Alternative concepts and measures of democratic governance
Mon 27th Sept
Structure

I. Planning for assignment #1 (Last class)
II. Expanded conceptual framework: democratic governance (last class)

---
I. Why use indices? (Today)
II. What types of indicators and measures of democratic governance are available? (Today)
III. How could you use and present the results effectively for a professional report? (Today)
III. WHY USE INDICATORS?
Why use indicators?

• **Diagnosis** (what’s wrong?)
  – Needs assessment is the first stage in identifying priorities for reform eg MDG dashboard, World Bank PRSP
  – Benchmarks can be a conditional criteria for distribution of aid e.g. used by the MCA
  – Ranking can be an external ‘shaming’ pressure mechanism on governments eg TI
  – Agenda-setting and determining policy priorities
  – Can be an internal mechanism for reform dialogue

• **Analysis** (what works?)
  – Performance indicators, results based management, and policy evaluation; dashboard methods
  – Change in rankings helps to identify effective policies/strategies for reducing corruption, improving transparency, strengthening accountability, etc

• **Prescription** (how can good governance be strengthened?)
  – Classifies regimes and identifies policy options and solutions
Levels of measurement

• **Regime indicators and typologies**
  – By ‘regime’ we mean the basic framework for governing the nation-state within its territorial boundaries. This includes the over-arching constitutional arrangements and the core government institutions at national, regional and local levels, reflecting the accepted formal and informal rules of the game.
  – E.g. classifying electoral autocracies

• **Disaggregated institutions**
  – E.g. Rule of law, legislative strength, types of electoral systems, types of executives, levels of decentralization and human rights

• **Programmatic and policy evaluative indicators**
  – E.g. User surveys, randomized policy experiments, randomized observer evaluations
Performance indicators

• A quantitative or qualitative yardstick which can be used to evaluate how well certain overarching goals are being achieved

• Applied to any specific project, program, organizational unit, sub-national governance, the nation-state, or a multilateral agency

• Private sector Balanced Scorecard methodology

• Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-limited (SMART)
Evaluating Indicators

• **Valid indicator?**
  - Measures the underlying concept
  - **Comprehensive?**
    - Covers all major dimensions of concept
  - **Balanced?**
    - Not skewed towards only partial aspect
  - **Value bias?**
    - Generates consensus

• **Reliable measures?**
  - Can be repeated consistently
  - **Equivalence**
    - Across societies/time? Measures like-with-like
  - **Transparent**
    - Public processes and clear decision rules
  - **Replicable?**
    - Can be recreated using the same steps
  - **Robust findings?**
    - Generates same outcome in repeated tests

• **Political legitimacy**
  - Widely acceptable to the agency and international community as an authoritative source
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>Identify attributes</td>
<td>Avoid maximalist def</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical organization</td>
<td>Avoid redundancy or conflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Select indicators</td>
<td>Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>Select levels</td>
<td>Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregation rules</td>
<td>Validity/robustness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency of rules</td>
<td>Replicability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. WHAT INDICATORS ARE AVAILABLE?
Diagnostic tools

- Public evaluations
  - Democratic audit
    - E.g. Britain, Canada, Sweden, Australia
  - Representative public opinion surveys
    - E.g. World Values Survey, Afrobarometer
  - 'Expert' perceptual surveys
    - E.g. TI Corruption Perception Index
- Official data
- Elite evaluations
  - Composite indicators
    - E.g. KK Good Governance
Governance Indicators: A Users' Guide
(2nd Edition)
UNDP Oslo Governance Center

Source: http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/flagship/governance_indicators_project.html
www.gaportal.org
"Until the mid-nineties, I did not think that governance could be measured. The Worldwide Governance Indicators have shown me otherwise ... It constitutes the state of the art on how to build periodic governance indicators which can be a crucial tool for policy analysts and decision-makers benchmarking their countries. Uniquely, it publicly discloses the aggregated and disaggregated data, as well as the estimated margins of error for each country. It definitely sets a standard for transparency in data."

Shlomo Yitzhaki,
Director of Israel’s Central Bureau of Statistics and Professor of Economics at the Hebrew University

The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) project reports aggregate and individual governance indicators for 212 countries and territories over the period 1996-2008, for six dimensions of governance:

- Voice and Accountability
- Political Stability and Absence of Violence
- Government Effectiveness
- Regulatory Quality
- Rule of Law
- Control of Corruption

The aggregate indicators combine the views of a large number of enterprise, citizen and expert survey respondents in industrial and developing countries. The individual data sources underlying the aggregate indicators are drawn from a diverse variety of survey institutes, think tanks, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations.

