

Comparative Data Set for 28 Post-Communist Countries

The Comparative Data Set for 28 Post-Communist Countries, 1989 – 2004, is a collection of political and institutional data which has been assembled in the context of the research project “Forms of Government. A Comparative Data Set for 28 Eastern Countries,” directed by Klaus Armingeon and funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. It consists of annual data for 28 former communist countries, covering the period from 1989 to 2004. For member states of the former Soviet Union, the entries cover the period following their official independence from the USSR (mostly after 1991 and 1992).

The data set contains additional demographic, and socio and economic variables.

The data set is offered in two formats: 1. Excel files, with detailed information, including information on sources; and 2. SPSS files, suitable for cross-national, longitudinal and pooled time series analyses. **The present codebook refers to the Excel files.**

In any work using data from this data set, please quote both the data set and, where appropriate, the original source. Please quote this data set as: Klaus Armingeon and Romana Careja, *Comparative Data Set for 28 Post-Communist Countries, 1989-2004*, Institute of Political Science, University of Berne, 2004.

Content

1. General variables
2. Elections
3. Institutions
4. Women in parliament
5. Party system
6. Complexion of government
7. Democracy
8. Labour relations
9. Economy

List of variables

1. General variables (the first three columns of each Excel table)

year	year
Country	country name
Countrysn	country code: Albania 1; Armenia 2; Azerbaijan 3; Belarus 4; Bosnia Herzegovina 5; Bulgaria 6; Croatia 7; Czech Republic 8; Estonia 9; Georgia 10; Hungary 11; Kazakhstan 12; Kyrgyzstan 13; Latvia 14; Lithuania 15; Macedonia 16; Moldova 17; Mongolia 18; Poland 19; Romania 20; Russian Federation 21; Slovakia 22; Slovenia 23; Tajikistan 24; Turkmenistan 25; Ukraine 26; Uzbekistan 27; Yugoslavia 28

2. Elections (Excel file *Elections*)

electpa	date of election of national Parliament (lower house) (if there were two elections in a year, date of the second was given)
vturnpa	voter turnout in the parliamentary election (lower house)
seats	number of seats contested in each election
thrhold	electoral threshold in cases where the parallel electoral system was used, the electoral threshold for the proportional part of it was included -1 is used for pure majoritarian systems na – information not available source: electoral laws; OSCE election reports
vsocial1, vsocial2	percentage of votes (see note 8) na – number of votes is not available
ssocial1, ssocial2	percentage of seats (see note 8)
presmode	mode of electing the president codes: direct (president was elected directly by the people); indirect (president was elected by Parliament); na – information not available; -2 – communist rules applied (in case of Slovakia and Czech Republic, -2 means federal constitution) source: post-communist constitutions
term	president's term in office. source: post-communist constitutions
electpr	date of election of president (if there were various electoral rounds, the decisive last round was used) code "nap" – "not applicable" was employed when the president was indirectly elected
turnpr	turnout for presidential election code "nap" – "not applicable" was employed when the president was indirectly elected code "na" – "not available" was employed when the (reliable) turnout for elections was not found
svsocial1, svsocial2	percentage of votes obtained by the winning candidate (by party affiliation) in presidential election (if several rounds were needed, the last decisive one was taken into consideration)

NOTES:

1. The *Elections* file has two sheets: the first sheet refers to parliamentary elections (lower chamber) and the second sheet refers to presidential elections; data was entered starting with the first election after the fall of communist rule.

2. As a general rule, parties with more than two percent of votes were included separately in the database, all others being grouped under "others" category. However, in some cases, where a party managed to win seats in Parliament despite the fact that it obtained less than two percent of votes, that party was entered separately.

3. In the cases of Belarus, Kyrgyzstan (1995), Mongolia, Ukraine (1994), Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, where the lower chamber is elected through a majoritarian system, the percentage of

votes was not available. Therefore code 'na' was introduced. Similarly, where independent candidates were elected through a majoritarian system and the percentage of votes could not be retrieved, code 'na' was used.

