

CODEBOOK

Media and Authoritarianism Data, 2001-2009

January 27, 2013

If you are using this data set, please cite:

Stockmann, Daniela. *Media Commercialization and Authoritarian Rule in China*, Communication, Society & Politics Series. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Note: Variables in the data set ending with “rec” refer to variables recoded to run from zero to one; if variable names contain “ln” they were logged; “irbussp2rec” “fhrankingrecoilreslnrec” and “polity2recoilreslnrec” are interaction terms. These variables are variations of variables listed below.

country

Country name.

country abbr

Abbreviation of country name.

caseid

Each country is coded with an individual ID number.

year_iv

Year of observation of independent and control variables (lagged by one year with respect to the two main dependent variables (fhrating_lag and irex_plur_lag). A four-digit code identifies the particular year that refers to the actual situation of the corresponding country in that year.

year_dv

Year of observation of the two main dependent variables (fhrating_lag and irex_plur_lag).

gdpus

Levels of economic development based on gross domestic product per capita (purchasing power parity) from the World Development Indicators.

region

The region to which the country belongs. It is coded as: 1 = Asia; 2 = Central America and Caribbean; 3 = Eastern Europe; 4 = Middle East; 5 = North Africa; 6 = South America; 7 = Sub-Saharan Africa; 8 = Southern Europe.

Source: Geddes (1999).

rtype /sp2

Regime type. It is coded as: 1 = military; 2 = military/personalist hybrid, 3 = personalist; 4 = single-party hybrids with either the military or personalist; 5 = single-party; 6 =

military/personalist/single-party amalgam (there are only a few of these and the category is used mainly to control for a few uncategorizable and very long-lived regimes). The data until the year of 2002 (excluding the post-Soviet countries, see below) are drawn from Geddes (1999). For years after 2002, the data are taken from Brownlee (2007), so are the data for the eight post-Soviet countries excluded in Geddes' work (Bahrain, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates). Consistent with Geddes' classification of authoritarian regimes, these cases are classified into the category of personalist regimes, coded as "3". If data that were not available in either source mentioned above, they were collected from the CIA Factbook, following Geddes' and Brownlee's coding rules.

Sources: Geddes (1999); Brownlee (2007); the CIA Factbook, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>.

length

The length of time of an authoritarian regime. lengthrec refers to the

Source: Geddes (1999); Brownlee (2007); the CIA Factbook, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>.

irex_freedom

The first aspect or "objective" of the Media Sustainability Index (MSI) released by the IREX. The value of this variable determines how well a country meets the objective to have legal and social norms protecting and promoting free speech and access to public information. It is obtained by averaging the scores of nine indicators, each of which is measured on a 1-4 ordinal scale:

1. Legal and social protections of free speech exist and are enforced
2. Licensing of broadcast media is fair, competitive, and apolitical.
3. Market entry and tax structure for media are fair and comparable to other industries.
4. Crimes against journalists or media outlets are prosecuted vigorously, but occurrences of such crimes are rare.
5. State or public media do not receive preferential legal treatment, and law guarantees editorial independence.
6. Libel is a civil law issue; public officials are held to higher standards, and offended parties must prove falsity and malice.
7. Public information is easily accessible; right of access to information is equally enforced for all media and journalists.
8. Media outlets have unrestricted access to information; this is equally enforced for all media and journalists.
9. Entry into the journalism profession is free, and government imposes no licensing, restrictions, or special rights for journalists.

And the scoring system is as following:

0 = Country does not meet the indicator; government or social forces may actively oppose its implementation.

1 = Country minimally meets aspects of the indicator; forces may not actively oppose its implementation, but business environment may not support it and government or profession do not fully and actively support change.

2 = Country has begun to meet many aspects of the indicator, but progress may be too recent to judge or still dependent on current government or political forces.

3 = Country meets most aspects of the indicator; implementation of the indicator has occurred over several years and/or through changes in government, indicating likely sustainability.

4 = Country meets the aspects of the indicator; implementation has remained intact over multiple changes in government, economic fluctuations, changes in public opinion, and/or changing social conventions.

