

Table Templates for L^AT_EX

Thiago Silva
Graduate Student in Political Science
Texas A&M University
nsthiago@tamu.edu

February 18, 2019

Table 1: President's Executive Powers Over Cabinets - Descriptive Statistics

Variable Label (Variable Name)	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Year of the Constitution (Year)	18			1853	2010
Last Update of the Constitution (Updated)	18			1993	2014
Cabinet Removal (Removal)	18	0.8	0.4	0	1
Cabinet Selection (Selection)	18	0.8	0.4	0	1
Ministers' Eligibility (Eligibility)	18	0.8	0.4	0	1
Ministers' Countersignature (Countersignature)	18	0.3	0.5	0	1
Powers of the Cabinet (Powers Cabinet)	18	0.5	0.5	0	1
Summation of the Powers (Sum)	18	3.2	1.5	0	5

Source: Silva, Vieira and Araujo (2015).

Table 2: Latin American Gender Quota Laws in Lower or Single House

Country	Adoption's		Women Representation	
	Year	% of the Quota	1 yr Before Law	January 2016
Brazil	1995	30%	6.6%	9.9%
Venezuela	1998	30%	5.9%	14.4%
Paraguay	1996	20%	2.5%	15%
Panama	1997	30%	9.7%	18.3%
Dominican Republic	1997	33%	11.7%	20.8%
Peru	1997	30%	10.8%	22.3%
Costa Rica	1996	50%	15.8%	33.3%
Argentina	1991	30%	6%	35.8%
Ecuador	1997	50%	17%	41.6%
Bolivia	1997	50%	6.9%	53.1%

Source: Freidenberg and Garcia (2015), Sagarzazu and Silva (2015), and IPU (2016).

Table 3: Party Divisions of the U.S. Congress (1981-2015)

President	Congress	Years	Senate		House	
			Dem.	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.
Ronald Reagan (Republican)	97th	1981-1983	46	53	242	192
	98th	1983-1985	46	54	269	166
	99th	1985-1987	47	53	253	182
	100th	1987-1989	55	45	258	177
George H. W. Bush (Republican)	101st	1989-1991	55	45	260	175
	102nd	1991-1993	56	44	267	167
Bill Clinton (Democrat)	103rd	1993-1995	57	43	258	176
	104th	1995-1997	48	52	204	230
	105th	1997-1999	45	55	207	226
	106th	1999-2001	45	55	211	223
George W. Bush (Republican)	107th	2001-2003	50/50 ^a	50/49 ^b	212	221
	108th	2003-2005	48	51	205	229
	109th	2005-2007	44	55	202	231
	110th	2007-2009	49	49	236	199
Barack Obama (Democrat)	111th	2009-2011	56/58 ^c	41/42 ^d	257	178
	112th	2011-2013	51	47	193	242
	113th	2013-2015	53	45	201	234

Source: Elaborated by Silva. Information from the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, 2014.

Notes: Bold numbers indicate divided government.

a. The Democratic Party controlled the 107th Congress from January 3 to January 20, 2001 (50/50 tie) and from May 24, 2001 to January 3, 2003.

b. The Republican Party controlled the 107th Congress from January 20, 2001 (50/50 tie) until May 24, 2001.

c. From January 27 to April 28, 2009, there were 56 Democratic Senators and 41 Republican Senators.

d. From January 3 to April 28, 2009, there were 41 Republican Senators. The Senate in the last month of the 111th Congress stood at 42 Republicans and 56 Democrats.

Table 4: World Cup Hosts, Champions and Respective Political Regimes

Year	Host	Host's Political Regime	Champion	Champion's Political Regime
1930	Uruguay	Democracy	Uruguay	Democracy
1934	Italy	Dictatorship	Italy	Dictatorship
1938	France	Democracy	Italy	Dictatorship
1950	Brazil	Democracy	Uruguay	Democracy
1954	Switzerland	Democracy	West Germany	Democracy
1958	Sweden	Democracy	Brazil	Democracy
1962	Chile	Democracy	Brazil	Democracy
1966	England	Democracy	England	Democracy
1970	Mexico	Dictatorship	Brazil	Dictatorship
1974	West Germany	Democracy	West Germany	Democracy
1978	Argentina	Dictatorship	Argentina	Dictatorship
1982	Spain	Democracy	Italy	Democracy
1986	Mexico	Dictatorship	Argentina	Democracy
1990	Italy	Democracy	West Germany	Democracy
1994	US	Democracy	Brazil	Democracy
1998	France	Democracy	France	Democracy
2002	South Korea/Japan	Democracy	Brazil	Democracy
2006	Germany	Democracy	Italy	Democracy
2010	South Africa	Democracy	Spain	Democracy
2014	Brazil	Democracy	Germany	Democracy
2018	Russia	?	?	?
2022	Qatar	Dictatorship (Monarchy)	?	?

