Democracy and Data Dissemination: The Effect of Political Regime on Transparency[1]

B. Peter Rosendorff[2] and James Raymond Vreeland[3]

Version 7, June 2006

[1] Many thanks to David Singer, and seminar participants at Syracuse University and UCLA.

[2]Associate Professor of Politics, New York University, 726 Broadway, Seventh Floor New York, N.Y. 10003-9580.

[3]Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University, 124 Prospect St., New Haven, CT 06520-8301.

Abstract: Are democracies more transparent than other types of political regimes? The answer to this question is often assumed to be yes. Yet the logic and empirical implications behind this assertion have not been rigorously tested. We investigate theoretically the willingness of policymakers to provide credible announcements of intended inflation and unemployment rates, and show that the availability (or absence) of that data is correlated with regime type, even after controlling for level of development, participation in IMF programs, and country-specific effects. Democracies are indeed more transparent.

Are democracies more transparent than other political regimes? The answer to this question is often assumed to be yes. Indeed, in the minds of many, transparency has become synonymous with democracy. As Shapiro (2003: 200) suggests, "democratic leaders can never be entirely free from a commitment to truth-telling." Yet the logic and empirical implications behind this assertion have not been rigorously tested. As Mitchell (1998: 110) notes, "few scholars have made transparency the focus of study," even though "many literatures discuss transparency or touch on topics related to transparency" (Lindley 1996: 4, cited in Mitchell 1998: 110).

In this study, we build a theoretical argument as to the conditions under which governments prefer to have credible information available about their policy choices and the associated economic outcomes. In an environment of electoral uncertainty, we show that the more accountable are the policymakers to the electorate, the greater are the gains (to both the policymakers and the voters) from transparency.

Our work follows the approach of Bueno de Mesquita, Smith, Siverson, and Morrow (2003), who have developed a comprehensive theory of leadership survival under different political institutions. Their model indicates that leaders of "large coalition systems" – or democracies – have stronger incentives to provide public goods than leaders of "small coalition systems" – or autocracies. They conjecture (2003: 179) that one such public good is transparency, defined as the "ready access to information about how and what the government is doing." To test if democracies are more transparent than non-democracies, they consider whether governments report data on their tax revenue collection and their countries' per capita incomes. They find that leaders beholden to large coalitions for their survival, such as under democracy, are indeed more likely to report information than leaders in other political systems.

We develop a theory that explicitly models the incentives of governments to provide information on two areas of interest: inflation and unemployment. The theory starts with a macroeconomic model of the economy where the government determines the inflation rate. The payoff to the government may depend in part on reelection, if the country is a democracy. Next we allow governments to decide whether or not to provide information about their policies. We find that where governments depend on winning elections for their survival, policy transparency is more likely.

To measure transparency, we make use of something that is usually considered a hindrance in cross-national research: missing data. The World Bank's *World Development Indicators* is a large panel of measures of economic and social performance. For many countries, however, data are missing for certain years. If democracies are more transparent than non-democracies, then they should be more willing to report data on economic and social indicators. By the very definition, more transparency implies more information. Do we have more data from democracies than from other regimes?

In what follows, after defining the key terms, we present the argument about why democracies should be more transparent than non-democracies, which is then subjected to several empirical tests controlling for factors such as level of development, participation in international surveillance programs, country and regional specific factors, and duration dependence. We conclude with a discussion of the methodological implications from our findings for studies of democracies.

Defining Democracy and Transparency

We employ a minimalist definition of democracy. Following Schumpeter (1942) and more recently Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub and Limongi (2000), we define democracy as a regime in which the executive and the legislature are both filled by "contested elections." Contestation implies multiple parties compete, incumbents have some probability of losing the elections, and all parties comply with the results of the elections. Przeworski et al. have developed a dichotomous measure[1] of regime that follows this definition: democracy is a political system in which key government offices are filled through contested elections. The definition has two parts: "key government office," which they define as the executive and the legislature; and "contested," which implies that more than one party has some probability of winning office through election.[2]

[1] Updated by Cheibub (2004) and Cheibub and Gandhi (2004).

[2] Sometimes this is obvious, such as when incumbents lose elections and relinquish power. Sometimes it is not, such as when incumbents successively win elections contested by other parties. While this introduces measurement error, it does so in an

Conversely, dictatorships are regimes in which either the executive or the legislature are not filled by contested elections.

The nature of our study requires this narrow definition. To paraphrase Przeworski et al. (2000: 14-5), we want to know if holding repeated elections (where incumbents abide by the results of elections) induces governmental transparency. Our inquiry pertains specifically to the effect of elections on transparency, so we do not want to employ a measure of democracy that conflates other features of a political system with elections. In particular, we want to avoid measures of regime that define democracies as transparent.

Note that by employing a minimalist definition of democracy that pertains only to the role of elections in a political system, we can explore interesting possibilities. On the one hand, if we do not find that our measure of democracy is correlated with transparency, we will know that contested elections alone are not sufficient to produce transparent regimes. If, on the other hand, we do find that our measure of democracy leads to transparency, we will know that the minimalist conception of democracy actually covers more territory than just elections, because contested elections actually do cause regimes to be more transparent.

What is "transparency"? Mitchell (1998: 109) defines transparency as the dissemination of regular and accurate information. Simply put, a transparent political regime is one that provides accurate information about itself, its operations, and the country as a whole, or permits that information to be collected and made available.

We focus here on data compiled by the World Bank. The World Bank obtains their data from other international organizations, such as the International Monetary Fund (e.g., inflation data) and the International Labour Organization (e.g., unemployment data), who in turn obtain their data directly from national governments. Much of the data are missing. Regarding inflation, for example, out of a possible total of 6,439

---

observable way. We know when we are in the latter situation, and can introduce a second variable to make sure results do not depend on these ambiguous cases. Przeworski et al. have made this variable – TYPEII – available with the rest of their data at: http://pantheon.yale.edu/~jac236/Research.htm.

independent country-years for 188 independent countries from 1961 to 2002, 25 percent of the observations are missing. The World Bank explains that the data are not available because governments have failed to report in a timely way or failed to report at all, or in some cases, "data which have been determined to be questionable may be deleted."[3]

In this study, we emphasize the government's willingness to permit credible measures of inflation and unemployment to be made available. Among the many policy instruments at the disposal of the government one of the most important is the control of the monetary base, and hence the inflation rate. Inflation is costly to society at large, but it also has distributional effects. Not only does it redistribute from debtors to creditors, it also acts as a tax on money holdings. Governments therefore use inflation to generate revenues - known as seigniorage - and in the process influence unemployment by the usual Phillips curve trade-off.

This paper builds on the growing awareness that electoral accountability alone is insufficient to ensure high quality governance and representative policy-making. Adserà, Boix and Payne (2003) show that both accountability and free flow of information (in the form of newspaper circulation) affect the quality of governance; the case of Montesinos in Peru shows that the high price of bribes paid to television station owners relative to judges and bureaucrats indicates the importance of controlling the information flow if democracy is to be subverted (McMillan and Zoido 2004). The importance of freely flowing information has become particularly important among international organizations. Both academics (e.g. Mitchell 1998) and officials at international organizations (e.g. the International Monetary Fund or IMF) have emphasized that transparency is crucial for their operation. In the aftermath of the East Asian Financial Crisis, for example, the IMF adopted in 1999 its *Code of Good Practices on Transparency in Monetary and Financial Policies* to make the operations of its members publicly available and took the "Transparency Decision" in January 2001 to make information about its own operations more accessible to the public. As Erbaş (2004: 3) contends, "The importance of transparency in successful economies is becoming

[3] See the World Bank statements about *World Development Indicators*: **http://www.worldbank.org/data/datafaq.htm#cdroms**

increasingly recognized in the literature and in the operational work of international organizations, including the IMF."

We are aware of no study of transparency, however, as a function of domestic political institutions. In *The Moral Foundations of Politics*, Shapiro (2003) makes the case that democracies are more likely than non-democracies to converge on the truth[4], but the argument is suppositional not based on any studies or empirical work. Elsewhere, democracies are simply assumed to be more transparent. Is it true that democracies are more likely to provide accurate information than non-democracies? In the following sections we investigate this question both theoretically and empirically.

The Effect of Democracy on Transparency

Consider a polity with a large number of identical individuals/voters who earn at the start of each period, *t,* an aggregate income normalized to unity. The income is subject to a shock θ_t, drawn from a known distribution independently and identically each period from a finite support with mean 0.

The income and the shock generate the aggregate money balances held at the start of the period $m_t = 1 + \theta_t$ with $Em_t = 1$.