Source: IREX (Media Sustainability Index), <http://www.irex.org/resource/media-sustainability-index-msi-methodology>.

irex_professionalism

The second aspect or “objective” of MSI/IREX. It assesses whether the journalism of a country meets professional standards of quality. The score is obtained by averaging eight indicators:

1. Reporting is fair, objective, and well sourced.
2. Journalists follow recognized and accepted ethical standards.
3. Journalists and editors do not practice self-censorship.
4. Journalists cover key events and issues.
5. Pay levels for journalists and other media professionals are sufficiently high to discourage corruption.
6. Entertainment programming does not eclipse news and information programming.
7. Technical facilities and equipment for gathering, producing, and distributing news are modern and efficient.
8. Quality niche reporting and programming exists (investigative, economics/business, local, political).

And the scoring system is as following:

0 = Country does not meet the indicator; government or social forces may actively oppose its implementation.

1 = Country minimally meets aspects of the indicator; forces may not actively oppose its implementation, but business environment may not support it and government or profession do not fully and actively support change.

2 = Country has begun to meet many aspects of the indicator, but progress may be too recent to judge or still dependent on current government or political forces.

3 = Country meets most aspects of the indicator; implementation of the indicator has occurred over several years and/or through changes in government, indicating likely sustainability.

4 = Country meets the aspects of the indicator; implementation has remained intact over multiple changes in government, economic fluctuations, changes in public opinion, and/or changing social conventions.

Source: IREX (Media Sustainability Index), <http://www.irex.org/resource/media-sustainability-index-msi-methodology>.

irex_plurality/irex_plur_lag

The third aspect or “objective” of MSI/IREX. It assesses whether a country meets the objective to have multiple news sources that provide citizens with reliable, objective

news. Observations of irex_plurality refer to the situation in year_iv; rex_plur_lag refers to the situation in year_dv. The score is obtained by averaging seven indicators:

1. A plurality of affordable public and private news sources (e.g., print, broadcast, Internet) exists.
2. Citizens' access to domestic or international media is not restricted.
3. State or public media reflect the views of the entire political spectrum, are nonpartisan, and serve the public interest.
4. Independent news agencies gather and distribute news for print and broadcast media.
5. Independent broadcast media produce their own news programs.
6. Transparency of media ownership allows consumers to judge objectivity of news; media ownership is not concentrated in a few conglomerates.
7. A broad spectrum of social interests are reflected and represented in the media, including minority-language information sources.

And the scoring system is as following:

0 = Country does not meet the indicator; government or social forces may actively oppose its implementation.

1 = Country minimally meets aspects of the indicator; forces may not actively oppose its implementation, but business environment may not support it and government or profession do not fully and actively support change.

2 = Country has begun to meet many aspects of the indicator, but progress may be too recent to judge or still dependent on current government or political forces.

3 = Country meets most aspects of the indicator; implementation of the indicator has occurred over several years and/or through changes in government, indicating likely sustainability.

4 = Country meets the aspects of the indicator; implementation has remained intact over multiple changes in government, economic fluctuations, changes in public opinion, and/or changing social conventions.

Source: IREX (Media Sustainability Index), <http://www.irex.org/resource/media-sustainability-index-msi-methodology>.

irex_business

The fourth aspect or “objective” of MSI/IREX. It determines how well a country meets the objective to have independent media, which are well-managed businesses and allow editorial independence. The score is obtained by averaging seven indicators:

1. Media outlets and supporting firms operate as efficient, professional, and profit-generating businesses.
2. Media receive revenue from a multitude of sources.
3. Advertising agencies and related industries support an advertising market.
4. Advertising revenue as a percentage of total revenue is in line with accepted standards at commercial outlets.
5. Independent media do not receive government subsidies.
6. Market research is used to formulate strategic plans, enhance advertising revenue, and tailor products to the needs and interests of audiences.
7. Broadcast ratings and circulation figures are reliably and independently produced.

And the scoring system is as following:

0 = Country does not meet the indicator; government or social forces may actively oppose its implementation.

1 = Country minimally meets aspects of the indicator; forces may not actively oppose its implementation, but business environment may not support it and government or profession do not fully and actively support change.