4. In cases where the parallel electoral system is used, namely Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Lithuania, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan (1999), Macedonia, Russia, Tajikistan, and Ukraine (since 1998), the share of votes entered represents the share of votes received on party lists (proportional part of the electoral system).

5. In the cases of Azerbaijan (1995), Kazakhstan (1994, 1995), and Macedonia (1994, 1998), information on the percentage of votes was not available or it was not complete. Code 'na' was then entered.

6. In the case of Yugoslavia, the information from various sources was scattered and could not be used for purposes of comparison. The data will be added later on, pending further research into better sources.

7. The Excel table contains information on sources used for each election. See the 'comments' inserted in Excel cells.

8. For party list, see **Annex Party list**. At the end of each country party list, an account of the sources used to determine the labels is given. For Central and Eastern European countries, Janusz Bugajski (2002) was the main source for labelling, combined with additional national sources. For former Soviet countries, national sources and international organizations' reports were used. As often acknowledged in the literature, parties in these areas often do not have a clear ideological standpoint, therefore their placement in distinct categories is not a straightforward process. For the sake of clarity, the authors made a tentative assignment of parties.

In order to allow for detailed analyses of the political make-up of parliaments, parties were classified according to the scheme developed by Lane/McKay/Newton (1997). The national parties in a given family of parties were given consecutive numbers. If, for example, there are three political parties in the socialist spectrum of the party system, they were given the names social1, social2, and social3. The share of votes and seats were entered under these variable names for each party. This structure of the data set allows for various reclassifications and aggregations.

Following the scheme of Lane/McKay/Newton (1997), we differentiated between 11 party families, and added several more categories: *alliance*, *independents*, *no-label*, *personalist*, *pensioners* and *others*. "Alliance" designates a coalition between several parties or groupings; most commonly such an alliance is formed to strengthen members' chances of passing the threshold for a seat, and obtaining a larger number of seats in Parliament. "Independents" designates the unaffiliated candidates. "No-label" is a residual category for those parties that could not be placed in any of the above categories. The "personalist" label is used to designate parties created to support one candidate and cannot be assigned an ideological label. "Pensioners" is a category comprising parties of pensioners and persons with special needs. "Others" is a residual category comprised of all parties that have received less than two percent of the votes in the election. As a general rule, parties received the label "nationalist" if they focused their discourse/program on the notion of recovering the past greatness of the nation (in CEE) or of fighting for/maintaining independence from URSS (in NIS). The "conservative" label is used for party programs which emphasize both nationalist and religious values. The number of variables is determined by the number of parties that obtained at least two percent of votes in an election in at least one country.

Party family	Variable name					
socialist	social1	social2	social3	social4	social5	social...
left-socialist	leftsoc1	leftsoc2	leftsoc3	leftsoc...		
communist	comm1	comm2	comm3	comm4	comm...	
agrarian	Agrarian	agrarian...				
conservative	conserv1	conserv2	conserv3	conserv4	conserv...	
religious	relig1	relig2	relig3	relig4	relig5	relig...
liberal	liberal1	liberal2	liberal3	liberal4	liberal5	liberal...
ultra-right	ultrar1	ultrar2	ultrar...			
protest	protest1	protest2	protest3	protest...		
green	green1	green2	green3	green...		
ethnic	ethnic1	ethnic2	ethnic3	ethnic4	ethnic5	ethnic...
alliance	alliance1	alliance2	alliance3	alliance...		

If there is no party for a given variable, there is no entry in the database.

Votes are entered under the party variable name, preceded by a 'v' (for 'votes'). The share of seats are entered under the party variable name, preceded by a 's' (for 'seats'). For example, in the case of Albania, under 'vsocial1,' votes for the Social Democratic Party are entered; the variable 'ssocial1' denotes the share of seats of the Social Democratic Party.