Each period is divided into two subperiods *t1* and *t2*. In *t1* the voter/individual consumes some portion of the money balances c_{t1} and saves the rest for consumption in the second period, c_{t2}. Savings (endogenously determined) is risk free, and for simplicity, earns no interest. There is also no borrowing. Then per period utility is

$$u(\pi_t) = u_1(c_{t1}) + u_2(c_{t2})$$

where the subperiod utility functions have the usual properties $u_i' > 0$, $u_i'' < 0$ for $i = 1,2$. Second subperiod consumption is determined by the inflation rate, π, to be endogenously determined.[5]

[4] See especially pages 200-201, 225-6, 230.

[5] Note that discounting across the subperiods is possible and could be part of the definition of u_2.

The voters save at rate *s* across the subperiods. The real value of the money balances saved for consumption in the next subperiod depends on the price level, which is controlled by the government via the money supply. If the price in *t1* is p_{t1} and in *t2* is p_{t2} the government taxes savings each period by setting the inflation rate $\pi_t = \frac{p_{t2} - p_{t1}}{p_{t2}}$.

So inflation erodes savings; it can also be thought of as a tax on savings, here in the form of money balances. This tax revenue accrues to the issuer of money, government, and is called *seigniorage* - the real government revenue accrued from printing money (Drazen 2000)[6]. We treat these revenues as pure rents, and accrue to the private benefit of the government policymaker.

Then in each period, consumption in the subperiods is

$$c_{t1} = m_t(1-s)$$

$$c_{t2} = m_t s(1-\pi_t) - \frac{\pi^2}{2}$$

where the last term in the *t2* consumption is the deadweight loss of inflation that recognizes the general welfare costs associated with inflation. We treat this as a public bad (both the voters and the government experience this loss), and we assume the linear-quadratic structure as is common in the literature on central bank credibility (Drazen 2000, Barro and Gordon 1983, Obstfeld 1997, Cukierman, Edwards and Tabellini 1992, Desai et al 2000).

Then

$$u(\pi_t) = u_1\left(m_t(1-s)\right) + u_2\left(m_t s(1-\pi_t) - \frac{\pi_t^2}{2}\right).$$

Per period earnings to the government (as a result of the accrued inflation tax) is

$$v(\pi_t) = m_t s\pi_t - \frac{\pi_t^2}{2} \text{ and } Ev(\pi_t) = s\pi_t - \frac{\pi_t^2}{2}.$$

[6] Desai, Olofsgård and Yousef (2000) treat the inflation tax as the sole source of government revenue, which in their model is used for transfers back to subgroups of voters. Here no transfers occur, and the rents accrue to the policymaker.

Notice that we have set this up with some degree of a conflict of interest between the government and the voters, but there is also some coincidence of interest - both understand that inflation is costly.

Given any (equilibrium) inflation rate, we can solve for the consumers' saving rate. Optimality (and its implied consumption smoothing) requires the expected marginal utility of consumption to be equalized across the subperiods. Hence

$-Eu_1'\left(m_t\left(1-s\right)\right)+Eu_2'\left(m_t s\left(1-\pi_t\right)-\frac{\pi_t^2}{2}\right)\left(1-\pi_t\right)=0$ or s solves

$$\frac{Eu_2'\left(m_t s\left(1-\pi_t\right)-\frac{\pi_t^2}{2}\right)}{Eu_1'\left(m_t\left(1-s\right)\right)}=\frac{1}{\left(1-\pi_t\right)}. \qquad (1.1)$$

Let this value of s be denoted $s\left(\pi_t\right)$.

Both the voters and the government are infinitely lived. There is no savings across periods (only across each subperiod). Each seeks to maximize the discounted sum of the per period utilities. For the voters, $E\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}\delta^t u\left(\pi_t\right)$ and $E\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}\delta^t v\left(\pi_t\right)$ for the government, where $\delta\in\left(0,1\right)$ is the standard discount factor.

Maximal Extraction

Voters save the fraction $s\left(\pi_t\right)$ of their income $m_t=1+\theta_t$. In the case that the government wishes to maximize the current period extraction, it will choose an inflation rate to maximize $Ev\left(\pi_t\right)=s\left(\pi_t\right)\pi_t-\frac{\pi_t^2}{2}$. Differentiating,

$Ev'\left(\pi_t\right)=s\left(\pi_t\right)+\pi_t s'\left(\pi_t\right)-\pi_t=0$ yields $\pi_t=\frac{s\left(\pi_t\right)}{1-s'\left(\pi_t\right)}$. Let the solution to this equation be denoted Π. The government per-period payoff then is

$$V\left(\Pi\right)=\frac{\Pi\left(s\left(\Pi\right)-\Pi\right)}{2}.$$

Elections

At the end of each period an election is held. If the incumbent is evicted, that player earns zero for the rest of the game, and another executive is chosen that is identical in all respects to the incumbent. The election punishes or rewards the past behavior of an executive - voters adopt a retrospective voting rule.[7]

Non-transparency

At the beginning of each period t the executive chooses the inflation rate $s(\pi_t)$, and then nature picks the value of the shock θ_t. The voters do not see the shock θ_t or the inflation rate π_t; they make their best guess as to the inflation rate to expect, π^e, choose their savings rate accordingly. At the end of the period, they observe the end of period utility $u(\pi_t) = u_1\left(m_t\left(1 - s\left(\pi^e\right)\right)\right) + u_2\left(m_t s\left(\pi^e\right)\left(1 - \pi_t\right) - \frac{\pi_t^2}{2}\right)$. The government does not announce its actions, nor are they observable - the polity is not *transparent.*

At the end of the period, and based on the utility experienced, an election is held as to whether the incumbent should be reelected. Following Persson, Roland and Tabellini (1997) we assume the voters coordinate on the same reelection rule, and they condition their reelection rule on their observed utility. Voters choose a threshold level of

[7] Since executives are in all ways identical, elections do not serve to choose amongst executives with differing levels of competence or differing attributes. Fearon (1999) suggests that voters care more about selecting competent legislators than disciplining extractive policymakers; Lewis-Beck (1988) provides evidence that voters use retrospective strategies to punish their elected officials when outcomes are poor. See Banks and Sundaram (1993) for a model in which executives display both moral hazard (potentially extractive behavior) and adverse selection (having differing attributes).

utility $\bar{u}$ and will vote to reelect the incumbent if $u(\pi_t) \geq \bar{u}$ and eject the incumbent otherwise.[8]

Note that the incumbent has to take an action (that will impact his/her reelection probabilities) before the shock has materialized. Following Rosendorff (2004), we can define the ex ante probability that any threshold $\bar{u}$ is breached after choosing inflation rate π_t as

$$\phi(\pi_t, \bar{u}) = \Pr\{u(\pi_t) \geq \bar{u}\}.$$

Notice therefore that given any policy choice and threshold, there is always positive probability that the voters choose to evict the incumbent from office. In environments where the executive has not been too extractive, the exogenous shock can be severe enough to induce eviction. Hence the non-transparent environment admits the possibility of "unfair dismissal" - eviction in cases even where the tax was low or moderate.

Assumption: $\phi(\Pi, u) = 0$ for all *u*.

If the executive chooses the maximally extractive level of inflation Π in any period, the distribution of the random shock is such that the threshold is never breached, and the voters throw out the incumbent with certainty.

Regime Type

We characterize each polity by a scalar $\sigma \in [0,1]$, which captures the degree to which the sentiments of the voters are binding on the executive. If the voters' will is always honored, we have $\sigma = 1$; a pure autocracy has $\sigma = 0$. We permit a continuous measure of the degree to which the executive is accountable to the voters. Then the actual probability of keeping office in any period *t* after both π_t and $\bar{u}$ have been chosen is

$$\rho(\pi_t, \bar{u}, \sigma) = \sigma\phi(\pi_t, \bar{u}) + (1 - \sigma).$$

[8] Banks and Sundaram (1998) show that cutoff rules are optimal in the class of retention models like this one. Fiorina (1981) suggests that this threshold behavior is typical of voters.

The Executive's Problem

The executive must choose a policy π_t each period that just balances the benefits of extracting this period, with the reduced probability of being in office and able to extract tomorrow. The threat of eviction acts to reduce the level of extraction today. We can write the (expected) value function associated with the executive's problem as

(1.2) $$V(\pi_t, \bar{u}) = v(\pi_t) + \delta\rho(\pi_t, \bar{u}, \sigma)V(\pi_{t+1}, \bar{u}).$$

Let the optimal response by the executive to threshold $\bar{u}$ be denoted $\bar{\pi}$.

