Max Rånge and Mikael Sandberg

Political Institutions and Regimes since 1600: A

New Historical Data Set Do national political institutions matter for social developments and changes? If so, how, where, and when do the critical conditions occur, and how long is the causal time lag? What are the patterns of interaction between political regime types and institutional changes from one country to another? These are some of the questions that historical data about such institutions can address. Given the different values that accrue at the national level, the information about the political systems under which these differences exist or emerge can help to explain variations or changes. For example, the co-evolution of political institutions with economic performance has long been of great interest among economists and political scientists. Do political institutions matter for economic growth, wealth, or economic inequality? Likewise, sociologists have studied trust and political culture in relation to political institutions. Political institutions can also be related to other forms of cultural evolution under various political regimes. Examining these issues requires historical data about political institutions among nations at several points in time. Depending on the design or, rather, as a consequence of designs made possible by long time series, we can estimate models of relationship between a set of focus variables and various political and historical institutions.

Max Rånge is Researcher, School of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, Halmstad University. He is the author, with Mikael Sandberg, of “Windfall Gains or Eco-Innovation? ‘Green’ Evolution in the Swedish Innovation System,” *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*, XVIII (2016), 229–246.

Mikael Sandberg is Professor of Political Science, School of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, Halmstad University. He is co-author, with Martin Åberg, of *Social Capital and Democratisation: Roots of Trust in Post-Communist Poland and Ukraine* (Aldershot, 2003); with Fredrik Jansson and Patrik Lindenfors, “Democratic Revolutions as Institutional Innovation Diffusion: Rapid Adoption and Survival of Democracy,” *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, LXXX (2013), 1546–1556.

The authors thank Matthew C. Wilson, Alan Hermes, participants at the second WINIR Conference in Rio de Janeiro (September 2015), and commentators at the Quality of Government Institute, Gothenburg University (February 2016) for their suggestions and comments.

Given certain types of time series, we can also investigate the possible endogenously driven mechanisms in political systems that sustain repeatable patterns as opposed to changes because of externally or internationally driven adaptations dynamically. For example, do political institutions evolve as a consequence of previous institutions? That is, can we discern path dependencies in the historical dynamics of political institutions, or do institutions and regimes adapt by necessity, and often in a diffused manner, to the influences of surrounding neighbors or strong powers? An analysis of data about political institutions in long time series can answer such questions.

The answer to many of those questions is now available, thanks to a historically informed new data set called MaxRange—the result of more than a decade of dedicated work by Max Rånge, one of the authors of this research note, to address the lack of comprehensive data about the world's institutions and regimes in long historical perspective. At the time, the data set Polity IV was the only one stretching as far back as 1800, but Polity IV did not, and does not, contain information about the dynamics of individual *formal* institutions of regimes, such as parliamentarism versus presidentialism, monarchy versus republic, and so on. MaxRange offers historians and historically interested researchers a valuable tool for the analysis of every kind of regime since 1600, highlighting institutional comparisons, and contrasts via a taxonomy that will help them to place their regime studies in a larger and deeper context. These institutional-component values enable the historical analysis of political institutions apart from the overarching regime types, which is critical for understanding nation-building processes, transitions, democratizations, revolutions, reversals, path dependences, and the interactive dynamics of political institutions and regime types in general (see Appendix for a sample page in the MaxRange Data Set).¹

CONCEPTS OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS Traditionally, political science has viewed the evolution of political institutions deductively along cumulative conceptual threads. Even Aristotle's ancient distinctions between democracy, oligarchy, and tyranny are still in use today to some extent, and not just by political

1 For queries about access to the MaxRange data set, please contact the authors.

scientists. For example, Schumpeter, an economist, defined the democratic method as “that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote.” Partly relying on Schumpeter’s conception of democracy, Dahl, a political scientist, distinguished between combinations of democracy’s two major dimensions—participation and contestation—as closed hegemonies, competitive oligarchies, inclusive hegemonies, and a conceptual invention of his own called “polyarchies.”²

These definitions are not the result of prior empirical tests or investigations of observed institutions; they are classifications developed on the basis of knowledge, logic, and conceptual distinctions. One potential problem with this deductive and conceptual, rather than empirical, approach is the lack of certainty whether these classifications correspond to existing conditions. A more serious consequence is that institutions that have not acquired a definition will go undetected. If the natural sciences had followed the research principles of political science, no discoveries beyond a priori declarations could ever have happened.

Institutional analysis is accumulating an increasing body of evolutionary methodologies, particularly in economics. In one sense, an institution, like a gene, is a particulate unit; it either exists or does not exist. Furthermore, the possible combinations of non-existing and existing institutions at any time and in any political or social space are beyond reasonable quantitative limits; any political or social unit can have, or not have, an infinite number of institutions. Thus, one task for political or social scientists is to detect the combination of existing and nonexisting institutions in each political system over time. Yet, given the number of institutions and nation-states throughout history, this task might appear to be a monumental challenge. This research note, however, shows that time-series data concerning the past four centuries of the world’s political systems are already at hand.

In general, the definition of *institution* in political science has been greatly influenced by economics—in particular, North’s understanding of institutions as “rules of the game” or, more specifically, the “humanly devised constraints that structure political,

2 Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (New York, 1942); Robert Dahl, *Polyarchy; Participation and Opposition* (New Haven, 1971).

economic and social interaction.” Ostrom applied a similar understanding of institutions in her various studies of the commons. Political science has produced fewer contributions to institutional theory, inclining far more toward deductively motivated empirical analyses of formal institutions. Political scientists have devoted numerous studies to democracy, which they tend to explain in terms of “requisites,” determinants, and diffusion patterns. However, their lack of attention to nondemocratic regime types is unfortunate, since the potential for a democracy’s survival depends on the regime that it succeeds. Dahl, Linz, and Stepan acknowledge this understanding of historical dynamics in their analysis of fundamental pathways toward a consolidated democracy.³

THE MAXRANGE DATA SET As a response to the need to identify institutions empirically when studying dynamics, causes, and effects, our MaxRange data set offers to resolve some of the inherent difficulties, as well as to complement other data sets. The data set