3. Institutions (Excel file *Institutions*)

General note: The data regarding post-communist institutions is introduced starting with the year of the first non-communist constitution. For the previous years code -2 is used to indicate the functioning of communist rules.

bicam	bicameral or unicameral parliament, as defined in the country's constitution. codes: 1 - unicameral parliament; 2 - bicameral parliament; -2 – communist constitution (in case of Slovakia and Czech Republic, -2 means federal constitution) source: post-communist constitutions
subordup	subordinated upper chamber (Lijphart 1999: 200-215): relationship between the lower and upper chamber, as framed by the post-communist constitutions. codes: 1 – upper chamber is subordinated; 0 - upper chamber is not subordinated; -1 – unicameral parliament; -2 – communist constitution or undemocratic rule (in case of Slovakia and Czech Republic, -2 means federal constitution) basis for coding is given in Annex Subordination of upper chamber source: post-communist constitutions
electup	mode of election of upper chamber codes: 1 – appointment/delegation; 2 – indirect by regional/state legislature; 3 – directly by the people; 4 – other; -1 – unicameral Parliament; -2 – communist constitution or undemocratic rule basis for coding is given in Annex Election of upper chamber source: post-communist constitutions
federal	form of state organization as defined by constitution codes: 1 – federal state; 0 – other; -2 – communist constitution or undemocratic rule source: post-communist constitutions
judrev	judicial review (Lijphart 1999: 223) – existence of an independent body which decides whether laws are in conformity with the constitution codes: 1 – yes ; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution or undemocratic rule source: post-communist constitutions
electsys	electoral system for the (lower chamber of the) Parliament codes: 0 – proportional representation; 1 – proportional representation modified; 2 – majoritarian; 3 – parallel (the chamber is elected using both majoritarian and proportional representation systems, and each is allocated a fixed number of seats); -2 – communist election rule basis for coding is given in Annex Electoral Systems sources: post-communist constitutions and electoral laws

cab_type type of cabinet (Lijphart 1999, 90-115)
 codes: 1 - single party majority; 2 - minimal winning; 3 - surplus coalition; 4 - single party minority; 5 - minority coalition; 6 - caretaker; 7 - grand coalition
 n/p – non-party ministers or experts; na – presidential cabinets (cabinets at the formation of which the Parliament composition is not taken into account)
 sources: Zarate's Political Collections (ZPC), available at <www.terra.es/personal2/monolith>.
 Woldendorp, Jaap, Hans Keman and Ian Budge (2000)
 Berglund, Sten, Joakim Ekman and Franck H. Aarebrot (2004)

NOTE: Entries in the database represent the type of government which was in power most of the time in a given year. For more details regarding governmental changes, see **Annex Types of Government**.

Irid index of rigidity of constitution (Lijphart 1999: 216-223)
 codes: 1- ordinary majorities; 2 – more than ordinary but less than two-thirds majorities plus referendum; 3 - two-thirds majorities and equivalent; 4 - supermajorities (greater than two-thirds). If particularly difficult conditions for amending the constitution existed, an intermediary category was created by adding .5 to the code describing the basic conditions.
 source: post-independence constitutions
 basis for the coding is explained in **Annex Flexibility of Constitutions**

Req_rev required referendum (following an idea of Hug and Tsebelis (2002))
 codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution or other
 source: post-communist constitutions
 basis for the coding is explained in **Annex Required Referenda**

Vp_ref veto point referendum (following an idea of Hug and Tsebelis (2002))
 codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution or other
 source: post-communist constitutions
 basis for the coding is explained in **Annex Non-Required Referenda**

Pop_veto popular veto (following an idea of Hug and Tsebelis (2002))
 codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution or other
 source: post-communist constitutions
 basis for the coding is explained in **Annex Non-Required Referenda**

Pop_init popular initiative (following an idea of Hug and Tsebelis (2002))
 codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution or other
 source: post-communist constitutions
 basis for the coding is explained in **Annex Non-Required Referenda**

