

NÚMERO 206

ANDREAS SCHEDLER Y CAS MUDDE

The Quantitative Skeleton of  
Comparative Politics

DICIEMBRE 2008



[www.cide.edu](http://www.cide.edu)

• Las colecciones de **Documentos de Trabajo** del CIDE representan un medio para difundir los avances de la labor de investigación, y para permitir que los autores reciban comentarios antes de su publicación definitiva. Se agradecerá que los comentarios se hagan llegar directamente al (los) autor(es).

• D.R. © 2008. Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, carretera México-Toluca 3655 (km. 16.5), Lomas de Santa Fe, 01210, México, D.F.  
Fax: 5727•9800 ext. 6314  
Correo electrónico: [publicaciones@cide.edu](mailto:publicaciones@cide.edu)  
[www.cide.edu](http://www.cide.edu)

• Producción a cargo del (los) autor(es), por lo que tanto el contenido así como el estilo y la redacción son su responsabilidad.

---

## *Acknowledgements*

*We thank Mauricio A. Rivera for research assistance. Without his careful work this paper could not have been written. For useful comments on earlier versions, we thank Emmanuel Teitelbaum, Michael Coppedge and the participants in the workshop "The Numbers We Use, The World We See: Evaluating Cross-National Datasets in Comparative Politics", European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR), Joint Sessions of Workshops, Rennes, France, 11-16 April 2008 as well as in the panel session "Reviewing Comparative Datasets: Democracy and Elections" at the 104<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA), Boston, Massachusetts, 28-31 August 2008.*



## Abstract

---

*On the basis of a broad sample of quantitative studies in comparative politics, published in leading academic journals between 1989 and 2007, this paper offers an empirical radiography of data usage in comparative empirical research. It provides systematic information about the structure of quantitative comparative research (by research design, geographic focus and subject area), and presents disaggregate data on the use of country-specific and region-specific datasets, on the importance of author-constructed datasets, and on the reliance of thematic subfields on particular datasets. Its empirical findings put into question cherished assumptions about the nature of quantitative comparative politics.*

## Resumen

---

*El presente documento ofrece una radiografía empírica del uso de datos en los estudios cuantitativos de política comparada. Se basa en una muestra amplia de estudios publicados en revistas académicas de punta entre 1989 y 2007. Después de presentar información sistemática sobre la estructura de la política comparada cuantitativa (diseños de investigación, cobertura geográfica y área temática), el trabajo presenta datos desagregados sobre el uso de bases de datos regionales y nacionales, sobre la relevancia de datos producidos por los autores mismos y sobre la frecuencia de empleo de bases de datos particulares en diferentes áreas sustantivas de investigación. Los hallazgos empíricos del documento ponen en duda varias ideas convencionales sobre la naturaleza de la política comparada cuantitativa.*



## *Introduction*

---

The quantitative turn in comparative politics, which we have been observing over the past twenty years or so, involves a potential paradox. Apparently, the growing body of statistical research has been sustained by a thin skeleton of data. Quantitative comparative politics, we often hear, is driven by available data, and perhaps even more importantly, it is tightly constrained by available data. In many subfields, it appears, we end up mining the same databases over and over, for widely different purposes as well as for purposes wildly different from the ones they were designed for.

On the basis of a broad sample of 238 quantitative comparative studies, published in leading academic journals between 1989 and 2007, this paper presents a systematic radiography of the quantitative skeleton that sustains comparative research. Aiming to provide an empirical picture of patterns of data usage in the discipline, its basic purpose is diagnostic. After explaining the selection of articles that go into our dataset of datasets, we then address three fundamental issues that define the (variegated) structure of quantitative comparative studies: the design of quantitative research (according to the number of countries under study), its geographical focus (by world regions), and its subject matters (by thematic subfields). In the subsequent sections, we present disaggregate data on the use of national and regional databases; the presence of datasets developed by authors themselves; and finally, the frequencies of usage of particular datasets in different fields of comparative research.

### *The Data*

To conduct our (sub)disciplinary radiography, we reviewed a broad sample of quantitative studies published in disciplinary and general political science journals over the past two decades. We selected articles from the three leading comparative politics journals, *World Politics* (WP), *Comparative Politics* (CP), and *Comparative Political Studies* (CPS), as well as from the three leading general political science journals, *American Political Science Review* (APSR), *American Journal of Political Science* (AJPS), and *Journal of Politics* (JoP). Our sample comprises all quantitative articles in comparative politics that were published in these journals during one full calendar year at three-year intervals from 1989 through 2007. Our selection of articles thus covers about a third of quantitative comparative politics pieces that appeared in the most distinguished journals over the past two decades.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Our choice of journals and our rule of article selection follows Gerardo L. Munck, Richard Snyder, and James Mahoney in their respective contributions to the 2007 debate on “the direction of comparative politics” published

How did we define “comparative politics” and how “quantitative research” to delineate our sample? Our definition of *comparative politics* was in part institutional, in part residual. We took all articles that were published in the comparative politics journals to belong to the subfield of comparative political studies (except for IR pieces in *WP*). Among the articles published in the general political science journals, we classified those as comparative research that put forward empirical studies of domestic politics in any country except the US.

All over the world (except in Scandinavia), political science departments understand comparative politics as a residual subfield. It covers the empirical study of politics in foreign countries, excepting their international relations. Naturally, the definition of “foreign countries” is always relative to the speaker. If one switches perspectives among countries, comparative politics appears essentially as co-extensive with the empirical research of politics (within national boundaries, though increasingly intermingling and overlapping with the study of international politics).

The residual subdiscipline reveals itself to occupy the very center of the discipline. The definition adopted for the purpose of the present study is resignedly US-centric, accepting the hegemonic conception of the field as advanced by the hegemonic player in the field. Our definition *ex negativo* thus excludes studies of American politics. Given its emphasis on empirics, it also excludes the subfield of political theory as well as methodological discussions and experimental studies. Finally, following convention, it excludes the field of international relations (the study of interstate relations, international diplomacy, international organizations and regimes).<sup>2</sup>

While the delimitation of comparative politics is rather easy (once a particular privileged point of view is established), the definition of *quantitative research* is slightly more tricky. According to a widespread conception, qualitative research relies “on words as opposed to numbers” (Munck and Snyder, 2008: 12). Although plausible at first sight, this characterization is somewhat misleading. As a matter of fact, most qualitative work does make use of numbers. In research we commonly describe as qualitative, we can find all kinds of figures from all kinds of sources. These numbers may be sparse or abundant. They may be embedded in the text or formally presented in tables and figures. They may be descriptive only or central to the main explanatory argument. What distinguishes quantitative

---

in Comparative Political Studies (see Munck and Snyder, 2007 and Mahoney, 2007). We extend their sample to the year 2007, thus covering full seven years of publication: 1989, 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001, 2004, and 2007 (except for World Politics, whose 2007 issues were not available yet at the moment of writing).

<sup>2</sup> Although dominated by IR scholars, studies of civil war count as comparative according to our classification. Studies of the European Union as an organization count as IR, studies of the politics of EU member states as comparative. Note that our definition of comparative articles in general political science journals applies to the year 2007 only. For the previous years, we rely on Mahoney (2007), who does not offer a formal definition of his own, but apparently applied Munck and Snyder’s definition that is, in practical terms, analogous to ours: “the study of politics and political power around the word” (2007: 8).



research is not the use of numerical information (the form of the data), but its statistical treatment (its mode of inference). In our conception, empirical research should be classified as quantitative when *its primary causal inference is based on statistical techniques of data processing*.<sup>3</sup>

We believe that our emphasis on statistical inference captures the “common sense” in political science when it comes to drawing a line between (predominantly) qualitative and (predominantly) quantitative research methods. It seems to be in fundamental agreement with a host of other explicit definitions of qualitative versus quantitative methods. For instance, in their review of “the state of quantitative political methodology”, Larry Bartels and Henry Brady define “the mainstream” of quantitative research as work deploying the rich “armamentarium of techniques developed to relate statistical models to quantitative data of various sorts” (1993: 121). In his *Social Research Methods*, Alan Bryman states that “quantitative research can be construed as a research strategy that emphasizes quantification in the collection and analysis of data” (2004: 19). More recently, Michael Lewis-Beck proposed to distinguish three basic forms of theoretical argumentation: mathematical, statistical, and qualitative. The mathematical or “equation” approach involves “the presentation of a formal equation accompanied by statistical tests”. The statistical or “verbal” approach entails the “informal verbal presentation of theory accompanied by statistical tests”. Finally, the qualitative approach refers to “verbal presentation of theory without accompanying statistical tests” (2008: 11). Our definition of qualitative studies is analogous to this one, while our definition of quantitative research covers both styles of statistical theory testing, those based on equations as well as those based on language.