2 = Country has begun to meet many aspects of the indicator, but progress may be too recent to judge or still dependent on current government or political forces.

3 = Country meets most aspects of the indicator; implementation of the indicator has occurred over several years and/or through changes in government, indicating likely sustainability.

4 = Country meets the aspects of the indicator; implementation has remained intact over multiple changes in government, economic fluctuations, changes in public opinion, and/or changing social conventions.

Source: IREX (Media Sustainability Index), <http://www.irex.org/resource/media-sustainability-index-msi-methodology>.

irex_institutions

The fifth aspect or “objective” of MSI/IREX. It assesses whether the supporting institutions of a country function in the professional interests of independent media. The score is obtained by averaging seven indicators:

1. Trade associations represent the interests of private media owners and provide member services.
2. Professional associations work to protect journalists’ rights.
3. NGOs support free speech and independent media.
4. Quality journalism degree programs that provide substantial practical experience exist.
5. Short-term training and in-service training programs allow journalists to upgrade skills or acquire new skills.
6. Sources of newsprint and printing facilities are in private hands, apolitical, and unrestricted.
7. Channels of media distribution (kiosks, transmitters, Internet) are private, apolitical, and unrestricted.

And the scoring system is as following:

0 = Country does not meet the indicator; government or social forces may actively oppose its implementation.

1 = Country minimally meets aspects of the indicator; forces may not actively oppose its implementation, but business environment may not support it and government or profession do not fully and actively support change.

2 = Country has begun to meet many aspects of the indicator, but progress may be too recent to judge or still dependent on current government or political forces.

3 = Country meets most aspects of the indicator; implementation of the indicator has occurred over several years and/or through changes in government, indicating likely sustainability.

4 = Country meets the aspects of the indicator; implementation has remained intact over multiple changes in government, economic fluctuations, changes in public opinion, and/or changing social conventions.

Source: IREX (Media Sustainability Index), <http://www.irex.org/resource/media-sustainability-index-msi-methodology>.

irex_overall

The average of the five objectives of MSI/IREX above, which provide an overall score of the observed country. It is interpreted by a 0-4 ordinal range:

Unsustainable, Anti-Free Press (0-1): Country does not meet or only minimally meets objectives. Government and laws actively hinder free media development, professionalism is low, and media-industry activity is minimal.

Unsustainable Mixed System (1-2): Country minimally meets objectives, with segments of the legal system and government opposed to a free media system. Evident progress in free-press advocacy, increased professionalism, and new media businesses may be too recent to judge sustainability.

Near Sustainability (2-3): Country has progressed in meeting multiple objectives, with legal norms, professionalism, and the business environment supportive of independent media. Advances have survived changes in government and have been codified in law and practice. However, more time may be needed to ensure that change is enduring and that increased professionalism and the media business environment are sustainable.

Sustainable (3-4): Country has media that are considered generally professional, free, and sustainable, or to be approaching these objectives. Systems supporting independent media have survived multiple governments, economic fluctuations, and changes in public opinion or social conventions.

Source: See **irex_freedom**, **irex_professionalism**, **irex_plurality**, **irex_business** and **irex_institutions**.

fhpolrht

The "Political Rights" level of the country, drawn from the annual reports of "Freedom in the World" published by the Freedom House. It is measured on a 1-7 rating scale, with "1" representing the highest degree of political freedom, and "7" the lowest.

Source: Freedom House (Freedom in the world), www.freedomhouse.org.

fhcivlib

The "Civil Liberties" level of the country, drawn from the annual reports of "Freedom in the World" published by the Freedom House. It is measured on a 1-7 rating scale, with "1" representing the highest degree of civil liberties, and "7" the lowest.

Source: Freedom House (Freedom in the world), www.freedomhouse.org.

fhranking

The overall Freedom House ranking of a country, measured by the combined average of **fhpolrht** and **fhcivlib**. Until 2003, countries whose combined average ratings for Political Rights and Civil Liberties fell between 1.0 and 2.5 were designated "Free"; between 3.0 and 5.5 "Partly Free", and between 5.5 and 7.0 "Not Free". Since then, countries whose ratings average 1.0 to 2.5 are considered "Free", 3.0 to 5.0 "Partly Free", and 5.5 to 7.0 "Not Free".

