

Codebook for the Country Scores Dataset

Please cite the dataset as follows:

Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks, Arjan H. Schakel (2008) "Regional Authority in 42 Democracies, 1950–2006. A Measure and Five Hypotheses," *Regional and Federal Studies*, Vol.18, No.2-3, pp.111-302.

Data for the Regional Authority Index fall into two datasets, one with annual scores for regional governments/ tiers in 42 countries for the period 1950-2006, and one aggregating these scores to the country level. Regional authority is measured along eight dimensions. Four documents accompany the datasets:

- codebook of regional scores dataset
- calculation of country scores
- codebook of country scores dataset (this document)
- list of legislative documents

Unit of analysis in the country score dataset

The unit of analysis is a country in a given year of evaluation. Country scores aggregate scores for each regional tier and individual regional governments in a country.

The more regional tiers a country has, the higher is the country score, all other things equal. Where there is variation among regions at a given tier, scores are weighted by population. The following aggregation rules are employed:

- Horizontal asymmetry: Where a tier is composed of regions with different scores, an average score for that tier is calculated by weighting each region's score by its population.
- Vertical asymmetry: Where lower-level regions exist only in some higher-level regions or where scores for lower-level regions vary between higher-level regions, the lower-level scores are weighted by the population of the higher-level regions of which they are part
- Special autonomy: special autonomous regions are weighted by their population relative to that of the national population.

Users can consult the calculation of a particular country score in the accompanying excel file.

VARIABLE NAME	RANGE	VALUES AND LABELS
country_ID	1–42	Country ID (see table 1)
country_name		Country name in English (see table 1)
abbr_country		Abbreviation of country name (see table 1)
year	1950–2006	Year of evaluation
institutional_depth	0–3	Extent to which a regional government is autonomous rather than deconcentrated: 0: no functioning general-purpose administration at the regional level 1: deconcentrated, general-purpose, administration 2: non-deconcentrated, general-purpose, administration subject to central government veto 3: non-deconcentrated, general-purpose, administration not subject to central government veto
policy_scope	0–4	Range of policies for which a regional government is responsible: 0: no authoritative competencies over economic policy, cultural-educational policy, welfare state policy 1: authoritative competencies in one area: economic policy, cultural-educational policy, welfare state policy 2: authoritative competencies in at least two areas: economic policy, cultural-educational policy, welfare state policy 3: authoritative competencies in at least two areas above, and in at least two of the following: residual powers, police, authority over own institutional set-up, local government 4: regional government meets the criteria for 3, and has authority over immigration or citizenship
fiscal_autonomy	0–4	Extent to which a regional government can independently tax its population: 0: the central government sets base and rate of all regional taxes 1: the regional government sets the rate of minor taxes 2: the regional government sets base and rate of minor taxes 3: the regional government sets the rate of at least one major tax: personal income, corporate, value added or sales tax 4: the regional government sets base and rate of at least one major tax: personal income, corporate, value added or sales tax

representation	0–4	Extent to which a region is endowed with an independent legislature and executive: <i>Assembly:</i> 0: no regional assembly 1: an indirectly elected regional assembly 2: a directly elected assembly <i>Executive:</i> 0: the regional executive is appointed by central government 1: dual executives appointed by central government and the regional assembly 2: the regional executive is appointed by a regional assembly or directly elected
self_rule	1–15	The authority exercised by a regional government over those who live in the region, which is the sum of institutional_depth, policy_scope, fiscal_autonomy, and representation.
law_making_a	0–0.5	0: regions are not the unit of representation in the legislature 0.5: regions are the unit of representation in the legislature
law_making_b	0–0.5	0: regional governments do not designate representatives in the legislature 0.5: regional governments designate representatives in the legislature
law_making_c	0–0.5	0: regions do not have majority representation in the legislature 0.5: regions have majority representation in the legislature
law_making_d	0–0.5	0: the legislature with regional representation has extensive legislative authority 0.5: the legislature with regional representation does not have extensive legislative authority
law_making	0–2	Extent to which regional representatives co-determine national legislation, which is the sum of law_making_a to law_making_d
executive_control	0–2	Extent to which a regional government co-determines national policy in intergovernmental meetings 0: no routine meetings between central and regional governments to negotiate policy 1: routine meetings between central and regional governments without legally binding authority 2: routine meetings between central and regional governments with authority to reach legally binding decisions

