

Latin America and the Caribbean Political Dataset, 1945-2001

Beta version, February 2008

To be placed in the public domain in August 2008

The data contained in this data set were collected by a project entitled "The Determinants of Social Policy, Inequality, and Poverty in Latin America and the Caribbean" directed by Evelyne Huber and John D. Stephens. This project was supported in 2003-05 by a grant from the National Science Foundation (Grant # SES 0241389). Huber and Stephens worked on the data collection when they were fellows at the Hanse-Wissenschaftskolleg, January-June 2005. Support for preliminary data collection before 2003 and since 2005 was provided by the Morehead Alumni Chair held by Evelyne Huber and the Gerhard E. Lenski, Jr. chair held by John D. Stephens, both at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. We would like to acknowledge the work of a large number of political science graduate students on this dataset, especially Juan Bogliaccini, Kirk Bowman, and Fred Solt.

Citation: In any work using data from this data set, please cite both the data set and, where appropriate, the original source of the data. In most cases, the original source can simply be cited as World Bank, ECLAC, etc. Please cite this data set as Evelyne Huber, John D. Stephens, Thomas Mustillo, and Jennifer Pribble, Latin America and the Caribbean Political Dataset, 1945-2001, University of North Carolina, 2008.

country long spelling with no spaces between words (e.g., CostaRica)

idn two digit identification number

id three letter country code

COUNTRY	IDN	ID
Argentina	30	ARG
Bahamas	31	BHS
Barbados	32	BRB
Belize	33	BLZ
Bolivia	34	BOL
Brazil	35	BRA
Chile	36	CHL
Colombia	37	COL
CostaRica	38	CRI
DominicanRep	39	DOM
Ecuador	40	ECU
ElSalvador	41	ELV
Guatemala	42	GTM
Guyana	43	GUY
Haiti	44	HTI
Honduras	45	HON

Jamaica	46	JAM
Mexico	47	MEX
Nicaragua	48	NIC
Panama	49	PAN
Paraguay	50	PRY
Peru	51	PER
Suriname	52	SUR
TrinidadTob	53	TTO
Uruguay	54	URY
Venezuela	55	VEN

year 1945-2001

Democracy:

demrss Regime type with some data taken from Table 5.1 of Capitalist Development and Democracy and other data operationalized with rules from appendix of Capitalist Development and Democracy. Colony coded as "0", Authoritarian Regime coded as "1", Bureaucratic Authoritarian coded as "2", Restricted Democracy coded as "3", and Full Democracy coded as "4".

demtri democracy trichotomy, as defined by Mainwaring, et al 2001. "0" is authoritarian; "1" is semidemocracy; "2" is democracy. Mainwaring et al original scores fun 1945-1999. We have updated select countries for 2000.

Citation is: Mainwaring, Scott, Daniel Brinks, and Aníbal Pérez-Liñán. (2001) "Classifying Political Regimes in Latin America, 1945–1999." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Spring 2001, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 37–65.

demaclp democracy dichotomy, as defined by Przeworski et al 2000. "0" is non-democracy; "1" is democracy. Citation is: Adam Przeworski, Michael E. Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi, *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 1-141. Coverage is 1950-1990.

dempolity Polity IV scores. Range –10 to 10. Variable from dataset is "polity2."

demfhpr Political Rights score from Freedom House. Range 1 to 7 with 1 as free and 7 as not free. Coverage is 1972-2000.

demfhcl Civil Liberties score from Freedom House. Range 1 to 7 with 1 as free and 7 as not free. Coverage is 1972-2000.

demfh Overall Freedom House score from Freedom House. Range 0 to 2; "0" not free; "1" partly free; "2" free. Coverage is 1972-2000.

popauthor Designates populist authoritarian regime. Coded 1 for each full year of rule and .5 for each ½ year of rule. Otherwise, coded 0. Coding by authors.

repressauthor Designates repressive authoritarian regime. Coded 1 for each full year of rule and .5 for each ½ year of rule. Otherwise, coded 0. Coding by authors.

Variables SL through U and execpart are based upon the coding criteria in Michael Coppedge's Kellogg Institute Working Paper #244 entitled "A Classification of Latin American Political Parties."

