.correlatesofwar.org/>.

ccode

(*n*: 5867, *N*: 168)

Polity country code (polity IV)

Example: 85- Kenya
200- United Kingdom

Changes made in the country codes when incorporating them into our database:

Germany West (original code: 260) = Germany (ccode 255)

Ethiopia (original code: 530) = Ethiopia (ccode 529)

North Vietnam (original code: 816) = Vietnam (ccode 818)

Russia (original code: 365) before 1992 = USSR (ccode 364)

Source: Marshall, Monty G & Jaggers, Keith: Polity IV project, Integrated Network for societal Conflict research (INSCR) Program Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM) University of Maryland, Collage Park 20742,
www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity.

ccode_qog

(*n*: 7527, *N*: 193)

ISO country code.

In the following cases the ISO country numbers has been changed to match the country-coding principles of our database:

Germany West before 1991 (original code: 280) = Germany (ccode 276)

Ethiopia before 1993 (original code: 230) = Ethiopia (ccode 231)
North Vietnam before 1976 (original code: 998) = Vietnam (ccode 704)

Source: <http://www.iso.org/en/prods-services/iso3166ma/02iso-3166-code-lists/index.html>,
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO3166-1>

year

(*n*: 7991, *N*: 195)

Year of observation.

2. Indices of democracy

fhadd

(*n*: 6712, *N*: 195)

Average Freedom House political rights and civil liberty scores scaled 0-10, where 10 indicate the highest degree of political rights and civil liberties and 0 the lowest degree.

Source: The Freedom House surveys (Freedom in the world).
www.freedomhouse.org.

revpol2

(*n*: 5794, *N*: 170)

Revised combined polity score [polity2], scaled 0-10, where 10 indicates strongly democratic and 0 strongly autocratic.

Source: Marshall, Monty G & Jaggers, Keith: Polity IV project, Integrated Network for societal Conflict research (INSCR) Program Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM) University of Maryland, Collage Park 20742,
<http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>.

fhpol

(*n*: 5789, *N*: 170)

Average Polity [revpol2] & Freedom House [fhadd] scores, scaled 0-10.¹

Source: See *fhadd* and *revpol2*.

ifhpol

(*n*: 6712, *N*: 195)

Imputed average Polity [revpol2] & Freedom House [fhadd] scores (scaled 0–10), where missing values have been imputed by regressing the *fhpol* index on the Freedom House scores [fhadd], which have better country coverage than Polity.² Countries with an *ifhpol* score larger than 7.5 are coded as democracies.

¹ As we have shown in a recent paper, this combined FH/Polity index outperforms all rival indices of democracy in an independent assessment (Hadenius and Teorell 2005).

² Imputed scores larger than 10 are set equal to 10. This imputation in effect also affects the time-series information on *ifhpol* for countries with some Polity data (although with less coverage than FH). In rare instances, this means that *ifhpol* in these countries changes although the underlying FH scores do not change.

Source: See *fhadd* and *revpol2*.

3. Regime classification variables

regime1ny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Collapsed regime type

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

Using the mean of the Freedom House and Polity scales (*ifhpol*), we draw the line between democracies and autocracies at 7.0. We chose this threshold value by estimating the mean cutoff point separating democracy from autocracy in five well-known categorical measures of democracy: Cheibub et al. (2010), Boix et al (Forthcoming) and Bernhard et al. (2001)³, together with Polity's own categorical threshold for "democracy" and Freedom House's threshold for "Electoral Democracy."⁴

At the core of our typology of authoritarian regime types is a distinction between three different modes of political power maintenance (probably the three most widely used throughout history):⁵

1. Hereditary succession, or lineage, corresponding to *Monarchies*; we define monarchies as those regimes in which a person of royal descent has inherited the position of head of state in accordance with accepted practice and/or the constitution (one cannot proclaim oneself a monarch)⁶. It bears stressing that we only apply this classification to countries where the sovereign exercises real political power; ceremonial monarchies are thus excluded.

This occurs in Afghanistan 1979 and 2001, Bosnia-Herzegovina 1995, Cambodia 1979, Lebanon 1990, and Solomon Islands 2003. Users particularly interested in the time-series information on democracy for these countries should consider more case-specific imputation techniques.

³ We have used an updated version of the original dataset running up to 2005. We are grateful to Michael Bernhard for sharing this data with us.

⁴ More precisely, two mean values of the FH/Polity-scale were computed for each dichotomous measure: the mean democracy score in country years immediately following a transition from autocracy to democracy, and the mean democracy score in country years immediately preceding a transition from democracy to autocracy. For the Polity measure the threshold value of +6 or more on the revised combined Polity score (following Jagers and Gurr 1995, 479).