Source: Elaborated by Silva, based on information gathered from FIFA (<http://www.fifa.com>), Freedom House (<https://www.freedomhouse.org>) and ACLP Dataset.

Table 5: School Attendance and Health Surveillance of Cash Transfers's Beneficiaries in Brazil (2006-2010)

	Education		Health	
	Children (in Millions)	Percentage	Families (in Millions)	Percentage
2006 2nd semester	9.6	62.8	3.4	40.3
2007 1st semester	12.0	78.9	4.8	51.1
2007 2nd semester	13.2	84.7	5.2	54.6
2008 1st semester	13.0	84.9	6.1	62.7
2008 2nd semester	12.7	84.8	5.7	63.6
2009 1st semester	13.0	85.7.8	6.1	63.1
2009 2nd semester	14.0	89.5	6.3	64.5
2010 1st semester	13.6	85.7	6.8	67.5

Source: Monitoring System of School Attendance and Food and Nutrition Surveillance System (SISVAN); DEGES/SEANRC/MDS; Soares (IPEA, 2012, p. 10)

Table 6: Brazilian Federal Government's Social Transfers Programs

Type of Transfer	Name	Amount in 2009	
		In Billions of Reais	In % of the GDP
Social Assistance	Continuous Provision Benefit (BPC)	18.7	0.6
Social Assistance	Bolsa Família Program (PBF)	12.5	0.4
Social Security	Social Security General System (RGPS)	199.2	6.1
Social Security	Other Social Security System (RPPS)	134.2	4.1
Other	Money Allowance	7.6	0.2
Other	Funds for Length of Service (FGTS)	54.7	1.7
Other	Unemployment Insurance	19.7	0.6

Source: Secretaria de Avaliação e Gestão da Informação (SAGI/MDS); (IPEA, 2013, p. 198)

Table 7: 2x2: Dimension 1 and Dimension 2

		Dimension 2	
		High	Low
Dimension 1	High	✗	✓
	Low	✓	✗

Table 8: Rotating labels

	Collegial Executive	
	Yes	No
Strong President	Uruguay	Venezuela
Weak President	Bolivia	Paraguay
		Peru

Table 9: Row Conditional Relative Frequency: How much tax should each person pay, by household monthly income (2010).

Row = Into which of the following income ranges does the total monthly income of this household fit, including remittances from abroad and the income of all the working adults and children (in Brazilian Reais)?

Column = Suppose a rich person has 1 real and a poor person has 1 real. In your opinion, how much tax should each person pay?

<i>Income</i>	<i>More Progressive</i>		<i>Less Progressive</i>	
	Rich 60 cents	Rich 50 cents	Rich 40 cents	Rich 30 cents
	Poor 10 cents	Poor 20 cents	Poor 30 cents	Poor 30 cents
	%	%	%	%
No Income	52.9	20.6	5.9	20.6
R\$ 0,01 to R\$ 510	46.5	13.2	8.9	31.4
R\$ 510,01 to R\$ 1020	40.5	15.6	8.1	35.8
R\$ 1020,01 to R\$ 1.530	35.8	14.0	10.3	39.8
R\$ 1.530,01 to R\$ 2.550	37.1	12.9	11.9	38.1
R\$ 2.550,01 to R\$ 3.570	32.4	19.3	9.7	38.6
R\$ 3.570,01 to R\$ 4.080	29.6	14.8	7.4	48.1
R\$ 4.080,01 to R\$ 6.120	27.1	14.6	6.2	52.1
R\$ 6.120,01 to R\$ 7.650	22.2	33.3	0.0	44.4
R\$ 7.650,01 to R\$ 10.200	23.1	15.4	23.1	38.5
More than R\$ 10.200,01	42.9	21.4	7.1	28.6

Source: The Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) - Brazil 2010.

Notes: % = Relative frequency (percentage) by row.

Pearson $\chi^2(30) = 45.8277$. Pr = 0.032.