The six aggregate indicators and the underlying data sources can be viewed interactively on the Governance Indicators webpage of this site. To download the full dataset for all countries and indicators in Excel format, click here.

Documentation of the latest update of the WGI can be found in "Governance Matters VIII: Governance Indicators for 1996-2008." Further documentation and research using the WGI is available on the Resources page of this website or at www.worldbank.org/wgi/governance.
www.qog.pol.gu.se/

THE QOG INSTITUTE
QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT

About Us

The Institute conducts and promotes research on the causes, consequences and nature of good governance and Quality of Government (QoG) - that is, trustworthy, reliable, impartial, uncorrupted and competent government institutions.

Our research addresses the questions of how to create and maintain high quality government institutions and how the quality of such institutions influences public policy in a broader sense. While Quality of Government is our common intellectual focal point, we apply a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives in our various studies.

We also promote research by offering access to cross-national comparative data on QoG and its correlates. We have made publicly available both a cross-sectional dataset with global coverage pertaining to the year 2002, and a cross-sectional time-series dataset with global coverage spanning the time period 1946–2006. You can access these datasets here.

In 2006 the QoG Institute received a six-year grant of SEK 32 million (SEK 1 million SEK) from the Swedish Research Council Formas, and the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation to three different research projects. Please visit the links below for more info about the projects:

- Socio-Technical-Ecological Evaluation of Potential Renewable Energy Sources
- Fair and Feasible Climate Change Adaptation
- Governance for a High Environmental Quality of the Baltic

Sign up for QoG News

Get short notifications when we publish working papers, improve datasets or inform about upcoming events on our homepage.

Sign up here »

What’s New?

QoG Working Paper 2009:2 now available

Sverker C. Jagers has received grants from Stiftelsen Futura, the Swedish Research Council Formas, and the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation to three different research projects. Please visit the links below for more info about the projects:
Types of QoG variables

1. **WII (What It Is) variables,**
   - variables pertaining to the **core features of QoG** (such as corruption, bureaucratic quality, and democracy)

2. **HTG (How To Get it) variables, (causes)**
   - variables posited to **promote the development** of QoG (such as electoral rules, forms of government, federalism, legal & colonial origin, religion and social fractionalization); and

3. **WYG (What You Get) variables, (consequences)**
   - variables pertaining to some of the posited **consequences** of QoG (such as economic and human development, international and domestic peace, environmental sustainability, gender equality, and satisfied, trusting & confident citizens).
QoG dataset

How to get it

What QoG is

What you get
QoG What it is...

• Be *selective*....
• Cheibub & Gandhi
  • Type of regime democracy/autocracy
• Cingranelli & Richards
  • Human rights
• Freedom House
  • Freedom in the world
• Polity IV
  • Democracy-autocracy
• World Bank
  • Good governance indicators
Types of data

• **Cross-sectional**
  – 192 independent nation-states
  – 2006 (or latest year available)
  – Released June 2009

• **Time-series 1990-2006**
  – Same nation-states plus 13 historical countries
Examples of graphics and tables from the UNDP Human Development Report

V. PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cover</th>
<th>Title / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power, Voices and Rights</td>
<td>A Turning Point for Gender Equality in Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific - 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report focuses on the critical question of advancing gender equality, as seen through the prism of women's unequal power, voice, and rights. Despite the region's many economic gains, the Report chronicles how in many instances women across the region continue to be held back and disadvantaged. Even as many women have benefited from their countries' improved education, health, and prosperity, they continue to face barriers to the same opportunities available to men. The...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actuar sobre el futuro</th>
<th>romper la transmisión intergeneracional de la desigualdad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean - 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

El Informe regional sobre desarrollo humano para América Latina y el Caribe 2010 propone una nueva forma de entender y abordar el estado actual de la desigualdad en desarrollo humano en los países de América Latina y el Caribe. El estudio se estructura en seis capítulos que profundizan en los factores que explican la persistencia de la desigualdad. ¿Cómo podemos romper el círculo vicioso de desigualdad en la región? ¿Qué se... |

| Challenges to Human Security in the Arab Countries | In Arab countries, a widespread lack of human security undermines human development, according to the Arab Human Development Report 2009: Challenges to Human Security in the Arab Countries. This report is prepared by independent scholars drawn from the region. The report argues that human security is a prerequisite for human... |
Measuring and Monitoring Progress towards Good Governance: Updates on AGR II

