

# Identifying Ideologues: A Global Dataset on Political Leaders, 1945-2020

Accepted, *British Journal of Political Science*

## Abstract

Researchers have long studied how the ideology of political leaders affects policymaking and social welfare. The limited coverage of cross-country ideology datasets, however, has meant that researchers have mainly focused on Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. This letter therefore presents the Global Leader Ideology dataset, which vastly expands the scope of previous datasets by classifying chief executives as leftist, centrist, rightist, or non-ideological in 182 countries annually from 1945 or independence to 2020. The letter describes the dataset's contents and coding, compares it to existing datasets, and illustrates its uses by exploring how the ideologies of political leaders differ around the world and over time. The letter thereby outlines a research agenda on the global causes of chief executives' ideologies, and their effects on policies and socioeconomic outcomes.

**Key words:** ideology, dataset, political leaders, heads of government, global.

## Introduction

Scholars have long studied how the ideology of political leaders affects policymaking and social welfare.<sup>1</sup> The study of political leaders' ideologies and their effects, however, has been held back by the limited coverage of cross-country ideology datasets. While data on governments' ideologies have become more detailed and far-reaching, datasets still almost exclusively cover democratic countries in Europe and the Americas (e.g. Armingeon et al. 2019; Brambor et al. 2017; Huber and Stephens 2012; Jolly et al. 2022; Volkens et al. 2021). And the few exceptions have limited coverage across countries (Manzano 2017), time (Norris 2020), or many missing values (Cruz et al. 2021; Lührmann et al. 2020). Our knowledge of the ideological orientations of most of the world's governments and their effects on policymaking has thus remained limited.

This letter therefore presents the Global Leader Ideology dataset, which vastly expands the scope and refines the coding of existing datasets by identifying the economic ideology of chief executives in 182 countries on an annual basis from 1945 or independence to 2020. The dataset distinguishes between leftist, centrist, rightist, and chief executives with no discernible economic ideology, and covers both heads of government, and political leaders as identified by the Archigos project (Goemans et al. 2009). The dataset thereby provides unprecedented coverage of chief executives' ideologies across time and space.

---

<sup>1</sup> Potrafke (2017) provides an overview of about 100 studies.

The letter describes the dataset's contents and coding, compares it to existing datasets, and illustrates its uses. The data highlight that most chief executives around the globe have discernible ideologies, and that they differ between countries and over time. The dataset thereby allows scholars across Comparative Politics and International Relations to study both why the ideologies of political leaders differ, and how these differences affect their policies and social welfare, ranging from economic inequality and growth to international cooperation and the political status of women and minorities.

## **Existing datasets**

While previous data collection efforts have much improved our understanding of how governments' ideologies differ across space and time, the scope of existing datasets on the ideological orientations of political leaders has remained limited. They often cover exclusively or mostly industrialized democracies in Europe and North America (e.g. Armingeon et al. 2019; Brambor et al. 2017, Jolly et al. 2022; Volkens et al. 2021) or Latin America and the Caribbean (e.g. Huber and Stephens 2012), and exclude leaders and parties in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and the Middle East.

Other datasets tell us more about the ideological orientation of governments in these regions but have an otherwise limited coverage. Manzano (2017) covers the ideologies of chief executives globally, but only of dictators. The Global Party Survey

(Norris 2020) provides economic ideology measures for the largest political parties in most countries, yet only for the year 2019. And the Varieties of Party Identity and Organization (V-Party, Lührmann et al. 2020) provides ideology information for political parties in many countries since 1970, but it only covers election-years.

The dataset with the widest coverage across countries and time, and the one commonly used by researchers, has been the Database of Political Institutions (DPI; Cruz et al. 2021). For 180 countries from 1975 until 2020, the dataset annually codes the economic ideologies of a country’s chief executive and the largest government and opposition parties.

While far-reaching and fine-grained, the DPI’s ideology data has many missing values, non-transparent and contradictory sourcing, and possibly tautological reasoning.<sup>2</sup> It has high shares of observations without a coded ideology (approximately 40% for chief executives and the largest government party), especially in non-democracies and in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East. Its specific sources are unclear, and its primary source for parties’ ideologies — the editions of the Political Handbook of the World (Lansford 2019) — in a fair number of cases does not corroborate or even contradicts their own coding. And its coding rules allow for a chief executive’s ideology to be inferred from the policies they implemented — which risks

---

<sup>2</sup> These issues also hold for Ha’s (2012) extension of the DPI.

turning any analysis of the effects of political leaders' ideology on policymaking which relies on this data into a tautology.