Table 10: Correlation Matrix

<i>Variable</i>	Duration	Inflation	Unemployment	GDP	Cycle	Coalition Size
Duration	1	-0.167020554	0.129304483	0.022518059	0.10094269	-0.28183733
Inflation	-0.16702055	1	-0.422224931	-0.326982389	0.0604145	0.01195589
Unemployment	0.12930448	-0.422224931	1	0.002938322	0.23432405	-0.08494898
GDP	0.02251806	-0.326982389	0.002938322	1	0.01585105	0.08092697
Cycle	0.10094269	0.060414501	0.234324051	0.015851048	1	-0.02575777
Coalition Size	-0.28183733	0.01195589	-0.084948981	0.080926972	-0.02575777	1

Table 11: Independent Variables, Summary Statistics and Expectations

Variable and Summary Statistics	Coding	Expectation
<i>Inflation:</i> $\mu = 22.71, \sigma = 43.46, N = 82$ $min = -0.58, max = 204.54$	Quarterly percentage change in CPI	+
<i>Unemployment:</i> $\mu = 9.29, \sigma = 3.56, N = 82$ $min = 3.40, max = 19.82$	Quarterly percentage of the labor force without work	+
<i>President's Approval Rate:</i> $\mu = 43.30, \sigma = 11.91, N = 72$ $min = 14.93, max = 69.60$	Quarterly percentage of presidential job approval	-
<i>GDP Growth:</i> $\mu = 2.69, \sigma = 4.31, N = 82$ $min = -11.70, max = 11.94$	Annual percentage growth rate of GDP	-
<i>Cycle:</i> $\mu = 0.62, \sigma = 0.31, N = 82$ $min = 0, max = 1.5$	$\frac{T_e - T_{ca}}{T_{co}}$	No relationship
<i>Size of the Coalition:</i> $\mu = 3.50, \sigma = 1.62, N = 82$ $min = 2, max = 8$	Number of parties represented in the cabinet	+
<i>Legislative Power (IPIL):</i> $\mu = 0.50, \sigma = 0.08, N = 82$ $min = 0.28, max = 0.71$	Index of presidential dominance over the lawmaking process	-
<i>Ideological Dispersion:</i> $\mu = 0.85, \sigma = 0.66, N = 82$ $min = 0, max = 2$	$ P_{fl} - P_{fr} $	+
<i>Majority Status</i> $N = 83$	Dichotomous variable: 1 = cabinet with a majority status; 0 = cabinet with a minority status	-
<i>Cabinet Coalescence Rate:</i> $\mu = 0.94, \sigma = 0.05, N = 82$ $min = 0.74, max = 1$	$1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (s_i - p_i)}{2}$	-
<i>Effective Number of Parties (ENP):</i> $\mu = 5.36, \sigma = 2.27, N = 82$ $min = 1.98, max = 9.34$	$\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n s_i^2}$	+

Notes: μ = arithmetic mean, and σ = standard deviation. The dependent variable is the hazard rate of cabinet duration. Thus, a negative sign (-) in the column *Expectation* refers to a smaller likelihood of cabinet termination—meaning a longer cabinet duration—as the value for the independent variable increases (keeping all other independent variables constant). A positive sign (+) refers to a greater likelihood of cabinet termination—a shorter cabinet duration—as the value for the independent variable increases (keeping all other independent variables constant).

Table 12: Column Conditional Relative Frequency: Brazil's most serious problem by household monthly income (2010).
Column = Into which of the following income ranges does the total monthly income of this household fit, including remittances from abroad and the income of all the working adults and children (in Brazilian Reais)?
Row = In your opinion, what is the most serious problem faced by Brazil?