3 Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of The Leisure Class; An Economic Study of Institutions* (New York, 1912); Douglass North, *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance* (New York, 1990); Peyton Young, *Individual Strategy and Social Structure: An Evolutionary Theory of Institution* (Princeton, 2001); Samuel Bowles, *Microeconomics: Behavior, Institutions, and Evolution* (Princeton, 2004). For an overview, see Geoffrey Hodgson, *Economics and Institutions: A Manifesto for a Modern Institutional Economics* (Philadelphia, 1988); Ellinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Boston, 1990); James March and Johan Olsen, *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics* (New York, 1989); *idem*, “Institutional Perspectives on Political Institutions,” *Governance*, IX (2005), 247–264; Paul Pierson, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton, 2004); Guy Peters, *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The “New Institutionalism”* (New York, 2012); Seymour M. Lipset, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (New York, 1960); Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, 1991); Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture; Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Princeton, 1963); Barrington T. Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy; Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston, 1966); Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics* (New Haven, 1989); Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America* (New York, 1991); Robert Putnam, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton, 1992); Dahl, *Polyarchy*; Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore, 1996); Tatu Vanhanen, *Democratization: A Comparative Analysis Of 170 Countries* (London, 2003); Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (New York, 2005); Barbara Wejnert, “Diffusion, Development, and Democracy, 1800–1999,” *American Sociological Review*, LXX (2005), 53–81; Fredrik Jansson, Patrik Lindenfors, and Sandberg, “Democratic Revolutions as Institutional Innovation Diffusion: Rapid Adoption and Survival of Democracy,” *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, LXXX (2013), 1546–1556.

aggregates specific attributes to create ordinal rankings of political regimes on a 1 to 1,000 point scale. The data are the product of more than a decade of historical research in a project spearheaded by Max Rånge, based at Halmstad University.

The MaxRange data set provides information about political institutions for all countries from 1789 on a monthly and a yearly basis, and from 1600 on a yearly one, covering two more centuries of yearly data than the largest other current data sets about political institutions. As a comprehensive political-regime data set, it offers several advantages when compared to other ones. The monthly coverage is an especially critical feature; many political events and changes are frequently omitted from yearly data. By providing documentation about monthly changes, MaxRange supports detailed descriptions of the transition process that it can relate to other changes that occur simultaneously. For example, monthly sequence data about transitional systems can help political scientists and political sociologists to discern patterns conducive to further democratic consolidation and pinpoint risky paths for sustainable democratization. It could also benefit practitioners involved in aid or development with knowledge about the various paths that can influence democratic consolidation.

The MaxRange data set includes institutions, regime types, and political systems that may or may not be pertinent to democracy, as well as the various measures employed to create them, thereby allowing researchers to focus on individual institutions and to employ different categorizations of regime type. The identification of political institutions and regime attributes entailed no prior assumptions about what systems actually exist or existed; nor was it dependent on existing classifications of regime type. Therefore, the new data set supports the empirical study of political transitions in the long term by providing information about both democratic and nondemocratic institutions. It can show how regimes evolved. MaxRange can also complement and cross-validate other data sets. The data collection is fully transparent; all of the sources that contributed to the coding are documented and archived, allowing scholars to compare source materials and to evaluate their reliability across data sets for specific country–year observations.⁴

4 For further, updated information, see <http://www.hh.se/English/maxrange/> and <http://sites.google.com/site/regimedata/home/download>.

PREVIOUS DATA SETS An empirical interest in the relationship between institutions and their political outcomes—embodied in political science by the historical-institutionalist approach—has led to a number of different data sets. Many of the projects have attempted to classify types of regimes and document the temporal changes between them. Some of the most well-known data sets centered on democratic institutions are the Freedom House, the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), the Institutional and Elections Project (IAEP), and the Democracy–Dictatorship Index. However, only three data sets targeting democracy reach back so far as the early nineteenth century—the Vanhanen’s Polyarchy, which goes back to 1810; Boix, Miller, and Rosato’s Political Regimes (BMR); and Polity IV, the latter two beginning in 1800. Polity IV represents nation-states with a population of more than 500,000 inhabitants starting from 1800. One recent project—the Varieties of Democracy (V-DEM), based at the University of Gothenburg and the Kellogg Institute at the University Notre Dame—is refining the indicators of democracy through the joint efforts of scientists and political experts. One of the primary benefits of V-DEM is its attempt to provide the full set of indexes for each conception and component by which different forms of democracy are measured. V-DEM extends back to 1900.⁵

CONCEPTUAL MOTIVATION AND COLLECTION SCHEME One of MaxRange’s primary goals is to identify political institutions and institutional practices that distinguish democratic regimes from other kinds of polities. Another is to provide information to distinguish between different forms of democratic government and different forms of nondemocratic government. Identifying

5 Peter A. Hall and Rosemary C. R. Taylor, “Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms,” *Political Studies*, XLIV (1996), 936–957; Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market*; José Antonio Cheibub, Jennifer Gandhi, and James Raymond Vreeland, “Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited,” *Public Choice*, CXLIII (2010), 67–101 [hereinafter Cheibub et al.]; Tatu Vanhanen, *Prospects of Democracy: A Study of 172 countries* (New York, 1997); Carles Boix, Michael K Miller, and Sebastian Rosato, “A Complete Dataset of Political Regimes, 1800–2007,” *Comparative Political Studies*, XX (2012), 1–32; Ted R. Gurr, “Persistence and Change in Political Systems, 1800–1971,” *American Political Science Review*, LXVIII (1974), 1482–1504; Keith Jagers and Gurr, “Tracking Democracy’s Third Wave with the Polity III Data,” *Journal of Peace Research*, XXXII (1995), 469–482; Monty Marshall and Jagers, “Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800–2002: Dataset Users’ Manual,” Polity IV Project (University of Maryland, 2002); *idem*, “Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions 1800–2008” (University of Maryland, 2010).

potential indicators for inclusion involved studying country histories and inductively coding the “forms” that the evolving political regimes took, first by relying on traditional concepts and then gradually expanding the taxonomy. The finished taxonomy was thus the result of an interactive process that entailed an engagement with, and a scoring of, concepts, the possible addition of other institutions, and the evaluation of any added concepts.