Taken together, although existing datasets cover a fair share of countries and years and can tell us much about the ideological orientation of political leaders, their coverage ultimately has remained limited. The next section therefore presents a dataset on chief executives' ideologies with both comprehensive coverage across time and space and refined coding procedures.

## **Data contents and collection**

This letter introduces the Global Leader Ideology dataset, which identifies the chief executives, their parties, and their ideologies in 182 countries for each year from 1945 or independence to 2020.

The dataset codes the economic ideology and party affiliation of two types of chief executives: the head of government and the leader, the politically most powerful individual.<sup>3</sup> To identify the heads of government, a team of research assistants and I used data from the Varieties of Democracy-project (V-Dem, Coppedge et al. 2021), and supplanted it with information from Cahoon (2021), Schemmel (2021), and Lentz (1994). I identified leaders with data from the Archigos project (Goemans et al. 2009), with data for the years 2016-2020 added from Bell et al. (2021). In many cases, the

---

<sup>3</sup> Table A1 in the supplementary materials lists the countries and years covered.

head of government and the leader are the same person. When they differ, the head of government tends to be primarily responsible for domestic policymaking, while the leader often is a head of state focusing also or more on foreign policy. I coded the head of government and leader in office on December 31 of each year. In total, the dataset covers the heads of government in 178 countries from 1945 or independence to 2020, and the leaders in a set of 178 slightly different countries from 1945 or independence to 2020. The dataset thereby both covers chief executives in more countries, and — with V-Party and DPI starting in 1970 and 1975, respectively — covers them decades before existing datasets.

For these heads of government and leaders, the dataset distinguishes between a leftist, centrist, rightist, or no economic ideology, understood as the preferences over how much the state should intervene into the economy. Leftist chief executives are those that want the state to take an active role in the economy, while rightist chief executives want the state to rarely intervene. Centrist chief executives hold a middling position on this question.

Chief executives may be genuine believers or express these preferences for strategic reasons. Leftists may believe in increasing social equality and rightists in increasing freedom. Or they may in part hold their views because they want to attract social support, such as from workers or business owners. I only make a nominal distinction between leftist, centrist, and rightist chief executives because finer-grained measures — such as distinguishing between center- and far-leftist ideologies — may be

incomparable across the wide country and year coverage (Brambor and Lindvall 2018).

I generally assumed that a chief executive did not sufficiently change their ideology over time to warrant a different coding. Importantly, distinguishing chief executives based on their economic ideology does not mean that they did not have other views such as on the role of religion or ethnicity.

The ideology coding is based on many diverse sources. My research assistants and I drew on chief executives' own statements about their views and agendas, their personal background – such as membership in leftist student organizations – and secondary sources' descriptions of a chief executive's ideology, including the datasets by Brambor et al. (2017) and Manzano (2017). In many cases, we identified a chief executive's ideology by first identifying the party they were affiliated with, and then which ideology the party had. Finally, in rare instances we used chief executives' specific actions unrelated to policies, such as constitutional provisions for socialism or bans on leftist newspapers, or close ties to other political leaders.

We also relied on numerous sources to code chief executives' parties. For chief executives' party affiliation, we used information by Mattes et al. (2016), Cahoon (2021), Schemmel (2021), and many other sources. To identify parties' ideologies, we used wherever possible the datasets by Armingeon et al. (2019), Huber and Stephens (2012), the Global Party Survey, and V-Party, as well as information from Cahoon (2021), Döring and Manow (2020), the Perspective Monde project (2021), the DPI

party coding<sup>4</sup> – which we checked against the Political Handbooks of the World – and many additional sources, including parties’ memberships in international organizations such as the Socialist International. If we found evidence that the chief executive’s ideology deviated from their party, we coded their personal ideology.

To ensure the validity of the coding, we went to great lengths to not infer a chief executive’s ideology from their policies. We excluded any descriptions of implemented economic or social policies, such as the nationalization of companies or cuts to social services, and disregarded sources that seemed to base their assessment on such policies. We also sought to distinguish rightist and centrist economic positions from other issue dimensions, such as disregarding sources that used “rightist” or “centrist” in terms of social matters, ethnicity, or religion.

We further worked to make the coding consistent across sources and comparable across countries and years. We sought to base each coding on at least two sources, and often have more. When sources disagreed, we worked to either bolster one of the views or to resolve the discrepancy, such as because the ideology of the chief executive and their party differed. We preferred sources covering several or many countries, sources describing a chief executive’s views in detail, and academic and expert sources to newspaper reports. Finally, we used training vignettes, and two or more coders evaluated all the sources and the coding for each chief executive.