Rank ^a	Problem	No		0.01		510.01		1020.01		1.530,01		2.550,01		3.570,01		4.080,01		6.120,01		7.650,01		More than	
		Income	%	to 510	%	to 1.020	%	to 1.530	%	to 2.550	%	to 3.570	%	to 4.080	%	to 6.120	%	to 7.650	%	to 10.200	%	10.200,01	
1	Violence	20.0		16.9		15.3		18.4		12.2		10.1		14.3		11.8		22.2		13.3		0.0	15.4
2	Health	11.4		12.8		14.0		16.0		16.2		13.4		12.5		7.8		0.0		6.7		7.1	14.0
3	Unemployment	8.6		16.5		13.3		13.1		8.4		6.0		12.5		3.9		0.0		0.0		21.4	12.5
4	Corruption	17.1		5.0		7.5		8.1		11.9		10.7		23.2		13.7		33.3		20.0		14.3	8.7
5	Inequality	8.6		3.3		5.7		4.3		5.6		6.0		1.8		9.8		11.1		0.0		0.0	4.9
6	Security	5.7		5.0		4.3		4.8		5.0		5.4		5.4		5.9		0.0		13.3		0.0	4.8
7	Drugs	0.0		3.9		4.3		3.6		5.3		8.7		3.6		2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	4.3
8	Crime	0.0		4.1		6.1		3.1		3.4		4.0		1.8		4.0		11.1		0.0		0.0	4.2
9	Poverty	5.7		4.5		4.2		3.3		3.8		5.4		3.6		2.0		0.0		0.0		21.4	4.1
10	Education	2.9		1.9		3.7		3.3		5.0		7.4		5.4		5.9		0.0		6.7		7.1	3.7
11	Other	5.7		1.3		2.8		2.4		3.1		2.0		3.6		7.8		0.0		0.0		7.1	2.6
12	Drug trafficking	0.0		3.0		2.4		2.1		3.4		2.0		1.8		2.0		0.0		6.7		0.0	2.6
13	Economy	2.9		1.9		3.0		2.1		2.8		2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		13.3		7.1	2.4
14	Politicians	0.0		1.5		0.9		2.6		2.2		4.0		3.6		7.8		11.1		0.0		7.1	2.0
15	Environment	2.9		1.7		1.6		1.2		1.6		1.3		1.8		2.0		11.1		0.0		0.0	1.6
16	Electricity	0.0		1.9		1.5		1.4		0.9		1.3		1.8		2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	1.5
17	Forced displacement	0.0		2.0		1.5		1.7		0.6		0.0		0.0		2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	1.4
18	Inflation	2.9		1.3		1.1		1.2		0.6		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	1.0
19	Water	0.0		2.6		0.8		0.0		0.6		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.9
20	Bad government	2.9		0.9		0.9		0.2		1.6		0.0		0.0		3.9		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.9
21	Habitation	0.0		1.1		0.9		0.7		0.3		0.7		1.8		2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.9
22	Roads	0.0		1.3		0.4		0.7		0.9		1.3		0.0		2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.8
23	Impunity	0.0		1.1		0.5		1.2		0.3		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		6.7		0.0	0.7
24	Malnutrition	0.0		0.7		0.4		0.2		0.9		0.7		1.8		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.6
25	Discrimination	0.0		0.9		0.3		1.0		0.6		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.6
26	Human rights	0.0		0.4		0.1		0.2		1.6		1.3		0.0		0.0		0.0		6.7		0.0	0.5
27	War on terror	0.0		0.2		0.7		0.2		0.3		0.7		0.0		2.0		0.0		0.0		7.1	0.5
28	Population explosion	0.0		0.9		0.3		0.2		0.0		1.3		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.4
29	Gangs	0.0		0.0		0.3		0.7		0.0		0.7		0.0		3.9		0.0		6.7		0.0	0.4
30	Armed conflict	2.9		0.6		0.1		0.2		0.3		0.7		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.3
31	Financial credit	0.0		0.6		0.3		0.5		0.0		0.7		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.3
32	Migration	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.5		0.3		0.7		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.2
33	Popular protests	0.0		0.2		0.0		0.2		0.0		0.7		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.1
34	Land to farm	0.0		0.2		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.7		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.1
35	Terrorism	0.0		0.0		0.3		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.1
36	External debt	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.2		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0
37	Kidnappings	0.0		0.0		0.1		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0
38	Transportations	0.0		0.0		0.1		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0

Source: The Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) - Brazil 2010.

a. Respondents' ranking from the most important problem to the least important problem.

Notes: % = Relative frequency (percentage) by column. Pearson chi2(370) = 434.6210. Pr = 0.011.

Table 13: Municipal Applications to the Capacity-Building Program (PMAT)

	<i>Dependent variable: PMAT Application</i>			
	(Model 1)	(Model 2)	(Model 3)	(Model 4)
	OLS	OLS	Logit	Logit
Gini	-0.265*** (0.0678)	-0.265*** (0.0825)	-2.408* (1.306)	-2.408* (1.310)
IPTU (log)	0.009*** (0.003)	0.009* (0.004)	0.351*** (0.078)	0.351*** (0.118)
Population (log)	0.029*** (0.008)	0.029** (0.012)	0.309** (0.141)	0.309* (0.179)
GDP (log)	0.007 (0.007)	0.007 (0.010)	0.523*** (0.156)	0.523*** (0.202)
Rural Share	-0.098*** (0.023)	-0.098*** (0.032)	-0.926* (0.488)	-0.926* (0.540)
Transfers (log)	0.059*** (0.017)	0.059*** (0.014)	-0.422 (0.261)	-0.422 (0.319)
Constant	-0.398*** (0.065)	-0.398*** (0.091)	-7.979*** (1.303)	-7.979*** (1.479)
N	2,732	2,732	2,732	2,732
R^2	0.180	0.180		
<i>Log-Likelihood</i>			-594.689	-594.689

Standard errors in parentheses. Two-tailed test.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$