Codebook for the LATINNO dataset: Technical report

Pogrebinschi, Thamy

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB)

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Pogrebinschi, T. (2021). *Codebook for the LATINNO dataset: Technical report.* (Discussion Papers / Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Forschungsschwerpunkt Wandel politischer Systeme, Abteilung Demokratie und Demokratisierung, SP V 2021-101). Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH.
https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-95059-9

WZB
Berlin Social Science Center

Thamy Pogrebinschi

Codebook for the LATINNO Dataset
Technical Report

Discussion Paper
SP V 2021-101
June 2021

Research Area
Dynamics of Political Systems
Research Unit
Democracy and Democratization

WZB Berlin Social Science Center
Reichpietschufer 50
10785 Berlin
Germany
www.wzb.eu

Pogrebinschi, Thamy
Codebook for the LATINNO Dataset
Technical Report
Discussion Paper SP V 2021-101
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (2021)

Affiliation of the author

Thamy Pogrebinschi

WZB Berlin Social Science Center
Reichpietschufer 50
10785 Berlin
Germany

Email: thamy.pogrebinschi@wzb.eu

Contents

1. Presentation

LATINNO (Innovations for Democracy in Latin America) is the first and so far the most comprehensive and systematic source of data on new forms of citizen participation that have evolved in Latin America – the so-called democratic innovations. The LATINNO database gathers data on democratic innovations developed in 18 Latin American countries between 1990 and 2020. The data is coded for 43 variables related to the context, institutional design, and impact of each innovation. Along with the quantitative data, qualitative information on each case has also been gathered and assessed.

The countries covered by LATINNO are: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Additionally, the database also registers transnational cases with similar institutional design that take place in more than one country.

LATINNO sought to emphasize that democracy in Latin America encompasses more than elections, and that new forms of citizen participation go beyond protests and demonstrations. The evidence collected by the LATINNO database shows that the growing volume and scope of participatory innovations should not be ignored by assessments of democracy in Latin America.

The project and database were designed to fill the gap on comparative knowledge about democratic innovations. More than providing information on individual cases, LATINNO sought to underscore the diversity of new democratic institutional designs and experimentations with citizen participation in Latin America. The data we have gathered and processed enables cross-country comparison over thousands of different institutional designs in 18 countries.

In this codebook, we present the conceptual elements that allow for the identification of democratic innovations and offer the detailed instructions that were used to collect and assess data on each individual case according to their context, institutional design and impact. This codebook has served as basis for the project's endeavor to collect, assess, and generate valid and reliable data between 2015 and 2020.

2. Democratic Innovations as Analytical Units (Cases)

LATINNO adopts a broad definition of democratic innovation, and comprises various forms of political experimentation, provided that they involve citizen participation and are designed to impact on the public policy cycle.

Each *case* means a particular experimentation with citizen participation, which is a specific *institutional design*, and not every single occurrence of one same innovation. For instance, LATINNO does not count every single implementation of the participatory budgeting (PB) as a case. In our database, there would be no more than three cases of PB per country: face-to-face PB, online PB, and multi-channel PB[1]. Based on the available information, we do however try to register how many of each of these three institutional designs have existed or are active in each country, and in which cities they have been implemented. The same

[1] Exceptionally, we code more than one type of PB per country if there are essential differences in institutional design, i.e. whether they are mandatory or elective, dedicated to a specific policy issue, using particular means for voting or a combination thereof, etc.

logic applies to other types of innovations with several implementations/occurrences within a single country. However, where there is variation in the institutional design, we code as a separate case.
LATINNO's database covers as many cases as our team has been able to find in each country until reaching a stage of data exhaustion. After a long experimental phase and a pilot project, we have developed and tested a procedure to search, code and assess information on democratic innovations. We have devised a protocol to search information, which includes: academic sources, civil society organizations, governments, international organizations, existing databanks, and the media. The primary and secondary data we rely on comprise academic work, research reports, impact assessments, constitutions, laws, administrative norms, policies, governmental programs, and different media outlets. The data is extracted from these sources and coded following this codebook, which has been drafted and adjusted several times during our experimental stage to better reflect the empirical reality.