Topics of referenda:
 refers to the issues on which referenda are required or can be organized based on post-communist constitutions

Topic 1 border issues and association/secession issues; delegation of state powers to international organizations
 codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution (in case of Czech Republic and Slovakia – federal constitution)

Topic2 adoption of and amendments to constitution; adoption of and change in other laws

	codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution (in case of Czech Republic and Slovakia – federal constitution)
Topic3	dissolution of Parliament; impeachment codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution (in case of Czech Republic and Slovakia – federal constitution)
Topic4	other issues "of national importance" codes: 1- yes; 0 – no; -2 – communist constitution (in case of Czech Republic and Slovakia – federal constitution)
polsys	political system (Lijphart 1999, 116-127) codes: 0 – parliamentary; 1 – presidential; 2 – semi-presidential, dominated by president; 3 – semi-presidential, dominated by parliament; 4 – other source: post-communist constitutions
Idis	Gallagher index of disproportionality (Lijphart 1999: 158) $G = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (v_i - s_i)^2}$, where s_i is the share of seats for party i, v_i is the share of votes for party i, and m is the number of parties
NOTE: In calculating the index, the shares of seats occupied by independents and by small parties grouped under the “other” category were neglected.	
ppi	presidential power index The rules for the calculation of the index are explained in Annex Presidential Power Index . -2 - communist constitutions (in case of Czech Republic and Slovakia – federal constitution) source: post-communist constitutions

4. Women in Parliament (Excel file *Women in Parliament*)

Women_per	percentage of women in Parliament (lower house)
Women_no	number of women in Parliament (lower house)
	codes: -2 designates the period under communist rule or prior to first multiparty elections; na – information not available source: Inter-Parliamentary Union Available at http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/world.htm , page “Women in National Parliaments”

5. Party system (Excel file *Institutions*)

effpar	effective number of parties in Parliament, according to Laakso/Taagepera (1979) for the election mentioned in the category “elect.” The effective number of parties (N) carries the same information as the Rae-Index and is calculated from this index as follows: $N=1/1-Rae$. It is calculated on the basis of the proportion of seats in Parliament.
rae	index of fractionalization of the party –system, according to Douglas Rae. The formula of the index is $Rae = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m s_i^2$, where s_i is the share of seats for party i and m is the number of parties.

NOTE: In the calculation of both indexes the share of seats occupied by independents and by small parties, grouped under the “other” category, was not included.

6. Complexion of government (Excel file *Complexion of government*)

The complexion of government represents the party composition of the cabinet. For each cabinet, it is calculated as a function of the shares of parliamentary support enjoyed by the parties which held ministerial portfolios

The *formula* used for this calculation is:

(share of parliamentary seats of party X * 100 * number of days in office) / (total share of parliamentary seats of all parties in government * number of days in given year)

Explanations for the variables are as follows:

wsocia1 = party label (as given in the **Annex List of Parties**) preceded by “W” (for ‘weight’). Only parties which were part of the government were taken into consideration. Parties which offered parliamentary support without being rewarded with governmental positions were excluded.

Data was gathered starting with the first year we were able to obtain accurate information about government composition. For the first governments after independence / the fall of communist rule, the total weight does not amount to 100, since the governments did not commence their time in office at the beginning of the calendar year.

Codes:

0 was entered for parties which have not been in office.

-2 was entered for governments under communist regimes (before 1998 – 1990 in the case of CEE and before the independence year for NIS).

Those years for which election results were not available, the missing value is recorded as “.” As a general rule, values were entered starting with the first governments formed following the first multiparty elections.

Data was included only from the first year of independence or the breakdown of communist rule onward.

source: own calculations based on the election results

NOTES:

1. For Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Macedonia, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan, complete and comparison-worthy information on the party composition of government was not available. The main reason for this is that cabinet formation is not based on the rationale of “acquisition of a parliamentary majority,” and the party affiliation of ministers is not declared. For these cases, code *na* (not available) was recorded in the database.

