

Dataset on International Election Monitoring (DIEM)*

Judith Kelley, Principal Investigator

Version 1.0
June 2010

* This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0550111. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Contents

DESCRIPTION.....	2
SOURCES.....	2
CODING PROCEDURE	2
BASIC INFORMATION.....	2
DOCUMENT DETAILS	3
MISSION INFORMATION	5
ELECTION QUALITY VARIABLES.....	9
Summary variables.....	9
Main specific criticisms	11
STRUCTURAL VARIABLES.....	12
PRE-ELECTION CHEATING.....	14
PRE-ELECTION ADMINISTRATIVE IRREGULARITIES.....	17
PRE-ELECTION VIOLENCE AND UNREST	19
EXPLICIT CHEATING ON ELECTION DAY	20
ELECTION DAY ADMINISTRATIVE IRREGULARITIES.....	21
ELECTION DAY VIOLENCE AND UNREST	23
SUMMARY VARIABLES.....	24
INTERCODER RELIABILITY SCORES PRE-RECONCILIATION	24
LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS DOCUMENTS USED AS SOURCES	25
LIST OF ACRONYMS	38
CODING MANUAL.....	39

Dataset on International Election Monitoring (DIEM)

DESCRIPTION

This data set codes the assessment and activities of international election monitoring organizations to national level legislative and presidential elections in 108 countries from 1980 to 2004. The overall election quality variables as well as the seven categories of violence and irregularities in the pre-election period and on Election Day are the same categories as were also coded in the QED data set.

SOURCES

Organizational documentation from election observation missions. An overview of sources can be found at the end of this codebook.

CODING PROCEDURE

All documents were coded twice by the same two coders, one a graduate student and one an undergraduate student. Both students were trained extensively by the Principal Investigator. After initial coding, reports were reconciled under the supervision of the Principal Investigator. Reconciliation variables were tracked on the major variables, as listed at the end of this coding manual. Codings were recorded on paper coding sheets and later entered using the Epidata software (<http://www.epidata.dk/>) to reduce entry errors.

BASIC INFORMATION

newid: *unique master identification number.*

cow: *Correlates of War ID number.*

country: *Name of the country.*

year: *Year of the election.*

legelec: *Legislative election.*

This is coded "1" only for legislative elections, "0" otherwise.

dateleg: *Month of the legislative election.*

exelec: *Executive election.*

This is coded "1" only for executive elections, "0" otherwise.

dateexec: *Month of the executive election.*

eltrans: *Transitional election.*

This is coded "1" only if the election monitoring report specifically mentions the word "transition" or "transitional" election, "0" otherwise.

elrunoff: *Run-off election.*

This is coded "1" if the report notes that there was a run-off election, "0" otherwise.

DOCUMENT DETAILS

dprel: *Pre-election documents coded.*

This is coded 1 if a pre-election document was coded. "0" otherwise.

dpoel: *Post-election documents coded.*

This is coded 1 if a post-election document was coded, "0" otherwise. Post election documents do NOT include final reports, but may include press statements, preliminary statements, post-election statements and the like.

dpoeln: *Number of pages of post-election documents coded.*

dfin: *Final document.*

This is coded "1" if a final report was coded, "0" otherwise.

dfinpn: *Number of pages of final report coded.*

del1num: *Number of persons in the first observer delegation.*

A delegation is any person(s) sent prior to the election which remains in the country until the elections without departing. A member of a delegation is anyone officially participating in the mission. Thus staff and official observers get counted equally as long as they are officially working for the organization.

MISSION INFORMATION

joint: *Joint observation mission*

Indicated whether election was monitored jointly by more than one organization.

morg2: *Monitoring organization code.*

IFES	1	
NDI	2	
IRI	3	
CC	4	
UN	5	
OSCE	6	
EP	7	
NHC	8	
SADC	9	
EISA	10	
OAS	11	
CW	12	
CoE	13	
EU	14	
ANFREL	15	
CIS	16	
IHRLG	17	
Other	18	
ECF	19	
OAU / AU	20	Joint
IFES / UN	21	Joint
NDI / IRI	22	Joint
NDI / CC	23	Joint
OSCE / EP	24	Joint
OSCE / NHC	25	Joint
SADC / EISA	26	Joint

del1days: *Number of days that delegation 1 is the in country.*

The number includes both start and end date.

del2num. *Number of persons in the second observer delegation.*

This indicates if a second delegation arrived to join the first. A delegation is any person(s) sent prior to the election which remains in the country until the elections without departing. A member of a delegation is anyone officially participating in the mission. Thus staff and official observers get counted equally as long as they are working for the organization.

del2days: *Number of days that delegation 2 is the in country.*

The number includes both start and end date.

del3num. *Number of persons in the third observer delegation.*

This indicates if a third delegation arrived to join the first and the second. A delegation is any person(s) sent prior to the election which remains in the country until the elections without departing. A member of a delegation is anyone officially participating in the mission. Thus staff and official observers get counted equally as long as they are working for the organization.

del3days: *Number of days that delegation 3 is the in country.*

The number includes both start and end date.

obsnum: *Total number of observers present on election day.*

This number is the number specifically reported in the document. If no total number is recorded, this is the sum of delegations 1 to 3. If the report gives a total that varies from what would otherwise be the sum of the delegations that they have indicated are present, the given total number provided is used. If there was a run-off election and the number of observers differed on the two election days, then the larger number is used.