The executive can guarantee, in expected value, a minimum intertemporal value (by taking the maximally extractive action each period) and risking eviction of

$$V(\Pi, u) = \frac{v(\Pi)}{1-\delta(1-\sigma)} = \frac{\Pi(s(\Pi)-\Pi)/2}{1-\delta(1-\sigma)} \text{ for all } \bar{u}.$$

Then the executive's best response is to set inflation each period at

$\bar{\pi}$ if $V(\bar{\pi}, \bar{u}) \geq V(\Pi, u)$, Π otherwise.

The Voters' Problem

Given the behavior of the executive, they will seek to keep inflation as low as possible. So given the best response function above, they will choose a threshold that induces the lowest inflation without inducing the executive to switch to the maximally extractive action. Hence let $\bar{u}$ solve $V(\bar{\pi}, \bar{u}) \geq V(\Pi, u)$.

Then the Nash equilibrium to this game is $(\bar{\pi}, \bar{u})$, and the probability of unfair eviction is $1-\rho(\bar{\pi}, \bar{u}, \sigma) > 0$.

And the executive is kept indifferent between playing $\bar{\pi}$ and playing *s*. Hence the payoff to the executive is

(1.3) $$V(\bar{\pi}, \bar{u}) = V(\Pi, u) = \frac{\Pi(s(\Pi)-\Pi)/2}{1-\delta(1-\sigma)}.$$

We cannot solve for the level of the equilibrium inflation rate explicitly. It must however satisfy $\frac{\bar{\pi}s(\bar{\pi})-\bar{\pi}^2/2}{1-\delta\rho(\bar{\pi},\bar{u},\sigma)}=\frac{\Pi(s(\Pi)-\Pi)/2}{1-\delta(1-\sigma)}$.

Transparency

Voters do not directly observe π_t; the policymaker announces a policy $\tilde{\pi}$. A new player, a credible source, is informed of the actual policy π_t and makes its determination available to voters: either, yes, the government policy indeed is as announced (or better for the voters), $\pi_t \le \tilde{\pi}$, or no, the policy is worse than announced, $\pi_t > \tilde{\pi}$. This fits the observed reality - voters receive information that is to some degree reliable - from sources such as the World Bank, independent government agencies, the IMF and other sources. The voter compares this information with what they might have expected given the government's own announcements and their own expectations of government behavior. Voters then choose whether to reelect the incumbent.

The sequence of moves is that government chooses an announcement $(\tilde{\pi})$ and a policy (π_t) simultaneously (but only the announcement is observed by the voters). At the same time the voter chooses the savings rate (*s*). Then the credible source sends its message, and the voter chooses to reelect or not $\phi \in \{1,0\}$. A Nash equilibrium is the pair $\{(\tilde{\pi},\pi_t),(s,\phi)\}$.

Voters will now condition their reelection decision on the announcement. The voter's optimal strategy will be as follows: As before they choose their savings rate according to equation (1), $s = s(\pi_t)$. If $\tilde{\pi} \le \bar{\pi}$ then they will reelect if they hear the announcement that $\pi_t \le \tilde{\pi}$; they evict if not. And if $\tilde{\pi} > \bar{\pi}$, they evict.

In any equilibrium $\{(\tilde{\pi},\pi^*),(s,\phi)\}$ where $\tilde{\pi} \le \bar{\pi}$, and the message sent is that $\pi^* \le \tilde{\pi}$, the voters reelect, setting $\phi = 1$ and from equation (1.2) we can see that $\rho = 1$; the effective discount factor (see equation) is therefore simply δ, and the expected

discounted value of the game (with some abuse of notation) to the government is $V\left(\left(\tilde{\pi},\pi^*\right),\left(s\left(\pi^*\right),1\right)\right)=\frac{\pi^* s\left(\pi^*\right)-\pi^{*2}/2}{1-\delta}$. If at any point $\phi=0$, then $\rho=1-\sigma$; the effective discount rate is $\delta\left(1-\sigma\right)$ and the government as before can assure itself of $V\left(\left(\tilde{\pi},\Pi\right),\left(s\left(\Pi\right),0\right)\right)=\frac{\Pi\left(s\left(\Pi\right)-\Pi\right)/2}{1-\delta\left(1-\sigma\right)}$. In order for π^* to be a best response for the government, it must be that $\frac{\pi^* s\left(\pi^*\right)-\pi^{*2}/2}{1-\delta}\geq\frac{\Pi s\left(\Pi\right)-\Pi/2}{1-\delta\left(1-\sigma\right)}$ which is equivalent to

$$\sigma\geq\frac{1}{\delta}\left[1-\frac{\Pi s\left(\Pi\right)-\Pi/2}{\pi^* s\left(\pi^*\right)-\pi^{*2}/2}\left(1-\delta\right)\right]-1. \tag{1.4}$$

For the voters, the lowest interest rate feasible is preferred; it is always optimal to reward commitment to a low rate than to punish it. The Nash equilibrium to the game under transparency is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{If } \sigma\geq\frac{1}{\delta}\left[1-\frac{\Pi s\left(\Pi\right)-\Pi/2}{\pi^* s\left(\pi^*\right)-\pi^{*2}/2}\left(1-\delta\right)\right]-1\\ &\text{then } \pi^*=\tilde{\pi}<\overline{\pi} \text{ and } \phi=1;\\ &\text{otherwise } \pi^*=\Pi,\tilde{\pi}\in\left[0,1\right] \text{ and } \phi=0.\end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

We are now able to compare the equilibria across the two informational environments, and make a Pareto ordering.

Proposition: *Transparency is preferred to non-transparency by both players when the polity is sufficiently democratic.*

Proof: Under transparency, the government earns $\frac{\pi^* s\left(\pi^*\right)-\pi^{*2}/2}{1-\delta}$. Under non-transparency, the government earns (from equation(1.3)) $\frac{\Pi s\left(\Pi\right)-\Pi/2}{1-\delta\left(1-\sigma\right)}$. Then for transparency to be preferred to non-transparency, $\frac{\pi^* s\left(\pi^*\right)-\pi^{*2}/2}{1-\delta}\geq\frac{\Pi s\left(\Pi\right)-\Pi/2}{1-\delta\left(1-\sigma\right)}$ or

$\sigma \geq \frac{1}{\delta}\left[1-\frac{\Pi s(\Pi)-\Pi/2}{\pi^* s(\pi^*)-\pi^{*2}/2}(1-\delta)\right]-1$, which is the condition for the existence of the transparency equilibrium, equation (1.4) above. Of course, transparency is preferred by the voters, since the transparent inflation rate is lower than the non-transparent rate, $\pi^* < \bar{\pi}$, from equation (1.5) above. ■

Hence for any value of δ, the larger is σ, the more likely it is that transparency will be preferred to non-transparency. The more likely the fate of incumbents depends on elections, the more likely information will be provided.

Voters dislike inflation, and attempt to discipline their executives via the ballot box. Since government can be unfairly evicted from office even if rent-shifting has been moderate, executives may be willing to trade away the opportunities for rent extraction (by providing access to credible information about their actions) in return for reducing the risk of being unfairly dismissed. Those policymakers more accountable to their electorates are more likely to be unfairly dismissed, and therefore are more likely to offer up, or provide access to, credible data. Hence those polities characterized by more electoral accountability will be more transparent.

Unemployment

The unemployment rate is related to the inflation rate either by a traditional Phillips curve

$$U_t = -\pi_t$$

or by a more modern expectations adjusted Phillips curve, where a reduction in unemployment happens only when the voters are surprised by inflation that is higher than expected

$$U_t = -(\pi_t - E\pi_t).$$

In the first case, more information about the inflation rate policy adopted by the government, as in the "transparent" environment is equivalent to more information about the unemployment rate. Hence "transparency" means that a credible announcement of the inflation rate is also a credible announcement of the unemployment rate. And therefore

we can draw a similar conclusion about unemployment data that we draw from inflation data: we are more likely to see credible information about unemployment flowing to the voters in democracies than in non-democracies.

In the second case, where the Phillips curve is expectations adjusted, in equilibrium in both the transparent and non-transparent regimes, there is no surprise inflation (since both players operate under the same the informational constraints), and hence in equilibrium in both regimes, unemployment is zero. In this case the model cannot speak to the informational value of a credible announcement of the unemployment rate. Nevertheless, extending the general logic of the argument, it is not unreasonable that democratic polities are likely to be characterized by better flows of data about the economic variables over which the government asserts some degree of control, for the same reasons as postulated above. Consequently, we might expect to see democracies generate more information about unemployment as well as inflation.