Source: See **fhpolrht** and **fhcivlib**.

fhplegal

The legal environment category in the “Freedom of Press” survey, published by Freedom House. It examines the laws and regulations that could influence media content and the government’s inclination to use these legal institutions to restrict media freedom.

Countries are assessed by a score ranging from 0-30 points, with “0” referring to the most liberal legal environment, and “30” to the least liberal legal environment. The score is the sum of the points allocated to the following eight methodology questions:

1. Do the constitution or other basic laws contain provisions designed to protect freedom of the press and of expression and are they enforced? (0-6 points).
2. Do the penal code, security laws, or any other laws restrict reporting and are journalists punished under these laws? (0-6 points).
3. Are there penalties for libeling officials or the state and are they enforced? (0-3 points).
4. Is the judiciary independent and do courts judge cases concerning the media impartially? (0-3 points).
5. Is freedom of information legislation in place and are journalists able to make use of it? (0-2 points).
6. Can individuals or business entities legally establish and operate private media outlets without undue interference? (0-4 points).
7. Are media regulatory bodies, such as a broadcasting authority or national press or communications council, able to operate freely and independently? (0-2 points).
8. Is there freedom to become a journalist and to practice journalism? (0-4 points).

Source: Freedom House (Freedom of Press),

http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=350&ana_page=348&year=2005.

fhppol

The political environment category in the “Freedom of Press” survey, published by Freedom House. It examines the degree of political control over news media content.

Countries are assessed by a score ranging from 0-40 points, with “0” referring to the most liberal political environment, and “40” to the least liberal political environment. The score is the sum of the points allocated to the following seven methodology questions:

1. To what extent are media outlets' news and information content determined by the government or a particular partisan interest? (0-10 points).
2. Is access to official or unofficial sources generally controlled? (0-2 points).
3. Is there official censorship? (0-4 points).
4. Do journalists practice self-censorship? (0-4 points).
5. Is media coverage robust and does it reflect a diversity of viewpoints? (0-4 points).
6. Are both local and foreign journalists able to cover the news freely? (0-6 points).
7. Are journalists or media outlets subject to extralegal intimidation or physical violence by state authorities or any other actor? (0-10 points).

Source: Freedom House (Freedom of Press),

http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=350&ana_page=348&year=2005.

fhpecon

The economic environment category in the “Freedom of Press” survey, published by Freedom House. It examines the general economic situation. Countries are assessed by a

score ranging from 0-30, with “0” refers to the most liberal economic environment, and “30” to the least liberal economic environment. The score is the sum of the points allocated to the following eight methodology questions:

1. To what extent are media owned or controlled by the government and does this influence their diversity of views? (0-6 points).
2. Is private media ownership transparent, thus allowing consumers to judge the impartiality of the news? (0-3 points).
3. Is private media ownership highly concentrated and does it influence diversity of content? (0-3 points).
4. Are there restrictions on the means of journalistic production and distribution? (0-4 points).
5. Does the state place prohibitively high costs on the establishment and operation of media outlets? (0-4 points).
6. Do the state or other actors try to control the media through allocation of advertising or subsidies? (0-3 points).
7. Do journalists receive payment from private or public sources whose design is to influence their journalistic content? (0-3 points).
8. Does the economic situation in a country accentuate media dependency on the state, political parties, big business, or other influential political actors for funding? (0-4 points).

Source: Freedom House (Freedom of Press),
http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=350&ana_page=348&year=2005.

fhprating/fhprating_lag

The overall score that assesses the level of press freedom of a country rating from 0 to 100. It is the total of the scores of the above three categories, **fhplegal**, **fhppol** and **fhpecon**. Countries scoring 0 to 30 are regarded as having “Free” media; 31 to 60, “Partly Free” media; and 61 to 100, “Not Free” media.. Observations of fhprating refer to the situation in year_iv; fhprating_lag refers to the situation in year_dv.