3. Conceptual Framework: The Means of Participation and the Ends of Innovation

Democratic innovations are usually defined by the specialized literature as institutions designed to foster citizen participation (Warren and Pearse 2008; Smith 2009). In this reading, it is the specific goal of *promoting citizen participation* that qualifies a new institutional design as a democratic innovation. LATINNO understands democratic innovations more broadly, but at the same time with a very specific perspective.
The LATINNO framework challenges this conceptualization, as it considers that citizen participation is not simply the *end*, but mainly the *means* of democratic innovation. LATINNO understands democratic innovations as "*institutions, mechanisms* and *processes* whose *ends* aim to strengthen at least one of the five dimensions of the quality of democracy through one of the four *means* of participation, and which can have an *impact* on at least one of the stages of the *policy cycle*" (Pogrebinschi, 2021). The four means of participation in democratic innovation can combine in different ways and are often interrelated, however, these categories represent four distinct forms that citizen participation can take: deliberation, citizen representation, e- participation, and direct voting.
LATINNO assumes that the ends of democratic innovation are the many dimensions of the quality of democracy, such as accountability, responsiveness, political inclusion, social equality, and the rule of law. The ends of innovation are based on the categories that are now standard in assessments of the quality of democracy inspired by Morlino's (2012) work. The categories have been adapted and expanded to better capture the design of democratic innovations. These adaptions stem from the empirical cases of the LATINNO Dataset. To our understanding, the different forms of citizen participation are a means to achieve those ends.
Such an approach of means and ends, initially called *pragmatic* (Pogrebinschi 2013), lies at the core of the LATINNO project. The LATINNO database shows that those many means and ends combine in different ways, and that such experimentalism is characteristic of democracy in Latin America, where citizen participation evolves within the representative system without competing with it.

4. The Codebook: Structure

The LATINNO codebook indicates and describes all the variables and values that allow to capture each individual case that constitutes the dataset. Each case is coded for three sets of variables related to context, institutional design, and impact.
Context variables are designed to reflect the conditions of emergence of a specific democratic innovation. This set of variables seeks to answer the questions of where, when, for how long and under which government a democratic innovation has come to exist.
Institutional design variables capture the features and functioning of each case, and allow to report on the formal conditions and internal organization of a case, the means and ends of participation, policy areas and policy cycle stages affected.
Impact variables seek to reflect whether the democratic innovation has taken place as designed and projected, and to which extent it has been successful in reaching its aims, impacting the ends, and producing output and outcomes.

5. Data

The data is accessible on the project's website http://www.latinno.net/. In addition, the entire data set is permanently available and archived in the research data repository "SowiDataNet | datorium" at https://doi.org/10.7802/2278 after the expiration of an embargo.

When using the data, please cite as follows:
Pogrebinschi, Thamy (2021): LATINNO Database on Democratic Innovations in Latin America. Version 1.0.0. WZB Berlin Social Science Center. Dataset. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7802/2278

6. The LATINNO Codebook – V.12.2020

Variable	Codes and Instructions
CONTEXT	
ID Assigned by country. See Appendix II	Numeric: Country Code + Case Number
1.Country Choose name of the country.	Select from List
2.Description Coders should write case descriptions based on information gathered from all consulted sources.	String
3.Innovation_Name_EN Name of Democratic Innovation (English Translation)	String
4.City/Municipality/Region The name of the city or region where the DI is implemented (original language). If more than one, separate them by ",". If too many to enumerate or DI takes place in most municipalities, code "NA".	String NA Non-Applicable
5.Year of Start The year when the DI was created/ first implemented; or year of first evidence.	Numeric: Year . *(No info)*
6.Year of Conclusion The year when the DI ended; or of last evidence. If DI is still underway, code "ongoing".	Numeric: Year Ongoing . *(No info)*
DESIGN	
7.Name_of_Organization_in_Charge The names of all organizations in charge of the DI (original language), separated by ",".	String
8.Type_of_Organization_in_Charge Select option from list for the type of organization(s) in charge of the DI.	Government (GOV) Civil Society (CS) International Organization (IO) Private Stakeholder (PS) GOV/CS GOV/IO GOV/PS CS/IO CS/PS IO/PS GOV/CS/IO GOV/CS/PS CS/IO/PS GOV/IO/PS All