Rånge’s collecting of historical data about institutions and institutional practices, which occurred from 2002 to 2011, relied on historical sources, such as countries’ constitutions and laws, as well as news reports and encyclopedias (such as *The Statesman’s Yearbook*, *Keesing’s Record of World Events*, and *Encyclopedia Britannica*). All of this library work and coding into tables resulted in copious Excel worksheets. In 2011, after Sandberg had joined the project, the next order of business was the transformation of these data into matrices within statistical software formats, the further elaboration of the index scale, the extraction of institutional dummy variables, and the creation of syntax for quick updates of the variables. All country cases acquired country codes to facilitate merges with other data sets. The problems encountered in this work were mostly due to the fact that the nature of political institutions in some countries is a matter of ongoing historical and political-science research, not yet reaching unanimous conclusions about regime characteristics that can be checked in several independent sources and accounts. The project’s intention, however, is always to scan such documentation for missing data to make revisions as soon as new reliable information is at hand. MaxRange coding relies entirely on the historical evidence regarding institutions.

Copies of the reference material about regime changes that underlies the coding is archived at Halmstad University, which financed part of the work. The sources referenced contributed to the qualitative assessment of the institutional changes throughout the entire period of observation. Beginning in January 1600 for yearly and 1789 for monthly data, we entered specific regime types, constitutional arrangements, and institutional practices into the database and coded changes in each of them by year and month. Combining indicators as they changed provided the basis for determining regime types. Given that “parchment institutions,” or institutions on paper, do not always reflect empirical reality, the coding of institutional practices favored de jure authority.

The first order of differentiation between regimes involved distinguishing democracies from other regime types. To do so required taking election results for all national general elections into account through news publications or other historical sources. Mandates and reports from international observers and other contemporary outlets helped to gauge the fairness of these elections. Democracies came under the heading of either “qualified” or “electoral” based on how well their parliaments and elected leaders represented the “will of the people,” as well as how well they maintained political and civil rights. In both qualified and electoral democracies, elections must be free and legitimate. In electoral democracies, however, political or civil-rights violations sometimes occur, and their governments sometimes exceed their constitutional powers or obstruct democratic rule through malpractice or corruption.

MaxRange covers 219 countries defined according to today’s national territories, including countries that do necessarily have full international recognition at present but are nonetheless largely autonomous, independent by United Nations standards as well as by territorial and historical antecedents (for example, those within the United Kingdom). States with a significant degree of autonomy in domestic legislation (like Greenland) and independent political institutions and parties with connections to a central power also have a place in the database, as do historically existing nation-states within borders of existing nations today (for one, the German Democratic Republic). In the case of several previous states located within the territory of a single current nation, only the most dominating state has a code—for instance, Prussia, even though it is now enveloped within a unified Germany. Certain countries within countries, such as Bavaria and Mecklenburg, remain as possible extensions to the standard data set. Italy before unification in 1861 consisted of a number of absolute monarchies, which are coded such. Earlier minor states with salient dissimilarities and no dominant umbrella state received the specific code 165 in the MaxRange Codebook. Certain city-state nations—Andorra and San Marino, for two—are yet not included.⁶

6 The Codebook is available online with this article as supplementary material at http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/suppl/10.1162/JINH_a_01052.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE VARIABLES The MaxRange index has 199 values on its hierarchical scale from 1 to 1,000. First, each value has a descriptive label, corresponding with one of fourteen identified regime types, which range from absolutism to qualified democracy. Next, the nations of every regime type are ranked on an ordinal scale according to their executive strength. In the third step, regime types and their levels of executive strength receive their individual values for the institutional structure and accountability variable. Fourth, these combinations also get values depending on a system's degree of centralization. Lastly, we note interim versus normal or non-interim regime types. Not all of the combinations of the five ordinal scales are necessarily coded in every case, since having a value for one variable can restrict the occurrence of a country-year or country-month value for another.⁷

The index as a whole represents a composite “institutional configuration” score for every nation, encompassing the legitimacy and degree of pluralism in its political elections, the democratic legitimacy of its executive, the division of power between its major institutional actors, its observance of rights (freedom of expression and equal rights in nominations and elections), and its degree of constitutionalism. The regime types from absolutism to limited, electoral, and qualified democracy are ordered by the strength of their executive branch, their accountability to the people, their degree of centralization, and their interim status. The MaxRange Codebook describes all of these variables and categories.

MaxRange's categorical information about formal political institutions is important for most interdisciplinary applications. To evaluate the effect of an institution, we need to compare social phenomena in nations that have it with those in nations that do not have it, preferably with a time dimension included in the analysis—in the case of MaxRange, years or, after January 1789, months.

The variables in the monthly MaxRange 1789 to 2015 data set for the approximately 220 nations during a total of 2,700 months constitute approximately 600,000 unique values in the MaxRange index. Figure 1 depicts the sequences of the regime types, ranging from absolutism (darkest) to electoral and qualified democracy (lightest) between 1789 and 2014, with bars of sequences sorted from their end state in 2014 (using TraMineR in R). As the figure shows,

7 Value 5 is omitted on the scale of the MaxRange, since it cannot exist as a type of absolutism.

Fig. 1 Sequences of Political Regimes in the World, Sorted from End State, 1789–2014

NOTE Sequences of political regimes from absolutism (black) to qualified democracy (white) using TraMineR sequence analysis package in R.