Evidence

The theory suggests that democracies – defined as those polities where elections determine the fate of incumbents – will provide better access to, or permit the publication of, data on inflation and unemployment by sources credible to the voters, such as international organizations. To test this, we examine patterns of missing data. The World Bank Group publishes data from nearly all countries around the world starting as far back as 1960 up to 2002 (at this writing). The publication, *World Development Indicators*, includes country-year data on hundreds of variables, including inflation[9] and unemployment[10], but much of the data are missing for certain countries during certain years. To examine the patterns of missing data, we create two dummy variables – one for inflation and one for unemployment – coded 1 if data are available and 0 if they are missing. Since our theory also has broader implications about the gains to both voters and democratic governments from transparency, we look at other measures of economic performance to investigate the generality of the intuition. To get an overall picture of the

[9] Consumer prices (annual %): FP.CPI.TOTL.ZG.

[10] Unemployment, total (% of total labor force): SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS.

economic situation, we consider the availability of economic growth data as reported by *World Development Indicators* (2004).[11] To get an overall picture of the conditions of the poor, we follow Ross (2004), who suggests infant mortality rate data.[12]

Because our dependent variables are measures of simply whether or not information is provided, we have no missing observations. Either data are provided or they are not. So our dataset includes all 188 independent countries recognized by the World Bank in 2002.[13] The analysis of each variable begins with the year that data were first reported by the World Bank by any country.

Consider what we observe:

- The World Bank begins reporting data on inflation in 1961. From 1961 to 2002, there are a total of 6,349 country-year observations of independent regimes, and data on inflation are missing in 24.6 percent of them. Data are reported for 63.5 percent of the 3,713 observations of dictatorship. Data are reported for 92.2 percent of the 2,636 observations of democracy.
- The World Bank begins reporting data on unemployment in 1980. From 1980 to 2002, there are a total of 3,912 country-year observations of independent regimes, and data on inflation are missing in 60.6 percent of them. Data are

[11] GDP growth (annual %): NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG.

[12] Mortality rate, infant (per 1,000 live births): SP.DYN.IMRT.IN.

[13] Some countries, while possessing independent regimes, are not recognized by the World Bank: Greek Cyprus, Nauru, Somaliland, and Taiwan. Countries that ceased to exist before 2002 are not included because the World Bank does not include data on these countries in its publications. This is unfortunate, since it precludes studying a number of independent countries from the post-War period: Czechoslovakia, East Germany, U.S.S.R., West Germany, Yemen Arab Republic (North, Sana), Yemen PDR (South, Aden), and Yugoslavia. The World Bank does report data on many other regions of the world, but these are not independent countries and do not have independent political regimes.

reported for 17.0 percent of the 2,031 observations of dictatorship. Data are reported for 63.5 percent of the 1,881 observations of democracy.

- The World Bank begins reporting data on economic growth in 1961. From 1961 to 2002, there are a total of 6,349 country-year observations of independent regimes, and data on economic growth are missing in 12.8 percent of them. Data are reported for 80.6 percent of the 3,713 observations of dictatorship. Data are reported for 96.6 percent of the 2,636 observations of democracy.
- The World Bank begins reporting data on infant mortality rates in 1960. From 1960 to 2002, there are a total of 6,449 country-year observations of independent regimes, and data on infant mortality rates are missing in 83.4 percent of them. Data are reported for 14.7 percent of the 3,772 observations of dictatorship. Data are reported for 19.2 percent of the 2,677 observations of democracy.

Figure 1 about here

These basic descriptive statistics (displayed in Figure 1) support our hypothesis that democracies are more transparent than dictatorships, particularly for inflation and unemployment.

As a first step towards analyzing the relationship between regime and missing data more rigorously, we use a simple logit analysis to test if democracies are more likely to report data. In each model, our dependent variable d_{it} is coded 1 if country i reports data in year t and coded 0 if data are not reported. We estimate $\Pr(d_{it} = 1) = \frac{e^{\beta' x_{it}}}{1 + e^{\beta' x_{it}}}$, where x_{it} represents the independent variables that determine the decision to report or not, and β captures the effects of these variables. The likelihood function is $L(\beta \mid d_{it}, x_{it}) = \prod_{it} (F)^{d_{it}} (1 - F)^{1 - d_{it}}$, where F represents the cumulative distribution function.

In Table 1, we test the effect only of our dichotomous measure of regime, coded 1 for democracies and 0 for dictatorships as defined above. For each dummy variable indicating whether information is provided during a given country-year, democracy has a statistically significant positive impact. We are more likely to have information from democracies than dictatorships on our key variables of inflation and unemployment, as well as on the secondary variables of interest, growth and infant mortality rates.

Table 1 about here

These could be spurious results. So far, we have included no control variables. Unfortunately, we do not have a battery of variables that we can use to control for all other possible factors that may influence patterns of missing data because data are also missing for many of these variables. Fortunately, we do have a complete set of data for the most important factors.

First of all, level of economic development may be a factor. More developed states may be more likely to report data because with development comes greater technical capacity to collect data. As Bueno de Mesquita et al. (2003: 182) note, poor countries "just cannot afford to gather the information." The collection and reporting of data may also simply be a more routine activity in more modern states, as Scott (1999) contends. Level of economic development is important to account for because it is correlated with political regime. Democratic regimes are more likely to survive at higher levels of income (Przeworski et al. 2000). So the positive effects of democracy on transparency reported in Table 1 may be driven in part by level of economic development. Fortunately, Heston and Summers (1995) have collected data on per capita in come for nearly all countries with no missing data. We use their data, measured in 1995 purchasing power parity (PPP) dollars, to control for level of economic development.[14]

A second factor that may influence the reporting of data is the degree of scrutiny that a government is under by international organizations. For example, countries participating in programs sponsored by the IMF are required to submit to increased

[14] The data actually come from the *Democracy and Development* ACLP data project, updated to 2000 by Jose Antonio Cheibub, Jennifer Gandhi, Adam Przeworski, and Sebastian Saiegh.

surveillance of the economy. Like economic development, participation in an IMF program is also important to account for because it is correlated with regime. The IMF has historically been more likely to enter into arrangements with dictatorships (Bandow 1994, Przeworski and Vreeland 2000). To the extent this is true, the effect of democracy in Table 1 may actually be understated. Fortunately, we have data on all IMF arrangements for all countries and can control for this factor.[15]

Table 2 presents the results when we control for GDP per capita and IMF participation. We employ the same logit statistical model as above, but the independent variables now include democracy, GDP per capita, and the dummy variable for IMF participation. As expected, level of economic development has a positive significant effect for the reporting of inflation and unemployment data; surprisingly, the positive effect is not significant for growth or infant mortality rates. IMF participation has positive and significant effects on reporting all of our indicators.

Even after controlling for these factors, democracies appear to be more transparent than non-democracies. The effect is strong and significant at the 0.99 confidence level for our key variables of interest, inflation and unemployment, as it is for growth and infant mortality rates. For dictatorships, the estimated probability of reporting data on inflation, assuming no participation in IMF programs and holding per capita income to its median of $3,701 (1995 PPP), is 0.67. The estimated probability for democracies is 0.94. Democracies are 1.40 times more likely to report data on inflation than dictatorships. For unemployment data, the estimated probability for dictatorships is 0.14 and for democracies it is 0.46; democracies are 3.28 times more likely to report. For growth, democracies are 1.15 times more likely to report data, and for infant mortality rates, democracies are 1.24 times more likely to report.

Table 2 about here

Overall, these are striking results. Data are not missing at random: level of economic development and international surveillance play a role in the likelihood of data being

[15] The data come from Vreeland (2003).

available. So do political institutions. Democracies are more transparent than dictatorships.

As a further step to account for other factors that may be related to transparency, we control for country and regional specific effects. We hesitate to do this because – as is often the case when such techniques are employed – we have no theory about what country-specific factors might matter or which regions are more likely to report data. We could speculate that country-specific effects account for a residual level of information collection technology or culture. Regarding region, we could follow what others have claimed – sometime disparagingly – about "backward" regions of the world (yet see what Hanchard (1999) has to say about this). If region does matter, it is especially important to account for their effects because region is correlated with democracy. The growing literature on "diffusion" shows that political regime is correlated across regions (see Gleditsch 2002, Simmons and Elkins 2000).

To control for country effects, we employ the method suggested by Green et al. (2001). The model, developed by Chamberlain (1980), is sometimes called "the conditional logit model" because one maximizes the conditional likelihood function: $L(\beta \mid d_{it}, x_{it}) = \prod_i \Pr\left(D_{i1} = d_{i1}, D_{i2} = d_{i2}, ..., D_{iT_i} = d_{iT_i} \mid \sum_t d_{it} \right)$, where T_i is the last observed time for country *i*. Note that this method involves estimating the 1's and 0's for a particular country, conditioned on the total number of 1's for that country. If a country never reports data or reports data all of the time, the conditional probability of observing the data for that country is 1. Such countries have no impact on the overall estimation and are thus dropped from the analysis.