9.Branch_of_State When a state organization is in charge (also if together with CS, IO or PS), the branch and the level should be indicated individually or in combination according to the options in the list.	Local Executive Regional Executive National Executive Local Parliament Regional Parliament National Parliament Judiciary National Executive/National Parliament Local Executive/National Executive Local Executive/Regional Executive Regional Executive/National Executive Local Executive/Regional Execu- tive/National Executive NA
10.Level-1 For Level-1, select from list on which level or level combination the innovation has been implemented (e.g. local, regional, national...).	Local Regional National Local/Regional Local/National Local/Regional/National Regional/National Transnational *. (No info)*
11.Level-2 For Level-2, select from list the level of implementation for the case based on the following equivalences.	1 Local (Local or Local/National or Local/Regional) 2 Regional (Regional or Regional/National) 3 National (National or Local/Regional/National) 4 Transnational *. (No info)*
12.Scope Select from list if the scope/coverage/reach of the democratic innovation despite its level of implementation.	Local Regional National Transnational *. (No info)*
13.Frequency Indicate how often the DI takes place/has taken place.	Single *(occurred only one single time)* Sporadic *(>1 occurrence, but not necessarily regular)* Regular *(occurrence is periodic or permanent)* *. (No info)*

14.Formalization Assess the degree of institutionalization of the DI by considering its embeddedness in the country's constitutional, legal or administrative framework.	0 *(DI is not backed by constitution nor legislation nor by any governmental policy or program)* 1 *(DI is only backed by a governmental program or policy. Formalization derives from an administrative act – e.g. regulation, decree, manual, code, resolution, agreement – or from decisions of the public administration – e.g. ministries, secretariats, agencies etc.–)* 2 *(DI is embedded in the Constitution/legislation, e.g. law, statute, regulation, decree. Formalization derives from a normative act enacted by the Legislative branch)* *. (No info)*
15.Decisiveness Indicate the type of decision that is taken by/within the Democratic Innovation	0 *(DI yields no decision)* 1 *(DI yields a non–binding decision)* 2 *(DI yields a binding decision)* . No info
16.Co-governance Indicate if the government is involved in any stage of the DI process. Dummy variable where 1 means co-governance and 0 no co-governance.	0 No 1 Yes *. (No info)*
17.Type_of_Participants Indicate the type(s) of participant(s) by selecting a value or combination from the list.	Citizens CSO *(Civil Society Organizations, NGOs, academia)* PS *(Private Stakeholders: companies, business associations)* Citizens + CSO CSO + PS CSO + PS + Citizens Citizens + PS *. (No info)*
18.Mode_of_Selection_of_Participants Indicate the selection method through which the DI process allows for participation of citizens.	Open *(general public, no restrictions or selection method)* Restricted *(any kind of selection or condition for participation)* Both *. (No info)*
19.Primary_Means Select main form of participation in the DI (see concept definitions in Pogrebinschi 2021).	Deliberation Direct Voting E-Participation Citizen Representation NA Non-Applicable (available for variable 20 only)
20.Secondary_Means	

21.Primary_End Indicate which dimension of the quality of democracy the DI's institutional design aims at enhancing (see concept definitions in Pogrebinschi 2021).	Social Equality *(Redistribution, Social Inclusion, Improvement of Life Conditions, Economic and Social Rights)* Political Inclusion *(Recognition, Empowerment, Capacity Building, Inclusion of Minority and Underrepresented Groups, Cultural Rights, Political Rights of Participation)* Responsiveness *(Issue Congruence, Preference Expression and Formation)* Accountability *(Monitoring, Efficiency, Transparency, Publicity)* Rule of Law *(Law Enforcement, Security, Conflict Resolution, Access to Justice, Constitution Making and Human Rights, Civic Rights)* All Ends NA Non-Applicable (value available for variables 22 to 24 only)
22.Secondary_End	
23.Tertiary_End	
24.Quartiary_End	
25.Primary_Policy_Issue Select main policy area concerned by the DI.	Social Policy *(e.g. service delivery of rights and goods, poverty reduction, minority groups)* Urban Planning and Local Development *(e.g. local infrastructure projects, urbanization, urban governance)* Environment *(e.g. protection of natural resources, industrial or mining pollution)* Capacity Building *(e.g. improvement of citizens and groups skills and abilities, empowerment)* Covid-19 (*e.g. creation of datasets to trace numbers of cases and deaths, mapping of existing health infrastructure, collaborative campaigns to mitigate impact on vulnerable groups*) Budget *(e.g. budget allocation, reallocation, prioritization)* Transparency and Monitoring *(e.g. evaluation and provision of public information, oversight reports, open data for governments)* Institutional Performance *(e.g. evaluations of public accountability, proposals to improve existing institutions, recall, constitutional reform)*
26.Secondary_Policy_Issue	