SOURCE Max Rånge and Mikael Sandberg “‘Civilizations’ and Political-Institutional Paths: A Sequence Analysis of the MaxRange2 Data Set, 1789–2013,” paper delivered at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington D.C., 2014 (“MaxRange2” was an earlier name for one of the MaxRange data sets).

the MaxRange data allow scholars to trace modern-day nations back to 1789, or to the month that they emerged as nation-states, permitting institutional paths or path dependencies to be investigated as institutions emerge, diffuse, and vanish. Thus, the MaxRange data set provides a comprehensive basis for analyzing state-building and political institutional development in a variety of ways.⁸

The values associated with the MaxRange indexes imply a specific combination of dummy variables. As such, they map onto a large number of dummy variables regarding specific institutions and institutional practices. The index can therefore also be subdivided into regime-type groups, as well as dummy (0 and 1 value) variables, denoting the presence or absence of specific institutions in a national political system. The ability to disaggregate the MaxRange scale into combinations of institutional dummy variables makes it possible to place in operation different classifications of regime type or institutional configurations, as well as to analyze

8 The TraMineR (Life Trajectory Miner for R) software—developed at the Institute of Demography and Socioeconomics (IDESO), University of Geneva, under the auspices of the TraMineR Scientific Committee—is used primarily in the analysis of longitudinal data. “R” is a separate platform for statistics and graphics.

the temporal dynamics of specific political institutions. Other data sets, such as the Institutional and Elections Project (IAEP) and the Database of Political Institutions, offer this feature, but the temporal window associated with MaxRange is considerably larger. MaxRange permits approximately ninety-five institutional dummy variables, thus offering over 8,600,000 yearly data points for the years 1600 to 2015 and more than 57,000,000 monthly data points for the years 1789 to 2015.⁹

REGIME TYPES In combination with other institutional components, as described below, the MaxRange index values are coded within the context of regime types. Hence, components add information to the specification of the resulting MaxRange index value.

Democratic Criteria MaxRange index values and regime-type classifications are based on a number of criteria checked for consistency through published or otherwise reliably documented research based on several sources. These criteria are not simply added to each other but are weighted and sorted in order of importance. To meet the classification as a democracy, a polity must satisfy seven main criteria that together, in order of importance, provide a formal definition of *democracy*:

(1) Territorial control. Functioning democratic governments exercise control over a significant part of a territory (we use two-thirds of a territory as a lower limit). We classify countries without such control as having a semi-anarchical or dysfunctional governance.

(2) Political competition. According to the MaxRange index and regime type, the most important factor behind a functioning democracy is the existence of at least two serious and competing political alternatives in national elections. These alternatives must have a reasonably equal chance to gain power and receive fair and equal treatment from state agencies and media coverage alike. Without sufficient political competition, a country can never achieve democratic standards. For example, Botswana has met this criterion since 1967. Despite its dominating party, its free elections carry a genuine opportunity for opposition. Singapore, however, has not been democratic in this respect since 1959.

9 For the IAEP, see <https://hvardhegre.net/iaep/>; for the Database of Political Institutions (2015), http://www.iadb.org/en/research-and-data/publication-details,3169.html?pub_id=IDB-DB-121.

(3) Freedom of speech, media, assembly, etc. Such freedoms allow and provide opportunities for fair political competition. Objective and uncensored media are essential for proper coverage of political alternatives. Freedom of speech is indispensable to political candidates campaigning for the electorate. To assess these freedoms, we use reports from such international organizations as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Human Rights Watch, the United Nations, etc.

(4) Electoral integrity and quality. Candidates must not be subject to intimidation, repression, or major obstruction. In addition, voters are entitled to secrecy and the absence of systematic electoral fraud. In this context, we distinguish between systematic obstructions by the state and logistical problems that do not involve deliberate state interference.

(5) Constitutional consensus/legitimacy. An established democratic constitution implies the mutual respect of political competitors, functions, and positions after elections. The minority must honor the majority's (the government's) right to rule as long as it follows constitutional procedure. In return, a government must guarantee minorities the right to function both inside and outside parliament as legitimate, legal oppositions.

(6) General suffrage. Citizens of both genders, from at least twenty-one years of age, should have the right to vote. A country can be democratic if all of the other criteria are in order, but to be a qualified democracy requires general suffrage.

(7) Constitutional order. A government or executive must not violate an established constitutional order, such as the separation of executive, legislative, and judiciary authorities. Furthermore, a government or executive cannot make decisions without a proper constitutional amendment or parliamentary approval.

In our view, no other criteria—neither social equality, the absence of violence, logistical/infrastructural capacity, nor political/legislative content (reforms)—need be listed explicitly as fundamental to democracy so long as these seven criteria are met. Besides the first, elemental, criterion for the possibility of democracy, territorial integrity, the next six criteria assess levels of democracy on an ordinal scale in relation to existing historical documentation. According to MaxRange, democracies rate as qualified or electoral depending on their ability to accommodate political and civil rights as documented in the sources described above.

Regime Types On the basis of how well they meet these criteria, and embody the institutional components described above, MaxRange permits a classification of Regime types (see Appendix):

Qualified democracy. We define this type of democracy as a comparatively well-functioning polity in which the political leadership is legitimate, elected in free and fair elections without serious protest. Political and civil rights, as well as constitutional and legal rights, are the norm. Public administration and public authority are politically independent. Qualified democracy requires that all of the seven criteria are well in evidence. Qualified democracies outnumber all other regime types today, but nineteenth-century examples were Australia, Canada, Switzerland, and the United States.

Electoral democracy. This type of democracy does not function as well as its counterpart. Even with a political leadership generally regarded as legitimate and elections as reflective of the “will of the people,” the dominant party in an electoral democracy often exercises some degree of control over the media and public opinion; does not fully protect constitutional, political, and/or civil rights; and has a grip on public administration. Electoral democracies meet only criteria 1 to 4 (Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Fiji, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Nepal, Pakistan, and Tanzania in 2015).

MaxRange locates a number of intermediate forms of regime between qualified and electoral democracy on one end and despotism and absolutism on the other:

False democracy. This entity is a non-functioning democracy with a pluralistic political system. In general its elections are under the sway of a dominant party, which often manipulates the results, although it also has significant political opposition. False democracies do not meet criteria 2 and 4, but they must fulfill criterion 1. They often meet criteria 3, 5, 6, and 7 to varying degrees (Angola, Armenia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Chad, Djibouti, Ecuador, Malaysia, Mauretania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Turkey, Zimbabwe in 2015, Sweden in 1770, Uganda in 1982, and Tanzania in 2002).