⁵ For a more detailed description of our coding criteria, we refer to Hadenius & Teorell 2006, 2007.

⁶ This applies to Jean Bédel Bokassa, military dictator of the Central African Republic, who in 1977 declared himself "emperor of the Central African Empire". By our reckoning, he was still a military ruler, not a monarch.

2. The actual or threatened use of military force, referring to *Military* regimes, where the armed forces may exercise political power either directly or indirectly (i.e., by controlling civilian leaders behind the scenes). Regimes where persons of military background are chosen in open elections (which have not been controlled by the military) thus should not count as military. “Rebel regimes” form a special subcategory. They include cases where a rebel movement (one not formed out of the regular armed forces) has taken power by military means, and the regime has not as yet been reconstituted as another kind of regime.

3. Popular elections, designating the various electoral regimes. We distinguish among three basic types of electoral regimes. The first is the *No-Party Regime*, where elections are held but *all* political parties (or at least any candidate representing a party) are prohibited. Elections in no-party regimes may display an element of competition, but thus only among individual candidates. Second, in *One-Party Regimes*, all parties but *one* is forbidden (formally or *de facto*) from taking part in elections. A small number of non-party candidates may also be allowed to take part and get elected; there may be satellite parties which are autonomous in name, but which cannot take an independent position; and competition between candidates from the same (ruling) party may also obtain; we still code the regime one-party. It is not enough, moreover, that a regime calls itself a one-party state; elections in such a structure must also be held. Third, and finally, we define *Limited Multiparty* regimes as regimes that hold parliamentary or presidential elections in which (at least some) candidates are able to participate who are independent of the ruling regime. This classification holds even when opposition parties refrain voluntarily from taking part in elections. It also embraces cases where parties are absent, but where this is not the result of any prohibition against party activities: the candidates in question have simply chosen to stand for election as individuals. These latter we classify as *Party-Less* limited multiparty systems. Finally, we have a residual category called *others*, including a few cases that do not fit under any other regime type, given the definitions applied.

The categories in regime1ny are not mutually exclusive. All monarchical regimes with amalgams [*regimeny*=16, 17, 23 or 24] are treated as monarchies, all military regimes with sub-types and amalgams [*regimeny*=4, 5, 6, 7 or 18] are treated as military regimes, and multiparty regimes with sub-types are treated as multiparty regimes [*regimeny*=1 or 2]. Only pure no-party [*regimeny*=3] and one-party [*regimeny*=8] regimes are treated as no-party and one-party regimes, respectively. The minor types [*regimeny*=9, 19, 20, 21, 22] are treated as other.

Our regime classification pertains to December 31 as of each year.

Sources: Banks and Wilson (2012), supplemented with: Elections in the world <http://www.electionworld.org>, IFES Election guide [http:// 209.50.195.230](http://209.50.195.230), Journal of democracy: Election watch http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/election_watch/, Parties and elections in Europe <http://www.parties-and-elections.de/index.html>, Freedom House “Freedom in the World Reports” <http://www.freedomhouse.org>, The interparliamentary Union <http://www.ipu.org/english/home.htm>, Political Database of the Americas <http://www.georgetown.edu/pdba/>, Rulers <http://www.rulers.org>, Keesing’s Record of World Events <http://keesings.gvpi.net/keesings/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm>, The Swedish Institute of International affairs, Country guides <http://www.landguiden.se>, The US Library of

Congress Country Studies (Federal Research Division of Library of Congress) <http://memory.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html#toc>, Banks and Mueller: Political handbook of the world 1979, The Europe world year book, various years, The Economist Intelligence Unit: Quarterly Economic Reviews, Country profiles and Country Reports, various years, The CIA World Fact book <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook>, Country Reports on Human Rights practices (Reports submitted to Congress by US Department of State), various years, later editions on <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/c1470.htm>, Encyclopedia Britannica online <http://search.eb.com>.

regime1nyrobust

Same as regime1ny, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

regimeny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Regime type

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

Based on the classifications in regime1ny we also code hybrids (or amalgams) combining elements from more than one regime type. Monarchies may carry out elections in various forms: multiparty elections, no-party elections, and also one-party elections. The same goes for military regimes.

In addition to the main types and their amalgams, we have identified several minor types of authoritarian regime. In a *theocracy*, decisive political power lies in the hands of a religious elite. Temporary regimes, the purpose of which is to carry out a transition, are classified as

transitional regimes.⁷ There are furthermore countries in which the official government does not in reality control the territory. This may be due to *civil war* or *occupation* by foreign troops.

Source: See *regime1ny*

regimenyrobust

Same as *regimeny*, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

mon

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Monarchy main type dummy

- 0- Not a monarchy
- 1- Monarchy

Coded as 1 for all monarchies, regardless of whether they are amalgams or sub-types [*regimeny*=16, 17, 23 or 24], 0 otherwise.