To control for region, we use the basic logit model and include a series of dummy variables for each region of the world. We must leave out one region for identification purposes, and also, as with the fixed effects, if there is no variation in the dependent variable for a given region, the region is dropped.

Tables 3 and 4 about here

Tables 3 and 4 present the results when we control for country specific and regional effects, respectively. Note that the democracy findings for our key variables of interest, inflation and unemployment, are robust. Indeed, when we introduce country specific

effects (Table 3), the effect of democracy on transparency is positive and statistically significant at the 0.99 confidence level for all of our indicators except growth, where the effect is significant at the 0.90 level. When we introduce regional effects (Table 4), we get highly significant results for the effect of democracy on all of our indicators.

The effects of the control variables of per capita income and IMF participation are similar to the results presented in Table 2. Again, however, per capita income is not a strong predictor of reporting growth data. Regional effects, as we suspected, are often significant but not systematic. Africa, for example, is slightly more likely to report data on inflation than East Asia, much less likely than East Asia to report data on unemployment, and not significantly different from East Asia to report data on infant mortality rates. Regional patterns of reporting data are generally haphazard across our indicators and model specifications.

Beyond these controls, there is yet another factor that must be accounted for in our empirical work: the impact of time. Duration dependence is a phenomenon of increased concern to Political Scientists since the development of new techniques to account for it (e.g., Beck et al. 1998). Often the techniques are employed agnostically, like fixed effects, with little theory behind why time should have some kind of effect on the dependent variable. For our question, however, modeling duration dependence is theoretically appropriate.

There are several reasons to believe that transparency has trended upward over time. First of all, concern with transparency is a relatively new phenomenon. As people have become more concerned with it, data collection has become a priority. Secondly, with technological advances in computing, the ever-improving ability to conduct extensive statistical studies has produced ever-increasing demands for more data. International agencies have more incentives to collect and report data. Finally, the technological capacity to collect and store data has also increased with time. Both the supply and demand for data has increased over time.

Similar arguments were recently suggested by Carol Carson, who was the Director of the IMF's Statistics Department from 1996 until 2004. She notes an "increasing realization of the importance of internationally comparable data." She cites several factors for the improvement in data collection, including (1) the Internet, (2) "increased

recognition, by countries of all sizes, of the importance of the data," and (3) regional organizations that "are also pushing the cause" (IMF 2004: 213).

It is rare that the passage of time has causal power, and there are potentially other variables we could use to capture the phenomena that have occurred over time. For example, we could develop a measure of "concern with transparency," or we could look at the resources invested in data collection, or we could track the technological improvements in database capacity. But all of these phenomena will be highly correlated with time. In the absence of better proxies, modeling duration dependence appears to be a better approach.

The approach here is quite different from the statistical models we employed above. Instead of simply predicting instances of "reporting" and "not reporting" data (Pr(y=1)), we predict the transition probability of going from "not reporting" to "reporting." Let *T* be a nonnegative random variable denoting the time at which a country reports data. *T* can be specified as a hazard function – the instantaneous probability of reporting data at $T=t$ $(0 < t < \infty)$ conditioned on not having yet reported up to time *t*:

$\lambda(t) = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{\Pr(t \le T \le t + \Delta \mid T \ge t)}{\Delta} = \frac{f(t)}{S(t)}$, where $f(t)$ represents the probability density function of *T* and $S(t)$ represents one minus the cumulative distribution function of *T*.

How one models $\lambda(t)$ depends on how one believes that time matters. In our case, we suspect that over time countries have become more likely to report data for the reasons specified above. Thus, we employ a model that allows for an increasing hazard over time, the Weibull model: $\lambda(t_i) = pe^{-\beta' x_i}\left(e^{-\beta' x_i} t_i\right)^{p-1}$, where the subscript *i* indicates the country, $\beta' x_i$ are (as above) the independent variables and their effects, and *p* is a parameter capturing duration dependence. If *p* is greater than 1, then duration dependence is positive (the probability of reporting increases over time), and if it is less than 1 duration dependence is negative. To write the log-likelihood function of this model, we require one more variable, δ_i coded 1 if a country eventually reports data and 0 if a country never reports as long as we are able to observe. In the latter case, we say that reporting is "censored." The log-likelihood function is then:

$\ln L(\beta, p \mid t_i, x_i, \delta_i) = \sum_i \left[\delta_i \left(w_i - \ln \frac{1}{p} \right) - e^{w_i} \right]$, where $w_i = p(\beta' x_i + \ln t_i)$ and t_i is the time at which a country reported data if $\delta_i = 1$ or the last observed time if $\delta_i = 0$. Note that this is a simplified description of the model we actually use, because in our data, the independent variables *x* are not constant over time, but vary both over country and over time. We refer readers interested in seeing how time-varying covariates are incorporated to Kalbfleisch and Prentice (1980: 122-6).

While we have theoretical reasons to employ the Weibull model, we also employ various other hazard models that make different assumptions about the underlying shape of the hazard function. These results are reported in the appendix. Note that we can estimate these hazard models either considering only the first time a country reports information, or considering every country-year, even after a country has already begun to report. It turns out that once a country begins reporting on each of our indicators, the probability of continuing is random with respect to all of the variables that we tried. This is because once a country reports, it is likely to continue, regardless of regime. Thus, in Table 5 we report results that consider only the first transition – the first instance of going from "not reporting" to "reporting." Results allowing for repeated "events" only serve to increase our confidence in our findings. They are also reported in the appendix.

Table 5 about here

Table 5 presents the results. First, consider the effects of the passage of time reported in the row labeled "Duration Dependence." The effect is positive and significant for infant mortality rates. The effect is so powerful for infant mortality rates that democracy no longer has a significant effect. The coefficients for per capita income and IMF are not even positive! In contrast to the results presented earlier in the paper, these results are surprising, but they are understandable and illustrate exactly why it is important to account for duration dependence. The positive effect of duration dependence indicates that the likelihood of data becoming available has increased over time. Democratization, per capita income and IMF participation have also trended upward over time. Since these variables are correlated with time, once we account for the positive time trend of reporting data on infant mortality rates, the effects presented in the previous tables disappear entirely. The fact that democracy does not have a significant impact on

reporting infant mortality rate data, however, is not troubling for our theory. The theory posits that governments that rely on elections for their survival will be more likely to make data available to voters in order to reveal the competence of their policies. Policy impact on infant mortality rates, however, may be slow and impacted by many factors outside the control of governments.[16] When it comes to reporting infant mortality data, it seems that supply and demand trending upward over time better explains the reporting of data than other independent variables.

This does not have to be the case when one employs duration analysis.[17] Duration dependence turns out not to be a problem for our other variables. Note, however, that this model has other differences from the previous models presented; namely, we are looking at the transition probability of reporting data, instead of pooling all observations. The change leads to new results. Under this model, per capita income does not have a positive effect for reporting inflation or growth data, although the positive significant effect of IMF participation remains.

Turning to the effect of democracy, the impact of political regime proves robust. Even controlling for duration dependence, democracy has a positive and significant impact on reporting data for our main variables of interest, inflation and unemployment, as well as for economic growth. The impact is strong. For inflation, the baseline hazard of reporting data is 3.7 times higher for democracies than for dictatorships. For unemployment, the baseline hazard of reporting data is 1.9 times higher for democracies

[16] Ross indeed finds the performance of democratic governments to be no better than the performance of dictatorships when it comes to infant mortality rates. Mani and Mukand (2000) argue that the obscure and long-run nature of infant mortality rates gives democratic governments incentives to focus on other issues to win reelection.

[17] See, for example, what Przeworski et al. (2000) found about the hazard rate for the breakdown of democracy after controlling for per capita income. Without income, the hazard appears to decline, indicating some kind of learning or cultural effect over time. The effect goes away once per capita income is included because income has also increased over time, wiping out any apparent effect of the passage of time.

than for dictatorships. For growth, the baseline hazard of reporting data is also 1.9 times higher for democracies than for dictatorships.[18]

We conclude the robustness analysis by including controls for central bank independence. Our theoretical approach concludes that the any government more susceptible to electoral discipline will provide more information about decisions over the monetary base. In some countries however, the central bank is by design insulated to a greater to lesser degree from electoral politics. The intent of course, is to prevent temporary monetary expansions to enhance output, at least in the short run, in order to influence electoral outcomes. Hence we might expect governments to have less influence over the inflation rate when the central bank is independent. It becomes instructive therefore to investigate whether the core result of this paper is robust to the institutionalization of central bank independence. We use the Cukierman et al. (1992) dataset that provides measures of central bank independence for each of 4 decades for 67 countries. This reduces our sample size somewhat; we replicate the previous analyses for the dissemination of inflation information adding the *CBI* control in Table A7 in the appendix. We find that *CBI* has no effect on the dissemination of the inflation data, and the effect of democracy persists.[19]

We conclude that democracies are indeed more transparent than dictatorships. Using a host of different statistical techniques and variables for which data are available, we show that when it comes to inflation, unemployment, and growth, democracies are more likely to report data than non-democracies.