False authoritarianism. This type is a de facto one-party system established as a result of an opposition’s boycott of elections despite its participation in parliament. In contrast to de facto authoritarian status, such a boycott is not considered to be fully authoritarian, since the government in question either shows democratic ambitions or reflects a legitimate mandate of the people. False authoritarianism generally

meets criteria 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7, but it does not meet criteria 2 and 5. False authoritarianism is rare, but Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea in 2015 exemplify it.

Semi-authoritarianism. This repressive and decidedly one-party system allows opposition legally but severely represses it. Election results are often the result of fraud, manipulation, repression, etc. Semi-authoritarianism meets criterion 1, usually criterion 6, and sometimes criterion 7, but its adherence to criteria 2 to 5 is too low to rate as democratic, though not always entirely absent (Algeria, Republic of Congo, Egypt, Iran, Rwanda, Singapore, and Uganda in 2015, Italy in 1860, Cambodia in 2001, and Romania in 1991).

De facto authoritarianism. This governmental form is similar to semi-authoritarianism, except for the complete absence of an opposition party in parliament as a result of a legitimate boycott or a failure to gain any mandate. The code for this regime type also applies to countries without political parties, in which the members of parliament are independent. De facto authoritarianism meets criterion 1, usually criterion 6, and sometimes even criterion 7, but rarely criteria 2 to 5 by any acceptable standard. Criterion 2 is also especially less pronounced than in the semi-authoritarian case (Colombia in 1953, Laos in 1968, and, in 2015, Ethiopia, Seychelles, and Sudan).

Authoritarianism (one-party system). In this historically frequent aristocratic polity or one-party system, opposition parties have no legal status or right to participate. A parliament and/or ruling party holds significant powers, unlike systems in which an individual is more dominant. Authoritarianism meets criterion 1 but totally fails criteria 2 to 5 (seventeenth-century Poland-Lithuania and Bahrain, Cuba, Laos, and Vietnam in 2015).

Hierarchical authoritarianism. This type is a combination of semi-authoritarianism with a dominating or overwhelming executive, either presidential or monarchical. Hierarchical authoritarianism meets criterion 1 and often criterion 6 but, at best, meets a low standard of criteria 2 to 5, and fails criterion 7 completely (France before the revolution in 1789, Nicaragua in 1977, and in 2015, Azerbaijan, Gambia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan).

Despotism. Despotism is authoritarianism in conjunction with an all-powerful executive, either presidential or monarchical. Despotism meets criterion 1 but totally fails the other criteria, except occasionally criterion 6. Compared to hierarchical authoritarianism, it falls far short of criteria 2 to 4 (Belarus, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Qatar,

Saudi Arabia, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, and Uzbekistan in 2015). Despotism was much more frequent before de-colonization (see Figure 2).

Absolutism. In this regime type, all executive and legislative power falls to the military, a president, a monarch, or a prime minister. It can be inherited, acquired via a suspended parliament or a military coup, or prime ministerial. A parliament exists in some iterations but often at the behest of, or in subordination to, an executive. No political institutions or oppositions exist (Brunei and North Korea, though with fundamentally different institutional arrangements). As shown in Figure 2, approximately fifty of them existed at their peak in the 1830s.

As residuals to these classes are the interim and semi-anarchical regimes. Interim regimes indicate a transition between various forms, typically without an elected executive or elected parliament. Semi-anarchical regimes are nondemocratic states without a single functional central government, or with two or more rival regimes controlling different parts of a territory.

The regime types have been described above in the order given in Figure 2. Since the 1850s, absolutism and despotism have largely given way to qualified democracy. A remarkably constant number of regime types are found between absolutism and despotism at one extreme and qualified democracy at the other (semi-anarchical regimes, colonies, military and interim regimes, authoritarianisms, and false democracies). In some designs, classification by regime type is important for enabling a comparison between political systems as a whole along certain dimensions, whereas in other cases and other designs—perhaps as a subsequent step after such comparisons—it focuses more on regimes' separate component institutions, their causes, and their effects.¹⁰

INSTITUTIONAL COMPONENTS As mentioned, the MaxRange index values are coded on the basis of six major institutional components—in order of importance, the strength of an executive (*vis à vis* parliament), accountability structure, centralization/decentralization

10 Notably, according to Polity IV, democracy made its first appearance in the United States in 1809 (value 9 on the revised Polity score), whereas MaxRange does not locate democracy in the United States—on formal institutional grounds, including suffrage for at least all male citizens—until 1870. The first countries with a score of at least 6 in the revised Polity scheme, apart from the United States in 1809, are France Switzerland in 1848. The first electoral democracy in MaxRange is Ireland in 1783 and the first qualified democracy, Switzerland in 1789.

Fig. 2 Regime Types in MaxRange (Country Count, 1600–2015)

(government versus parliament), and normal versus interim. The regime-type variables help to indicate the extent to which particular regimes influence our models' dependent variables, as well as to determine which factors influence the emergence and consolidation of regimes, such as qualified democracy. They are sketched below in slightly abbreviated form.¹¹

As the Codebook reveals, the MaxRange data set offers other institutional components that are not essential in the resulting index-value classifications—executive concentration (in one or two offices), head of government (the primary executive power), election of head of state, and head of state (in a republic or a monarchy)—making a total of nine categorical variables that can enter into analyses. As mentioned above, we have also transformed MaxRange index values 1 to 1,000 into a large set of institutional dummies, which are also listed in the Codebook. Although they do not contribute to the index classification, they are handy for detailed

11 See the Codebook and the URL in note 3 for more detail.

studies of separate institutions because they provide unique institutional dummy combinations for each value on the 1 to 1,000 scale.

Since some analysts might favor regime types other than the MaxRange variables, the additional institutional components described below can be mixed and matched to correspond with other designs and models. Below we depict the occurrence of some of the most important institutions.