The African Governance Report (AGR) is a biannual publication, which assesses and monitors progress towards good governance in African countries. AGR 1 entitled “Striving for good governance in Africa” was published in 2005 and covered a survey of 27 countries using instruments developed by ECA to assess the perception on governance by households and experts at the country level. The Report is published in response to a growing and powerful consensus emerging around the world, and among African leaders, that good governance is a prerequisite for the realization of development challenges and the achievement of the MDGs.

The ground-breaking survey and empirical findings and analysis enriched the dialogue during the 2005 Fourth African Development Forum (ADFFV), whose main theme was Governance for a Progressing Africa. ADF IV placed emphasis on the need to “support and strengthen the “capable state” - one with transparent, accountable political and economic systems, and efficient public institutions providing an enabling environment for the private sector and civil society to play their respective roles in national efforts.”

AGR I covered 27 countries. ECA is now in the process of producing the second report, aimed at 12 new countries while updating the first 27. This website features information emerging from the National Stakeholders’ Workshops that launched the research for the second AGR as well as the Validation Workshops to be held in the months to come.

For more information on specific countries involved in AGR II, contact: ecainfo@unea.org

Country updates

- Sierra Leone
- Cape Verde
- Djibouti
- Congo Brazzaville
- Togo
- Madagascar
- Tunisia
- Seychelles
FIGURE 1.1
The world is becoming more democratic

Number of countries
Democratic regimes on the rise as authoritarianism declines

82 Most democratic
44
39 Intermediate
26 Authoritarian

1985: 45%
1990: 45%
1995: 57%
2000: 57%

Shares of world population

Source: Polity IV 2002.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region or country group</th>
<th>Number of countries with multiparty electoral systems (countries with data)</th>
<th>Population of countries with multiparty electoral systems (millions)</th>
<th>Share of regional population living in countries with multiparty electoral systems (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>29 (42)</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>9 (16)</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>25 (26)</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern Europe and CIS</td>
<td>21 (25)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>30 (30)</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low human development</td>
<td>23 (36)</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>140 (189)</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low human development countries are also included in their respective regional groups. Regional data do not sum to the world total because some countries included in the world total are not included in a regional group.

FIGURE 1.2
Ratification of human rights treaties
Number of countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CRC</th>
<th>CEDAW</th>
<th>ICERD</th>
<th>ICCPR</th>
<th>ICESCR</th>
<th>CAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See indicator table 28 for definitions.
FIGURE 1.4
Womens' participation lags everywhere
Percentage of parliament seats held by women, 2000

- Sweden
- Denmark
- Finland, Norway
- Iceland
- Netherlands
- Argentina, Germany
- Mozambique, South Africa

- World

Source: IPU 2002c and Indicator table 23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Share (percent)</th>
<th>Number (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding China</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding China</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $1 a day is $1.08 in 1993 purchasing power parity (PPP) prices.
Low income is no obstacle to democracy

GDP per capita, 2000 (purchasing power parity U.S. dollars)

Note: Democracy score is the voice and accountability indicator from World Bank 2001c.
Figure 2.8: No automatic link between democracy and equity

Gini coefficient of income distribution

Note: Democracy score is the voice and accountability indicator from World Bank 2001c.
BOX 3.5

India’s judiciary—indeedence and activism
defending democratic institutions and practices

India’s judiciary—its Supreme Court and state high courts—has been a cornerstone of the country’s democracy since independence. Over the decades the judiciary has rebuffed continued encroachments on its independence. In recent years renewed judicial activism has vigorously defended citizens’ fundamental rights. It has also safeguarded environmental and other public goods. And it has tackled issues of democratic accountability and charges of corruption in the executive.

In the 1970s the courts encountered several challenges to their independence. In a celebrated case in 1976, the prime minister at the time tried to eliminate the use of judicial review to limit parliament’s powers. The attempt was defeated and the courts ruled that the basic framework of the constitution could not be altered.