In the additional file named *Prime Ministers*, information on the duration of cabinets and the party affiliation of prime ministers is given for all countries. Source of data: Zarate’s Political Collections (ZPC), available at <www.terra.es/personal2/monolith>.

Codes: n/p – non-party; abbreviations for party names can be found in the **Annex List of Parties**.

2. Given the fact that reliable electoral results were not available for Yugoslavia, the complexion of government could not be calculated. This data will be entered at a later date.

7. Democracy (Excel file *Democracy*)

independ	year of acquisition of independence (for NIS) or official end of communist rule (for CEE) codes: 0 – communist rule; 1 - independent or non-communist
FH	overall status of a country as calculated by Freedom House and reported annually in the publication “Freedom in the World” codes: 0 – not free; 1 - partly free; 2 – free; “.” missing value – data does not exist
FH_PR	rating of Political Rights as calculated by Freedom House and reported annually in the publication “Freedom in the World”
FH_CL	rating of Civil Liberties as calculated by Freedom House and reported annually in the publication “Freedom in the World”

NOTE

Description of the Freedom House rating

Each country and territory is awarded from 0 to 4 raw points for each of 10 questions grouped into three subcategories in a **political rights** checklist (A. Electoral Process, B. Political Pluralism and Participation and C. Functioning of Government) and for each of 15 questions grouped into four subcategories in a **civil liberties** checklist (A. Freedom of Expression and Belief, B. Associational and Organizational Rights, C. Rule of Law and D. Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights). A country or territory is assigned a numerical rating on a scale of 1 to 7 based on the total number of raw points awarded to the political rights and civil liberties checklist questions. For both checklists, 1 represents the most free and 7 the least free; each 1 to 7 rating corresponds to a range of total raw scores.

Each pair of political rights and civil liberties ratings is averaged to determine an **overall status** of “Free,” “Partly Free,” or “Not Free.” Those whose ratings average 1-2.5 are considered Free, 3-5.5 Partly Free, and 5.5-7 Not Free. The dividing line between Partly Free and Not Free falls at 5.5. For example, countries that receive a rating of 6 for political rights and 5 for civil liberties, or a 5 for political rights and a 6 for civil liberties, could be either Partly Free or Not Free. The total number of raw points is the definitive factor that determines the final status. Countries and territories with combined raw scores of 0-33 points are Not Free, 34-67 points are Partly Free, and 68-100 are Free.

source: Freedom in the World, available at www.freedomhouse.org

NiT_DEM	Nations in Transit - Democratization score is calculated as the average of scores obtained on 4 dimensions: Electoral Process, Civil Society, Independent Media and Governance (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_ROL	Nations in Transit - Rule of Law score is calculated as the average of ratings obtained on two dimensions: Constitutional, Legislative and Judicial Framework and Corruption (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_EC	Nations in Transit - Economic Liberalization score is calculated as the average of ratings obtained on three dimensions: Privatization, Macroeconomic Policy and Microeconomic Policy (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_DEM2	Nations in Transit - Democracy score is calculated as the average of scores obtained on 7 dimensions: Electoral Process, Civil Society, Independent Media, National Democratic Governance, Local Democratic Governance, Judicial Framework and Independence and Corruption (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_EP	Nations in Transit – Electoral process score (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_CS	Nations in Transit – Civil society score (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_Media	Nations in Transit – Independent media score (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_GOV	Nations in Transit – Governance score (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_NGov	Nations in Transit – National democratic governance score (1 highest, 7 lowest); was introduced in 2005 edition (imputed as of 2004)
NiT_LGov	Nations in Transit – Local democratic governance score (1 highest, 7 lowest); was introduced in 2005 edition (imputed as of 2004)
NiT_JUD	Nations in Transit – Judicial Framework and Independence score (1 highest, 7 lowest)
NiT_COR	Nations in Transit – Corruption score (1 highest, 7 lowest)

