

Codebook RAI-Indigenous Regional Authority Index (RAI v. 3)

version January 24, 2021

Citation for the dataset

Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks, Arjan H. Schakel, Sandra Chapman Osterkat, Sara Niedzwiecki, Sarah Shair-Rosenfield. 2016. *Measuring Regional Authority: A Postfunctionalist Theory of Governance, Volume I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, xiv+ 687pp.

&

Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah, Arjan H. Schakel, Sara Niedzwiecki, Gary Marks, Liesbet Hooghe, Sandra Chapman-Osterkat. 2020. "Language difference and regional authority." *Regional and Federal Studies*, online <https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2020.1831476> [published online Oct 14, 2020].

Data for the Regional Authority Index (RAI) v.3. are available in five different aggregations. RAI-Indigenous contains estimates for subnational units that are governed by or on behalf of indigenous or tribal communities. **This is the codebook for RAI-Indigenous.**

Contents

Table 1: Five RAI V.3 datasets	2
Indigenous people	3
Unit of analysis	3
Differentiated governance	3
Table 2: Explanation of entries in excel file	6
Table 3: Country id, region id, region name, year-rows in dataset	11
Notes on categorizations	13

Table 1: Five RAI V.3 datasets

RAI-MLG	Annual scores for each individual region or regional tier from 1950-2018. Each row breaks a region–year down into ten dimensions, two domains, overall RAI. This is the master dataset that has a comprehensive record of all scores at the most disaggregated level.
RAI-Country	Annual scores for each country from 1950-2018. Each row breaks a country–year down in ten dimensions, two domains, and overall RAI.
RAI-Region	Annual scores for the most authoritative regional tier from 1950-2018. Each row breaks a tier–year down into ten dimensions, two domains, and overall RAI.
RAI-Metro	Annual scores for each individual metropolitan region or metropolitan tiers from 1950-2018. Each row breaks a metro–year down into ten dimensions, two domains, and overall RAI.
RAI-Indigenous	Annual scores for each individual indigenous region or collective indigenous territorial arrangements from 1950-2018. Each row breaks an indigenous–year down into ten dimensions, two domains, and overall RAI.

A codebook accompanies each dataset. **This is the codebook for RAI-Indigenous.**

Indigenous people

There is no generally accepted definition of an indigenous people, and some claim that a precise definition is overly restrictive (Corntassel and Witmer 2006; Emi 2006; O'Malley 1996; van Cott 2005; Warren and Jackson eds. 2002; Yashar 2005).¹ The UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues suggests the following guidelines:

- self-identification as an indigenous people;
 - historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies;
 - a strong link to a territory and its natural resources;
 - distinct social, economic, or political norms;
 - a distinct language, culture, and beliefs;
 - status as a non-dominant group of society;
 - commitment to maintain and reproduce their ancestral heritage as a distinctive people.
- (http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_factsheet1.pdf).

We define **an indigenous region** as a general purpose jurisdiction created with the explicit purpose to provide governance for an indigenous people or peoples. A region is coded as indigenous when it meets the following criteria: a) it exists between the local level of government and the national level; b) the jurisdiction is codified in law. An indigenous region may or may not be contiguous, and it does not need to meet the population criterion of minimally 150,000 inhabitants.

This implies that, aside from the criteria above, we require the existence of a jurisdiction whose boundaries are intended to encompass one or several indigenous communities. We do not presume that this jurisdiction has self-governance. Our decisions are informed by the UN conceptualization, our own research and secondary literature (see profiles), and extant classifications (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_indigenous_peoples).

This operationalization of governance of and by indigenous people in a regional jurisdiction contributes to a burgeoning literature on *indigenous multilevel governance* (e.g. Alcantara & Morden 2019; Papillon 2012; Papillon & Juneau 2015).

Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis is the individual region which we define as a jurisdiction between national government and local government. We relax the population criteria (minimally 150,000).

Differentiated governance

Each indigenous jurisdiction is evaluated on whether its jurisdictional status is differentiated from that of standard regions at its tier. This differentiated status is almost always reflected in a

¹ In practice, the definition varies widely across countries. In settler states colonized by Europeans, it is usually unproblematic to pinpoint indigenous people, but in Asia and Africa, where the majority of the world's 250 to 600 million indigenous peoples live, it is often less clear where to draw the line and governments tend to exploit this gray zone to minimize their existence.

different score on self-rule or shared rule from standard regions, or if there are no standard regions, in an anomalous status in the country.