Conclusion

Our substantive conclusion is straightforward: democracies are more transparent than other political regimes. We provide both theoretical arguments of why this is so as well

[18] These hazard ratios are easily obtained by exponentiating the coefficients reported in Table 5.

[19] In the appendix, we present the evidence of CBI on inflation dissemination only, as the potential theoreticl impact of CBI is on the reporting of this variable in particular; the effect of CBI on unemployment, growth, and infant mortality is of no significant effect.

as evidence from data provided by governments to the World Bank. We feel that this finding is intrinsically interesting. It confirms what has often been taken for granted about democracy and transparency. Beyond this, however, our results have at least two important methodological implications for other research on democracy.

The first implication regards the definition of democracy. Debate about the most appropriate measure for political regime abounds. The debate is waged today by proponents of various indicators of democracy, but it stretches back throughout modern political science. Dahl (1971), for example, took issue with Schumpeter's (1942) minimalist conception of democracy when he first introduced his concept of "polyarchy." Dahl argued that contested elections alone were not sufficient to define democracy, because "responsiveness" was also required. And for there to be responsiveness, Dahl listed several guarantees that were necessary, including, for example, the free flow of information.

Przeworski and his colleagues, Cheibub, Limongi and Alvarez, have proposed a return to the minimalist definition of democracy. They make this suggestion not because other features – such as those listed by Dahl – are unimportant, but because the relationships among these various other features should be examined not assumed. So, for example, rather than require the free flow of information to be a defining feature of democracy, they restrict the definition of democracy to cover only elections. This allows researchers to test to see if there is, in fact, a relationship between elections and information.

It turns out that there is. As we have shown in our research here, the most transparent regimes are those in which the key offices of the executive and the legislature are filled through contested elections. The relationship between democracy and transparency is a causal one, not something that must be included by definition. So the minimalist definition of democracy actually covers more territory than just elections.

The second methodological concern that this paper addresses regards the nonrandom nature of missing data. Whether or not information about a country is available is no accident. The availability of data may well be driven in part by political institutions. The implication for cross-national research on democracy is clear: missing data cannot be ignored. Researchers studying the causes and consequences of political regime must be

wary that their empirical findings are not driven simply by the subset of observations for which data are available. Fortunately, political scientists have been taking the problems of missing data more seriously. Methods, such as suggested by King et al. 2001, should be employed to address potential biases that may result from missing data. Beyond this concern, however, our paper shows that missing data is not just a problem to be overcome. In many cases, missing data may also be a phenomenon worthy of explanation.

Appendix

In this section we present a series of robustness tests by analyzing alternative models of duration dependence beyond the Weibull model presented in the main text.[20] The results for inflation are reported in Table A1; the results for unemployment are reported in Table A2; the results for growth are reported in Table A3. (We do not further analyze infant mortality rates because the results are shown not to be robust in Table 5.)

Dynamic probit estimates the transition probability of going from "not reporting data" to "reporting data," given that a government was not reporting the previous year. This model, like the exponential hazard model below, assumes that hazard rate is constant and that data are reported in discrete units of time. If duration dependence is indeed constant, the probability of transition depends only on the previous period, not on any longer history. Note that for the reporting of data on inflation, unemployment, and growth, the Weibull model indicated no significant trend in the hazard rate (see Table 5). So, dynamic probit may be the appropriate model for these variables. Results from the dynamic probit model indicate that democracy has a positive significant effect on reporting all three variables.

A closely related model to dynamic probit is the exponential hazard model (see Takeshi 1985: Chapter 11). The difference is that the exponential hazard model assumes data are reported over continuous time units. Continuous-time data are rare in political science, but the model is widely used. Our findings on the reporting of inflation, unemployment, and growth hold using this model.

The safest duration model to employ is the Cox regression. The Cox model can accommodate any underlying hazard shape – increasing, decreasing, or constant – because the model does not rely on assumptions of the effect of duration dependence (while in the Weibull model one assumes positive/negative duration dependence and in the exponential model one assumes constant duration dependence). The Cox model is not as efficient as other duration models, but it is unbiased – other models might be biased if the assumptions about the effect of duration dependence do not hold. Not surprisingly, the qualitative findings from the Weibull model (presented in Table 5 above) and the exponential model hold under the Cox model as well.

Tables A1, A2, and A3 about here

Finally, in Tables A4, A5, and A6, we re-analyze all of the survival models allowing for "multiple-reporting." In the survival models above, we analyzed countries only up to the point where they first report data (except dynamic probit). We assume that once a country

[20] We present here results controlling only for per capita income and IMF participation. When we include significant regional dummies all our results hold. Results are available upon request.

begins reporting data, it will continue to do so, regardless of regime. This is reflected in the data for most countries. Here, however, we analyze the full data, allowing countries to remain in the dataset even after they have reported data once before in the past. Note that here we find the duration dependence in the data that we expected. In the Weibull model, the parameter p is positive and statistically significant. This indicates an increasing hazard over – countries become increasing likely to report data over time. Unlike with the infant mortality rate data, however, the effect of democracy is robust even in this model for the reporting of data on inflation, unemployment, and growth. The strong positive and significant effects of democracy in all of the models tested here only serve to increase our confidence in our main results.

Tables A4, A5, and A6 about here

Finally, we test for the importance of central bank independence and the dissemination of inflation data. It is possible, since democracies are more likely than dictatorships to have an independent central bank, that our results on inflation are driven by central bank independence. Independent central banks may be more likely to reveal information about the inflation rate and central banks whose jobs are dependent upon the current government. If, however, our results are driven by central bank independence, this is a problem for our theory because - by definition - independent central banks need not respond to voter preferences. If independent central banks lead to transparency on inflation, it must be through an alternative mechanism than the one we lay out, because independent central banks do not depend on elections. Furthermore, governments have less influence over the inflation rate when the central bank is independent. Thus, we introduce central bank independence as a control variable into our specifications on inflation. We do this in an appendix because central bank independence data suffer from the very problem we address in this paper – missing data. We use the Cukierman et al. (1992) measure of central bank independence, which are aggregated over 1950-1959, 1960-1971, 1972-1979, and 1980-1989, covering 67 countries for a total of 2,346 country-year observations.

When we introduce this control variable into our inflation specifications, we find that it has no effect on the dissemination of inflation data, and the effect of democracy persists. These results displayed in Table A7.

Table A7 about here

References

Adserà, Alicia, Charles Boix and Mark Payne. 2003. "Are You Being Served? Political Accountability and Quality of Government." *Journal of Law, Economics & Organization* 19(2): 445-490.

Bandow, Doug. 1994. "The IMF: A Record of Addiction and Failure." In *Perpetuating Poverty: The World Bank, the IMF, and the Developing World*, edited by Doug Bandow and Ian Vasquez, pp. 15-36. Washington, DC: The Cato Institute.

Barro, Robert J. and David B. Gordon. 1983. "Rules, Discretion and Reputation in a Model of Monetary Policy". *Journal of Monetary Economics* 12(1):101-120.

Beck, Nathaniel, Jonathan N. Katz, and Richard Tucker. 1998."Taking Time Seriously: Time-Series–Cross-Section Analysis with a Binary Dependent Variable." *American Journal of Political Science* 42: 1260-1288.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson and James D. Morrow. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chamberlain, G. 1980. "Analysis of Covariance with Qualitative Data." Review of Economic Studies 47: 225-238.

Cheibub, Jose Antonio. 2004. "Political Institutions." Unpublished. Yale University.

Cheibub, Jose Antonio and Jennifer Gandhi. 2004. "Classifying Political Regimes: A Six-Fold Measure of Democracies and Dictatorships." Paper prepared for annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September 2004.

Cukierman, Alex, 1992. *Central Bank Strategy, Credibility and Independence: Theory and Evidence*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cukierman, Alex, Sebastian Edwards, and Guido Tabellini. 1992. "Seignorage and Political Instability." *American Economic Review* 82(3):537-55

Dahl, Robert. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Desai, Raj M., Anders Olofsgård and Tarik M. Yousef. 2003 "Democracy, Inequality, and Inflation." *American Political Science Review* 97(3):391-406.