If there was a run-off and both were observed, the date of the first round is used.

obsdom: *Domestic observers.*

This is coded "1" if the report mentions the presence of domestic observers. "0" otherwise.

obsdomn: *Number of domestic observers.*

This is the number of domestic observers present, if mentioned.

c1visitn: *Number of pre-election assessment visits.*

A pre-election assessment visit is any delegation by the organization which arrives before the election and then leaves before the election.

c1pressn: *Number of press statements issued before the election.*

A press statement is a document labeled a press release, press statement, or a preliminary statement.

c1media: *Media monitoring.*

0: None

1: Informal

2: Systematic

This variable captures how systematic the organizations media monitoring was.

This is coded “0” if the organization did not monitor the media in the pre-election period. The report may have a brief one or two line mention, but there is no effort at assessing or evaluating the media.

This is coded “1” if the report contains an informal overview, suggests there were some meetings with media, attention was paid to the role of the media and the organization makes some informal assessment that fills at least a paragraph. There may be more than one paragraph, but the distinguishing difference from a 2 coding here is that there is NOT any numbers, counts, percentages that would indicate a systematic analysis.

This is coded “2” if there is an extensive formal overview that uses quantitative, systematic analysis. To receive this coding, the analysis must report results of a more academic analysis of the content of media. There must be a specific sub-section of the report devoted to the media, with its own heading. There must be emphasis on systematic analysis of content either in the form of space provided in the press, or time on the television or radio, as well as analysis of biases and access to media outlets. To receive this coding there should be quantitative analysis, indicating share of coverage, percentages, counts or other ways of breaking down the coverage into numbers that were then clearly analyzed. This coding is likely to require at least two pages and frequently more of a discussion.

c1train: *Training of domestic monitors.*

This is coded “1” if the report notes that the organization trained domestic monitors. If the report itself uses the word training, then the activity qualifies as such. If the report discusses official sessions in which domestic monitors are taught skills, then it qualifies as training. It does not qualify as domestic training if the election observing organization provided training for its own monitoring team (usually recruited from locals, especially medium and long term monitoring staff). The training refers to observers other than the organization's own employed monitoring staff. “0” otherwise.

c1legal: *Legal advice.*

This is coded "1" if the organization provided legal advice regarding election administration. This activity must involve recommendations to change laws and regulations pertaining to the election, not just discussions of how to improve the running or implementation of the election. Note further: advice given as recommendations after the election does not qualify. It must be engagement on the legal and administrative issues before the election. An example would be an organization making specific recommendations before the election to change the provisions of the election law, or an organization recommending before the election that the legal rules underpinning the independence of the electoral commission be changed. Legal advice is sometimes included in pre-election statements or summaries of pre-election visits included in a final report.

c1civic: *Civic education.*

This is coded "1" if the organization conducted voter education or other forms of civic education. Words commonly used to describe these activities are civic education or voter education, or information campaigns. Also code this as "1" if the organization reports that it undertook activities such as holding meetings for voters, producing media (TV, radio, newspaper) programs, or printed and distributed leaflets to voters about:

- where to vote or how to read the ballot,
- the offices for which the election would be held, about the importance of voting,
- what is proper procedures for voting (secrecy, not marking name on ballot etc),
- not having group or family voting,
- not taking money for votes and so on.

c1rallies: *Campaign rallies.*

This is coded "1" if the organization specifically notes having observed campaign rallies. This may be indicated in the itinerary in the appendices or discussed in the text.

c2quickc: *Quick count.*

This is coded "1" if the report discusses a quick-count and if the organization was in charge of it.

c2logist: *Logistical support.*

This is coded "1" if the organization provided some form of support to aid in the administration of the elections. Examples include support for ballot printing/design, transport of ballots or any other logistical or technical support that normally would be done by the electoral administration of a country. Only activities that are operationally a practical part of the election are considered logistical support.

c2pressn: *Number of press statements issued after the election.*

A press statement is a document labeled a press release, press statement, or a preliminary statement.

c2voting: *Observation of voting.*

This is coded “1” if the organization directly observed some of the voting process in the polling booths, “0” otherwise.

c2count: *Observation of counting.*

This is coded “1” if the organization directly observed some of the vote counting process, “0” otherwise.

c2conflict: *Conflict mediation.*

This is coded “1” if the organization reports that one of its officials performed mediatory functions to calm tensions and resolve problems during and especially after the election. An example would be Jimmy Carter stepping in to convince a loosing incumbent to step down from power or an observer mission helping to provide a solution on the day of elections to a group of protesting people who claim they have been prevented from voting. “0” otherwise.

ELECTION QUALITY VARIABLES

Summary variables

a1: *Overall election quality*

0: *Acceptable*

1: *Ambiguous*

2: *Unacceptable*

Note, this assessment does NOT draw on the final report in full, but instead relies ONLY on any overall assessment the organization provides. This should be found either in an executive summary, in the introduction, or in a summary or conclusion. It may also be found in press statements or other ways the organization projects an overall assessment. Thus, this coding of this variable is done prior to reading the report in full and it draws ONLY on the text of the introduction, summary, conclusion and press statements.