A standard region is defined as follows:

- A *standard region* (S) is part of a regional tier. Standard regions have a uniform institutional set up. Hence, standard regions are scored in a tier (e.g. Changwat, Cantons, Länder), each of which has a separate entry in the dataset. Each year of evaluation has a separate row.

Our measure distinguishes three kinds of differentiated regions:

- An *asymmetric region* (Y) is embedded in a national tier, yet has distinctive authority on one or several dimensions of the RAI. Asymmetry is usually specified in one or more executive decisions, constitutional articles, or special clauses in framework legislation.
- An *autonomous region* (A) is exempt from the country-wide constitutional framework and receives special treatment as an individual jurisdiction. It operates mostly in a bilateral setting with the central state alone. The arrangement is laid down in a special protocol, statute, special law, or separate section of the constitution.
- A *dependency* (D) is not part of a standard tier, but is governed hierarchically by the central state. It has a separate government with no, or very little, authority.

Standard, asymmetry, autonomy, and dependency are mutually exclusive categorizations. No region can have more than one categorization at a given time.

We evaluate five dimensions of self-rule: institutional depth, policy scope, fiscal autonomy, borrowing autonomy, and representation. We evaluate five dimensions of shared rule: law making, executive control, fiscal control, borrowing control, and constitutional reform. There are two forms of shared rule. We code a region as having multilateral shared rule when its authority is contingent on coordination with other regions. We code a region as having bilateral shared rule when its authority is not contingent on coordination with other regions.

For a detailed discussion of the coding schema:

Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks, Arjan H. Schakel, Sandra Chapman Osterkatz, Sara Niedzwiecki, Sarah Shair-Rosenfield (2016). Chapter Three: How We Apply the Coding Scheme. *A Postfunctionalist Theory of Governance. Volume I: Measuring Regional Authority*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

References

- Alcantara, Christopher and Michael Morden. 2019. Indigenous multilevel governance and power relations. *Territory, Politics, Governance* 7(2): 250-264.
- Corntassel, Jeff, and Richard C. Witmer II. 2006. *Forced Federalism: Contemporary Challenges to Indigenous Nationhood*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Erni, Christian ed. 2009. *The Concept of Indigenous Peoples in Asia: A Resource Book*. International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

- O'Malley, Pat. 1996. Indigenous governance. *Economy and Society* 25(3):310-326.
- Papillon, Martin. 2012. Adapting federalism: Indigenous multilevel governance in Canada and the United States. *Publius: Journal of Federalism* 42: 289–312.
- Papillon, Martin and André Juneau (eds). (2015). *Aboriginal Multilevel Governance*. Montreal–Kingston: MQUP.
- Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2005. *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Warren, Kay B., and Jean E. Jackson, eds. 2002. *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Yashar, Deborah. 2005. *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Table 2: Explanation of entries in the excel file

VARIABLE NAME	RANGE	VALUES AND LABELS
cowcode	2-920	Correlates of War codes (http://www.correlatesofwar.org)
iso3166	8-891	International Organization for Standardization (ISO 3166-1)
countryid	1-152	Country ID (see table below)
country_name		Country name in English (see table below)
abbr_country		Abbreviation of country name
regionid	101-15212	Region ID (see table below)
region_name		Name of region in local language (see table below)
year	1950-2018	Year of evaluation
tier	1-5	1: highest tier 2: second tier 3: third tier 4: fourth tier 5: fifth tier
indigenous		1=indigenous; 0=other
type		S: standard region Y: asymmetrical region A: autonomous region D: dependent region
instdepth	0-3	The extent to which a regional government is autonomous rather than deconcentrated: 0: no functioning general-purpose administration at regional level 1: deconcentrated, general-purpose, administration 2: non-deconcentrated, general-purpose, administration subject to central government veto 3: non-deconcentrated, general-purpose, administration *not* subject to central government veto.
policyautonomy	0-4	The range of policies for which a regional government is responsible: 0: very weak authoritative competence in a), b), c), d) whereby a) economic policy; b) cultural-educational policy; c) welfare policy; d) one of the following: residual powers, police, own institutional set-up, local government 1: authoritative competencies in one of a), b), c) or d) 2: authoritative competencies in at least two of a), b), c), or d) 3: authoritative competencies in d) and at least two of a), b), or c) 4: criteria for 3 plus authority over immigration or citizenship.
fiscalautonomy	0-4	The extent to which a regional government can independently tax its population: 0: central government sets base and rate of all regional taxes 1: regional government sets the rate of minor taxes 2: regional government sets base and rate of minor taxes