Drazen, Allan. 2000. *Political Economy in Macroeconomics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Erbaş, S. Nuri. 2004. Ambiguity, Transparency, and Institutional Strength. International Institute of Public Finance, The 60th Congress, Milan, Italy, August 23-26. IMF Working Paper.

Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede. 2002. *All International Politics is Local: The Diffusion of Conflict, Integration, and Democratization*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Green, Donald, Soo Yeon Kim, and David Yoon. 2001. Dirty Pool. *International Organization* 55: 441-468.

Hanchard, Michael. 1999. Afro-Modernity: Temporality, Politics and the African Diaspora. *Alternative Modernities, special issue of Public Culture* 27: 245-268.

Heston, Alan and Robert Summers. 1995. *Penn World Tables 5.6*. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.

IMF. 2004. *IMF Survey 2004*. Vol. 33 no. 14. July 26, 2004. Washington DC: 2004.

Kalbfleisch, John D. and Ross L. Prentice. 1980. *The Statistical Analysis of Failure Time Data*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lindley, D. 1996. Transparency and Security Regimes: A Study of the Concert of Europe and the United Nations. Paper presented at the CSIA Library, Harvard University.

Mani, Anandi and Sharun W. Mukand. 2000. Democracy and the Politics of Visibility. Paper prepared for the Yale Conference on the Political Economy of Development, March 16-18, 2001.

McMillan, John and Pablo Zoido. 2004. "How to Subvert Democracy: Montesinos in Peru", unpublished, Stanford University.

Mitchell, Ronald B. 1998. Sources of Transparency: Information Systems in International Regimes. *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (1): 109-30.

Obstfeld, Maurice.1997. "Destablizing Effects of Exchange Rate Escape Clauses". *Journal of International Economics* 43:61-77.

Persson, Torsten, Gerard Roland and Guido Tabellini. 1997. "Separation of Powers and Political Accountability." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(4):1163-1202

Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Regimes and Economic Well-being in the World, 1950-1990*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Przeworski, Adam and James Vreeland. 2000. "The Effect of IMF Programs on Economic Growth." *Journal of Development Economics* 62: 385-421.

Rosendorff, B. Peter. 2004. "Democracy and the Supply of Transparency." Unpublished, University of Southern California.

Ross, Michael. 2004. "Is Democracy Good for the Poor?" Unpublished. UCLA.

Schumpeter, Joseph. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper.

Scott, James C. 1999. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shapiro, Ian. 2003. *The Moral Foundations of Politics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Simmons, Beth and Zachary Elkins 2000. "Globalization and Policy Diffusion: Explaining Three Decades of Liberalization." Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 2000.

World Bank. 2004. *World Development Indicators on CD-ROM*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Table 1: The pooled effect of democracy on transparency

	Inflation	Unemployment	Growth	Infant Mortality Rates
The effect of Democracy	**1.92****	**2.14****	**1.92****	**0.32****
(Robust std error)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.07)
Constant	0.55**	-1.59**	1.42**	-1.76**
(Robust std error)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.05)
# of obs.	6,349	3,912	6,349	6,449
Log pseudolikelihood	-3157.43	-2159.55	-2218.63	-2883.54

Table 2: The pooled effect of democracy on transparency controlling for level of economic development and IMF participation

	Inflation	Unemployment	Growth	Infant Mortality Rates
The effect of Democracy	**2.02****	**1.65****	**1.97****	**0.24****
(Robust std error)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.24)	(0.09)
The effect of GDP/capita	0.0001**	0.0002**	0.00002	0.00001
(Robust std error)	(0.00002)	(0.00001)	(0.00002)	(0.00001)
The effect of IMF participation	0.82**	0.66**	1.41**	0.23**
(Robust std error)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.16)	(0.09)
Constant	0.31**	-2.46**	1.67**	-2.06**
(Robust std error)	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.09)	(0.08)
# of obs.	5,042	2,935	5,042	5,128
Log pseudolikelihood	-1932.65	-1428.22	-1114.83	-2084.83

Table 3: The effect of democracy on transparency controlling for economic development, IMF participation, and country specific effects

	Inflation	Unemployment	Growth	Infant Mortality Rates
The effect of Democracy	**4.93****	**1.96****	**1.59***	**0.60****
(Robust std error)	(0.87)	(0.64)	(0.94)	(0.10)
The effect of GDP/capita	0.0014**	0.0005**	0.0010*	0.0001**
(Robust std error)	(0.00035)	(0.00016)	(0.00051)	(0.00001)
The effect of IMF participation	2.73**	0.96**	2.45**	0.16*
(Robust std error)	(0.43)	(0.25)	(0.49)	(0.08)
# of ctries	65	73	34	169
# of obs.	1,806	1,306	915	5,101
Log pseudolikelihood	-466.41	-477.21	-301.03	-1793.52

Table 4: The effect of democracy on transparency controlling for economic development, IMF participation, and regional effects

	Inflation	Unemployment	Growth	Infant Mortality Rates
The effect of Democracy	**1.87****	**1.45****	**1.57****	**0.36****
(Robust std error)	(0.16)	(0.13)	(0.30)	(0.11)
The effect of GDP/capita	0.0001**	0.0001**	0.00003	0.00002**
(Robust std error)	0.00002	0.00002	0.00002	0.00001
The effect of IMF participation	0.87**	0.62**	1.40**	0.19**
(Robust std error)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.17)	(0.09)
Africa	-0.88**	-4.83**	-2.82**	0.16
(Robust std error)	(0.26)	(0.44)	(0.72)	(0.34)
South Asia		-2.86**		0.09
(Robust std error)		(0.47)		(0.39)
East Asia	-1.49**			0.21
(Robust std error)	(0.32)			(0.45)
S. E. Asia	1.20**	-1.52**		0.17
(Robust std error)	(0.38)	(0.43)		(0.38)
Oceania		-3.64**	-3.31**	
(Robust std error)		(0.58)	(0.79)	
Middle East	-0.50*	-2.88**	-2.87**	0.10
(Robust std error)	(0.28)	(0.43)	(0.72)	(0.36)
Latin America	0.33	-1.55**	-1.31*	0.02
(Robust std error)	(0.30)	(0.43)	(0.78)	(0.34)
Caribbean	-1.18**	-3.71**	-0.71	-0.19
(Robust std error)	(0.30)	(0.44)	(1.01)	(0.36)
East Europe	-1.37**	-1.57**	-3.96**	0.38
(Robust std error)	(0.30)	(0.44)	(0.73)	(0.36)
Industrial ctries		-0.58	-2.22**	-0.25
(Robust std error)		(0.53)	(0.81)	(0.36)
Constant	1.06**	0.93**	4.29**	-2.21**
(Robust std error)	(0.25)	(0.41)	(0.72)	(0.33)
# of obs.	4,013	2,935	4,762	5,128
Log pseudolikelihood	-1775.38	-1083.57	-1025.76	-2078.72

Table 5: The effect of democracy on transparency controlling for duration dependence

	Inflation	Unemployment	Growth	Infant Mortality Rates
The effect of Democracy	**1.30****	**0.65****	**0.62****	**-0.14**
(Robust std error)	(0.27)	(0.30)	(0.23)	(0.18)
The effect of GDP/capita	-0.00003	0.00004*	-0.00003	-0.0001*
(Robust std error)	(0.00006)	(0.00002)	(0.00003)	(0.00004)
The effect of IMF participation	0.55**	0.42*	0.44**	-0.29**
(Robust std error)	(0.17)	(0.24)	(0.19)	(0.14)
Africa	-3.19**	-2.51**	-1.54**	-2.53**
(Robust std error)	(0.25)	(1.08)	(0.38)	(0.85)
South Asia	-2.12**	-1.48		0.05
(Robust std error)	(0.52)	(1.18)		(0.10)
East Asia	-3.18**		0.36*	0.07
(Robust std error)	(0.38)		(0.21)	(0.11)
S. E. Asia	-1.49**	-0.81	-0.09	0.07
(Robust std error)	(0.30)	(1.15)	(0.21)	(0.07)
Oceania		-2.78*	-16.10**	-14.76**
(Robust std error)		(1.56)	(1.06)	(1.30)
Middle East	-2.38**	-1.46	-1.43**	0.24**
(Robust std error)	(0.36)	(1.12)	(0.45)	(0.09)
Latin America	-2.20**	-0.29	-0.55**	0.43**
(Robust std error)	(0.41)	(1.08)	(0.27)	(0.13)
Caribbean	-3.31**	-1.59	-0.44	-3.25**
(Robust std error)	(0.65)	(1.09)	(0.29)	(0.95)
East Europe	-2.26**	-0.34	-1.85**	
(Robust std error)	(0.39)	(1.07)	(0.52)	
Industrial ctries	-1.25**	0.57	-0.47	0.65**
(Robust std error)	(0.39)	(1.14)	(0.39)	(0.23)
Constant	0.20	-2.23**	-0.33	0.08*
(Robust std error)	(0.24)	(1.08)	(0.22)	(0.04)
Duration dependence (ln p)	-0.03	0.11	-0.05	0.30**
(Robust std error)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.15)
# of countries:	144	160	113	97
# eventually reporting:	126	103	110	95
# of obs.	998	1,431	457	270
Log pseudolikelihood	-123.30	-162.24	-126.86	-107.12