Table 1 presents the distribution of the resulting 238 cases across the six journals under review. Strikingly, the traditional comparative politics journals *World Politics* and *Comparative Politics* are almost absent from the scene of quantitative studies. *CPS* contains a fair share of articles (22.3%), yet more than two thirds of the quantitative pieces in our sample come from general

---

<sup>3</sup> Let us cite some examples of qualitative studies that were published in the years and journals we took our sample from and that contain significant quantitative elements for different argumentative purposes, yet do not ground their major explanatory argument in the use of statistical techniques. Qualitative pieces that present some contextual information in tabular form are Berman (2001), Eckstein (2004), Levitsky (2001) and Morrison (2004), among numerous others. Qualitative studies that use quantitative data to show variations in their dependent variable, and herewith establish their explanatory puzzle, are Garman, Haggard and Willies (2001), Steinmo (1989) and Wampler and Avritzer (2004). Others, like Taylor (2001) do the same for causal factors (that fail to trigger expected consequences). Examples of qualitative work that present quantitative information to document variations in some independent variable, and herewith establish the empirical plausibility of its causal claims, are Cox (2001) and Staton (2004). Given their visual display of numbers in graphs or tables, one might be tempted to classify them as well as a small number of similar pieces as quantitative (we counted a total of twenty-one for the seven years of publication under review; list available from the authors upon request). Yet doing so would create irresolvable problems of boundary delimitation. It would compel us to count as quantitative literally any empirical work that contains some relevant numbers (in text or tables), thus bringing the distinction between qualitative and quantitative methods to collapse.

political science journals. There may be demand as well as supply factors at work. But, clearly, the bulk of first-rate quantitative work in comparative politics finds its outlet in general political science journals, much less so in the subdisciplinary publications (with the noteworthy exception of *CPS*).<sup>4</sup> Table 2 gives a faint reflection of the temporal trend we are all aware of: quantitative work has become much more common over the past two decades. The last year in our dataset (2007) contains almost twice as many quantitative pieces as the first (1989). Almost half of the quantitative articles in our sample were published in last two years under review (2004 and 2007).<sup>5</sup>

### *Patterns of Quantitative Comparative Research*

Given its broad disciplinary reach, we should not expect the world of comparative politics to reveal uniform tendencies. Quite to the contrary, within the narrower but still extensive family of quantitative research, we should expect patterns of database usage to vary according to methodology, geographic scope, and thematic field. To (inductively) uncover existing variations in database usage, we classified articles according to three general criteria: the number of countries they cover, their geographic scope and their thematic focus.

#### *Case numbers*

While comparative politics is the study of politics in foreign countries, it is also defined as a specific method: the study of politics in comparative perspective, whatever that is supposed to mean. Its twin status as a (relative) geographic perspective and a (relational) methodological perspective perpetually raises the playfully paradoxical question: How comparative is comparative politics? As Munck and Snyder put it: “How much research by comparativists is really comparative?” (2007: 22). As they found, strikingly, “nearly half (45.7%) the articles published in journals dedicated to comparative politics are single-country studies” (*Ibid.*). Even more surprisingly, we found a very similar trend within our case sample –which is broader insofar as it includes general political science journals and more narrow insofar as it excludes all qualitative work.

According to data offered by Munck and Snyder, about two thirds of quantitative studies cover 5 years or more (2007: 23). The number of *countries* these articles cover therefore does not reflect properly the number of *cases* they study. It is nevertheless remarkable that only about a quarter of

---

<sup>4</sup> All tables are in the appendix. Note that due to differences in the definition, operationalization, and coding of quantitative research our sample retains only one third of the quantitative articles from comparative politics journals analyzed by Munck and Snyder (2007).

<sup>5</sup> Upon publication of this paper, our Dataset of Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP) will be made public through the CIDE Data Archive for Applied Research in the Social Sciences (BIIACS) (<http://biiacs.cide.edu/>).

all quantitative studies in comparative politics examine more than 20 countries (24.5%). About a fifth (19.7%) works with medium-sized samples that contain between 11 and 20 countries. In terms of their geographic scope, only a meager 13.3% may be classified as small-N studies with sample sizes between two and ten countries. Finally, subverting the standard image of large-N statistical studies, almost two fifths of all quantitative articles (42.5%) offer single-country studies (see Table 3). What was once identified as the defining method of comparative politics, the comparison of small numbers of countries (see Lijphart, 1971), seems to be the less inviting terrain for quantitative comparative research. Quantitative researchers either go for larger numbers of countries, or augment their number of observations within single countries.

Note, however, that the proportion of quantitative single-country studies has experienced a marked decline over time. In the first year of our dataset (1989), an impressive 68.2% of all quantitative pieces were single-country studies (15 out of 22 articles). In its last year (2007), their share had been halved to 31.5% despite an increase in absolute numbers (23 out of 73 articles). At the same time, the portion of articles covering more than 20 countries has climbed from one to 30, now representing 41.1% of all quantitative articles. Accordingly, the mean number of countries covered by quantitative studies in comparative politics has doubled from 12.9 countries per article, in the period from 1989 to 1998, to an average of 24.2 countries, in the period from 2001 to 2007 (which is, by the way, a statistically significant difference, bilateral t-test,  $p = .012$ ,  $N = 233$ ).

### *World regions*

In terms of its geographical reach, quantitative comparative research displays notable regional disparities. A large plurality of studies covers either Western Europe or industrial countries at large. Together, these two overlapping geographical groups account for almost two fifths of articles (38.9%). In the scholarly top journals under examination, with one article in eight (12.8%), Latin America stands out as the second world region explored by quantitative comparativists. The MENA region (Middle East and Northern Africa, with 2.6% of articles), and Eastern Europe (2.1%) draw attention due to the lack of attention they receive in quantitative comparative research. The coverage of Sub-Saharan Africa (4.7%), the former Soviet Union (6.4%) and Asia (7.7%) looks slightly less marginal. Given their paradigmatic status in quantitative cross-national research, worldwide studies (11.5%) and multi-regional research (10.7%) are perhaps somewhat less frequent than one might expect (see Table 4).

The geographic pattern we are seeing may well be symptomatic of the malady we are examining: the data dependency of quantitative comparative research. For instance, the dearth of quantitative research on African politics

probably reflects (at least in part) the historical shortage of quantitative data on African politics. Research depends on available data, whose availability depends on scholars willing to construct them. Over the past years, though, datasets on African politics have been growing in number and quality—and so have comparative political studies on sub-Saharan Africa.<sup>6</sup> The regional distribution of articles by year yields cell numbers too small to conclude much. Yet two rough tendencies deserve mention: Ten of the eleven articles in our sample on sub-Saharan Africa, and twenty of the 27 pieces with worldwide coverage, appeared in the last two years in our dataset.

### *Thematic subfields*

Since all datasets are thematic, their use is bound to vary according to thematic subfields. We sorted the articles in our sample according to their primary thematic orientation by assigning one broad theme to each of them. Since articles may touch several research themes, situating them in one field often does not accurately reflect their substantive breadth. In doubtful cases, we gave precedence to the dependent variables the article strives to explain. Quantitative comparative research tends to be *y*-centered rather than *x*-centered. With explanatory variables *x* often covering a broad range of phenomena, it is usually the *explanandum y* that provides its substantive focus.<sup>7</sup>

Trying to avoid overly small clusters with less than five members, we ended up dividing our sample into twelve thematic groups, plus one residual category of “various” subjects. Table 5 provides the resulting frequency distribution.<sup>8</sup> Only five broad subfields account for more than three fifths of all articles (60.9%): the study of political elections, political parties, public opinion, economic policy, and social policies. These are classical fields of political science. Three vibrant, more recent fields of study also garner significant shares: the study of social movements and civil society (7.1%), the study of political regimes and regime change (6.3%), and the study of civil war

---

<sup>6</sup> Fine examples of new datasets on African politics are the Afrobarometer surveys conducted since 1999 under the leadership of Michael Bratton ([www.afrobarometer.org](http://www.afrobarometer.org)), the data on “ethnopolitical cleavages” gathered by Mozaffar, Scarritt, and Galaich (2003), and the dataset on “democratic qualities” of political elections constructed by Lindberg (2006).

<sup>7</sup> On the distinction between *x*-centered and *y*-centered analyses, see Gerring (2001: 137). The analytical categories Munck and Snyder (2007) use in their examination of the substantive scope of comparative politics differ from ours. Given the larger number of articles in their (both quantitative and qualitative) sample, they are able to introduce some finer distinctions. Besides, they do allow for the possibility that single articles cover multiple subjects (see 2007: 9).