Coppedge reports VOTE share by party block. We converted the measure to SEAT share by block. We used an alternative source to determine number of seats by party (mostly, Dieter Nohlen. 1993. Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana Y Del Caribe. Costa Rica: Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos.) and matched party names from Nohlen to party names from Coppedge to calculate the values. Seat Share refers to the proportion of seats received by each category of party in each lower house legislative session during periods of democratic rule (that is, during periods of "demrss" scores of 3 or 4). Party codings for 10 of the countries in the dataset are from Coppedge, including his update for select countries. Party codings for the remaining countries were scored by the authors according to Coppedge's coding criteria.

For years during which there was a transition from one legislature to another (usually through an election), a given year was coded as from the previous legislature if the transition occurred before July 1 and as from the new legislature if the transition occurred on July 1 or later.

sl	Secular left
scl	Secular center-left
sc	Secular center
scr	Secular center-right
sr	Secular right
xl	Christian left
xcl	Christian center-left
xc	Christian center
xcr	Christian center-right
xr	Christian right
per	Personalist
o	Other
u	Unknown

Coppedge classifies the Peronist party as "other" throughout the period. One might plausibly argue that the Peronists should be classified as scl up through 1973, as sc from

74 to 1989, and as scr from 1990 on. In order to test the effect of the alternative classifications, we include in the dataset the following three variables.

sclalt
scalt
scralt
oalt

execpart Orientation of the party of the executive, according to Coppedge's coding rules.

execlhshare Seat share in the lower house of the party of the executive.

Variables "electoral" through "judrev" represent VETO POINTS scores and are coded by the authors and adapting the criteria outlined in Huber and Stephens (2001).

electoral Electoral system used for the lower house of congress (or for the single chamber in unicameral legislatures). 0 for proportional representation (PR) (including MMP with FPTP component); 1 for modified PR (including STV (NA in this sample), SMD w/ runoff, Parallel Systems); 2 for single member district plurality. Electoral system names are from Andrew Reynolds and Ben Reilly. 1997. The International IDEA Handbook of Electoral System Design. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.

formgov Form of government. 0 for parliamentary systems and 1 for presidential systems.

federal Degree of federalism. 0 for none; 1 for weak; 2 for strong.

cameral Type of cameralism. 2 for strong bicameralism (symmetrical and incongruent); 1 for weak bicameralism (symmetrical and congruent); 0 for unicameralism (and any variety of asymmetrical bicameralism)

referen Referenda as a provision in the constitution. 0 for doesn't exist; 1 for exists but isn't used; 2 for exists and is used. We include both binding referenda and binding popular initiatives in this category (and exclude binding plebiscites, as they are generally about affirming public support for the government). The only country in the region in which binding referenda and binding popular initiatives have been employed is Uruguay. For that case, we code the country with a "2" for the four years prior to the event, for the year of the event, and for the five years following the event (assuming that during the previous four years and subsequent five the country was democratic and the constitution provided for binding public initiatives and plebiscites). The existence of a referenda or binding popular initiative mechanism was coded based on a reading of the constitution, consultation with country-experts, and the coding of when it was used was based on press articles and scholarly publications. In particular, for the Uruguayan case we used:

Altman, David. 2005. "Democracia directa en el continente americano: Autolegitimación gubernamental o censura ciudadana?" *Politica y Gobierno*. Vol. XII (2): 203-232.

Altman, David. 2002. "Prospects for E-government in Latin America: Satisfaction with Democracy, Social Accountability, and Direct Democracy." *International Review of Public Administration*. Vol. 7. N. 2: 5-20.

judrev Judicial Review. 0 for exists and 1 for does not exist.

Variables "womenlh" and "womenuh" are taken from Inter-Parliamentary Union. 1995. "Women in Parliaments: 1945-1995" and from the IPU website for elections from 1995 to 2000.

womenlh Percentage of seats in the lower or only chamber held by women. When elections were held in the first half of the year, the entire year was coded as the new result; when elections were held in the second half of the year, the entire year was coded as the old result. The same rule is applied to legislatures that were dissolved. Null values are therefore present when there was no lower chamber or, in a few cases, where data are missing.

womenuh Percentage of seats in the upper chamber held by women. When elections (or selections) were held in the first half of the year, the entire year was coded as the new result; when elections were held in the second half of the year, the entire year was coded as the old result. The same rule is applied to upper chambers that were dissolved. Null values are therefore present when there was no upper chamber or, in a few cases, where data are missing.