Source: See **fhplegal**, **fhppol** and **fhpecon**.

polity2

The revised combined polity score, a modified version of the Polity variable from the Polity IV project ranging from -10 to +10, whereby -10 is the lowest score – i.e. most authoritarian regime – and +10 is the highest score. It modifies the combined annual Polity score by applying a simple treatment, or fix to convert instances of “standardized authority scores” (i.e., -66, -77, and -88) to conventional polity scores.

In cases of mismatch between the Freedom House ranking and **polity2** score (i.e. in cases where a country has a **polity2** score above 0), the country will be assigned a value of “99” for **polity2**. Polity codes pertain to December 31 as of year_iv in the data set.

Source: Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2009, <http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>

rgdpch_lastv/econ

The one-year lag of the Real GDP per capita (Constant Prices: Chain series) from the Penn World Tables (PWT) 6.2 (e.g. the value listed for 2001 is the value of 2000 in the

PWT). If the year of the observation is not included in the PWT data, this variable is coded the value of the latest year available.

Source: Penn World Table Version 6.2,

http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/php_site/pwt62/pwt62_form.php

population

Total population.

Source: World Development Indicators (2008).

oilres

Based on oil reserves in billion barrels.

Source: Statistical Review of World Energy (www.bp.com, accessed January 12, 2012)

mena

Dummy variable for countries located in the Middle East and North Africa. Coded one if region equals four or five.

subafrica

Dummy variable for countries located in Sub-Saharan Africa. Coded one if region equals seven.

diffmediagovt

Based on country mean of WVS waves 2000 and 2005: “What is your degree of confidence towards the organizations below? – A great deal, quite a lot, not very much, none at all. Relevant answer categories included the press, television, government, political party/ies, and parliament/legislature. Based on the last three items I created a scale for political trust. To assess media credibility I subtracted the average level of political trust among respondents within a country from their average level of trust in the press or television. Coding runs from -1 (media much less trustworthy) to +1 (media much more trustworthy).

trustcases

dummy variable coded one if cases were included in regression analysis in Stockmann (2013), table 11.2, p. 252.

Bibliography

- Brownlee, Jason. 2007. *Authoritarianism in an Age of Democratization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Djankov, Simeon, Carlee McLiesh, Tatiana Nenova, and Andrei Shleifer. 2003. Who Owns the Media?. *Journal of Law and Economics* 46 (2): 341–81.
<http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/377116> (Accessed October 20, 2010).
- Geddes, Barbara. 1999. What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years? *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2(1): 115-144.
<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.115> (Accessed October 11, 2010).
- Hasebrink, Uwe and Wolfgang Schulz. 2002. *Internationales Handbuch der Medien*. 26th Edition. Nomos Verlag: Baden-Baden.
- Henisz, Witold J., Bennet A. Zelner and Mauro F. Guillén. 2005. The Worldwide Diffusion of Market-Oriented Infrastructure Reform, 1977–1999. *American Sociological Review*, 70 (6): 871-897.
- Heston, Alan, Robert Summers and Bettina Aten. 2006. *Penn World Table Version 6.2*, Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania, September. http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/php_site/pwt62/pwt62_form.php
- Howard, Philip N. and World Information Access Project. 2007. *World Information Access Report – 2007*. 9. Seattle: University of Washington.
http://www.wiareport.org/wp-content/uploads/wia_report_2007_with_map.pdf
- Warren, T. Camber. 2009. A House United: Mass Media Structure and the Emergence of Civil Conflict. Unpublished manuscript, Princeton University. <http://www.princeton.edu/politics/events/repository/public/faculty/AHU.pdf> (Accessed on October 11, 2010).
- Warren, T. Camber. 2008. Communicative Structure and the Emergence of Armed Conflict. PhD. dissertation. Duke University.
http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/606/D_Warren_Timothy_a_200805.pdf;jsessionid=0910D8D60E9D750304F33CE80B736C67?sequence=1 (Accessed on October 12, 2010).
- World Bank. 2008. *World Development Indicators*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank Publications.
- World Association of Newspapers. 2007. *World Press Trends*. Paris: World Association of Newspapers.