---

<sup>4</sup> The DPI’s coding rules for legislative parties does not mention the option of inferring their ideology from policies the party passes.



To make our coding transparent, we have written several hundred pages of country profiles. In addition to the information in the dataset — the annual head of government and leader, their parties, and their ideologies — the profiles list and often quote the sources used for each chief executive.

The dataset can be easily merged with other datasets on political parties and leaders by including a party’s PartyFacts ID (Döring and Regel 2019) and indicators for whether the chief executives match those identified by Brambor et al. (2017), Manzano (2017), and Mattes et al. (2016). Both the dataset and country profiles are available on my homepage ([bastianherre.com/data](http://bastianherre.com/data)) and GitHub ([github.com/bastianherre/global-leader-ideologies](https://github.com/bastianherre/global-leader-ideologies)).

## **Descriptive statistics**


The Global Leader Ideology dataset allows us to explore leaders’ ideological orientations worldwide. It reveals that most chief executives have identifiable ideologies: Figure 1 shows that among the 10,708 country-year observations covered for heads of governments, we only could not identify an ideological orientation – or found sources explicitly stating that they had none – for 760 (7%) observations.<sup>5</sup> Examples are monarchs Khalifah ibn Hamad Al Thani of Qatar and Bhutan’s Jigme Dorj Wangchuk. Among heads of governments with an identifiable ideology, leftist

---

<sup>5</sup> These are many fewer missing values than the 40% missing for DPI’s chief executives.

country-years constitute almost a majority (4,758 observations), with most other heads of government being rightist (4,206) and the remainder centrist (984). Examples of leftist chief executives include democrats Robert Fico of Slovakia and South Africa's Nelson Mandela, as well dictators Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt and North Korea's Kim Il Sung. Rightist chief executives include democratically elected Japanese prime minister Shinzo Abe and Lithuanian president Dalia Grybauskaite, as well as autocratic presidents François Duvalier of Haiti and Ivory Coast's Felix Houphouët-Boigny. Centrist chief executives include presidents Bill Clinton of the United States, Bambang Yudhoyono of Indonesia, and South Korea's Kim Dae-jung.

**Figure 1: Heads of government's ideologies across regimes, 1945-2020**



The dataset also shows that ideologies differ across regimes. Figure 1, with regime data from Lührmann et al. (2018), demonstrates that heads of government with a missing ideology preside almost exclusively over non-democracies.<sup>6</sup> Whereas they constitute a sizable minority (15%) of democratic country-years, centrist governments are relatively rare in dictatorships. In democracies, leftist and rightist heads of government are about equally common, while in dictatorships, leftist heads of government are clearly more common than rightist ones. This questions the common assumption that dictatorships are political systems of and for the wealthy (e.g. Acemoglu and Robinson 2006; Acemoglu et al. 2015), and instead corroborates and expands research suggesting that autocracies do not only differ in their political institutions, but also in the actors that run them (Manzano 2017).

When comparing the data on heads of government and leaders, I find that ideological cohabitation of chief executives is rare. Among the 26% of country-years for which the head of government and leader differ, their ideological orientation differs in only 20% of cases. The data thereby also speaks to debates about the commonality of cohabitation and pitfalls of systems of government (e.g. Samuels and Shugart 2010; Sedelius and Linde 2018).

---

<sup>6</sup> This may be because autocrats are more often non-ideological or that there is less information on them.

## Validation

To externally validate the data, Table 1 compares the Global Leader Ideology dataset to datasets by Brambor et al. (2017), Manzano (2017), the DPI, and V-Party. I find overlaps in a large majority of cases. Table 1 shows that when they identify the same chief executive, the ideologies match for 96% of observations compared to Brambor et al. (2017), and for 94% compared to Manzano (2017). The data is more difficult to compare to DPI and V-Party because DPI does not identify chief executives by name and V-Party identifies the ideologies of parties. For DPI, I therefore used its information on the system of government and assumed that in presidential systems their chief executive matches my leader, and my head of government in parliamentary and semi-presidential systems. Under this assumption, the ideology matches about 81% of the time<sup>7</sup>. To compare my data and V-Party, I collapse its data into leftist, centrist, and rightist parties, use PartyFacts IDs to link them to my heads of government, thereby assuming that party and head-of-government ideologies match. This yields about 77% matching observations. The main difference seems to be that Lührmann et al. (2020) assign an outright centrist ideology to more parties in their dataset than my dataset to its heads of government.