	Security, Justice and Rights *(e.g.: community police, access to courts, conflict resolution, human rights, access to rights)* Rural Development *(e.g. agricultural projects, capacity–building programs in rural areas)* Culture and Sports *(e.g. culture and arts, heritage, sports and leisure activities)* Economy and Industry *(e.g. promotion of specific productive sectors and economic activities, solidary economy)* Communications and Technology *(e.g. ICTs, media regulation)* Infrastructure *(e.g. water, energy, transportation, services)* Foreign Policy *(e.g. international treaties, cooperation, regional integration, migration)* Many Other Policies NA Non-Applicable (available for variable 26 only)
27.Sub-category_of_Social_Policy If Social Policy was selected for variables 29 or 30, select sub-type, topic, group or area policy affected.	Social Rights and Goods: Education Social Rights and Goods: Health Social Rights and Goods: Social Assistance Social Rights and Goods: Food Sovereignty Social Rights and Goods: Housing Social Rights and Goods: Various Social Rights and Goods: Others Minority Groups: Women Minority Groups: Indigenous Groups Minority Groups: Afro-descendent Groups Minority Groups: Disabled People Minority Groups: Youth Minority Groups: Elderly Minority Groups: Migrants Minority Groups: LGTB Minority Groups: Various Minority Groups: Others Poverty Reduction Buen Vivir Many Others NA Non-Applicable

28.Primary_Policy_Cycle Indicate stage(s) of policy cycle impacted by the DI process. (See definitions in Pogrebinschi 2021)	Agenda-setting Formulation and Decision-Making Implementation Evaluation All stages NA Non-Applicable (value available for variables 29 and 30 only)
29.Secondary_Policy_Cycle	
30.Tertiary_Policy_Cycle	
31.Type_of_Institutional_Design Assign the type of institutional design that better fits the combination of variables coded so far. (See definitions in Pogrebinschi 2021)	Citizen Assembly Citizen Oversight Citizens' Initiative Collaborative Administration Consultation Crowdsourced Policymaking Deliberative Council Deliberative Table Digital Campaign Digital Oversight Face-to-Face Participatory Budget Innovation Lab Management Council Multichannel Participatory Budget Multilevel Policymaking Online Participatory Budget Participatory Planning Participatory Policy Implementation Policymaking Platform Popular Recall Prior Consultation Referendum and Plebiscite Representative Council Other

32.Kind_of_Innovation Indicate the nature of the case. (See definitions in Pogrebinschi 2021)	Institution *(e.g. organs, bodies, formalized or regular)* Mechanism *(e.g. tools, events, single or sporadic)* Process *(e.g. sequential, multi-level, single or regular but split in time)*
IMPACT	
33.Number_of_Cases-1_(absolute) Register the exact number of cases (=implementations/occurrences/events) of the innovation found, if any.	Numeric . *(No Info)*
34.Number_of_Cases-2_(interval) Select the interval that matches that number (or reasonable assumption).	1 2-100 101-1000 >1000 . *(No info)*
35.Volume_of_Participation-1_(absolute) Register the exact number of participants found, if any.	Numeric . *(No info)*
36.Volume_of_Participation-2_(interval) Select the interval that matches that number (or reasonable assumption).	0 – 50 51 - 100 101 - 500 501 - 1000 1001 - 5000 5001 - 10000 10001 - 50000 50001 - 100000 100001 - 500000 500001 - 1 million > 1 million . *(No info)*
37.Implementation Indicate whether the DI's formal design has been carried out or implemented in reality.	0 *(Explicit evidence of no implementation, even after publication or announcement of the respective DI)* 1 *(Explicit evidence of partial implementation of DI – i.e. it was not implemented as planned or not all the stages or goals have been achieved–)* 2 *(Explicit evidence of full implementation)* . *(No info)*
38.Fulfillment_of_DI's_Aim Indicate if specific aim or goals of the DI's design were achieved and cite source in the qualitative report.	0 *(Not fulfilled)* 1 *(Partially fulfilled)* 2 *(Fulfilled)* NA Non-Applicable *(in cases of no implementation)* . *(No info)*