		3: regional government sets the rate of at least one major tax: personal income, corporate, value added, or sales tax 4: regional government sets base and rate of at least one major tax.
borrowautonomy	0-3	The extent to which a regional government can borrow: 0: the regional government does not borrow (e.g. centrally imposed rules prohibit borrowing) 1: the regional government may borrow under prior authorization (<i>ex ante</i>) by the central government and with one or more of the following centrally imposed restrictions: a. golden rule (e.g. no borrowing to cover current account deficits) b. no foreign borrowing or borrowing from the central bank c. no borrowing above a ceiling d. borrowing is limited to specific purposes 2: the regional government may borrow without prior authorization (<i>ex post</i>) and under one or more of a), b), c), d), e) 3: the regional government may borrow without centrally imposed restrictions.
representation	0-4	The extent to which a region has an independent legislature and executive, which is the sum of <i>assembly</i> and <i>executive</i> .
lawmaking	0-2	The extent to which regional representatives co-determine national legislation, which is the sum of <i>L1 to L6 (max=2)</i> .
executivecontrol	0-2	The extent to which a regional government co-determines national policy in intergovernmental meetings, which is the maximum value of <i>exec_multilateral</i> and <i>exec_bilateral</i> .
fiscalcontrol	0-2	The extent to which regional representatives co-determine the distribution of national tax revenues, which is the maximum value of <i>fiscal_multilateral</i> and <i>fiscal_bilateral</i> .
borrowcontrol	0-2	The extent to which a regional government co-determines subnational and national borrowing constraints, which is the maximum value of <i>borrow_multilateral</i> and <i>borrow_bilateral</i> .
constitutional	0-4	The extent to which regional representatives co-determine constitutional change, which is the maximum value of <i>constit_multilateral</i> and <i>constit_bilateral</i> .
selfrule	0-18	The authority exercised by a regional government over those who live in the region, which is the sum of <i>instdepth</i> , <i>policyautonomy</i> , <i>fiscalautonomy</i> , <i>borrowautonomy</i> , and <i>representation</i> .
sharedrule	0-12	The authority exercised by a regional government or its representatives in the country as a whole, which is the sum of <i>lawmaking</i> , <i>executivecontrol</i> , <i>fiscalcontrol</i> , <i>borrowcontrol</i> , and <i>constitutional</i> .
RAI	0-30	Regional authority index, which is the sum of <i>selfrule</i> and <i>sharedrule</i> .
COMPONENTS		
instdepth	0-3	Same as <i>instdepth</i>
policyautonomy	0-4	Same as <i>policyautonomy</i>
fiscalautonomy	0-4	Same as <i>fiscalautonomy</i>

borrowautonomy	0-4	Same as <i>borrowautonomy</i>
assembly	0-2	0: no regional assembly 1: indirectly elected regional assembly 2: directly elected assembly
executive	0-2	0: regional executive appointed by central government 1: dual executive appointed by central government and regional assembly 2: regional executive appointed by a regional assembly or directly elected
L1lawmaking	0-0.5	0: a region or regional tier is <i>*not*</i> the unit of representation in a national legislature 0.5: a region or regional tier is the unit of representation in a national legislature
L2lawmaking	0-0.5	0: a regional government or regional tier does <i>*not*</i> designate representatives in a national legislature 0.5: a region or regional tier designates representatives in a national legislature
L3lawmaking	0-0.5	0: regions do <i>*not*</i> have majority representation in a national legislature based on regional representation 0.5: regions have majority representation in a national legislature based on regional representation
L4lawmaking	0-0.5	0: the legislature based on regional representation does <i>*not*</i> have extensive legislative authority 0.5: the legislature based on regional representation has extensive legislative authority
L5lawmaking	0-0.5	0: the regional government or its regional representatives in a national legislature are <i>*not*</i> consulted on national legislation affecting the region 0.5: the regional government or its regional representatives in a national legislature are consulted on national legislation affecting the region
L6lawmaking	0-0.5	0: the regional government or its regional representatives in a national legislature do <i>*not*</i> have veto power over national legislation affecting the region 0.5: the regional government or regional representatives in a national legislature have veto power over national legislation affecting the region
exec_multilateral	0-2	0: no routine meetings between the central government and regional governments to negotiate policy 1: routine meetings between the central government and regional governments without legally binding authority 2: routine meetings between the central government and regional governments with legally binding authority
exec_bilateral	0-2	0: no routine meetings between the central government and the regional government to discuss national policy affecting the region 1: routine meetings between the central government and the regional government without legally binding authority