The overall election quality is coded “0” if the organization says that the election represents the will of the people. This may be stated in language such as “free and fair,”

reflected the will of the people, “properly/Impartially carried out, the election met or exceeded all requirements, the elections were held in compliance with international standards, elections were transparent and well run, elections were legitimate, the outcome was legitimate, elections were not marred by disturbances, the observers witnessed no evidence of fraud. It may even include mild criticisms but still place confidence in the elections by making statements such as: the elections were conducted with only minor difficulties, assertions of fraud/problems were minor/negligible, elections were conducted in a generally adequate manner. This may also be coded “0” if in spite of various issues the assessment raises. It is coded “0” as long as whatever problems discussed “did not affect the outcome of the election,” or “we nevertheless have confidence that the voters expressed their preferences,” or something similar. Thus, this variable can be coded “0” even in the face of strong criticisms such as “the elections reflected the will of the people, but it was marred by serious irregularities.”

The overall election quality is coded “1” if the organization says that the election does NOT represent the will of the people. The organization may note that the elections were fraudulent, not free and fair, fell short of international standards/accepted norms/international commitments, or otherwise states that the elections were marred by gross/grave/blatant violation/manipulation. A code of “1” is also used if the organization notes that there are serious questions about the validity of the outcome or if the elections show serious concerns about the environment of democratic institutions.

The overall election quality is coded “0.5” if the organization is ambivalent and it is not possible to discern if the organization’s opinion about the overall validity of the outcome of the election. The organization may either simply not make any defining statement, or they may say that they are unable or unwilling to assess the validity of the election. Note that if they nevertheless then go on to make statements that would fit under coding 0 or 1, then the variable should not be coded 9.

a2: Extent of the problems.

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| 0: Good | -- no problems |
| 1: low | --minor problems only |
| 2: moderate | --moderate problems |
| 3: high | --major problems |

Note, this assessment does NOT draw on the final report in full, but instead relies ONLY on any overall assessment the organization provides. This should be found either in an executive summary, in the introduction, or in a summary or conclusion. It may also be found in press statements or other ways the organization projects an overall assessment. Thus, this coding of this variable is done prior to reading the report in full and it draws ONLY on the text of the introduction, summary, conclusion and press statements.

This variable is coded “0” if the overall assessment does not note any problems. Note, a coding of “0” on this variable is only possible if a1, the will of the people” is coded “0.”

This variable is coded "1" if the overall assessment notes only minor problems. The assessment may state that the elections were conducted with only minor/negligible problems, or that they were generally adequate, that there was an absence of major problems. The assessment may mention specific issues/criticisms but none of these are serious concerns that relate to the core conduct of the election. Note, a coding of "1" on this variable is only possible if a1, the will of the people" is coded "0 or 9."

This variable is coded "2" if the overall assessment notes major problems. It is the only level of this variable which may coincide with any coding of a1, the will of the people. The assessment may note that were serious problems/irregularities and list many highly problematic issues. It may use words such as "marred" and "fraud" and cheating and use adjectives like serious or grave.

This variable is coded "3" if the overall assessment notes the highest level of problems possible. Note, a coding of "9" on this variable is only possible if a1, the will of the people" is coded "1 or 9." A coding of "3" is given if the assessment's list of criticisms is very long and grave in nature and if the conclusion lists few redeeming values of the election at all.

Main specific criticisms

These variables are all based on the entire report including the introduction, conclusion and the main body and any other materials of the election monitoring organization such as press releases, preliminary statements and the like. Efforts are made to avoid double counting. For example, beware of double counting. For example: if a government misuses the media, this gets counted as misuse of the media, but not as a misuse of government resources. If the media is restricted, this clearly influences the freedom to campaign, but gets coded as a media problem. However, if a problem was present/affects both in the pre-election period and during the election itself, this is noted by coding it in both periods.

Note: these variables are all coded based on the following scale:

<i>0: Good</i>	<i>-- no problems</i>
<i>1: low</i>	<i>--minor problems only</i>
<i>2: moderate</i>	<i>--moderate problems</i>
<i>3: high</i>	<i>--major problems</i>

Description of levels:

Good: There is no mention of violations in a given category and the report may outright praise the relevant behavior was good.

Low: The reports mentions problems once or twice in passing but do not voice the issues in terms of a complaint. Words like rare, uncommon, unusual, exceptional, singular, “few and far between,” sporadic or infrequent may be used. The report does not dwell on it or elaborate or direct criticism of this towards the government. They note that the incident or violation only occurred in some limited or isolated cases of minor proportion. The report does not indicate that this was something the organization was concerned about. There is no sense that this was a ubiquitous practice. Important: under low, also include problems that were discussed in the report but the organization dismisses as unfounded or stresses that they have not been able to substantiate. However, if the only reason for a low coding is unsubstantiated allegations, note this in the margin of the coding sheet.

Medium: The report provides some detailed discussion of the particular problem and expresses some dissatisfaction and concern about the effect on the complaint on the election. The report does not go so far as to say that these were serious problems or that they threw into doubt the validity of the elections. It does not use terminology like serious, widespread, prevalent, rife, pervasive, common, extensive, severe, grave or similar words that would indicate the magnitude of the violation was of a high level. Rather, the report tends to use terms like several, “more than a few”, “in a considerable number of cases,” “it was not uncommon,” or other phrases that indicate that the situation was not negligible, but that it was also not egregious.