Accountability Structures Fundamental to the MaxRange index values are the accountability structures of political regime types and systems. The MaxRange scale tracks how persons are elected or appointed to specific institutional positions and the degree to which they are accountable to each other or the “people.” The accountability structure of institutions, together with specific institutional components, comprises nineteen distinct “types” that apply to various research models in which political systems and regime institutions are paramount:

Parliamentarism. This form of accountability occurs whenever an executive comes from, or is dependent on, a parliament. Since it is an accountability structure of institutions, rather than a regime type in MaxRange, parliamentarism can occur in democracies as well as non-democracies. As such, it applies to several regime types classified in other data sets.¹²

Presidential parliamentarism. This component marks a country’s *de facto* character as a parliamentary state but with the distinction of a president elected directly by the people. Direct election of this sort implies powers that are either limited or ceremonial. This structure is found in the MaxRange regimes listed as qualified democracy and semi-authoritarianism.

Divided executive. A president in this case holds individual powers similar to a semi-presidential leader (see below), with the exception of a responsibility for cabinet/domestic affairs. This institutional structure belonged to the French “Fifth Republic” during periods of cohabitation. Most other divided executive structures are not affected under cohabitation. Divided executive as an accountability structure in MaxRange is associated with

12 Cheibub et al. distinguish between parliamentary democracy, mixed (semi-presidential) democracy, presidential democracy, civilian dictatorship, military dictatorship, and royal dictatorship from 1946 to 2008. In the MaxRange descriptions of accountability structures, parliamentarism appears primarily within the categories of parliamentary democracy and civilian dictatorship.

qualified democracy, electoral democracy, false democracy, and semi-authoritarianism.¹³

Semi-presidential institutional accountability. In this hybrid structure, a president has significant powers, though he or she much share control of the executive branch and cabinet affairs with a prime minister. This structure refers to qualified democracy, electoral democracy, false democracy, semi-authoritarianism, de facto authoritarianism, and hierarchical authoritarianism.¹⁴

Parliamentarian presidentialism. Another hybrid, this de facto presidentially dominated government accountability structure is part of a government based on parliamentary approval and/or support. The presidency, however, is a more dominant force within this form of government than is parliament, and it has some capacity to rule by decree and to veto legislation. It also runs the executive branch and approves cabinet decisions. In the reliability test below, this accountability structure is assessed in relation to regime types in both MaxRange and Cheibub et al.'s scheme. In MaxRange, parliamentarian presidentialism is found in qualified democracy, false democracy, semi-authoritarianism, authoritarianism, and hierarchical authoritarianism.

Presidentialism. This generic structure vests executive power in a (usually) directly elected president who is not dependent upon parliamentary approval. The strength of such a president, which can vary, is not relevant for determining institutional structure, though it is otherwise subject to separate measurement. Presidentialism is relevant to most MaxRange regime types, such as qualified democracy, interim regime, electoral democracy, false democracy, false authoritarianism, semi-authoritarianism, de facto authoritarianism, authoritarianism, despotism, and absolutism.

Accountable presidentialism. In this form, individual ministers, including the prime minister, are accountable to a parliament and liable for dismissal. This rare accountability structure in MaxRange always applies to qualified democracy.

Interim structure. MaxRange defines this structure for transitional periods that do not fit into the above-mentioned categories.

13 Country-year cases of the divided-executive accountability structure are found in all of Cheibub et al.'s regime types except royal dictatorships, but mostly in mixed (semi-presidential) democracy and parliamentary democracy.

14 In other data sets, such as Cheibub et al., these country cases are most likely to be defined as partly mixed (semi-presidential) democracies or civilian dictatorships.

The “type” of interim period depends on the existence of a parliament/assembly, the breadth of the political base, and government’s stage in the transition phase. This structure, which frequently occurs immediately after a change of regime, the establishment of a new/restored constitution, or a call for fresh elections, is similar to negative Polity IV scores that represent interrupted, interregna, and transitional observations. Interim structures are therefore always classified under the rubric of interim regime.¹⁵

Council parliamentarism. In this structure, chairmanship in government is based on a rotation or a variety of parliaments representing different groups (such as in Bosnia and Herzegovina). Rare as it is, it always pertains to a qualified democracy.

Constitutional executive. This is another rare accountability structure found in a qualified democracy. In this case, a constitution stipulates which parties can participate in the government (Switzerland is one example).¹⁶

Monarchical parliamentarism. This hybrid category sees executive power shared between a monarch and a government and subject to parliamentary approval. The monarch usually does not take any active part in cabinet affairs, but he appoints the prime minister. Cases in which the monarch plays a more active role are marked by a distinct accountability structure. Monarchical parliamentarism can exist in qualified, electoral, and false democracies.

Semi-parliamentarism. This hybrid structure implies a government appointed by an institution outside parliament (for example, a foreign power).

Monarchical regime. This government is headed directly or indirectly by a monarch with limited constitutional powers. Cases in which a monarch possesses stronger authority comprise a separate regime type. A monarchical regime can instantiate false democracy, semi-authoritarianism, hierarchical authoritarianism, authoritarianism, despotism, and absolutism.

Colonial structure. A colony, as a structure of accountability, is a territory under the control of an executive appointed by a foreign nation. It can exist as a false democracy and a despotism.

15 In Cheibub et al., interim structure applies to all three types of regime but primarily civilian and military ones.

16 Most of the constitutional executive cases in Cheibub et al. apply to presidential democracies, though a few of them are coded as civilian and military dictatorships.

Military structure. In this structure, executive power belongs to a military, whether officially or unofficially, as a junta or as the authority controlling a prime minister, president, or even a monarch whose role in government is weak. Militarism resembles an interim structure when the military delegates executive powers to a civilian government. Whether the institutional structure is interim or military depends upon whether the government represents a broad political base and/or whether a constitutional restoration is in process. In general, periods of martial law are counted as military accountability structures. This structure pertains to military regime, interim regime, despotism, and absolutism.¹⁷

Party regime. In this structure, a general secretary of a party's central committee has significant executive authority.