<sup>8</sup> Our thematic categories are often broader than their brief labels suggest. The category of political parties includes studies on parties, party coalitions, and party systems. The notion of electoral studies covers research on electoral systems, voter behaviour, and electoral campaigns. The category of government formation includes government termination and government duration. Economic policies include economic performance, tax and expenditure policies. Social and labor policies include studies of welfare states and welfare reform. The label of civil society includes social movements (including labor movements and labor conflicts), social trust, social capital, and political participation. The category of civil wars and ethnicity includes studies of nationalism.

and ethnic conflict (6.3%). Remarkably, research on democratic core institutions is less well represented in our sample: 5.5% of articles study legislatures, 4.6% the formation and termination of governments, and 3.4% judicial decision-making. With respect to legislatures and courts, quantitative research may simply be following the trail of available numbers. Our best quantitative data on judicial politics and legislative politics are national, not cross-national.

Note, though, that our geographical and thematic radiography may be distorted by our sample. The English-speaking flagship journals of political science and comparative politics may not be very representative of the work done outside the Northwestern corners of the world, nor of the accomplishments in subfields with strong specialized research journals. A good deal of (quantitative) comparative political science (often mislabeled and disqualified as “area studies”) gets published by the numerous regional journals, some of them disciplinary, others inter-disciplinary, such as the *Journal of Modern African Studies*, *East European Politics and Societies*, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, *West European Politics*, *European Union Politics*, *Latin American Research Review*, *Latin American Politics and Society*, *Journal of Asian Studies* and *Middle East Journal*. In a similar manner, a significant share of work in different subfields gets absorbed by high-quality journals that specialize in different subfields, such as the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Party Politics*, *Electoral Studies*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, *Political Communication*, and *Nations and Nationalism*. The universe of quantitative comparative politics is therefore likely to look markedly different from our sample.

### ***National and Regional Datasets***

Debates on the use of datasets in comparative politics usually revolve around the few prominent global datasets everyone knows and seems to use, such as the Freedom House annual reports on political rights and civil liberties and the Polity data on political regime characteristics and transitions in the study of regimes, Minorities at Risk (MAR) and Correlates of War (COW) in the study of civil conflict, or the conflict data from the Tony Banks Cross-National-Time-Series (CNTS) in the study of contentious politics. However, the fact that only a minority of quantitative comparative research actually studies large numbers of countries may be mitigating the use of longitudinal datasets that are worldwide in scope.

In our second-order dataset, we analyzed if authors employed either national datasets (that are specific to particular countries) or regional datasets (that are specific to particular regions). National census data, local election results or national opinion polls would be examples of the former. Surveys like Eurobarometer, region-wide collections of election data like

Mackie and Rose (1991) and Nohlen *et al.* (1999 and 2001), and the Political Database of the Americas at Georgetown University ([www.georgetown.edu/pdba](http://www.georgetown.edu/pdba)) would be examples of the latter.<sup>9</sup>

As Table 6 shows, the use of national datasets is remarkably common in quantitative comparative politics. About two fifths of the articles in our sample employ country-specific datasets (41%). As the same table indicates, reliance on regional datasets is less frequent. Only about one in eight pieces are grounded in region-specific data (13.5%). Most recent figures may announce a certain retreat of country-specific datasets. In the last two years of our sample, the portion of articles making use of national data has fallen below average (32.1%). By contrast, the use of region-specific data seems to be gaining ground, at least in absolute terms: 24 of the 31 articles based on regional data stem from the last three years included in our dataset (77.4%).

Unsurprisingly, the use of geographically circumscribed datasets varies according to the number of countries under study. As Table 7 indicates, single-country studies and paired comparisons account for four fifths of the national datasets used (79.8%). Similarly, studies in the intermediate range of sample size (between 11 and 100 countries) account for a similar share of the few regional datasets employed (87.1%).

By disaggregating the use of sub-global datasets by world region (at a higher level of aggregation than shown before),<sup>10</sup> Table 8 documents that the recourse to national datasets is not a “poor-nations” phenomenon. Latin America lies well above the average, accounting for 22.3% of articles relying on country-specific data. Yet, almost two fifths of national datasets (39.4%) support studies on industrial countries. By contrast, extant regional datasets of the global South have not found their way into our dataset. Within our sample, the use of region-specific data is limited almost exclusively to multi-regional research and studies on industrial countries. Together they make use of 80.6% of the (scarce) regional data employed.

Table 9 cross-tabulates national and regional dataset by research subject. As it reveals, reliance on geographically circumscribed data is not a matter of neglected under-researched fields that have failed to yet develop cross-national datasets of global reach. Quite to the contrary. The study of elections and parties, two of the strongest subfields, each with a long

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that our database of databases covers political data only, plus some few politically relevant contextual data that are widely used in comparative political research (such as ethnolinguistic fragmentation). It excludes demographic data (such as urbanization and population density), economic data (such as national income, economic growth, inflation, public finances, labor markets, industrial structure, external accounts, international trade, foreign investment, and external debt), data on poverty and inequality, quality of life data (such as public health indicators, access to social services, human development indicators).

<sup>10</sup> The present table, as well as all subsequent regional tables, fuses Industrial Countries and Western Europe (“Industrial Countries”), Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union (“Post-Communist Region”), sub-Saharan Africa and the MENA region (“Africa”). It also adds, a bit arbitrarily, the six studies on developing countries to the basket of multi-regional studies.

pedigree in comparative research, show well-above-average tendencies to ground their empirical research in country-specific datasets. Together with public opinion research, these two subject areas account for well over half of the quantitative pieces that make use of national datasets (57.4%).

### ***Ready-Made and Self-Made Datasets***

At times, critics of data-driven research, including us, conceive the quantitative study of comparative politics as something like an academic blend of intellectual laziness, money laundering, and show business. Scholars take ready-made data from the shelves of global databases without caring much about their quality; declare them imaginatively to be proxies of theoretical concepts that bear only faint, long-distance relationships to the data; shrug off critics with brazenly unrealistic declarations of realism, like “this is what we have” or “working with bad data is better than not working at all and going on welfare”; put their bundles of dirty measures into high-tech washing machines of statistical sophistication; and declare the results, brighter than bright and whiter than white, to advance our understanding of politics in statistically significant ways, although more research needs to be done and we all look forward with great expectation to the inclusion of additional controls and the re-specification of the statistical model.

No doubt, we all have seen merry colleagues who excel at such versions of instant social science, self-confident experts in cheap and quick data laundering whose quantitative output is often impressive and their substantive contribution difficult to discern. However, to a considerable extent, quantitative comparative politics seems to work differently. Much of the best work of the discipline, *i.e.* the research that finds its way into the top journals, seems to be different. Rather than easy shortcuts to academic fame, achieved by impatient scholars toying rather mindlessly with prefabricated data, it often represents the terminal point of long and windy roads, traversed by self-enlaved scholars (and their enslaved assistants) who spend their academic lives laboriously and patiently collecting their own data.

In our own product of academic slavery, we tried to measure the extent to which authors develop their own data, rather than feeding their computers with pre-existing data. We credited them with *full* data development if they constructed *at least one variable* in their dataset from qualitative sources, such as national newspapers or international news services like *Keesing's Record of World Events* ([www.keesings.com](http://www.keesings.com)). We counted their efforts as *partial* data development if they modified or extended, in either substantive, temporal, or geographic terms, at least one variable contained in an existing dataset. As Table 10 shows, in less than half of all cases, authors simply work with pre-existing data (43.1%). In almost a fifth of articles, they modify extant

data, either by re-codifying variables, updating them, extending their historical reach, or including additional countries (18.2%).

Quite strikingly, in almost two fifths of the articles in our sample, authors process self-made data, hunted and gathered by the sweat of their brow (38.7%). Most recent data do not show any abatement of the prominence of self-made data. In 2007, the field was almost evenly split by three thirds: of the 68 articles registered that year, only 30.9% worked exclusively with ready-made data, another 30.9% with partially self-made data, and a plurality of 38.2% with at least one entirely self-developed variable.