High: The report elaborates and substantiates extensively on the problem. It expresses serious concerns that the violations mar the election. It uses terminology such as serious, widespread, prevalent, rife, pervasive, common, extensive, severe, grave or similar words that would indicate the magnitude of the violation was of a high level. It notes that the observers are very concerned, troubled, uneasy, worried or disturbed about the issue.

STRUCTURAL VARIABLES

r01r: *legal framework.*

0: *Good*

-- *no problems*

1: *low*

--*minor problems only*

2: *moderate*

--*moderate problems*

3: *high*

--*major problems*

The variable pertains to the quality of the legal framework for holding the elections. The problems noted here must be legal in nature, not simply behavioral. That is, if the underlying law is fine, but the problems are with implementation, then they do not get coded under the legal framework (but under various other variables such as complaints about the behavior of the electoral commission, administrative insufficiencies etc). Legal problems include, but are not limited to criticisms about the election law that organization stresses as:

- Vague wording of law that can be interpreted in multiple ways
- Weaknesses in the appeal and complaints process as written in the law
- 'Constitutional issues': Uncertainty in the role of a caretaker government, when or who can call elections or dissolve parliament etc.
- Some citizens, such as women, are not allowed to vote
- Any restrictions on who can vote that are not in the standard range of 18-21 years of age and citizen.
- Clauses that are clearly questionable- - prohibition against campaigning through the private media, etc.
- Flaws in the complaints procedures
- Giving full authority to a group that is obviously tied to the incumbent
- Law promotes ethnic divides
- Held under old laws that had been proven to be flawed
- Serious omissions
- Composition of electoral commissions – for example: members of the election commission are political appointees which takes opposing sides when the rules of the game are at stake.
- Does not provide the necessary conditions for free elections if applied
- Setting high minimum percent of votes needed and therefore affecting minority parties
- High threshold for parties to get registered
- Law makes people identify themselves by their ethnic group in order to participate in election
- Undemocratic legal provisions
- Allowing for multiple repeated elections

r02r: *Limiting scope and jurisdiction of elective offices.*

0: Good -- no problems

1: low --minor problems only

2: moderate --moderate problems

3: high --major problems

This pertains to the office for which elections are being held. If presidential, does the president really have any power? If legislative elections, do the elected politicians really have any power once in office? This does NOT pertain to the election commission or other administrative offices that are appointed positions. Criticisms by organizations under this variable may therefore include:

- Situations where the legislatures is elected in direct elections, but the legal framework effectively limits the power they will have once in office
- Situations where some seats in the legislature are appointed and decisions cannot be made without the consent of these appointed officials, effectively providing a veto by appointed officials.
- Situations where the head of state is elected in direct elections, but the position is a figure head with no real implementation powers

r03r: *Unreasonable limits of who can run for office.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*

1: *low* --*minor problems only*

2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*

3: *high* --*major problems*

This pertains to the office for which elections are being held. Criticisms by organizations under this variable may therefore include:

- Certain subgroups of the population such as women or minorities are not allowed to run for office
- Certain skills, such as language requirements or literacy skills, prevent some citizens from running for office
- Law has ambiguous requirements such as a prerequisite being that a citizen is honorable, or of good character, or patriotic
- There are official tests or educational requirements for running for office

r01str: *Overall structural environment.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*

1: *low* --*minor problems only*

2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*

3: *high* --*major problems*

This variable assesses the issues under r01r - r03r combined, but it is not a mathematical index of these. An election may be coded "0" for any sub-category, but if there are other issues that are highly important in other subcategories, then this overall assessment may be coded as "3". This variable is coded on the 0-3 scale. That is, it is coded 0 if the legal environment for the elections was good. It is coded "1" if there were minor deficiencies in the existing legal framework. It is coded "2" if there were moderate deficiencies and "3" if there were high deficiencies. A coding of "3" should generally be compatible with a coding of a1 as "1" since such major legal problems are of the magnitude that they make it impossible for the election to truly reflect the will of the voters.

PRE-ELECTION CHEATING

r111r: *Improper use of public funds.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*

1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This variable captures improper use of public funds and unfair use of government resources. All incumbent have certain advantages. However, the issue is whether the organization points out this particular category as an area of concern. Note, if the incumbent controls media outlets, this is not coded as improper use of public funds but as a media restriction. However, the organization may mention concerns of the following types:

- Substantial public campaign funding enjoyed by the party in power compared to other parties
- Misuse of public infrastructure for campaigning
- Distribution of humanitarian aid for campaigning purposes
- Interference by executive authorities with political campaign
- 'Promises of funding / development that is contingent on incumbent winning'
- Use of public employees in campaign activities

r112r: *Freedom to campaign.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This variable captures whether the report mentions restrictions on the freedom to campaign. Note that general poor conditions or lack of infrastructure does not qualify as a restriction. These must be political restrictions. Intimidation of candidates and misuse of media, while these interfere with campaigning, are not included in this variable. Examples of concerns reported by the organization included are:

- Constraints on freedom of movement
- Disruption of party meetings
- Political pressure on candidates
- Abuses of rules on freedom of association
- Representatives have not been allowed freedom of movement
- Limiting candidates possibilities for public debates, meetings and demonstrations
- Not allowing opposition to rent office

r113r: *Media.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This variable captures restrictions on media/ misuse of the media. All violations pertaining to the media should be coded under this heading. Thus, if an incumbent misuses his resources to influence or curtail the media freedom, this goes under this coding. Examples of concerns reported by the organization include:

- Imprisonment of journalists
- Candidates had no direct contact with the press
- Newspapers closed during the election campaign
- Only permitted media outlets are biased
- Journalists being sued for libel during elections or legal action being taken against journalists
- Can only use state owned media
- Not fair, not clean and not honest media coverage
- Harassment from tax inspectors and safety inspectorates
- Threats of losing privileges, including media licenses

r114r: *Intimidation.*

- 0: Good -- no problems
1: low --minor problems only
2: moderate --moderate problems
3: high --major problems

Intimidation is coded separately from violence. It includes reports by the organization of the following examples of behavior:

- Aggressive behavior of some party representatives
- Undue political pressure on voters
- Extraordinary tax inspections
- Administrative fines
- Dismissal from employment
- Declaration of martial law on day of election
- Threats made by some parties to voters in general or to groups in particular villages etc.
- Intimidation of candidates- trying to get them to drop out of the race
- Detention of election commission members/ police interference
- Arrest or detention of voters taking political initiatives

r11cheat: *Overall pre-election political conditions*

- 0: Good -- no problems
1: low --minor problems only
2: moderate --moderate problems
3: high --major problems

This variable assesses the issues under r111r – r114r combined, but it is not a mathematical index of these. An election may be coded “0” for any sub-category, but if there are other issues that are highly important in other subcategories, then this overall assessment may be coded as “3”. This variable is coded on the 0-3 scale. It is coded “0” if the political pre-

election environment was generally good. It is coded “1” if there were minor issues, “2” if there were moderate issues, and “3” if the problems were high.

PRE-ELECTION ADMINISTRATIVE IRREGULARITIES

r121r: *Problems in voter lists/ registration.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This captures administrative problems with the voter lists and registration that the organization reports as occurring in the pre-election period. These problems may be corrected prior to the election, but if the organization mentions them, they are coded here. Examples include:

- Missing names
- Dead people still on lists
- Duplicate voter cards issued
- Not delivering voter cards in time
- Incomplete/ inaccurate/out of date lists
- Voters unable to get their names on the list

r122r: *Complaints about electoral commission conduct.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This captures problems with the electoral commission that the organization reports as occurring in the pre-election period. These problems may be corrected prior to the election, but if the organization mentions them, they are coded here. Examples include:

- Irregularities in nomination of election commission
- Composition/appointment questionable
- Failure on part of the commission to establish a credible and consistent procedure to verify signatures
- Arbitrary decision making by the commission
- Uneven enforcement of election law by the commission
- The commission does not function in a transparent manner

r123r: *Voter Information problems and procedural problems.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*

1: *low* --*minor problems only*

2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*

3: *high* --*major problems*

This captures problems with the voter information and other procedural problems that that the organization reports as occurring in the pre-election period and contribute to confusion in the pre-election period.

Examples include:

- Failure to provide information about the electoral rules
- Failure to provide information about the candidates
- Failure to provide information about polling places

r124r: *Technical/procedural difficulties in pre-election capacity.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*

1: *low* --*minor problems only*

2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*

3: *high* --*major problems*

This captures technical/procedural problems that that the organization reports as occurring in the pre-election period. Examples include:

- Misprinted ballots
- Bad paper used to make the ballots and led to invalidation of ballots

r12cap: *Overall pre-election administrative capacity.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This variable assesses the issues under r121r – r124r combined, but it is not a mathematical index of these. An election may be coded “0” for any sub-category, but if there are other issues that are highly important in other subcategories, then this overall assessment may be coded as “3”. This variable is coded on the 0-3 scale. It is coded “0” if the pre-election capacity was generally good. It is coded “1” if there were minor issues, “2” if there were moderate issues, and “3” if the problems were high.

PRE-ELECTION VIOLENCE AND UNREST

r13viol: *Violence and Unrest.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This captures the level of violence reported by the election monitoring organization in the pre-election period. If the election takes place in a general condition of war, this is coded here as high. If a subpart of the country is in war, this may be coded lower depending on the effect the organization reports this to have on the election. Note that violence is different from intimidation as coded separately. The following are examples of behaviors that would qualify as violence and unrest:

- Grenades and other weapons use
- Murders
- Physical Assaults/abuse/beatings
- Protests turned violent
- Ongoing civil conflict or war in isolated areas

EXPLICIT CHEATING ON ELECTION DAY

r211r: *Vote processing.*

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| 0: Good | -- no problems |
| 1: low | --minor problems only |
| 2: moderate | --moderate problems |
| 3: high | --major problems |

This category is different from voter fraud, in that this relates to the PROCESSING of the vote and count. These are acts that primarily involve the participation of officials. Examples include:

- Vote padding
- Inflated Vote Count/
- Ballot stuffing
- Tampering with ballots or ballot box
- Falsification of election protocols
- Voter turn out higher than 100% / Suspicious high turn out figures
- Evidence of attempts to tamper with the ballot boxes
- Problems in the counting/tabulation
- Invalidated too many ballots for poor reasons

r212r: *Voter Fraud.*

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| 0: Good | -- no problems |
| 1: low | --minor problems only |
| 2: moderate | --moderate problems |
| 3: high | --major problems |

This category is different from the above Vote padding etc, in that it relates to the CASTING of the votes. These are acts that involve the participation of actual voters and are attempts to manipulate the vote during the process of casting the vote. Examples include:

- Vehicles were observed taking voters to multiple polling places
- Voter Impersonation
- Double Voting
- Vote buying
- Voters reported having been offered payments
- Parties were observed distributing favors
- Voters had fake IDs
- Voters were physically obstructed from reaching the polling booths (note, not intimidated, but actually prevented)
- Voters were denied access to polling station (again, not intimidated, but actually just denied entry)

r213r: *Intimidation on Election Day*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

Examples include:

- Aggressive behavior of some party representatives
- Having to show ballots to prison/military/hospital staff
- Political pressure on voters in the vicinity of the polling booth
- Presence of unauthorized people at the voting station (particularly police, secret police, military, militia)
- Detention of election commission members/ police interference
- Arbitrary arrests

r21cheat: *Election Day explicit cheating.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

Overall Election Day explicit cheating. This variable assesses the issues under r211r – r213r combined, but it is not a mathematical index of these. An election may be coded “0” for any sub-category, but if there are other issues that are highly important in other subcategories, then this overall assessment may be coded as “3”. This variable is coded on the 0-3 scale. It is coded “0” if the Election Day explicit cheating was generally absent. It is coded “1” if there were minor issues, “2” if there were moderate issues, and “3” if the problems were high.

ELECTION DAY ADMINISTRATIVE IRREGULARITIES

r221r: *Informational insufficiencies.*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
1: *low* --*minor problems only*
2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
3: *high* --*major problems*

This captures information-related failures that lead to voting difficulties. Examples include:

- Large crowds

- Long waits
- Not enough information
- Confusion
- Failure to inform voters how to use the ballot or equipment
- Polling places poorly marked
- Complicated ballots- numerous, long, etc.
- Lack of needed bilingual ballots

r222r: *Administrative insufficiencies.*

0: Good -- no problems

1: low --minor problems only

2: moderate --moderate problems

3: high --major problems

This captures administrative and logistical failures that lead to difficulties on the election day. Examples include:

- Lax polling booth officials/ procedures
- Inadequate lighting at polling stations
- Polling booths opening late
- Fictitious polling places
- Defective organization, inadequate provision of voting cabins
- Family voting/ husband voting for the rest of the family/proxy voting
- Unfamiliarity with elections laws by officials present
- Officials do not look at people's IDs
- Some lack of supervision of ballot boxes, not properly sealed (but no sign that this is systematic or intentional as much as it is neglect)
- Not signing/ stamping all ballot papers properly (non-intentional)
- Lack of training
- Incompetence
- Insufficient number of polling stations
- General administrative issues affecting secrecy - ballot paper too thin, ballot papers not put into envelopes in clear ballot boxes, numbering ballots according to how people enter the polling station
- Electronic voting causes problems such as the lack of a paper trail
- Too many party observers leads to overcrowding
- Quality of materials, e.g. ink

r223r: *Problems in voter lists.*

0: Good -- no problems

1: low --minor problems only

2: moderate --moderate problems

3: high

--major problems

This captures any problems with the voter lists on the day of election. Examples include:

- Missing names
- Dead people still on lists
- Not delivering voter cards in time
- Lists Not in polling stations on time
- Incomplete/ inaccurate
- Out of date
- Voters turned away because they were not on the lists

r224r: *Complaints about electoral commission conduct on Election Day*

0: Good -- no problems

1: low --minor problems only

2: moderate --moderate problems

3: high --major problems

This captures any complaints about the behavior of officials from the electoral commission on the day of the election.

r22cap: *Election Day Administrative Capacity*

0: Good -- no problems

1: low --minor problems only

2: moderate --moderate problems

3: high --major problems

Overall Election Day administrative capacity. This variable assesses the issues under r221r – r224r combined, but it is not a mathematical index of these. An election may be coded “0” for any sub-category, but if there are other issues that are highly important in other subcategories, then this overall assessment may be coded as “3”. This variable is coded on the 0-3 scale. It is coded “0” if the Election Day administrative irregularities were generally absent. It is coded “1” if there were minor issues, “2” if there were moderate issues, and “3” if the problems were high.

ELECTION DAY VIOLENCE AND UNREST

r23viol: *Violence and unrest*

0: *Good* -- *no problems*
 1: *low* --*minor problems only*
 2: *moderate* --*moderate problems*
 3: *high* --*major problems*

Note: this differs from intimidation which is based on threats. It has to involve physical abuses, overall violent clashes, or manhandling of persons.

- Security was a concern
- Grenades
- Murders
- Physical Assaults/abuse
- Mentions of protests turned violent

SUMMARY VARIABLES

Sum (name: sum[variable name]): Sums the values of a particular variable when more than one organization has monitored the particular election.

Max (name: max[variable name]): Denotes the highest value given to the variable by an organization when an election was monitored by more than one organization.