Source: See *regime1ny*.

monrobust

Same as *mon*, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

mil

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Military main type dummy

- 0- civilian rule
- 1- military rule

Coded as 1 for all military regimes, regardless of whether they are amalgams or sub-types [*regimeny*=4, 5, 6, 7 or 18], 0 otherwise.

Source: See *regime1ny*.

milrobust

Same as *mil*, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

mul

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

multiparty main type dummy

- 0- Not multiparty

⁷ A transitional regime can only last in our schema for up to three years; after that, it is given a different and more fitting classification.

1- Limited Multiparty

Coded as 1 for all limited multiparty regimes, regardless of whether they are amalgams or sub-types [*regimeny*=1, 2, 6, 24 or 25], 0 otherwise.

Source: See *regime1ny*.

mulrobust

Same as mul, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

onep

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

one-party main type dummy

0- Not a one party regime

1- One-party regime

Coded as 1 for all one-party regimes, regardless of whether they are amalgams or sub-types [*regimeny*=7, 8 or 16], 0 otherwise.

Source: See *regime1ny*.

oneprobust

Same as onep, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

nop

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

noparty main type dummy

0- Not a no-party system

1- No-party system

Coded as 1 for all no-party regimes, regardless of whether they are amalgams or sub-types [*regimeny*=3, 5 or 23], 0 otherwise.

Source: See *regime1ny*.

noproburst

Same as nop, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

partsz

(*n*:6504, *N*:194)

size of the largest party in legislature (in fractions)

Counts the largest parties' number of seats divided with the legislative assemblies' total number of seats expressed in fractions. In countries with a two-chamber parliament the lower house is counted.

Source: Banks and Wilson (2012), Elections in the world <http://www.electionworld.org>, Beck et al (2001), IFES Election guide <http://209.50.195.230>, Journal of democracy: Election watch http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/election_watch/, Parties and elections in Europe <http://www.parties-and-elections.de/index.html>, The interparliamentary Union <http://www.ipu.org/english/home.htm>, Political Database of the Americas <http://www.georgetown.edu/pdba/>, Rulers <http://www.rulers.org>, Keesing's Record of World Events <http://keesings.gvpi.net/keesings/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm>, The CIA World Fact book <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook>

partsz1

(*n*:6504, *N*:193)

size of largest party (in fraction), zero for one party regime

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

Source: See *partsz*.

4. Historical variables and regime duration indicators

yrindep

(*n*:7605, *N*:195)

Year of independence (1700=1700 or before)

We have generally used the data when a state became independent or unified within the (more or less) current borders. This pertains for instance to Hungary, which is coded as independent in 1918 and not in 1001 when it was first unified. Cases of occupation when the occupant power never established any civilian rule has not been counted as cases of colonisation. All countries that became independent in 1700 or prior to this year is coded as *yrindep*=1700.

Source: CIA World Fact Book and Encyclopedia Britannica Online.

yrterm

(*n*:7605, *N*:195)

Year of termination of the country (2005= still existing at the end of our observation period)

The following cases has a noted year of termination<2005: East Germany (1990), Czechoslovakia (1993), USSR (1991), South Yemen (1990), North Yemen (1990), Yugoslavia FPR (1992), South Vietnam (1976).

Source: CIA World Fact Book and Encyclopedia Britannica Online.

regstart

(*n*: 2673, *N*: 194)

Starting year of regime (backdated to 1960)

Indicates the starting year of the current regime type, backdated until 1960 for the regime that was in place in 1972, that is, at the start of our observation period. The variable is only coded for the first regime period of each country.

lagregime1ny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:194)

Previous regime type (collapsed regime type)

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

Indicates the current regimes' previous regime type according to the classification of *regime1ny*. At the first year of the time-series each country has its current regime type as *lagregime1ny*. For definitions of regime types, see *regime1ny*.

Source: See *regime1ny*.

lagregime1nyrobust

Same as *lagregime1ny*, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

lagregimeny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:194)

Previous regime type

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

25 Multiparty Occupied
100 Democracy

Indicates the current regimes' previous regime type according to the classification of *regimeny*. At the first year of the time-series each country has its current regime type as *lagregimeny*. For definitions of regime types, see *regimeny*.

Source: See *regime1ny*.

lagregimenyrobust

Same as *lagregimeny*, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

regnumb1ny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Number of consecutive regime periods (collapsed regime type)

Indicates the consecutive number of the current regime period for a country according to the classification of *regime1ny*.

Source: See *regime1ny*

regnumb1nyrobust

Same as *regnumb1ny*, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

regnumbny2

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Number of consecutive regime periods

Indicates the consecutive number of the current regime period for a country according to the classification of *regimeny*.