---

<sup>7</sup> Table A2 shows the results when using DPI's largest government parties and an overall measure of government ideology.

Overall, my dataset yields very similar results for the chief executives also included in other datasets, and similar results to datasets which are not as readily comparable.

**Table 1: Chief executives' ideologies across datasets**


|                       |          | Global Leader Ideology dataset |          |          |       |                       |
|-----------------------|----------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|-------|-----------------------|
|                       |          | Leftist                        | Centrist | Rightist | Total | matching observations |
| Brambor et al. (2017) | Leftist  | 728                            | 5        | 2        | 735   |                       |
|                       | Centrist | 15                             | 379      | 73       | 467   |                       |
|                       | Rightist | 3                              | 4        | 992      | 999   |                       |
|                       | Total    | 746                            | 388      | 1,067    | 2,201 | 95%                   |
| Manzano (2017)        | Leftist  | 1,969                          | 1        | 112      | 2,082 |                       |
|                       | Centrist | 0                              | 9        | 0        | 9     |                       |
|                       | Rightist | 122                            | 1        | 1,567    | 1,690 |                       |
|                       | Total    | 2,091                          | 11       | 1,679    | 3,781 | 94%                   |
| DPI                   | Leftist  | 2,081                          | 105      | 80       | 2,266 |                       |
|                       | Centrist | 95                             | 165      | 205      | 465   |                       |
|                       | Rightist | 169                            | 146      | 1,114    | 1,429 |                       |
|                       | Total    | 2,345                          | 416      | 1,399    | 4,160 | 81%                   |
| V-Party               | Leftist  | 3,034                          | 115      | 241      | 3,390 |                       |
|                       | Centrist | 492                            | 423      | 359      | 1,274 |                       |
|                       | Rightist | 341                            | 213      | 2,893    | 2,893 |                       |
|                       | Total    | 3,867                          | 751      | 2,939    | 7,557 | 77%                   |

## Illustrations

I further highlight the Global Leader Ideology dataset's uses by exploring how chief executives' ideologies differ across countries and over time.

I find that leaders' ideological orientations have not been equally common around the globe. Figure 2 graphs the share of leftist and rightist heads of government for each country between 1945 or independence and 2020. The graphs show that leftist heads of government have been especially prevalent in South and East Asia as well as Southern Africa, whereas rightist heads of government have been predominant in Western Europe and on the Arabian Peninsula. This again stresses that many governments beyond the commonly studied OECD have identifiable and diverse ideologies. The graph further shows that despite cross-regional and cross-national differences, many countries around the globe have experienced ideological changes, and have been headed by both leftist and rightist heads of government.

**Figure 2: Heads of government’s ideologies per country, 1945-2020**



I further find trends across regimes and different dynamics within them. Figure 3 gives the share of political leaders of each ideology per year.<sup>8</sup> Across regimes, the graph shows that leftist political leaders became increasingly common in the first few decades after World War II, increasing from a low of about 30% of all countries in 1950 to a high of more than 50% in the mid-1980s. This contrasts with Brambor and Lindvall’s (2018) finding for advanced industrialized democracies that the political left was relatively weak in the often-supposed ‘Golden Age’ of social democracy in the 1950s and 1960s. The global data instead suggest that leftist political leaders around

---


<sup>8</sup> I created this figure in Stata using Bischof’s (2017) graphic schemes.

the world were gaining ground during the Cold War. In the wake of its end, leftist leaders then became less and rightist ones more common, though political leaders until today have been most commonly leftist in almost all years. Since the mid-2000s, rightist leaders indeed have slightly lost ground to centrist leaders.

I moreover find that trends over time have differed between democracies and dictatorships. Using again regime data from Lührmann et al. (2018), I find that the trends for dictatorships and all regimes have been similar, as most countries have had non-democratic governments. Beyond these general similarities, however, leftist political leaders were even more predominant in dictatorships in the 1970s and 1980s, making up almost 60% of all non-democratic leaders. Leftist leaders in democracies were only predominant in democracies in the early 1970s, fluctuated in the 1980s and 1990s, and were less common than rightist leaders in a fair share of years. Rightist non-democratic leaders meanwhile – despite temporary gains in the 1990s and early 2000s – have become less and less common, making up only about 20% of all non-democratic leaders in 2020. This has gone along with more non-democratic leaders with no or a non-identifiable ideology. Finally, centrist non-democratic leaders have recently become more common, while centrist democratic leaders were prevalent (at time around 30% of all democratic leaders) in the 1950s and 1960s, but have since been relegated to a stable, but ultimately limited share of around 15% of democratic leaders.