INTERCODER RELIABILITY SCORES PRE-RECONCILIATION

rec: This variable is 0 if either the a1 variable or a2 variable had to be reconciled. It is 9 if reconciliation information is not relevant or missing.

```
. sum rec if rec!=9
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
rec	578	.1349481	.3419641	0	1

This tells that 86.5% percent of the time, neither of these variables had to be reconciled. Final reconciliation was done under the supervision of the principal investigator.

Icr1: This variable counts the number of categories of the 18 subcategories of irregularities (r111r r112r r113r r114r r121r r122r r123r r124r r211r r212r r213r r221r r222r r223r r224r r01r r02r r03r), not including the violence variables that had to be reconciled.

icr1per: is icr1/18, thus giving an average rate of reconciliation for the subcategories.

```
. sum icr1per
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
icr1per	542	.0730832	.0719357	0	.3333333

This tells that 92.7% percent of the time, these variables did not have to be reconciled. Final reconciliation was done under the supervision of the principal investigator.

Icr2: This variable counts the number of categories of the 7 subcategories of irregularities (r11cheat r12cap r13viol r21cheat r22cap r23viol r01str) that had to be reconciled.

icr1per: is icr1/7, thus giving an average rate of reconciliation for the main categories.

```
. sum icr2per
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
icr2per	560	.1704082	.1595386	0	.5714286

This tells that 83% percent of the time, these variables did not have to be reconciled. Final reconciliation was done under the supervision of the principal investigator.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS DOCUMENTS USED AS SOURCES

Summary data on documentation coded:

Percent of missions for which pre-election statements were coded	14.6
Percent of missions for which post-election statements were coded	62.82
Average number of pages of post-election statement	4.716923
Percent of missions for which final reports were coded	88.29
Average number of pages of final report	39.35586

Data for individual observations:

Organization	country	Year	Pre-election statement	Post-election statement	# pages of post-election statement	Final report	# pages of final report
IFES	Albania	1992	0	0		1	65
IFES	Angola	1992	0	0		1	70
IFES	Brazil	1994	0	0		1	34
IFES	Cambodia	1998	0	0		1	141
IFES	Croatia	1995	0	1	1	1	73
IFES	El Salvador	1994	0	0		1	29
IFES	Eq. Guinea	1996	0	0		1	84
IFES	Estonia	1992	0	0		1	30
IFES	Guinea	1993	0	0		1	78
IFES	Guinea	1993	0	0		1	78
IFES	Haiti	1990	0	0		1	15
IFES	Honduras	1993	0	0		1	42
IFES	Honduras	2001	1	1	1	1	14
IFES	Indonesia	1999	0	1	2	1	11
IFES	Kazakhstan	1995	0	0		1	7
IFES	Madagascar	1996	0	0		1	29
IFES	Mexico	1994	0	0		1	31
IFES	Mexico	1997	0	1	2	1	15
IFES	Mongolia	1992	0	0		1	25
IFES	Mongolia	1993	0	0		1	20
IFES	Morocco	1993	0	0		1	103
IFES	Nepal	1991	0	0		1	33
IFES	Nepal	1994	0	1	1	1	29
IFES	Nicaragua	1996	0	0		1	15
IFES	Nigeria	1999	1	1	4	1	37
IFES	Nigeria	1999	1	1	4	1	37
IFES	Panama	1999	0	0		1	34
IFES	Paraguay	1988	0	0		1	14
IFES	Paraguay	1998	0	1		1	
IFES	Paraguay	2003	0	0		1	18
IFES	Philippines	2004	0	0		1	55
IFES	Russia	1996	0	0		1	14
IFES	Sierra Leone	2002	0	0		1	120
IFES	Tanzania	1995	0	0		1	83
IFES	Tanzania and Zanzibar	2000	0	1	2	1	50
IFES	Thailand	1996	0	0		1	24
IFES	Tunisia	1989	0	0		1	20
IFES	Uganda	1996	0	1	4	1	50
IFES	Uganda	1996	0	1	6	1	68
IFES	Venezuela	1998	0	0		1	45