If we quickly revise the distribution of author-constructed datasets, we can see that the self-production of datasets is not an exclusive domain of small-*N* studies. The big share of case studies (41.4%) corresponds closely to its weight in the overall sample. Still, the few quantitative small-*N* studies in our sample do slightly lean towards the full development of key dependent or independent variables, while the medium-*N* studies that cover between 21 and 100 countries show a larger-than-average tendency to invest in the partial development of data (see Table 11). The regional distribution of self-made data is rather even. Still, Latin American scholars seem to be somewhat more able and willing to rely on extant datasets while students of Asian, African, and post-communist politics have been investing somewhat more to compensate for the dearth of political data on either the two regions. Notably, more than two thirds of studies that are worldwide or multi-regional in scope require some investment in data collection (see Table 12).

With respect to data collection by subject matters, Table 13 reveals some intriguing patterns. In their early phases of subdisciplinary take-off, most fields of research do not have well-established cross-national time series that comparative scholars could rely on. In new thematic areas, rates of data construction by authors should be higher than elsewhere. Seemingly consistent with this expectation, we find scarce exclusive reliance on *ready-made* data in quantitative research on corruption and clientelism (0.0%), government formation and termination (18.2%), judicial politics (14.3%), legislative politics (23.1%), and civil society (33.3%).<sup>11</sup>

Remarkably, other fields that do possess strong cross-national datasets nevertheless display only average tendencies of making actual use of established dataset without even modifying them. This is true for the study of political regimes (40% of articles without data innovation), public opinion (43.5%), economic policies (50%), and political elections (47.7%). Only studies on political parties do not seem to require the development of new data or the adaptation of existing ones. Within the quantitative pieces on political parties in our sample, 84.2% do their statistical testing with exclusive recourse to existing data.

---

<sup>11</sup> None of these fields of research are new as such. Yet, their entry into quantitative comparative politics is (in the case of studies on government formation and duration, reaching back to the 1990s).



## *Individual Datasets*

Finally, after having walked through our simple categorizations of datasets, we wish to answer the question of proper names: Which particular datasets do quantitative comparativists use after all? To what extent does our sample confirm the common idea that various subfields of quantitative comparative politics are grounded in a very few dominant datasets everybody criticizes but uses nevertheless?

Table 14 lists all political datasets we found in our sample, excepting country-specific ones and those built by authors themselves. Overall, it gives testimony of considerable dispersion, rather than concentration. The 238 articles in our sample make use of 66 cross-national datasets (without counting disaggregate measures within individual datasets). Twenty of them appear only once, and only eleven appear in more than five articles. The most widely used datasets are the Polity political regime data (used in 14 articles), the Almanac of Electoral History by Thomas Mackie and Richard Rose (12 articles), Freedom House data on political rights, civil liberties, and freedom of the press (11 articles), the World Bank Governance Indicators (11 articles), the Cross-National Time Series by Tony Banks (9 articles), Correlates of War (7 articles), and the World Bank Dataset on Political Institutions (7 articles).<sup>12</sup> All in all, the 66 datasets appear 207 times in different articles, which gives us an average of 3.1 instances of usage by dataset. If we calculate the effective number of datasets (analogous to the Laakso-Taagepera index of the effective number of political parties) it lies at 36.5 datasets, a relatively high number for 207 instances of data usage.<sup>13</sup>

Table 14 cross-tabulates individual datasets by thematic subfields. Again, the picture that emerges seems to be one of dispersion in the usage of data, rather than monopolization. The frequency of data usage in different areas of research seems largely proportional to their overall weight in our sample. Some fields like legislative studies, judicial studies, analyses of civil society, and corruption research make almost no use of datasets beyond the national level. Regime studies, by contrast, representing 6.3% of articles in our sample, stand out with 17.9% of instances of data usage. The dominant areas of research that make frequent use of either regional or global data seem to shop rather widely among a broad range of datasets. Thematic fields like the study of economic policies (with 41 instances of data usage), political regimes (37 instances), political elections (28 instances), and civil war (22 instances)

---

<sup>12</sup> Some prominent datasets that we had expected to find, happen to be absent in our sample of articles, in particular Minorities at Risk, State Failure: Political Instability Task Force, Cingranelli-Richards Human Rights Data, European Values Study and the Comparative Manifesto Project.

<sup>13</sup> END, the effective number of datasets, is  $1/\sum d_i^2$ , where  $d_i$  is the usage share of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  dataset (the ratio of articles using the particular dataset, in relation to all instances of articles using either global or regional datasets).

rely on multiple and diverse datasets to feed their typically long lists of explanatory and control variables.

Of course, our disciplinary sample of quantitative articles cannot provide a wholly accurate diagnosis of subdisciplinary trends. Our case selection is designed to provide a representative picture of the discipline of comparative politics. Given the inevitable thematic specialization of all cross-national datasets, no single dataset will ever be able, or even aspire to, dominate the discipline as a whole. In order to establish the extent to which a few datasets have created situations of oligopolistic or even monopolistic dominance in particular subfields of quantitative research, we would need to create weighted samples that over-represent specific subfields we are interested in.

## *Conclusions*

---

Our empirical radiography of data usage in quantitative comparative politics has yielded some intriguing findings, many of them running against well-established preconceptions outsiders as well as insiders of comparative political studies tend to embrace. In conclusion, we recapitulate the major surprises our dataset of datasets allowed us to uncover:

- Despite much talk in recent years about bridging the methodological divide between qualitative and quantitative methods, comparative politics bears the distinctive appearance of a divided discipline. With the partial exception of *CPS*, the leading subdisciplinary journals publish almost no quantitative work —while the leading general political science journals publish almost no qualitative work in comparative politics.
- In the collective imagery of the scholarly community, large-*N* cross-national time series research that covers dozens of countries and dozens of years represents the prototypical instance of quantitative comparative work. This seems to be profoundly mistaken. Only a minority of quantitative comparative work studies more than 20 countries. The true representative of the subfield is the quantitative single-country study.
- In the six top journals we examined, comparative politics presents itself like a Eurocentric enterprise that does not look much beyond Western Europe and the Americas. While this is patently wrong for the discipline as a whole, it does seem to be the case that most political research on the global South does not find, or seek, its entry into the English-speaking flagship journals.
- In thematic terms, quantitative comparative research published in the top journals appears of almost boring narrowness. Essentially, it presents itself as the study of parties, elections, public opinion, governments, regimes, and socio-economic policies. We see little research on courts and legislatures, not very much (although increasing) on contentious politics and political violence, almost none on civil and military bureaucracies. It's a small world, the world of comparative political statistics.
- Global political datasets are the shining stars in the firmament of quantitative comparative politics. However, in accordance with the salience of single-country studies, almost half of the quantitative articles in our dataset make use of (idiosyncratic) national datasets.
- According to their caricature, quantitative students of comparative politics need do no more than subjecting ready-made datasets to technically sophisticated and theoretically simple-minded statistical processing. Yet, rather than simply exploiting loatable data resources, comparative scholars seem to invest systematically in the (often partial)

construction of original data, building or adapting variables crucial to resolve their explanatory puzzles. At least among those who publish in the top journals of our sample, well over half do. Investing in the construction or adaptation of original data clearly seems to pay off.

The sample of articles we studied strove to be representative of the field as a whole (as it presents itself in the top English-speaking, US-based journals). It may well be the case that specific thematic subfields of comparative politics are dominated, even constituted, by a few global datasets. Within our sample, however, we did not find a pattern of either monopolistic or oligopolistic concentration in data usage. Neither do a few datasets dominate the field, nor do specific subfields look dominated by a few datasets.

**TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY JOURNAL**

JOURNAL	N	%	CUMULATIVE %
AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW	51	21,4	21,4
AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE	59	24,8	46,2
JOURNAL OF POLITICS	53	22,3	68,5
COMPARATIVE POLITICS	9	3,8	72,3
COMPARATIVE POLITICAL STUDIES	53	22,3	94,5
WORLD POLITICS	13	5,5	100,0
TOTAL	238	100,0	

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY YEAR OF PUBLICATION**

YEAR	N	%	CUMULATIVE %
1989	22	9,2	9,2
1992	21	8,8	18,1
1995	17	7,1	25,2
1998	30	12,6	37,8
2001	32	13,4	51,3
2004	42	17,6	68,9
2007	74	31,1	100,0
TOTAL	238	100,0	

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY NUMBER OF COUNTRIES UNDER STUDY**

NUMBER OF CASES	N	%
CASE STUDY	99	42,5
PAIRED COMPARISON	13	5,6
3-10 COUNTRIES	18	7,7
11-20 COUNTRIES	46	19,7
21-100 COUNTRIES	43	18,5
> 100 COUNTRIES	14	6,0
TOTAL	233	100,0

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES, BY GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS**