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Table A1: Robustness tests of the effect of DEMOCRACY on reporting INLFATION data

	Dynamic Probit	Exponential Hazard Model	Cox Hazard Model
The effect of Democracy	**1.31****	**1.67****	**0.68****
(Robust std error)	(0.14)	(0.23)	(0.22)
The effect of GDP/capita	0.00001	0.00002	0.00003
(Robust std error)	(0.00001)	(0.00003)	(0.00002)
The effect of IMF participation	0.38**	0.52**	0.44**
(Robust std error)	(0.12)	(0.21)	(0.15)
Constant	-1.53**	-2.76**	
(Robust std error)	(0.08)	(0.18)	
# of countries:		144	144
# eventually reporting:		126	126
# of obs.	983	998	998
Log pseudolikelihood	-327.28	-150.41	-467.00

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Table A2: Robustness tests of the effect of DEMOCRACY on reporting UNEMPLOYMENT data

	Dynamic Probit	Exponential Hazard Model	Cox Hazard Model
The effect of Democracy	**0.60****	**1.35****	**1.11****
(Robust std error)	(0.09)	(0.23)	(0.20)
The effect of GDP/capita	0.00004**	0.0001**	0.0001**
(Robust std error)	(0.00001)	(0.00002)	(0.00001)
The effect of IMF participation	0.09	0.20	0.30
(Robust std error)	(0.10)	(0.23)	(0.22)
Constant	-1.78**	-3.70**	
(Robust std error)	(0.09)	(0.23)	
# of countries:		160	160
# eventually reporting:		103	103
# of obs.	1,668	1,431	1,431
Log pseudolikelihood	-484.60	-201.27	-438.04

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Table A3: Robustness tests of the effect of DEMOCRACY on reporting ECONOMIC GROWTH data

	Dynamic Probit	Exponential Hazard Model	Cox Hazard Model
The effect of Democracy	**1.14****	**1.19****	**0.38****
(Robust std error)	(0.17)	(0.27)	(0.11)
The effect of GDP/capita	-0.00002	-0.00002	-0.00002
(Robust std error)	(0.00002)	(0.00002)	(0.00002)
The effect of IMF participation	0.35**	0.33	0.14
(Robust std error)	(0.17)	(0.23)	(0.10)
Constant	-0.93**	-1.77**	
(Robust std error)	(0.10)	(0.22)	
Duration dependence			
(Robust std error)			
# of countries:		113	113
# eventually reporting:		110	110
# of obs.	443	457	457
Log pseudolikelihood	-217.54	-147.70	-417.90

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Table A4: The effect of DEMOCRACY on reporting INLFATION data with multiple-reporting

	Weibull Hazard Model	Exponential Hazard Model	Cox Hazard Model
The effect of Democracy	**0.25****	**0.26****	**0.26****
(Robust std error)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
The effect of GDP/capita	0.00001*	0.00001**	0.00001**
(Robust std error)	(0.000003)	(0.000003)	(0.000003)
The effect of IMF participation	0.09**	0.14**	0.12**
(Robust std error)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Constant	-0.92**	-0.42**	
(Robust std error)	(0.10)	(0.06)	
Duration dependence	0.13**		
(Robust std error)	(0.02)		
# of countries:	173	173	173
# eventually reporting:	4,160	4,160	4,160
# of obs.	5,042	5,042	5,042
Log pseudolikelihood	7334.41	7307.35	-20157.09

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Table A5: The effect of DEMOCRACY on reporting UNEMPLOYMENT data with multiple-reporting

	Weibull Hazard Model	Exponential Hazard Model	Cox Hazard Model
The effect of Democracy	**0.90****	**1.01****	**0.94****
(Robust std error)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.18)
The effect of GDP/capita	0.00004**	0.00004**	0.00004**
(Robust std error)	(0.00001)	(0.00001)	(0.00001)
The effect of IMF participation	0.20*	0.26**	0.22**
(Robust std error)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Constant	-2.66**	-1.94**	
(Robust std error)	(0.22)	(0.20)	
Duration dependence	0.24**		
(Robust std error)	(0.04)		
# of countries:	173	173	173
# eventually reporting:	1,331	1,331	1,331
# of obs.	2,935	2,935	2,935
Log pseudolikelihood	1045.51	1016.38	-6337.83

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Table A6: The effect of DEMOCRACY on reporting ECONOMIC GROWTH data with multiple-reporting

	Weibull Hazard Model	Exponential Hazard Model	Cox Hazard Model
The effect of Democracy	**0.09****	**0.09****	**0.08****
(Robust std error)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
The effect of GDP/capita	-0.000001	0.000002	0.000001
(Robust std error)	(0.000002)	(0.000002)	(0.000002)
The effect of IMF participation	0.05**	0.08**	0.07**
(Robust std error)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Constant	-0.54**	-0.15**	
(Robust std error)	(0.07)	(0.04)	
Duration dependence	0.11**		
(Robust std error)	(0.01)		
# of countries:	173	173	173
# eventually reporting:	4,695	4,695	4,695
# of obs.	5,042	5,042	5,042
Log pseudolikelihood	8606.40	8586.90	-22770.67

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Table A7: Central Bank Independence has no significant efftect on inflation data dissemination

	Pooled Logit	Pooled Logit	Cond'l (FE) Logit	Pooled Logit	Weibull	Dyn. Probit	Expon'l	Cox	Weibull (mult. fail.)	Expon'l (mult. fail.)	Cox (mult. fail.)
The effect of Democracy	**2.61****	**2.35****	**4.56****	**2.05****	**1.50****	**1.81****	**1.75****	**0.42***	**0.21****	**0.16****	**0.17****
(Robust std error)	0.24	0.44	1.52	0.47	0.29	0.31	0.27	0.22	0.06	0.06	0.06
Central Bank Independence	-0.01	0.27	8.30	2.11	-1.09	-0.73	-0.65	-0.99	-0.05	-0.04	-0.04
(Robust std error)	0.67	0.87	6.88	1.36	1.08	1.06	1.30	0.66	0.20	0.20	0.20
The effect of GDP/capita		0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00*
(Robust std error)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
The effect of IMF participation		0.43**	0.66	0.42*	0.50**	0.14	0.20	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.06
(Robust std error)		0.20	0.67	0.24	0.21	0.23	0.19	0.17	0.04	0.04	0.04
Africa				2.21**	-3.09**						
(Robust std error)				0.32	0.82						
South Asia				4.17**	-1.11*						
(Robust std error)				0.58	0.60						
East Asia					-3.73**						
(Robust std error)					0.80						
S. E. Asia											
(Robust std error)											
Oceania											
(Robust std error)											
Middle East					-0.53						
(Robust std error)					0.55						
Latin America				0.33	-2.59**						
(Robust std error)				0.39	0.67						
Caribbean											
(Robust std error)											
East Europe				-2.26**	-3.81**						
(Robust std error)				0.48	1.20						
Industrial ctries					-0.80**						
(Robust std error)					0.40						
Constant	1.24**	0.37		-2.96**	-0.28	-1.24**	-2.06**		-0.74**	-0.25**	
(Robust std error)	0.22	0.31		0.52	0.52	0.37	0.55		0.13	0.10	
Duration dependence (ln p)					0.36**				0.14**		
(Robust std error)					0.10				0.02		
# of countries:			12		57		57	57	65	65	65
# eventually reporting:					56		56	56	1589	1589	1589
# of obs.	1,804	1,743	315	838	21	211	21	21	174	174	174
Log pseudolikelihood	-545.86	-383.90	-83.60	-267.00	-56.45	-78.97	-70.03	-187.28	2352.79	2339.86	#######

Note: Coefficients not hazard ratios are reported.

Figure 1: Reporting of data by regime