		2: routine meetings between the central government and the regional government with legally binding authority
fiscal_multilateral	0-2	0: neither the regional governments nor their representatives in a national legislature are consulted over the distribution of national tax revenues 1: regional governments or their representatives in a national legislature negotiate over the distribution of national tax revenues, but do not have a veto 2: regional governments or their representatives in a national legislature have a veto over the distribution of national tax revenues
fiscal_bilateral	0-2	0: neither the regional government nor its representatives in a national legislature are consulted over the distribution of tax revenues affecting the region 1: the regional government or its representatives in a national legislature negotiate with the central government over the distribution of tax revenues affecting the region, but does not have a veto 2: the regional government or its representatives in a national legislature have a veto over the distribution of tax revenues affecting the region
borrow_multilateral	0-2	0: regional governments are not routinely consulted over borrowing constraints 1: regional governments negotiate routinely over borrowing constraints, but do not have a veto 2: regional governments negotiate routinely over borrowing constraints and have a veto
borrow_bilateral	0-2	0: the regional government is not routinely consulted over borrowing constraints affecting the region 1: the regional government negotiates routinely over borrowing constraints affecting the region, but does not have a veto 2: the regional government negotiates routinely over borrowing constraints affecting the region, and has a veto

constit_multilateral	0-4	<p>0: the central government or national electorate can unilaterally reform the constitution</p> <p>1: a legislature based on regional representation can propose or postpone constitutional reform, raise the decision hurdle in the other chamber, require a second vote in the other chamber, or require a popular referendum</p> <p>2: regional governments or their representatives in a national legislature propose or postpone constitutional reform, raise the decision hurdle in the other chamber, require a second vote in the other chamber, or require a popular referendum</p> <p>3: a legislature based on regional representation can veto constitutional change; or constitutional change requires a referendum based on the principle of equal regional representation</p> <p>4: regional governments or their representatives in a legislature can veto constitutional change</p>
constit_bilateral	0-4	<p>0: the central government or national electorate can unilaterally reform the region's constitutional relation with the center</p> <p>1: a regional referendum can propose or postpone reform of the region's constitutional relation with the center</p> <p>2: the regional government can propose or postpone reform of the region's constitutional provisions or require a popular referendum</p> <p>3: a regional referendum can veto a reform of a region's constitutional relation with the center</p> <p>4: the regional government can veto a reform of the region's constitutional relation with the center</p>
popweight	0-1	Population weight=proportion of country population in this region

Table 3: Country id, region id, region name, year-rows in dataset

Country ID	Country Name	Region ID	Region Name	Year-rows in the dataset
2	Australia	202	Northern Territory	1950-2018
		703	Northwest Territories	1950-2018
		704	Yukon	1950-2018
3	Canada	705	Nunavut	1999-2018
		706	Indian Act bands	1950-2018
		707	Self-governing Aboriginal People	1977-2018
		1104	Kalaallit Nunaat/ Grønland	1950-2018
33	Russian Federation	3301.01	Adygeya	1993-2018
		3301.02	Altai	1993-2018
		3301.03	Bashkortostan	1993-2018
		3301.04	Buryatiya	1993-2018
		3301.05	Chechen	1993-2018
		3301.06	Chuvash	1993-2018
		3301.08	Dagestan	1993-2018
		3301.09	Ingushetiya	1993-2018
		3301.1	Kabardino-Balkar	1993-2018
		3301.11	Kalmykiya	1993-2018
		3301.12	Karachai-Cherkess	1993-2018
		3301.13	Kareliya	1993-2018
		3301.14	Khakasiya	1993-2018
		3301.15	Komi	1993-2018
		3301.16	Marii-El	1993-2018
		3301.17	Mordoviya	1993-2018
		3301.18	North Osetiya-Alaniya	1993-2018
		3301.19	Sakha (Yakutiya)	1993-2018
		3301.20	Tatarstan	1993-2018
		3301.21	Tyva	1993-2018
		3301.22	Udmurt	1993-2018
		3302.59	Ust-Orda Buryat	1993-2007
42	United States	4205	Indian Tribes	1950-2018
80	Indonesia	8006	Papua	2001-2018
		8902	Karen	1950-1973
		8903	Karenni	1950-1973
		8904	Kachin	1950-1973
		8905	Shan	1950-1973
		8906	Chin Hills District	1950-1973
		8908	Pyi Ne [states]	1974-2018
		8910	Kòbàin οστχοσ khwɪnjəhdèθə [koupain outhcou hkwinya deitha –Self-Administered Zone]	2010-2018