WORLD REGIONS	N	%
WORLDWIDE	27	11,5
INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES	48	20,5
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	6	2,6
WESTERN EUROPE	43	18,4
EASTERN EUROPE	5	2,1
FORMER SOVIET UNION	15	6,4
MIDDLE EAST AND NORTHERN AFRICA	6	2,6
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	11	4,7
ASIA	18	7,7
LATIN AMERICA	30	12,8
MULTI-REGIONAL STUDY	25	10,7
TOTAL	234	100,0

Source: Authors' Dataset On Datasets In Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES, BY THEMATIC SUBFIELD**

THEMATIC FIELDS	N	%
1 POLITICAL REGIMES	15	6,3
2 POLITICAL PARTIES	20	8,4
3 ELECTORAL STUDIES	46	19,3
4 LEGISLATIVE POLITICS	13	5,5
5 JUDICIAL POLITICS	8	3,4
6 GOVERNMENT FORMATION	11	4,6
7 ECONOMIC POLICIES	37	15,5
8 SOCIAL & LABOR POLICIES	18	7,6
9 PUBLIC OPINION	24	10,1
10 CIVIL SOCIETY	17	7,1
11 CIVIL WAR & ETHNICITY	15	6,3
12 CORRUPTION & CLIENTELISM	5	2,1
13 VARIOUS	9	3,8
TOTAL	238	100,0

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 6. THE USE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL DATASETS**

	NATIONAL DATASETS		REGIONAL DATASETS	
	N	%	N	%
NO	135	59,0	198	86,5
YES	94	41,0	31	13,5
TOTAL	229	100,0	229	100,0

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

TABLE 7. THE USE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL DATASETS, BY RESEARCH DESIGN

		NATIONAL DATASETS		REGIONAL DATASET	
		NO	YES	NO	YES
CASE STUDY	N	30	66	96	0
	ROW %	31,3%	68,8%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	22,4%	70,2%	48,7%	,0%
PAIRED COMPARISON	N	4	9	12	1
	ROW %	30,8%	69,2%	92,3%	7,7%
	COLUMN %	3,0%	9,6%	6,1%	3,2%
3-10 COUNTRIES	N	11	6	16	1
	ROW %	64,7%	35,3%	94,1%	5,9%
	COLUMN %	8,2%	6,4%	8,1%	3,2%
11-20 COUNTRIES	N	40	6	31	15
	ROW %	87,0%	13,0%	67,4%	32,6%
	COLUMN %	29,9%	6,4%	15,7%	48,4%
21-100 COUNTRIES	N	35	7	30	12
	ROW %	83,3%	16,7%	71,4%	28,6%
	COLUMN %	26,1%	7,4%	15,2%	38,7%
> 100 COUNTRIES	N	14	0	12	2
	ROW %	100,0%	,0%	85,7%	14,3%
	COLUMN %	10,4%	,0%	6,1%	6,5%
TOTAL	N	134	94	197	31
	ROW %	58,8%	41,2%	86,4%	13,6%
	COLUMN %	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 8. THE USE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL DATASETS, BY GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS**

		NATIONAL DATASETS		REGIONAL DATASET	
		NO	YES	NO	YES
WORLDWIDE	N	23	4	23	4
	ROW %	85,2%	14,8%	85,2%	14,8%
	COLUMN %	17,0%	4,3%	11,6%	12,9%
INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES	N	52	37	73	16
	ROW %	58,4%	41,6%	82,0%	18,0%
	COLUMN %	38,5%	39,4%	36,9%	51,6%
POST-COMMUNIST REGION	N	12	8	20	0
	ROW %	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	8,9%	8,5%	10,1%	,0%
AFRICA	N	9	8	17	0
	ROW %	52,9%	47,1%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	6,7%	8,5%	8,6%	,0%
ASIA	N	9	8	17	0
	ROW %	52,9%	47,1%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	6,7%	8,5%	8,6%	,0%
LATIN AMERICA	N	8	21	27	2
	ROW %	27,6%	72,4%	93,1%	6,9%
	COLUMN %	5,9%	22,3%	13,6%	6,5%
MULTI-REGION STUDY	N	22	8	21	9
	ROW %	73,3%	26,7%	70,0%	30,0%
	COLUMN %	16,3%	8,5%	10,6%	29,0%
TOTAL	N	135	94	198	31
	ROW %	59,0%	41,0%	86,5%	13,5%
	COLUMN %	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).



TABLE 9. THE USE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL DATASETS, BY THEMATIC SUBFIELD

		NATIONAL DATASETS		REGIONAL DATASET	
		NO	YES	NO	YES
POLITICAL REGIMES	N	12	3	13	2
	ROW %	80,0%	20,0%	86,7%	13,3%
	COLUMN %	8,9%	3,2%	6,6%	6,5%
POLITICAL PARTIES	N	6	14	20	0
	ROW %	30,0%	70,0%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	4,4%	14,9%	10,1%	,0%
ELECTORAL STUDIES	N	15	30	39	6
	ROW %	33,3%	66,7%	86,7%	13,3%
	COLUMN %	11,1%	31,9%	19,7%	19,4%
LEGISLATIVE POLITICS	N	7	6	10	3
	ROW %	53,8%	46,2%	76,9%	23,1%
	COLUMN %	5,2%	6,4%	5,1%	9,7%
JUDICIAL POLITICS	N	4	3	6	1
	ROW %	57,1%	42,9%	85,7%	14,3%
	COLUMN %	3,0%	3,2%	3,0%	3,2%
GOVERNMENT FORMATION	N	8	3	7	4
	ROW %	72,7%	27,3%	63,6%	36,4%
	COLUMN %	5,9%	3,2%	3,5%	12,9%
ECONOMIC POLICIES	N	29	7	30	6
	ROW %	80,6%	19,4%	83,3%	16,7%
	COLUMN %	21,5%	7,4%	15,2%	19,4%
SOCIAL & LABOR POLICIES	N	12	4	9	7
	ROW %	75,0%	25,0%	56,3%	43,8%
	COLUMN %	8,9%	4,3%	4,5%	22,6%
PUBLIC OPINION	N	13	10	23	0
	ROW %	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	9,6%	10,6%	11,6%	,0%
CIVIL SOCIETY	N	12	4	16	0
	ROW %	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	8,9%	4,3%	8,1%	,0%
CIVIL WAR & ETHNICITY	N	7	7	14	0
	ROW %	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	,0%
	COLUMN %	5,2%	7,4%	7,1%	,0%
CORRUPTION	N	2	2	3	1
	ROW %	50,0%	50,0%	75,0%	25,0%
	COLUMN %	1,5%	2,1%	1,5%	3,2%
VARIOUS	N	8	1	8	1
	ROW %	88,9%	11,1%	88,9%	11,1%
	COLUMN %	5,9%	1,1%	4,0%	3,2%
TOTAL	N	135	94	198	31
	ROW %	59,0%	41,0%	86,5%	13,5%
	COLUMN %	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

**TABLE 10. DATA COLLECTION BY AUTHORS**

DATA CONSTRUCTED BY AUTHOR	N	%
NONE	97	43,1
PARTIAL CONSTRUCTION (AT LEAST ONE VARIABLE)	41	18,2
FULL CONSTRUCTION (AT LEAST ONE VARIABLE)	87	38,7
TOTAL	225	100,0

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 11. DATA COLLECTION BY AUTHORS, BY RESEARCH DESIGN**

		NONE	PARTIAL	FULL	TOTAL
CASE STUDY	N	50	10	36	96
	ROW %	52,1%	10,4%	37,5%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	52,1%	24,4%	41,4%	42,9%
PAIRED COMPARISON	N	6	1	6	13
	ROW %	46,2%	7,7%	46,2%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	6,3%	2,4%	6,9%	5,8%
3-10 COUNTRIES	N	8	0	9	17
	ROW %	47,1%	,0%	52,9%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	8,3%	,0%	10,3%	7,6%
11-20 COUNTRIES	N	19	10	16	45
	ROW %	42,2%	22,2%	35,6%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	19,8%	24,4%	18,4%	20,1%
21-100 COUNTRIES	N	8	17	14	39
	ROW %	20,5%	43,6%	35,9%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	8,3%	41,5%	16,1%	17,4%
> 100 COUNTRIES	N	5	3	6	14
	ROW %	35,7%	21,4%	42,9%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	5,2%	7,3%	6,9%	6,3%
TOTAL	N	96	41	87	224
	ROW %	42,9%	18,3%	38,8%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 12. DATA COLLECTION BY AUTHORS, BY REGIONAL FOCUS**