39.Impact_on_DI's_Ends_(qualities_of_democracy) Indicate if there is clear evidence of the achievement of the DI's ends and cite source in the qualitative report.	0 *(No impact)* 1 *(Partial impact)* 2 *(Positive impact)* NA Non-Applicable *(in cases of no implementation)* . *(No info)*
40.DI's_Output Indicate if the DI generated an output? (e.g. policy recommendations, initiatives, decisions, guidelines, plans).	0 No 1 Yes . *(No info)* NA Non-Applicable
41.DI's_Outcome Indicate if, in case of policy output, it was enacted or implemented.	0 No 1 Yes . (*No info)* NA Non-Applicable *(in cases of output 0 or NA)*

7. Appendix I: Definitions and Coding Guidelines

7.1. The Means[2]

7.1.1. Deliberation:

Deliberative innovations are innovations in which the primary means are the communicative exchange among citizens, state officials and/or private stakeholders. These include all forms of dialogue, interaction, and mutual communication in which participants have the chance to *voice* their positions and hear the position of others.

7.1.2. Citizen Representation:

Citizen representation reflects the circumstances in which non-elected citizens advocate for others or speak on their behalf by voicing or implementing their interests and demands, with or without formal authorization or mandate. It may, to some extent, reproduce the traditional institutions and procedures of electoral representation and take the form of delegation, appointment, self-selection, or group intermediation.

7.1.3. Direct Voting:

Citizens vote to directly decide or express their opinion on policy issues or political matters. This includes the traditional instruments of direct democracy, namely popular recall, plebiscite, referendum, and citizens' initiatives, as well as other forms of consultation where a single manifestation of opinion or will is required.

7.1.4. E-Participation:

In digital democratic innovations, citizen participation relies on information and communication technologies (ICTs). Citizens use smartphones, computers, tablets with access to the internet, as well as mobile devices such as cell phones, and even analog devices that allow the expression of opinions and preferences through phone calls or message services. E-participation can take place in a variety of forms, but to be considered a participatory innovation, they must involve *active* citizen engagement, and not simply open access to data or dissemination of information.

[2] Adapted from Pogrebinschi 2021

7.2. The Ends[3]

7.2.1. Accountability:

Democratic innovations, whose main end is to achieve accountability, comprise all non-electoral forms of rendering governments, institutions, elected officials and representatives accountable, that is,
answerable and responsible for their actions and inactions. This can take the form of monitoring institutional performance, disclosing public information, sanctioning public agents, and the oversight of public services delivery.

7.2.2. Responsiveness:

Responsiveness refers to forms of signal-emission from citizens regarding their policy preferences, demands, opinions, and needs. Innovations aimed at improving responsiveness also comprise forms through which these signals can be received by governments and considered in their decisions.

7.2.3. Rule of Law:

Democratic innovations can aim to secure, enforce or strengthen the rule of law through diverse forms of enacting laws and rights, granting both individual and public security, preventing and controlling crime, curbing potential abuses of state power, ensuring an independent administration of justice, resolving conflicts, and providing access to justice. Democratic innovations that fall into this category are also concerned with the protection of human rights.