Presidential/party regimes. In mixed regimes of this sort, the structure is technically undefined, regardless of whether the executive authority belongs to a president or a party.

Presidential/monarchical regimes. Like the previous mixed structure, this one is undefined, regardless of whether the executive power is presidential or monarchical.

Figure 3 describes the number of all these accountability structures as they evolved from 1600 to 2015. It shows that parliamentarism, parliamentarian presidentialism, and presidentialism began to gain dominance as accountability structures during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Monarchical regimes and colonial structures diminished dramatically after World War II. Other changes are comparatively minor. The rise and fall of party and military regimes was typical of the twentieth century.

The MaxRange data also include a special institutional component, normal versus interim, which describes in more detail some of the interim forms that are of particular interest in the study of transitional periods on a monthly basis. Since these monthly sequences have not yet undergone analysis, they are not included in this introduction to the data set.

The MaxRange index values reflect legislative vis-à-vis executive powers, as exclusive or conditional. Exclusive and conditional executive powers as values for this variable mainly deal with the relationship between a president or regent and the head of a council

17 These regimes, which Cheibub et al. normally treat as military dictatorships, can also occur in other regime types, notably civilian dictatorships.

Fig. 3 Accountability Structure of Institutions (Country Counts, 1600–2015)

of ministers in order to define the various institutional conditions of semi-presidential systems. Conditional executive powers as related to parliament are also considered, when relevant, usually in authoritarian systems, in the coding of this variable. The values for this variable are indirect, direct, and undefined. Head of state, an institutional component in defining regime types and MaxRange index values, can have the values republic, monarchy, or undefined.

The derivation of each index value from the various combinations of institutions occurs in five stages. First, the ordinal scale for the level of democracy is established for each country–year or country–month case. Second, the executive strength is coded on an ordinal scale. Third, the institutional structure of the country–year or country–month case is decided on the basis of historical data. Fourth, the degree of centralization is established. Finally, the question of normal versus interim regime is considered. From these five ordinal scales, a hierarchy of possible regime types are established and used as a coding scheme. Furthermore, several other

traits are also observed, such as the election of the heads of state (republic versus monarchy). These institutional-component values enable analysis of the historical dynamics of separate political institutions, which is critical for understanding nation-building processes, transitions, democratizations, revolutions, reversals, path dependencies, and the dynamics of political institutions in general.¹⁸

RELIABILITY The variables in the MaxRange data set can also be merged with existing data sets, such as the V-DEM, Polity, and Polyarchy, through the country-code variable. Figure 4 shows a plot of several comparable variables. Included are the number of institutionalized democracies that scored at least a 6 or 7 on the (revised) Polity IV index scale; 1 to 2 on the Freedom House civil-rights index; 1 to 2 on the political-rights index; 1 (“free”) on the status scales; the “democracy” value for the Geddes, Wright, and Frantz non-autocracy (democracy) variable; the “democracy” count for the Cheibub et al. variable; and MaxRange “electoral democracies” (790 or greater) or “qualified democracies” (870 or greater). The information in the MaxRange data set provides observations that start earlier than Polity IV and includes more country cases, but it also comports with the time-series plots shown by aggregating Polity IV values. The correlations between the MaxRange value of 790 or higher with Polity IV values of 6 or higher and 7 or higher are 0.794 and 0.762, respectively.¹⁹

Figure 4 shows the aggregate similarities between the Geddes et al. democracy variable value, the revised Polity IV score 6 to 10, the Cheibub et al. democracy dummy, as well as the MaxRange electoral- and qualified-democracy values. The revised Polity IV scale 7 to 10 and MaxRange qualified democracy show aggregate similarities. The Freedom House scales for overall status and the political-rights scale coincide; the civil-rights scale has far fewer nations at the 1 to 2 value levels.

18 Since the number of possible combinations of the five ordinal scales by far exceeds the number of observed combinations, the coding scheme is collapsed into the simpler 1 to 1,000 index scale presented in the Codebook.

19 For Freedom House, see https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world?gclid=CjwKEAjwu8m-BRDm8KTcdj8qyoSjACdjSZp44IKQ1CtZmVFH1eoNgb8_gAlucMSAi1GWgoHVA8xoCUHHw_wcB. Barbara Geddes, Joseph Wright, and Erica Frantz, “Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set,” *Perspectives on Politics*, XII (2014), 313–331 [hereinafter Geddes et al.].

Fig. 4 Aggregate-Level Democracy Measurement: MaxRange Index for Electoral Democracy or Higher (790–1,000) and Qualified Democracy or Higher (870–1,000) in Comparison with Other Data Sets

The cross-tabulation of MaxRange and Cheibub et al. coding of variables in Table 1 reveals, as one example of a reliability test, discrepancies between the MaxRange regime types and the Cheibub et al. regime categories. In the Cheibub et al. data set, 424 country–year cases are classified as different types of dictatorships, whereas in MaxRange, they are defined as democracies, either qualified or electoral. Given Cheibub et al.’s data from 1946 to 2008, six to seven country cases per year differ between the two data sets. These discrepancies are most likely the effect of Cheibub et al.’s “alternation rule,” which requires an “alternation in power under electoral rules identical to the ones that brought the incumbent to office must have taken place,” in order for a political system to be classified as a democracy (69). But other reasons are possible. In the last year of the Cheibub et al. data set, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Guyana, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, and Zambia are all classified as civilian

Table 1 A Cross-Tabulation of the MaxRange and Cheibub et al. Regime Types (1946–2008)

MAX RANGE REGIME TYPE	CHEIBUB ET AL. REGIME TYPES						TOTAL
	PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY	MIXED (SEMI-PRESIDENTIAL) DEMOCRACY	PRESIDENTIAL DEMOCRACY	CIVILIAN DICTATORSHIP	MILITARY DICTATORSHIP	ROYAL DICTATORSHIP	
Absolutism	0	0	2	130	428	174	734
Despotism	8	0	2	479	496	224	1209
Semi-anarchical regime	4	0	2	27	3	0	36
Colony	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Military regime	0	2	5	29	40	0	76
Hierarchical authoritarianism	0	5	15	358	228	110	716
Authoritarianism	0	1	0	487	152	25	665
De facto authoritarianism	0	0	0	49	12	0	61
Semi- authoritarianism	11	32	30	307	87	10	477
False democracy	117	51	93	255	90	159	765
Interim Regime	18	7	9	53	47	8	142
Electoral Democracy	185	45	195	112	56	11	604
Qualified democracy	1,748	537	760	225	20	0	3,260
Total	2,091	680	1,113	2,511	1,660	721	8,776

dictatorships, whereas MaxRange codes them as democracies—Mozambique as an electoral democracy and the rest as qualified democracies. Cheibub et al.'s applications of their own strict criteria for democracy are consistent, and their alternation rule is certainly a point well taken. But MaxRange uses other criteria that in some cases can produce different classifications.