**Figure 3: Heads of government’s economic ideology per year, 1945-2020**



## Conclusion

This letter presented the Global Leader Ideology dataset, which vastly expands the coverage of previous datasets on the ideologies of political leaders. The letter also illustrated the dataset’s uses by exploring differences in the ideological orientations of political leaders around the world and over time. I show that common assumptions that political leaders in many parts of the world are non-ideological or exclusively rightist are incorrect, and that they instead hold identifiable and diverse ideologies worldwide. These findings corroborate research that highlights political systems around

the globe do not only differ in their political institutions, but also in the actors that run them.

Beyond the descriptive illustrations in this letter, the dataset offers researchers new opportunities to study the causes and effects of political leaders' ideologies. Researchers can leverage the data to explore the global origins of the ideological orientation of chief executives, such as whether economic development and decolonization sparked the rise of leftist governments over time. And scholars can study the global consequences of political leaders' ideologies, such as whether leftist governments lower economic inequality while rightist governments promote economic growth, whether governments with the same ideology cooperate more internationally, and whether leftist governments empower historically marginalized groups. These opportunities promise to deepen and widen our understanding of how political leaders and their ideologies matter for politics.

**Supplementary Material.** An online appendix is available at: [Link]

**Data Availability Statement.** Replication data for this article can be found at: <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/RTLDXF>. The most recent version of the dataset can be found on the author's homepage and GitHub.

**Acknowledgements.** I thank Sophia Barkoff, Aaron Casella, Austin Christhilf, Amisha Kapur, Russell Legate-Yang, Julia Lodoen, Lysimachos Mavridis, Mariana Paez, Ivanna Shevel, Alexander Shura, Benjamin Silvian, Wen Li Teng, Sean Uribe, Joshua Zakharov, and Hsin Min Zee for their outstanding research assistance in collecting the ideology data. I further thank Michael Albertus, Sara García Arteagoitia, Carl Henrik Knutsen, James Robinson, Tobias Rommel, Carina Schmitt, Dan Slater, Susan Stokes, and Tore Wig for their comments on earlier iterations of the project.

**Financial Support.** This work was supported by the Pearson Institute for the Study and Resolution of Global Conflicts, the Institute for Humane Studies, the Division of the Social Sciences at the University of Chicago, the Center for International Social Science Research, and the Stigler Center for the Study of the Economy and the State.

**Competing interests.** None.

## References

- Acemoglu D and Robinson J** (2006) *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Acemoglu D, Naidu S, Restrepo P, and Robinson J** (2015) Democracy, Redistribution, and Inequality. In Bourguignon F and Atkinson A. *Handbook of Income Distribution*. Vol(2). Elsevier: Amsterdam, pp. 1885-1966.
- Armingeon K, Wenger V, Wiedemeier F, Isler C, Laura Knöpfel L, Weisstanner D, and Engler S** (2019) Supplement to the Comparative Political Data Set – Government Composition 1960-2017. Bern: Institute of Political Science, University of Berne. [https://www.cpsds-data.org/images/Update2021/Codebook\\_Government\\_Composition\\_1960-2019.pdf](https://www.cpsds-data.org/images/Update2021/Codebook_Government_Composition_1960-2019.pdf) (accessed April 21, 2022).
- Bell C, Besaw C, and Frank M** (2021) The Rulers, Elections, and Irregular Governance (REIGN) Dataset. One Earth Future. <https://oefdatascience.github.io/REIGN.github.io/> (accessed April 21, 2022).
- Bischof D** (2017) New graphic schemes for Stata: plotplain and plotting. *Stata Journal* **17**(3), 748-759.
- Brambor T, Lindvall J, and Stjernquist A** (2017) The Ideology of Heads of Government, 1870-2012. Department of Political Science, Lund University. Lund.

**Brambor T, and Lindvall A** (2018) The Ideology of Heads of Government, 1870-2012. *European Political Science* **17**(2), 211-222.