Notes on categorizations

Australia	Northern Territory: The Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976 – 49% of land owned by aboriginal communities
Bangladesh	CHT Chittagong Hill Tracts--tribal refugees from Burma Arakan in 16th century and now settled by indigenous peoples who have been living there since.
Bolivia	30+ recently legally recognized indigenous communities. Not Gran Chaco region, which is predominantly settler.
Canada	Yukon, NWT, Nunavut: Nunavut is only predominantly indigenous government, but other two have strong indigenous governance components
China	Tibet, Uyghur, Guangxi special regions: somewhat restrictive application of what constitutes 'indigenous' given that China reportedly has almost 112 million recognized indigenous groups. There is a patchwork of limited legal recognition of indigenous and ethnic difference at lower tiers, but limited general-purpose tribal/indigenous/ethnic self-governance.
Colombia	+/- 644 resguardos indigenas. Like several Latin-American countries, areas with sizeable communities of pre-columbian descent were often kept under direct central government control outside the standard territorial governance framework until deep into the 20 th century. Nine dependencies, mostly in the west and south of the country, were upgraded to departments in 1991, and at the same time, a law introduced indigenous self-governance for local communities.
Costa Rica	Territorios indigenas
Denmark	The people and government of Greenland self-identify as primarily indigenous
Finland, Sweden, Norway	Saami self-governance – not coded because it does not meet territorial criteria. For example, in Norway, a law adopted in 1987 gave Sami people the right of linguistic and cultural self-government (Law No. 56/1987). From 1989 a Sami parliament has held direct elections every four years, and it has consultation rights on government decisions that may affect the Sami people. The Sami parliament is financially dependent on the central state. The law specifies language rights for Sami people including the right to use Sami language in communication with local and central government. Broadly similar to laws were enacted around the same time in Finland and Sweden.
India	The extent to which a state's population is tribal varies considerably. In the northeastern states of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, and Nagaland, upward of 90 percent of the population is tribal. Three of these—Nagaland, Meghalaya and Mizoram enjoy special legislative privileges. Dadra & Nagar Haveli (62%) and Andaman & Nicobar (protected indigenous) are also indigenous-dominant. There are also special protective arrangements (Scheduled Tribes) at the substate level enshrined in the Indian constitution (autonomous districts; special names). Some 8.6% of the population is estimated to be tribal-indigenous. In the remaining northeast states of Assam, Manipur, Sikkim, and Tripura, tribal peoples form between 20 and 30 percent of the population. http://factsanddetails.com/india/Minorities_Castes_and_Regions_in_India/sub7_4h/entry-4216.html .

Indonesia	Papua is special status province, where an estimated 50 per cent consists of indigenous peoples of Melanesian descent and 50 per cent Indonesian migrants. An argument could be made to also include West Papua.
Myanmar	Karen, Karenni (renamed Kayah), Kachin, Shan, Chin Hills District until 1973 --- thereafter largely respected as “states for ethnic nations” in post-authoritarian Myanmar (Chin, Kachin, Kayah, Kayin, Mon, Rakhine, Shan). Self-Administered region (Wa) and Self-administered zones (Naga, Danu, Pa-O, Pa Laung, Kokang) are smaller areas of self-governance for indigenous peoples.
New Zealand	Relatively large-scale Maori indigenous population, but not territorially concentrated. Falls outside the RAI criteria. Ongoing calls for Maori self-governance.
Nicaragua	Two autonomous regions along the Mosquito coast, self-governance recognized in 1987 by the sandinista government.
Pakistan	Baluchistan and Khyber-Pakhtunkwa are predominantly tribal; Gilgit-Baltistan appears not to be. FATA and PATA are tribal.
Panama	Long-standing recognition of indigenous communities (five)
Papua New Guinea	Strong survival (and protection) of native pre-modern governance though superimposed with modern administration. Provinces, Bougainville, and NCD
Paraguay	Has interestingly adopted Guarani as national language reflecting indigenous roots; large percentage of population reports indigenous roots, but is predominantly settler.
Russia	Broad definition – following here the legal practice of titular nations = peoples who gave rise to the names of republics or autonomous areas. Dagestan has its own list of indigenous peoples.
Spain	Some definitions of indigenous encompass Basques and Navarre. Not included here.
Taiwan	Pockets of prior Formosan inhabitants who have retained some of pre-colonial habits and mores, but no special territorial recognition.
USA	Indian Tribal governance is the chief, legally recognized form of indigenous governance; small, recognized, groups of indigenous peoples originating in Hawaii (Melanesian) and Alaska (Inuit) – too marginalized in their respective states to justify coding Hawaii or Alaska as indigenous.