Likewise, MaxRange has a total of 459 nondemocratic classifications between 1946 and 2008 that, according to Cheibub et al., are democracies—for example, Ghana (1980), Panama (1989), Honduras (1986), Comoros (1990 and 1991), Bangladesh (from 1986 to 1990), the Republic of Congo (1961/2), the Dominican Republic (1966–1977), Venezuela (2007), and Cape Verde (1990). But given that MaxRange determines a country's yearly value by its political situation on the last day of December, Ghana in 1980 on that date was hardly democratic; its government had just been toppled in a coup d'état. In December 1989, Panama's authoritarian government ended in a coup d'état, making it decidedly undemocratic at that point. MaxRange classifies Honduras as a democracy not in 1984, as Cheibub et al. do, but in 1986. Comoros in 1990 and 1991 was not a democracy, since it had neither elections nor a multi-party system. To MaxRange, Bangladesh between 1986 and 1990 was hierarchical authoritarian: President Hussain Muhammad Ershad was too dominant, and the elections were too restricted. In the Republic of Congo (1961/2), the presidential election was hardly fair enough to be called democratic. Elections in the Dominican Republic from 1966 to 1977 exhibited a similar pattern. In Venezuela, a boycott of the 2005 elections left the opposition without parliamentary representation in 2007. Moreover, Hugo Chavez essentially ruled by decree. The 1990 elections in Cape Verde were not democratic because the country had not yet implemented a multi-party system.

The upshot is that the criteria employed by Cheibub et al. to determine whether a polity was democratic do not always correspond with the ones that MaxRange employs. Hence, the outcomes in the two indexes can sometimes differ.

In addition to supporting a rigorous classification of democratic and nondemocratic regimes, the MaxRange data set allows researchers to follow institutional variation and to explore alternative ways of aggregating political institutions. Previous data sets

beginning in the early 1800s, such as Polity and Polyarchy, do not offer the institutional detail needed for modeling how formal political institutions have evolved, and they tend to fall short in studies of path dependency, which rely on longer time perspectives. Moreover, unlike Polity, MaxRange offers data about countries with fewer than 500,000 inhabitants, and MaxRange can merge with other data sets using United Nations and Correlates of War country codes. MaxRange helpfully analyzes the evolution of political institutions and also assists in the building of models in which political institutions have an effect on, are affected by, or co-vary with other forms of social and societal change. The MaxRange database, as a research instrument, permits historically minded scholars in various disciplines to address a number of issues related to historical dynamics that involve political institutions. MaxRange’s wealth of institutional categories and country–year and country–month cases creates unprecedented possibilities for comparative and historical social studies.

APPENDIX: A SAMPLE PAGE FROM THE MAXRANGE DATA SET

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Bolivia	910	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Decentralized	
2	Bosnia and Herzego	880	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Council Parliamentarism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Indirectly	Republic	Separated	Prime Ministerial	Decentralized	
3	Bosnian Fed	880	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Council Parliamentarism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Indirectly	Republic	Separated	Prime Ministerial	Decentralized	
4	Botswana	910	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Decentralized	
5	Brazil	910	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Decentralized	
6	British Virgin Islands	995	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Parliamentarism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Monarchy	Concentrated	Prime Ministerial	Decentralized	
7	Brunei Darussalam	40	2015	Absolutism	Absolutism/Overl	Monarchical Regime	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Monarchy	Concentrated	Monarchic	Centralized	
8	Bulgaria	990	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidential Parliame	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Separated	Prime Ministerial	Decentralized	
9	Burkina Faso	805	2015	Electoral Democracy	Constitutional	Parliamentarian Pres	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Separated	Presidential	Decentralized	
10	Burundi	385	2015	Semi-Authoritarianism	Significant	Parliamentarian Pres	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Separated	Presidential	Undefined	
11	Cabo Verde	915	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Separated	Presidential	Decentralized	
12	Cambodia	715	2015	False Democracy	Constitutional	Parliamentarism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Undefined	Concentrated	Prime Ministerial	Decentralized	
13	Cameroon	495	2015	Semi-Authoritarianism	Constitutional	Parliamentarian Pres	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Separated	Presidential	Decentralized	
14	Canada	995	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Parliamentarism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Monarchy	Concentrated	Prime Ministerial	Decentralized	
15	Central African Repu	800	2015	Electoral Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Undefined	Presidential	Decentralized	
16	Chad	685	2015	False Democracy	Constitutional	Parliamentarian Pres	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Undefined	Presidential	Decentralized	
17	Chechnya	325	2015	Hierarchical Authorita	Dominant	Parliamentarian Pres	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Separated	Presidential	Centralized	
18	Chile	910	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Decentralized	
19	China	245	2015	Hierarchical Authorita	Dominant	Parliamentarian Pres	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Separated	Presidential	Centralized	
20	Colombia	910	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Decentralized	
21	Comoros	910	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Decentralized	
22	Congo	380	2015	Semi-Authoritarianism	Significant	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Undefined	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Undefined	
23	Costa Rica	910	2015	Qualified Democracy	Constitutional	Presidentialism	Normal (Non-Interim)	Directly	Republic	Concentrated	Presidential	Decentralized	