**Cahoon B** (2021) World Statesmen. <https://www.worldstatesmen.org> (accessed November 18, 2021).

**Coppedge M, Gerring J, Knutsen CH, Lindberg S, Teorell J, Alizada N, Altman D, Bernhard M, Cornell A, Fish MS, Gastaldi L, Gjerløw H, Glynn A, Hicken A, Hindle G, Ilchenko N, Krusell J, Lührmann A, Maerz S, Marquardt K, McMann K, Mechkova V, Medzihorsky J, Paxton P, Pemstein D, Pernes J, von Römer J, Seim B, Sigman R, Skaaning SE, Staton J, Sundström A, Tzelgov E, Wang YT, Wig T, Wilson S, and Ziblatt D** (2021) *V-Dem [Country-Year/Country-Date] Dataset v11.1*. Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project. <https://v-dem.net/dsarchive.html> (accessed April 21, 2022).

**Cruz C, Keefer P, and Scartascini C** (2021) The Database of Political Institutions 2020. Inter-American Development Bank. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18235/0003049> (accessed April 21, 2022).

**Döring H, and Regel S** (2019) Party Facts: A database of political parties worldwide. *Party Politics* **25**(2), 97-109.

- Döring H, and Manow P** (2020) Parliaments and governments database (ParlGov): Information on parties, elections and cabinets in modern democracies. Development version. <https://www.parlgov.org/> (accessed April 21, 2022).
- Goemans H, Gleditsch K, and Chiozza G** (2009) Introducing Archigos: A dataset of political leaders. *Journal of Peace Research* **46**(2), 269-283.
- Ha E** (2012) Globalization, Government Ideology, and Income Inequality in Developing Countries. *Journal of Politics* **74**(2), 541-557.
- Herre B** (2022) Replication Data for: Identifying Ideologues: A Global Dataset on Political Leaders, 1945-2020. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/RTLDXF>, Harvard Dataverse, V1. UNF:6:IyHRkjOELmARUkUDvqcwlg==
- Huber E, and Stephens J** (2012) Latin America and the Caribbean Political Dataset, 1945-2012. University of North Carolina. <https://huberandstephens.web.unc.edu/common-works/data/> (accessed April 21, 2022).
- Lansford T** (ed) (2019) *Political Handbook of the World 2018-2019*. Thousand Oaks: CQ Press.
- Lentz H** (1994) *Heads of States and Governments*. London: McFarland and Co.
- Lührmann A, Tannenberg M, and Lindberg S** (2018) Regimes of the world (RoW): Opening new avenues for the comparative study of political regimes. *Politics and Governance* **6**(1), 60-77.

- Lührmann A, Düpont N, Higashijima M, Kavasoglu Y, Marquardt K, Bernhard M, Döring H, Hicken A, Laebens M, Lindberg S, Medzihorsky J, Neundorf A, Reuter OJ, Ruth-Lovell S, Weghorst K, Wiesehomeier N, Wright J, Alizada N, Bederke P, Gastaldi L, Grahn S, Hindle G, Ilchenko N, von Römer J, Wilson S, Pemstein D, and Seim B** (2020) Varieties of Party Identity and Organization (V-Party) Dataset V1. Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project. <https://www.v-dem.net/vpartyds.html>
- Manzano D** (2017) *Bringing Down the Educational Wall: Political Regimes, Ideology, and the Expansion of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mattes M, Leeds AB, and Matsumura N** (2016) Measuring change in source of leader support: The CHISOLS dataset. *Journal of Peace Research* **53**(2), 259-267.
- Norris P** (2020) Measuring populism worldwide. *Party Politics* **26**(6), 697-717.
- Perspective Monde** (2021) <http://perspective.usherbrooke.ca> (accessed November 18, 2021).
- Jolly S, Bakker R, Hooghe L, Marks G, Polk J, Rovny J, Steenbergen M, Vachudova M** (2022) Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999-2019. *Electoral Studies* **75**, 102420.
- Potrafke N** (2017) Partisan politics: The empirical evidence from OECD panel

studies. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **45**(4), 712-750.

**Samuels D, and Shugart M** (2010) *Presidents, Parties, Prime Ministers: A Framework for Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Schemmel B** (2021) Rulers. <http://rulers.org/> (accessed November 18, 2021).

**Sedelius T and Linde J** (2018) Unravelling semi-presidentialism: democracy and government performance in four distinct regime types. *Democratization* **25**(1), 136-157.

**Volkens A, Burst T, Krause W, Lehmann P, Matthieß T, Regel S, Weßels B, and Zehnter L** (2021) The Manifesto Data Collection. *Manifesto Project (MRG/CMP/MARPOR). Version 2021a*. Berlin. <https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/datasets> (accessed April 25, 2022).