NOTE

1. The *Nations in Transit* report was commissioned by the US Agency for International Development. The first such Freedom House survey focused on developments from January 1994 until June 1995. The second survey, Nations in Transit 1997, covered events through December 1996. Information is not available for all the countries in the present study. Therefore, the ratings are imputed lagged one year. For example, the data retrieved from Nations in Transit 1998 was imputed for year 1997.
2. In 2007 *Nations in Transit* changed the composition of its indexes. Therefore, the NiT_DEM, NiT_ROL and NiT_EC were discontinued in the database and replaced with the new indicators, which Nations in Transit recalculated retroactively from 1999/2000. These new indicators were inputted separately: NiT_DEM2, NiT_EP, NiT_CS, NiT_Media, NiT_GOV, NiT_NGov, NiT_LGov, NiT_JUD, NiT_COR.

codes: “na” was used to indicate that information is not available

“. “ value missing indicates that the survey was not available for a given year (before 1994)

source: Nations in Transit, available at www.freedomhouse.org

freedom1 rating of press freedom
codes: 0 - not free; 1 - partly free; 2 - free;
“.” missing value – data does not exist

NOTE: For the year 1993 the labels were interpolated for the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Poland, Moldova, Russia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Yugoslavia.

freedom2 rating of press freedom scores. Data is available only from 1994 onward.
“.” indicates a missing value – data does not exist

sources:

data between 1989-1992: Freedom House Annual Survey of Press Freedom –
Rankings 1980 – 1993, available at
<<http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/ratings80-93.XLS>>

data between 1994-2002: Freedom House Annual Survey of Press Freedom –
Rankings 1994 – 2002, available at
<<http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/ratings.XLS>>

CPI Corruption Perception Index. CPI score relates to perceptions of the degree of
corruption as seen by business people and country analysts, and ranges
between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).
codes: table entries are CPI values.
“.” indicates a missing value – data does not exist

source: Transparency International, available at

http://www.transparency.org/cpi/2003/dnld/cpi2003_background-data.pdf

The index is compiled with the data from previous years. Therefore, in this
database, the values are lagged one year. For example, values retrieved from CPI
2007 are introduced for year 2006.

war violent conflict inside the country or at the borders.
codes: 0 – no violent conflict; 1 – war, civil war or turmoil; 2 – ceasefire
“.” indicates a missing value – data does not exist

NOTE: Data was introduced starting with the year of independence (in the case of Newly Independent
States) or with the end of communist rule. For preceding years, “missing value” was entered.

8. Labour relations (Excel file *Industrial Relations*)

workers number of workers involved in labour conflicts

daynowrk number of days not worked
codes: “.” indicates a missing value, entered for the years where no
information is available
source: ILO Labour Statistical Yearbook 1998 and 2002

NOTE: ILO is using a variety of sources for its statistical yearbook. In the Excel table the source of the
data is given. The information on the source of data is given for the first year of a period where it
applies, unless otherwise specified.

unempl unemployment as a percentage of the labour force

NOTE: Main source of data is Kolodko, Grzegorz W. (2000): *From Shock to Therapy. The Political Economy of Postsocialist Transformation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 360 ff. For those years not covered in this source (1999 – 2001), Freedom House *Nations in Transit* 2002 country reports were used.

References

- Lane, J-E, D. McKay and K. Newton. 1997. *Political Data Handbook* 2/e. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bugajski, Janusz. 2002. *Political Parties of Eastern Europe. A Guide to Politics in the Post-Communist Era*. London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy. Government forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Woldendorp, Jaap, Hans Keman and Ian Budge. 2000. *Party Government in 48 Democracies (1945-1998). Composition – Duration – Personnel*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Berglund, Sten, Joakim Ekman and Franck H. Aarebrot. 2004. *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe*. 2/e. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Hug and Tsebelis. 2002. Veto Players and Referendums Around the World. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*. 14(4 (October))