		NONE	PARTIAL	FULL	TOTAL
WORLDWIDE	N	8	8	10	26
	ROW %	30,8%	30,8%	38,5%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	8,2%	19,5%	11,5%	11,6%
INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES	N	41	14	32	87
	ROW %	47,1%	16,1%	36,8%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	42,3%	34,1%	36,8%	38,7%
POST-COMMUNIST REGION	N	8	2	10	20
	ROW %	40,0%	10,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	8,2%	4,9%	11,5%	8,9%
AFRICA	N	7	2	7	16
	ROW %	43,8%	12,5%	43,8%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	7,2%	4,9%	8,0%	7,1%
ASIA	N	6	5	6	17
	ROW %	35,3%	29,4%	35,3%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	6,2%	12,2%	6,9%	7,6%
LATIN AMERICA	N	17	3	9	29
	ROW %	58,6%	10,3%	31,0%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	17,5%	7,3%	10,3%	12,9%
MULTI-REGION STUDY	N	10	7	13	30
	ROW %	33,3%	23,3%	43,3%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	10,3%	17,1%	14,9%	13,3%
TOTAL	N	97	41	87	225
	ROW %	43,1%	18,2%	38,7%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

**TABLE 13. DATA COLLECTION BY AUTHORS, BY THEMATIC SUBFIELD**

		NONE	PARTIAL	FULL	TOTAL
POLITICAL REGIMES	N	6	1	8	15
	ROW %	40,0%	6,7%	53,3%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	6,2%	2,4%	9,2%	6,7%
POLITICAL PARTIES	N	16	1	2	19
	ROW %	84,2%	5,3%	10,5%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	16,5%	2,4%	2,3%	8,4%
ELECTORAL STUDIES	N	21	12	11	44
	ROW %	47,7%	27,3%	25,0%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	21,6%	29,3%	12,6%	19,6%
LEGISLATIVE POLITICS	N	3	1	9	13
	ROW %	23,1%	7,7%	69,2%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	3,1%	2,4%	10,3%	5,8%
JUDICIAL POLITICS	N	1	2	4	7
	ROW %	14,3%	28,6%	57,1%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	1,0%	4,9%	4,6%	3,1%
GOVERNMENT FORMATION	N	2	0	9	11
	ROW %	18,2%	,0%	81,8%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	2,1%	,0%	10,3%	4,9%
ECONOMIC POLICIES	N	18	9	9	36
	ROW %	50,0%	25,0%	25,0%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	18,6%	22,0%	10,3%	16,0%
SOCIAL & LABOR POLICIES	N	7	3	6	16
	ROW %	43,8%	18,8%	37,5%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	7,2%	7,3%	6,9%	7,1%
PUBLIC OPINION	N	10	1	12	23
	ROW %	43,5%	4,3%	52,2%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	10,3%	2,4%	13,8%	10,2%
CIVIL SOCIETY	N	5	2	9	16
	ROW %	31,3%	12,5%	56,3%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	5,2%	4,9%	10,3%	7,1%
CIVIL WAR & ETHNICITY	N	5	5	2	12
	ROW %	41,7%	41,7%	16,7%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	5,2%	12,2%	2,3%	5,3%
CORRUPTION	N	0	3	1	4
	ROW %	,0%	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	,0%	7,3%	1,1%	1,8%
VARIOUS	N	3	1	5	9
	ROW %	33,3%	11,1%	55,6%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	3,1%	2,4%	5,7%	4,0%
TOTAL	N	97	41	87	225
	ROW %	43,1%	18,2%	38,7%	100,0%
	COLUMN %	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: Authors' Dataset on Datasets in Comparative Politics (DDCP).

TABLE 14. INDIVIDUAL DATABASES BY THEMATIC SUBFIELDS

DATABASES / THEMATIC SUBFIELDS	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
	REGIMES	PARTIES	ELECTIONS	LEGISLATURES	COURTS	GOVERNMENT FORMATION	ECONOMIC POLICIES	SOCIAL POLICIES	PUBLIC OPINION	CIVIL SOCIETY	CIVIL WAR	CORRUPTION	VARIOUS	
<b>POLITY</b>														14
AGGREGATE INDICES	3					1		1			2		1	
COMPETITIVENESS OF EXECUTIVE RECRUITMENT	1										1			
OPENNESS OF EXECUTIVE RECRUITMENT	1								1					
CONSTRAINTS ON CHIEF EXECUTIVE									1					
COMPETITIVENESS OF PARTICIPATION	1													
<b>FREEDOM HOUSE</b>														11
AGGREGATE SCORES			2				2						1	
POLITICAL RIGHTS												1		
CIVIL LIBERTIES	1		1		1						1			
FREEDOM OF THE PRESS									1					
<b>CNCS BANKS</b>														9
CONFLICT EVENTS	2													
POLITICAL REGIMES	1						1				1			
ELECTIONS AND PARTIES	3										1			
<b>WORLD BANK GOVERNANCE INDICATORS</b>														11
VOICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY	1											1		
POLITICAL STABILITY	1													
GOVERNMENT EFFECTIVENESS	1								1		1			
REGULATORY QUALITY	1													
RULE OF LAW	1										1			
CORRUPTION CONTROL	1						1							
<b>WORLD BANK DPI</b>														7
ELECTORAL SYSTEMS											1			
CHECKS AND BALANCES		1							1					
PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS	2				1						1			
<b>PUBLIC OPINION</b>														
WORLD VALUES SURVEYS	1					1			2	1	1			6
	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
GLOBAL BAROMETER DATA			1		1		1							3

DATABASES / THEMATIC SUBFIELDS	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
	REGIMES	PARTIES	ELECTIONS	LEGISLATURES	COURTS	GOVERNMENT FORMATION	ECONOMIC POLICIES	SOCIAL POLICIES	PUBLIC OPINION	CIVIL SOCIETY	CIVIL WAR	CORRUPTION	VARIOUS	
COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS			1				1				1			3
INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SURVEY			1				1							2
EUROPEAN SOCIAL SURVEY			1				1							2
<b>ELECTIONS</b>														
MACKIE AND ROSE: ALMANAC OF ELECTORAL HISTORY		2	2			1	4	3						12
NOHLEN: ELECTION DATA	1		1				1							3
INTERNATIONAL IDEA: VOTER TURNOUT			2											2
ELECTIONS ON FILE				1				1						2
WORLD ATLAS OF ELECTIONS								1						1
GOLDER: DEMOCRATIC ELECTORAL SYSTEMS AROUND THE WORLD										1				1
JOHNSON & AND WALLACK: ELECTORAL SYSTEMS & PERSONAL VOTE			1											1
<b>POLITICAL PARTIES</b>														
WOLDENDORP, KEMAN, AND BUDGE: PARTY GOVERNMENT		1				1	3							5
CASTLES AND MAIR: LEFT-RIGHT-SCALES						1	2	2						5
HUBER, RAGIN AND STEPHENS: PARTIES AND WELFARE STATE				1				3						4
BROADLEFT.ORG: LEFTIST PARTIES OF THE WORLD			2									1	1	4
HUBER AND INGLEHART: PARTY LOCATIONS		1				1		1						3
KATZ AND MAIR: PARTY ORGANIZATION	1	1									1			3
BROWNE AND DREJMANIS: GOVERNMENT COALITIONS							1	2						3
LAVER AND HUNT: POLICY AND PARTY COMPETITION						1	1							2
JANDA: INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE		1						1						2

*The Quantitative Skeleton of Comparative Politics*

DATABASES / THEMATIC SUBFIELDS	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
	REGIMES	PARTIES	ELECTIONS	LEGISLATURES	COURTS	GOVERNMENT FORMATION	ECONOMIC POLICIES	SOCIAL POLICIES	PUBLIC OPINION	CIVIL SOCIETY	CIVIL WAR	CORRUPTION	VARIOUS	
POLITICAL PARTIES														
MARKS, STEENBERGEN, AND RAY: PARTY POSITIONING EU INTEGRATION		1					1							2
RAUNIO: PARTIES AND LEGISLATORS				1								1		2
WORLD ENCYCLOPEDIA OF POLITICAL SYSTEMS AND PARTIES													1	1
<i>BUDGE</i>										1				1
<b>POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS</b>														
PRZEWORSKI, ALVAREZ, CHEIBUB & LIMONGI POLITICAL REGIMES	2					1	1							4
LIJPHART: CONSENSUS AND MAJORITARIAN DEMOCRACIES			1				3							4
<i>POLITICAL HANDBOOK OF THE WORLD</i>	1		2											3
BRATTON AND VAN DE WALLE: REGIMES IN AFRICA	1						1		1					3
SWANK: CAPITALIST DEMOCRACIES		1					1	1						3