In the 1980s the courts started to hear public interest litigation involving the human rights of poor and powerless people, especially in cases of police brutality and torture, custodial rape and inhumane treatment in jails. These cases also protected such public goods as clean air and water and uncontaminated blood supplies. This judicial activism coincided with the rise of civil society organizations and social movements dedicated to social justice and human rights goals. The synergy built among civil society, reform-minded members of the middle classes and several supreme and high court justices like Justices P. N. Bhagwati and Krishna Iyer helped advance these causes. Legal reforms provided for class action suits on behalf of poor, oppressed and victimized citizens.

In the 1990s the courts sought to uphold the principle of separation of powers and delink the intelligence services from the control of the political executive. They did so to restore the accountability of the Central Bureau of Investigations, the government’s main investigative agency. A series of scandals had revealed an unhealthy relationship between the bureau, the prime minister’s office and other political elites. The courts restructured authority over the bureau and set its director’s tenure to a minimum of two years. There were countermeasures in parliament, which alleged that the judiciary was encroaching on legislative and administrative functions beyond its authority, and that judges were exploiting recent corruption trials. A lively debate continues about these institutions, their development and their contribution to the vitality of democratic politics in India.

Source: Kohli 2001; Ralph and Ralph 2001.
The role of independent oversight bodies: Mexico’s Federal Election Commission

Mexico’s 2000 presidential elections marked a major step forward for the country’s democracy. This positive outcome has been widely attributed to 1996 constitutional reforms of electoral and political systems—and to the efforts and growing credibility of the Federal Election Commission (Instituto Federal Electoral). These changes were driven by pressure from civil society, the opposition and the international community resulting from the controversial presidential election of 1988 and lingering questions about process in the 1994 election.

In 1990 constitutional reforms established the Federal Election Commission as an independent entity fully responsible for federal elections and an Electoral Court that handles appeals of election-related disputes. Reforms in the early and mid-1990s strengthened the commission’s independence and authority. The 1996 constitutional reforms, in particular, eliminated executive oversight by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and created a non-partisan General Council of nine independent “electoral counsellors”.

Mexico’s other electoral innovations include creating observer committees, including judges as members of the election commission and establishing a professional service for supervising elections that is responsible for updating voter lists every year. The election commission has also instituted campaign finance reforms, though critics argue that Congress approved a much higher ceiling than was initially proposed to benefit the wealthy PRI—the party that had been in power for more than 70 years.

These improvements contributed to the opposition winning a majority in the Chamber of Deputies in the watershed 1997 legislative elections—for the first time in Mexico’s modern history—and to the 2000 presidential elections bringing an opposition candidate, Vicente Fox, to power. Electoral reforms have considerably strengthened direct democratic participation by all Mexican citizens in government institutions and processes.

BOX 3.8
South Africa’s Human Rights Commission—promoting democratic values and practices by investigating racism in the media

South Africa’s Human Rights Commission—an independent institution created by the country’s 1994 constitution—has turned its attention to racism in the media. Its investigations began with a 1998 complaint from the Black Lawyers Association and the Association of Black Accountants of South Africa, accusing two newspapers of racism in reports involving black people.

The commission later decided to broaden its inquiry to racism in the media generally. Racial discrimination at every level of society had featured heavily in complaints brought to the commission since its creation, posing risks to a peaceful and integrated South Africa. In broadening its investigation, the commission was not seeking to make a scapegoat of the media. Rather, it was recognizing the media’s immense power to shape public opinions and perceptions.

The outcry accompanying the announcement of the inquiry was significant in itself. Critics argued that the inquiry violated the media’s right to freedom of expression, undermining the commission’s role as protector of all the rights granted in South Africa’s constitution and bill of rights.

In its report the commission shared its understanding and interpretation of racism, particularly “subliminal racism”. But the commission had already achieved an important objective: it generated a broad public discussion on an issue that threatened to be a major obstacle to building democracy and respect for human rights across South Africa. In doing so, it enhanced the prospect of a popular consensus.

FIGURE 3.3
Developing countries' spectacular media growth

**Daily Newspapers**
- Developed countries
  - 1970: 2
  - 1996: 6
- Developing countries
  - 1970: 2
  - 1996: 4

**Radios**
- Developed countries
  - 1970: 0.5
  - 1997: 2.5
- Developing countries
  - 1970: 0.5
  - 1997: 2.5

**Televisions**
- Developed countries
  - 1970: 100
  - 1997: 500
- Developing countries
  - 1970: 20
  - 1997: 100

Next class:

Freedom house and Polity IV
Read FH ‘methodology’ Freedom of the World