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| Source | Construction | Coverage |
| Fiorino et al. (2017)  following Kaufmann (2004), with additional data from Hwang (2005) and Madroñal (2005)  DDI (Direct Democracy Index) | Qualitative and quantitative rating:  (1) radical democrat; (2) progressive; (3) cautious; (4) hesitant; (5) fearful; (6) beginner; (7) authoritarian.  we try to rely on a de facto measure of direct democracy. This implies that we consider the procedures a political system provides in order to propose, approve, amend, and delete laws through popular initiative and referenda, as well the actual practices of direct democracy and the general political condition a country experiences  subjective rating | 87 countries,  period 2000-2005 |
| Altman (2017)  V-DEM Data  Direct Democracy Practice Potential (DDPP) | This index results from the aggregation of the scores of four types of mechanisms of direct democracy:   * popular initiatives, * popular referendums, * obligatory referendums, * and authorities’ plebiscites   For each of the four mechanisms:   1. Ease of initiation    1. the existence of a direct democracy process    2. the number of signatures needed    3. time limits to collect signatures 2. Ease of approval: Quorums for    1. Participation    2. Approval    3. Supermajority    4. District majority   Regarding how consequential the vote is, it considers   * its decisiveness (whether the decision is binding), * and the threat capability of citizen-initiated mechanisms of direct democracy as measured by the frequency with which direct popular votes have been used and approved in the past | 200 countries |
| Gherghina (2016)  most data from IDEA | referendums (mandatory and optional),  citizens’ initiative,  agenda initiative,  and recall.  Both variables, local and national level direct democracy, are count measures with 1 given for the existence of one tool.   * A country with legislation for all four direct democracy tools at national level gets a score of 5 on the national level variable (referendum is split in mandatory and optional). If it has legal provisions for all tools at the local level it gets a sore of 10 (local and regional levels are counted together). * The use of referendums at national level is calculated with a formula that accounts for the number of referendums (deﬁned as a question/issue put to a vote), what happens after the vote (binding or not), and how easy a referendum can succeed (required quorum).   The quorum may be different for the two types of referendums and has three values: (1) for both turnout and approval quorums, (2) turnout quorum only, and (3) no quorum required. These scores are calculated for the referendums organized between 1990 and 2008.  This indicator ignores the difference between top-down and bottom-up initiated referendums because citizens cannot use bottom-up referendums if they are not included in the country’s legislation | 38 European countries |
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