DATABASES / THEMATIC SUBFIELDS	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
	REGIMES	PARTIES	ELECTIONS	LEGISLATURES	COURTS	GOVERNMENT FORMATION	ECONOMIC POLICIES	SOCIAL POLICIES	PUBLIC OPINION	CIVIL SOCIETY	CIVIL WAR	CORRUPTION	VARIOUS	
	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
BATES: HARVARD UNIVERSITY AFRICAN RESEARCH PROGRAM DATA	1								1					2
TSEBELIS: VETO PLAYERS DATA								1			1			2
ARMINGEON ET AL.: COMPARATIVE POLITICAL DATASET							1							1
GASIOROWSKI: CRISIS AND POLITICAL CHANGE							1							1
CHEIBUB & GANDHI: POLITICAL REGIMES	1													1
LIJPHART AND CREPAZ: CORPORATISM & CONSENSUS DEMOCRACY							1							1
<b>SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC POLICIES</b>														
GOLDEN, LANGE AND WALLERSTEIN: UNION CENTRALIZATION		1	3				1	1						6
GARRET AND LANGE: POLITICS OF GROWTH		1					1	1						3
FENG, KUGLER AND ZAK: POLITICS OF FERTILITY							1					1		2
HUBER, RAGIN, AND STEPHENS: COMPARATIVE WELFARE DATASET								1					1	2
SCRUGGS: WELFARE STATE ENTITLEMENTS DATASET								1						1
SCHMIDT: POLICY FIELDS							1							1
LANGE AND GARRET: POLITICS OF GROWTH							1							1
KAUFFMAN AND SEGURA-UBRIEGO: GLOBALIZATION, & SOCIAL SPENDING							1							1
<b>POLITICAL VIOLENCE</b>														
CORRELATES OF WAR	2					1	1				2	1		7
DOYLE AND SAMBANIS: PEACEBUILDING DATASET	1		1								1		1	4
MARK GIBNEY:	1		1											2



*The Quantitative Skeleton of Comparative Politics*

DATABASES / THEMATIC SUBFIELDS	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
	REGIMES	PARTIES	ELECTIONS	LEGISLATURES	COURTS	GOVERNMENT FORMATION	ECONOMIC POLICIES	SOCIAL POLICIES	PUBLIC OPINION	CIVIL SOCIETY	CIVIL WAR	CORRUPTION	VARIOUS	
POLITICAL TERROR SCALE														
SIPRI YEARBOOK							1				1			2
ICT TERRORISM DATA								1						1
UPPSALA CONFLICT DATA								1						1
FEARON: ETHNIC STRUCTURE AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY											1			1
<b>POLITICAL LEADERS</b>														
HEADS OF STATES AND GOVERNMENTS	1		2				1							4
BIENEN & VAN DE WALLE: LEADERSHIP DURATION	1		1	1										3
ORTIZ DE ZÁRATE: WORLD POLITICAL LEADERS	1	1												2
<b>VARIOUS</b>														
INTERNATIONAL COUNTRY RISK GUIDE			1				1				1			3
TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL CORRUPTION PERCEPTION			1						1					2
POSNER: ETHNIC FRACTIONALIZATION IN AFRICA										1	1			2
POLITICAL RISK SERVICES					1									1
	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	T 7	T 8	T 9	T 10	T 11	T 12	T 13	Σ
ALESINA: FRACTIONALIZATION											1			1
KENWORTHY AND MALAMI: GENDER INEQUALITY IN POLITICAL REPRESENTATION									1					1
YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION							1							1
Σ	37	12	28	4	4	9	41	23	11	4	22	6	6	207
%	17.9%	5.8%	13.5%	1.9%	1.9%	4.3%	19.8%	11.1%	5.3%	1.9%	10.6%	2.9%	2.9%	100.0%

## References

---

- Bartels, Larry M. and Henry E. Brady (1993), "The State of Quantitative Political Methodology", *The State of the Discipline II*, ed. Ada W. Finifter (Washington, DC: APSA), pp. 121-159.
- Berman, Sheri E. (2001), "Modernization in Historical Perspective: The Case of Imperial Germany", *World Politics* 53 (April): 431-462.
- Byrman, Alan (2004), *Social Research Methods* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition).
- Cox, Robert Henry (2001), "The Social Construction of an Imperative: Why Welfare Reform Happened in Denmark and the Netherlands but Not in Germany", *World Politics* 53 (April): 463-498.
- Eckstein, Susan (2004), "Dollarization and Its Discontents: Remittances and the Remaking of Cuba in the Post-Soviet Era", *Comparative Politics* 36/3 (April): 313-330.
- Garman, Christopher, Stephen Haggard and Eliza Willis (2001), "Fiscal Decentralization: A Political Theory with Latin American Cases", *World Politics* 53 (January): 205-236.
- Gerring, John (2001), *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press).
- Levitsky, Steven (2001), "Organization and Labor-Based Party Adaptation: The Transformation of Argentine Peronism in Comparative Perspective", *World Politics* 54 (October): 27-56.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S. (2008), "Is comparative politics methodologically exceptional?" *APSA-CP Newsletter* 19/1 (Winter): 11-12.
- Lijphart, Arend (1971), "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method", *American Political Science Review* 65/3 (September): 682-693.
- Lindberg, Staffan I. (2006), *Democracy and Elections in Africa* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Mackie, Thomas T. and Richard Rose (1991), *The International Almanac of Electoral History* (London: Macmillan, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition).
- Mahoney, James (2007), "Debating the State of Comparative Politics: Views from Qualitative Research", *Comparative Political Studies* 40/1 (January): 32-38.
- Morrison, Minion K.C. (2004), "Political Parties in Ghana through Four Republics: A Path to Democratic Consolidation", *Comparative Politics* 36/4 (July): 421-442.
- Mozaffar, Shaheen, James R. Scarritt and Glen Galaich (2003), "Electoral Institutions, Ethnopolitical Cleavages, and Party Systems in Africa's Emerging Democracies", *American Political Science Review* 97/3 (August): 397-390.
- Munck, Gerardo L. and Richard Snyder (2007), "Debating the Direction of Comparative Politics: An Analysis of Leading Journals", *Comparative Political Studies* 40/1 (January): 5-31.
- Nohlen, Dieter, et al. (eds.) (1999). *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press).
- Nohlen, Dieter, et al. (eds.) (2001). *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, 2 volumes (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press).

- Staton, Jeffrey K. (2004), "Judicial Policy Implementation in Mexico City and Mérida", *Comparative Politics* 37/1 (October): 41-60.
- Steinmo, Sven (1989), "Political Institutions and Tax Policy in the United States, Sweden and Britain", *World Politics* 41 (July): 500-535.
- Taylor, Brian D. (2001), "Russia's Passive Army: Rethinking Military Coups", *Comparative Political Studies* 34/8 (October): 924-952.
- Wampler, Brian and Leonardo Avritzer (2004), "Participatory Publics: Civil Society and New Institutions in Democratic Brazil", *Comparative Politics* 36/3 (April): 291-312.



## Novedades

---

### DIVISIÓN DE ADMINISTRACIÓN PÚBLICA

- Casar, Ma. Amparo, *Los gobiernos sin mayoría en México: 1997-2006*, DTAP-195
- De Angoitia, Regina, *La evolución de los portales del gobierno federal: la experiencia de ocho dependencias*, DTAP-196
- Cabrero, Enrique, *De la descentralización como aspiración a la descentralización como problema*, DTAP-197
- Sour, Laura y Eunises Rosillo, *¿Cuáles son los resultados del presupuesto por resultados?*, DTAP-198
- Arellano, David y Walter Lepore, *Prevención y control de conflictos de interés: lecciones para la Administración Pública Federal en México...*, DTAP-199
- Sour, Laura y Fredy Girón, *El efecto flypaper de las transferencias intergubernamentales del ramo 28...*, DTAP-200
- Mariscal, Judith, *Convergencia tecnológica y armonización regulatoria en México: una evaluación de los instrumentos regulatorios*, DTAP-201
- Mariscal, Judith, *Market Structure in the Latin American Mobile Sector*, DTAP-202
- De Angoitia, Regina y Fernando Ramírez, *Estrategias utilizadas para minimizar costos por los usuarios de telefonía celular...*, DTAP-203
- Cejudo, Guillermo, Gilberto Sánchez y Dionisio Zabaleta, *El (casi inexistente) debate conceptual sobre la calidad del gobierno*, DTAP-204