7.2.4. Political Inclusion:

Democratic innovations whose main end is political inclusion target those who have been historically excluded from the political process. These may be social, cultural or ethnic minorities, as well as any other underrepresented groups, regardless of their numbers (such as women). Groups of people who share a common characteristic (such as the elderly and youth), have a special need (such as persons with disabilities), or are affected by the same situation (such as migrants) also fall under this category. These innovations seek to ensure the presence of these groups in existing institutions, and also to create new spaces and processes in which they set the agenda and formulate new policies that are sensitive to their collective identities and interests.

7.2.5. Social Equality:

Social equality is the end of a democratic innovation when it aims to improve the living conditions, wellbeing, and capabilities of individuals, groups, and communities. These innovations provide spaces or mechanisms to the benefit of those in socially or economically disadvantaged situations. They may address social and economic policies, as

[3] Adapted from Pogrebinschi 2021

well as basic rights and goods, with the ultimate goal of combatting poverty, income inequality, and poor social and public service delivery.

7.3. Guidelines for further variables

7.3.1. Variables 32 to 34: Policy Cycle

These variables indicate the stage or stages of the policy cycle affected (or aimed at affecting) by the case. For a complete definition, see Pogrebinschi 2021. To the ends of coding, we understand the stages as follows:

- Agenda Setting: Problem recognition and issue selection.
- Policy Formulation and Decision Making: Includes the definition of objectives and the consideration of different action alternatives, as well as the drafting of the policy
- Policy Implementation: Execution and enforcement of policy.
- Policy Evaluation: Monitoring and assessment of public policies implementation and their outputs and outcomes

7.3.2. Variable 37: Number of Cases

This variable captures the total number of implementations or occurrences of the democratic innovation in the country, or an estimation based on available sources. While each case represents one specific institutional design, this variable captures how many times that same case took place or was conducted.
E.g.: Health Councils in Brazil: The number of councils should be registered here for the entire country, although they represent one single case in the database. The same procedure applies to any other similar participatory institution spread throughout the national/regional territory.
If there is a substantive variation in the institutional design, then these cases will be coded separately.

7.3.3. Variable 38: Number of Participants

This variable captures the sum of all individual participants in each case. For of collegiate bodies of permanent or sporadic character, where participants or representatives regularly intervene and/or are the same individual, they are counted only once. For cases implemented more than once (see above: Variable 37: Number of Cases), we register the sum of the total number of participants of all implementations or occurrences.

7.3.4. Variable 40: Fulfillment of DI's Aims

This variable seeks to capture whether there is evidence that the DI has been implemented and/or whether the case a) did not take place, b) was disrupted or c) was only planned and not implemented. E.g.: If the DI is a consultation, which has taken place, we consider the aim of the DI to have been fulfilled. However, if the consultation was initiated but could not be concluded, or the votes could not be counted, then it has not fulfilled its aim.

7.3.5. Variable 41: Impact on DI's Ends

This variable is coded only in cases where there is evidence that shows that the end or ends pursued by the DI (i.e. accountability, political inclusion, responsiveness, social equality and/or rule of law) has/have been achieved. This variable demands analytical evidence that demonstrates the ability of the DI to improve the dimensions of the quality of democracy.

8. Appendix II: ID codes per country

ID	Country
1000	Argentina
2000	Bolivia
3000	Brazil
4000	Chile
5000	Colombia
6000	Costa Rica
7000	Dominican Republic
8000	Ecuador
9000	El Salvador
10000	Guatemala
12000	Honduras
13000	Mexico
14000	Nicaragua
15000	Panama
16000	Paraguay
17000	Peru
18000	Uruguay
19000	Venezuela

References

Analytical Framework:

Pogrebinschi, Thamy (2013): Democratic Innovations and Quality of Democracy: Do we need new and more creative recipes? Paper presented at the European Consortium for Political Research Annual Conference, Bordeaux, September 4-7, 2013

Pogrebinschi, Thamy (2018): "Can Participatory Governance improve the Quality of Democracy?" A Response from Latin America. In: Huber Heinelt (ed.). Handbook on Participatory Governance. London: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 94-116.

Pogrebinschi, Thamy (2021): *Innovating Democracy? The Means and Ends of Citizen Participation in Latin America*. Book Manuscript (under review)

Qualities of Democracy:

Morlino, Leonardo (2012): *Changes for democracy*. Actors, Structures, Process. Oxford: Oxford University Press