Source: See *regime1ny*

regnumbny2robust

Same as *regnumbny2*, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

totdur1ny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Duration of current regime period (collapsed regime type)

Indicates the number of years that the current regime, according to the classification of *regime1ny*, has been in place in a country (up until 2003, the end of the observation period). Regime durations are backdated to 1960 according to *regstart*.

Source: See *regime1ny*

totdur1nyrobust

Same as totdur1ny, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

totdurny2

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Duration of current regime period (in years)

Indicates the number of years that the current regime, according to the classification of *regimeny*, has been in place in a country (up until 2003, the end of the observation period). Regime durations are backdated to 1960 according to *regstart*.

Source: See *regime1ny*

totdurny2robust

Same as regnumbny2, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

5. Indicators of personalism

persagg1ny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Mean executive turnover (collapsed regime type)

Measures the total number of changes of the chief executive during the regime spell divided by the years of regime spell duration, according to the classification of *regime1ny*. The effective executive may be the president, prime minister, leader of the ruling party, the monarch or the ruling military junta, or someone else, working behind political figure heads.

Source: Banks and Wilson (2012), Elections in the world <http://www.electionworld.org>, Rulers <http://www.rulers.org>, Keesing's Record of World Events <http://keesings.gvpi.net/keesings/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm>, The Swedish Institute of International affairs: Country guides <http://www.landguiden.se>, Country Reports on Human Rights practices (Reports submitted to Congress by US Department of State), Encyclopedia Britannica <http://search.eb.com>

persagg1nyrobust

Same as persagg1ny, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

persaggny2

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Mean executive turnover (within regime spells)

Same as *persagg1ny*, but according to the classification of *regimeny*.

persaggny2robust

Same as persaggny2, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

Source: See *persagg1ny*.

tenure1ny

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Mean years of executive tenure (collapsed regime type)

Measures the years of regime spell duration divided by the total number of changes of the executive during the regime spell, according to the classification of *regime1ny*. In case no change of executive occurred during a regime spell, *tenure1ny* is set equal to the regime spell duration.

Source: See *persaggny2*.

tenure1nyrobust

Same as tenure1ny, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

tenureny2

(*n*: 6693, *N*:195)

Mean years of executive tenure (within regime spells)

Same as tenure1ny, but according to the classification of *regimeny*.

Source: See *persagg1ny*.

tenureny2robust

Same as tenureny2, but with 7.5 democracy threshold.

6. References

- Banks, Arthur S. and Kenneth A. Wilson. 2012. Cross-National Time-Series Data Archive. Databanks International. Jerusalem.
- Bernhard, Michael, Timothy Nordstrom and Christopher Reenock. 2001. "Economic Performance, Institutional Intermediation, and Democratic Survival". *Journal of Politics*, 63(3): 775-803.

- Beck, Thorsten, George Clark, Alberto Groff, Philip Keefer and Patrick Walsh. 2001. "New Tools in Comparative Political Economy: The Database of Political Institutions", *World Bank Economic Review* 15(1): 165-176.
- Boix, Charles, Michael K. Miller and Sebastian Rosato. Forthcoming. A Complete Dataset of Political Regimes, 1800-2007. *Comparative Political Studies*.
- Cheibub, José Antonio, Jennifer Gandhi and James Raymond Vreeland, JR. 2010. Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited. *Public Choice*, 143(1): 67-101.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1999. "What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years?", *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 115–44.
- Hadenius, Axel and Jan Teorell. 2005. "Assessing Alternative Indices of Democracy", *C&M Working Papers* 6, IPSA, August 2005 (http://www.concepts-methods.org/working_papers/20050812_16_PC%206%20Hadenius%20&%20Teorell.pdf).
- Hadenius, Axel and Jan Teorell. 2006. "Authoritarian Regimes: Stability, Change, and Pathways to Democracy, 1972–2003", University of Notre Dame, Kellogg Institute Working Paper Series 331, November 2006 (<http://kellogg.nd.edu/publications/workingpapers/WPS/331.pdf>).
- Hadenius, Axel and Jan Teorell. 2007. "Pathways from Authoritarianism", *Journal of Democracy* 18(1): 143-156.
- Jagers, Keith and Ted Robert Gurr. 1995. "Tracking Democracy's Third Wave with the Polity III Data", *Journal of Peace Research* 32(4): 469–482.
- Mainwaring, Scott, Daniel Brinks and Aníbal Pérez-Liñán. 2001. "Classifying Political Regimes in Latin America, 1945–1999", *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 36(1): 37–65.
- Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub, & Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950–1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reich, Garry. 2002. "Categorizing Political Regimes: New Data for Old Problems", *Democratization* 9: 1–24.