fiscal_control	0-2	Extent to which regional representatives co-determine the distribution of national tax revenues: 0: regional governments or their representatives in the legislature are not consulted over the distribution of tax revenues 1: regional governments or their representatives in the legislature negotiate over the distribution of tax revenues, but do not have a veto 2: regional governments or their representatives in the legislature have a veto over the distribution of tax revenues
constitutional_reform	0-3	Extent to which regional representatives co-determine constitutional change: 0: the central government and/or national electorate can unilaterally change the constitution 1: a legislature based on the principle of regional representation must approve constitutional change; or constitutional change requires a referendum based on the principle of equal regional representation 2: regional governments are a directly represented majority in a legislature which can do one or more of the following: postpone constitutional reform, introduce amendments, raise the decision hurdle in the other chamber, require a second vote in the other chamber, require a popular referendum 3: a majority of regional governments can veto constitutional change
shared_rule	0-9	The authority exercised by a regional government or its representatives in the country as a whole, which is the sum of law_making, executive_control, fiscal_control, and constitutional_reform
RAI	1-24	Regional authority index, which is the sum of self_rule and shared_rule.

The table below provides country ID (**country_ID**) and abbreviation as well as the years evaluated.

Country ID	Country	Abbr.	Years evaluated
1	Albania	ALB	1992—2006
2	Australia	AUS	1950—2006
3	Austria	AUT	1955—2006
4	Belgium	BE	1950—2006
5	Bosnia and Herzegovina	BOS_HER	1995—2006
6	Bulgaria	BG	1991—2006
7	Canada	CAN	1950—2006
8	Croatia	CRO	1991—2006
9	Cyprus	CYP	1960—2006
10	Czech Republic	CZ	1993—2006
11	Denmark	DK	1950—2006
12	Estonia	EST	1992-2006
13	Finland	FIN	1950—2006
14	France	FR	1950—2006
15	Germany	DE	1950—2006
16	Greece	GR	1950—2006
17	Hungary	HUN	1990—2006
18	Iceland	ICE	1950—2006
19	Ireland	IRL	1950—2006
20	Italy	IT	1950—2006
21	Japan	JAP	1950—2006
22	Latvia	LV	1990—2006
23	Lithuania	LT	1992—2006
24	Luxembourg	LUX	1950—2006

25	Macedonia	MAC	1991–2006
26	Malta	MAL	1964–2006
27	Netherlands	NL	1950–2006
28	New Zealand	NZ	1950–2006
29	Norway	NOR	1950–2006
30	Poland	PL	1990–2006
31	Portugal	POR	1976–2006
32	Romania	ROM	1991–2006
33	Russian Federation	RUS	1993–2006
34	Serbia and Montenegro	SE_MO	1992–2006
35	Slovakia	SK	1993–2006
36	Slovenia	SLE	1991–2006
37	Spain	ESP	1978–2006
38	Sweden	SV	1950–2006
39	Switzerland	CH	1950–2006
40	Turkey	TURK	1950–2006
41	United Kingdom	UK	1950–2006
42	United States	USA	1950–2006

A small number of country scores have been updated in the dataset from those in Appendix B in *Regional and Federal Studies* (2008). The table below lists countries and years as well as the reason for adjustments.

Differences in country scores between dataset and Appendix B in *Regional and Federal Studies*

Country	Years	Adjustment	Reason
Australia	1965-1977	18.0→18.1	Rounding
Belgium	1970-1979 1980-1988 1995-2006	25.8→25.9 22.9→23.0 29.0→28.1	Population figures adjustment for <i>German community</i> ; authority of <i>Walloon region</i> now includes authority exercised over <i>German community</i> (see footnote excel file); now Brussels does not fall under provincial jurisdiction as of 1995.
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1995-2006	30.5→30.6	Population figures adjustment
Germany	1950-2003	+0.1	Now includes <i>Bremen</i> as having <i>Kreise</i>
Italy	1974-1976 1997-2000	14.5→14.6 19.5→19.6	Rounding
New Zealand	1963-1973	3.0→2.8	Now scores <i>Wellington</i> as a region from 1974 (instead of 1963)
Portugal	1999-2006	3.7→3.6	Rounding
Spain	1981 1982	15.9→15.5 18.7→18.3	Adjusted for the fact that some <i>Comunidades</i> replace <i>provincias</i> at the time of signing the autonomy statute. Autonomy statute for <i>Asturias</i> and <i>Cantabria</i> signed in 1981 (instead of 1983).
United Kingdom	1964-1971 1972 1998 1999 2000-2002 2003-2006	9.4→9.5 9.3→9.2 5.8→5.6 9.2→9.3 9.9→9.7 9.6→9.5	Population figures adjustment
United States	1950-1958 1959 1960-1979 1980-2006	22.8→23.1 23.0→23.2 22.9→23.1 23.0→23.2	Now includes counties and regions in <i>Massachusetts</i>

Further detail on scoring: Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks, and Arjan H. Schakel (2008), 'Operationalizing Regional Authority: A Coding Scheme for 42 Countries, 1950-2006', *Regional and Federal Studies*, Vol.18, No.2-3, pp.123-142.