### DIVISIÓN DE ECONOMÍA

- Hernández, Kólver, *State-Dependent Nominal Rigidities & Disinflation Programs in Small Open Economies*, DTE-418
- Hernández, Kólver and Asli Leblebicioglu, *A Regime Switching Analysis of the Exchange Rate Pass-through*, DTE-419
- Ramírez, José Carlos y David Juárez, *Viejas ideas económicas con nuevas tecnologías matemáticas*, DTE-420
- Delajara, Marcelo, *Household and Community Determinants of Infants' Nutritional Status in Argentina*, DTE-421
- Villagómez, Alejandro, Robert Duval y Lucía Cerilla, *Análisis de la evolución de la matrícula de la licenciatura en economía en México, 1974-2004*, DTE-422
- Brito, Dagobert and Juan Rosellón, *Quasi-Rents and Pricing Gas in Mexico*, DTE-423
- Rosellón, Juan and Hannes Weigt, *A Dynamic Incentive Mechanism for Transmission Expansion in Electricity Networks-Theory, Modeling and Application*, DTE-424
- Smith, Ricardo, *A Monte Carlo EM Algorithm for FIML Estimation of Multivariate Endogenous Switching Models with Censored and Discrete Responses*, DTE-425
- Brito, Dagobert and Juan Rosellón, *Lumpy Investment in Regulated Natural Gas Pipelines: An Application of the Theory of The Second Best*, DTE-426
- Di Giannatale, Sonia, Patricia López y María José Roa, *Una introducción conceptual al desarrollo financiero, capital social y anonimidad: el caso de México*, DTE-427

## DIVISIÓN DE ESTUDIOS INTERNACIONALES

- González, Guadalupe, *Percepciones sociales sobre la migración en México y Estados Unidos: ¿hay espacios para cooperar?*, DTEI-162
- Bernhard, William y David Leblang, *Standing Tall When the Wind Shifts: Financial Market Responses to Elections, Disasters and Terrorist Attacks*, DTEI-163
- Velázquez, Rafael, *La relación entre el Ejecutivo y el Congreso en materia de política exterior durante el sexenio de Vicente Fox...*, DTEI-164
- Ruano, Lorena, *De la exaltación al tedio: las relaciones entre México y la Unión Europea...*, DTEI-165
- Martínez, Ferrán e Ignacio Lago Peñas, *Why new Parties? Changes in the number of Parties over time within Countries*, DTEI-166
- Sotomayor, Arturo, *México y la ONU en momentos de transición: entre el activismo internacional, parálisis interna y crisis internacional*, DTEI-167
- Velasco, Jesús, *Acuerdo migratorio: la debilidad de la esperanza*, DTEI-168
- Velázquez, Rafael y Roberto Domínguez, *Relaciones México-Unión Europea: una evaluación general en el sexenio del presidente Vicente Fox*, DTEI-169
- Martínez i Coma, Ferrán e Ignacio Lago Peñas, *¿Qué piensan los mexicanos de los Estados Unidos?*, DTEI-170
- Velasco, Jesús, *Lou Dobbs and the Rise of Modern Nativism*, DTEI-171

## DIVISIÓN DE ESTUDIOS JURÍDICOS

- Magaloni, Ana Laura, *¿Cómo estudiar el derecho desde una perspectiva dinámica?*, DTEJ-19
- Fondevila, Gustavo, *Cumplimiento de normativa y satisfacción laboral: un estudio de impacto en México*, DTEJ-20
- Posadas, Alejandro, *La educación jurídica en el CIDE (México). El adecuado balance entre la innovación y la tradición*, DTEJ-21
- Ingram, Matthew C., *Judicial Politics in the Mexican States: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations*, DTEJ-22
- Fondevila, Gustavo e Ingram Matthew, *Detención y uso de la fuerza*, DTEJ-23
- Magaloni, Ana Laura y Ana María Ibarra Olguín, *La configuración jurisprudencial de los derechos fundamentales...*, DTEJ-24
- Magaloni, Ana Laura, *¿Por qué la Suprema Corte no ha sido un instrumento para la defensa de derechos fundamentales?*, DTEJ-25
- Magaloni, Ana Laura, *Arbitrariedad e ineficiencia de la procuración de justicia: dos caras de la misma moneda*, DTEJ-26
- Ibarra, Ana María, *Los artificios de la Dogmática Jurídica*, DTEJ-27
- Fierro, Ana Elena y Adriana García, *Responsabilidad patrimonial del Estado. Interpretación de la SCJN del artículo 113 constitucional*, DTEJ-28

## DIVISIÓN DE ESTUDIOS POLÍTICOS

- Lehoucq, Fabrice, *Why is Structural Reform Stagnating in Mexico? Policy Reform Episodes from Salinas to Fox*, DTEP-195
- Benton, Allyson, *Latin America's (Legal) Subnational Authoritarian Enclaves: The Case of Mexico*, DTEP-196
- Hacker, Casiano y Jeffrey Thomas, *An Antitrust Theory of Group Recognition*, DTEP-197
- Hacker, Casiano y Jeffrey Thomas, *Operationalizing and Reconstructing the Theory of Nationalism*, DTEP-198
- Langston, Joy y Allyson Benton, *"A ras de suelo": Candidate Appearances and Events in Mexico's Presidential Campaign*, DTEP-199
- Negretto, Gabriel, *The Durability of Constitutions in Changing Environments...*, DTEP-200
- Langston, Joy, *Hasta en las mejores familias: Madrazo and the PRI in the 2006 Presidential Elections*, DTEP-201
- Schedler, Andreas, *Protest Beats Manipulation. Exploring Sources of Interparty Competition under Competitive and Hegemonic Authoritarianism*, DTEP-202
- Villagómez, Alejandro y Jennifer Farias, *Análisis de la evolución de la matrícula de las licenciaturas en CP, AP y RI en México, 1974-2004*, DTEP-203
- Ríos, Julio, *Judicial Institutions and Corruption Control*, DTEP-204

## DIVISIÓN DE HISTORIA

- Barrón, Luis, *Revolucionarios sí, pero Revolución no*, DTH-44
- Pipitone, Ugo, *Oaxaca: comunidad, instituciones, vanguardias*, DTH-45
- Barrón, Luis, *Venustiano Carranza: un político porfiriano en la Revolución*, DTH-46
- Tenorio, Mauricio y Laurencio Sanguino, *Orígenes de una ciudad mexicana: Chicago y la ciencia del Mexican Problem (1900-1930)*, DTH-47
- Rojas, Rafael, *José María Heredia y la tradición republicana*, DTH-48
- Rojas, Rafael, *Traductores de la libertad: el americanismo de los primeros republicanos*, DTH-49
- Sánchez, Mónica Judith, *History vs. the Eternal Present or Liberal Individualism and the Morality of Compassion and Trust*, DTH-50
- Medina, Luis, *Salida: los años de Zedillo*, DTH-51
- Sauter, Michael, *The Edict on Religion of 1788 and the Statistics of Public Discussion in Prussia*, DTH-52
- Sauter, Michael, *Conscience and the Rhetoric of Freedom: Fichte's Reaction to the Edict on Religion*, DTH-53

## Ventas

El CIDE es una institución de educación superior especializada particularmente en las disciplinas de Economía, Administración Pública, Estudios Internacionales, Estudios Políticos, Historia y Estudios Jurídicos. El Centro publica, como producto del ejercicio intelectual de sus investigadores, libros, documentos de trabajo, y cuatro revistas especializadas: *Gestión y Política Pública*, *Política y Gobierno*, *Economía Mexicana Nueva Época* e *Istor*.

Para adquirir cualquiera de estas publicaciones, le ofrecemos las siguientes opciones:

VENTAS DIRECTAS:	VENTAS EN LÍNEA:
Tel. Directo: 5081-4003 Tel: 5727-9800 Ext. 6094 y 6091 Fax: 5727 9800 Ext. 6314  Av. Constituyentes 1046, 1er piso, Col. Lomas Altas, Del. Álvaro Obregón, 11950, México, D.F.	Librería virtual: <a href="http://www.e-cide.com">www.e-cide.com</a>  Dudas y comentarios: <a href="mailto:publicaciones@cide.edu">publicaciones@cide.edu</a>

### ¡¡Colecciones completas!!

Adquiere los CDs de las colecciones completas de los documentos de trabajo de todas las divisiones académicas del CIDE: Economía, Administración Pública, Estudios Internacionales, Estudios Políticos, Historia y Estudios Jurídicos.



### ¡Nuevo! ¡¡Arma tu CD!!



Visita nuestra Librería Virtual [www.e-cide.com](http://www.e-cide.com) y selecciona entre 10 y 20 documentos de trabajo. A partir de tu lista te enviaremos un CD con los documentos que elegiste.