NDI	Albania	1991	1	0		1	36
NDI	Algeria	1997	0	0		1	111
NDI	Armenia	1999	0	0		1	17
NDI	Armenia	2003	0	1	5	0	
NDI	Azerbaijan	1998	1	1	7	0	
NDI	Azerbaijan	2000	0	1	8	0	
NDI	Bangladesh	1991	0	0		1	32
NDI	Bangladesh	1996	0	1	3	0	
NDI	Bangladesh	2001	0	0		1	30
NDI	Benin	1996	1	1		0	
NDI	Bulgaria	1990	1	1	5	1	116
NDI	Bulgaria	1991	0	1		1	136
NDI	Burundi	1993	0	1	3	0	
NDI	Cambodia	1998	1	1		1	83
NDI	Cameroon	1992	0	1	3	1	55
NDI	Chile	1989	0	1	13	0	
NDI	Cote d'Ivoire	1995	0	1	3	0	
NDI	Dom. Rep.	1990	0	0		1	20
NDI	Dom. Rep.	1994	0	1		0	
NDI	Dom. Rep.	1996	1	1	5	1	46
NDI	Georgia	2003	1	1	1	0	
NDI	Ghana	1996	0	1	5	0	
NDI	Guatemala	1990	1	1	4	1	117
NDI	Hungary	1990	0	1	3	0	
NDI	Indonesia	1999	1	1	13	0	
NDI	Kenya	1997	0	0		1	7
NDI	Kyrgyzstan	2000	1	1	7	0	
NDI	Mexico	2000	1	1		0	
NDI	Nigeria	2003	0	1	12	0	
NDI	Pakistan	1988	1	0		1	60
NDI	Pakistan	1990	0	1	4	1	118
NDI	Pakistan	1993	1	1	4	1	28
NDI	Panama	1989	1	1	6	1	126
NDI	Paraguay	1989	0	1	2	1	68
NDI	Peru	2001	1	1	18	0	
NDI	Peru	2001	1	1		0	
NDI	Philippines	2004	0	0		1	38
NDI	Romania	1992	1	1	3	0	
NDI	Senegal	1993	0	1	11	0	
NDI	Ukraine	2004	0	1	5	0	
NDI	Ukraine	2004	0	1	1	0	
NDI	Yemen	1997	1	1	5	0	
NDI	Yemen	2003	0	1	8	1	33
IRI	Afghanistan	2004	0	1		0	
IRI	Albania	1991	0	1	5	1	64
IRI	Albania	1992	1	1	3	0	
IRI	Albania	1996	0	1		1	34

IRI	Azerbaijan	1998	0	1	3	1	46
IRI	Azerbaijan	2003	0	1	1	0	
IRI	Bulgaria	1996	0	0		1	23
IRI	Cambodia	1998	1	1		0	
IRI	Cambodia	2003	0	1	6	1	19
IRI	Croatia	2000	0	1	3	1	38
IRI	Ecuador	2002	0	1		1	27
IRI	El Salvador	1991	0	1	5	1	59
IRI	El Salvador	1994	0	1	3	1	36
IRI	El Salvador	1997	0	0		1	17
IRI	El Salvador	2004	0	1	3	0	
IRI	Georgia	2003	0	1	5	0	
IRI	Guinea	1993	1	0		1	25
IRI	Haiti	1990	0	1	3	1	51
IRI	Haiti	1995	0	1	3	1	57
IRI	Haiti	1995	0	1	1	1	47
IRI	Haiti	1997	1	0		1	56
IRI	Kenya	1992	1	1	9	1	60
IRI	Macedonia	1994	0	0		1	24
IRI	Macedonia	1998	0	0		1	8
IRI	Macedonia	2002	1	1	3	1	73
IRI	Macedonia	2004	0	1	1	0	
IRI	Mexico	2000	1	1	2	1	130
IRI	Mongolia	2000	0	1	3	1	112
IRI	Nicaragua	1996	1	0		1	25
IRI	Nicaragua	2001	0	0		1	49
IRI	Nigeria	2003	0	1	8	1	106
IRI	Philippines	1986	1	1	9	1	333
IRI	Romania	1990	1	1	3	1	133
IRI	Russia	1993	0	0		1	37
IRI	Russia	1995	0	0		1	121
IRI	Russia	1996	0	0		1	94
IRI	S. Africa	1994	0	0		1	129
IRI	Slovakia	1998	0	1	3	1	66
IRI	Ukraine	1994	0	1	5	1	45
IRI	Ukraine	1998	0	0		1	3
IRI	Ukraine	1999	0	1	5	1	183
IRI	Ukraine	2002	1	1	3	1	66
IRI	Ukraine	2004	0	1	3	0	
IRI	Venezuela	1998	0	1	3	1	16
IRI	Yemen	1993	0	0		1	7
Carter Center	Bangladesh	2001	1	1	2	0	
Carter Center	Dom. Rep.	1996	0	1	8	1	102
Carter Center	Dom. Rep.	2000	0	1	6	0	
Carter Center	Guatemala	2003	1	1	6	0	
Carter Center	Guyana	1992	0	0		1	143
Carter Center	Guyana	2001	0	1	2	1	88
Carter Center	Haiti	1990	1	1	4	1	71
Carter Center	Haiti	1995	0	0		1	54

Carter Center	Indonesia	2004	1	1	10	1	78
Carter Center	Jamaica	2002	0	1	3	1	90
Carter Center	Kenya	2002	0	1	3	1	47
Carter Center	Liberia	1997	0	1	3	1	72
Carter Center	Mali	2002	0	0		1	42
Carter Center	Mexico	1994	0	1	7	1	16
Carter Center	Mexico	1997	0	1		1	35
Carter Center	Mexico	2000	0	0		1	49
Carter Center	Mozambique	1999	0	1		1	36
Carter Center	Mozambique	2004	1	1	3	1	66
Carter Center	Nicaragua	1990	1	1		1	109
Carter Center	Nicaragua	1996	0	1	2	1	79
Carter Center	Nicaragua	2001	0	1		1	62
Carter Center	Panama	1994	0	1	3	1	24
Carter Center	Paraguay	1993	1	1	5	0	
Carter Center	Sierra Leone	2002	0	1	4	1	
Carter Center	Timor-Leste	2001	1	1		1	53
Carter Center	Timor-Leste	2002	0	1	2	1	53
Carter Center	Venezuela	1998	0	1	2	1	83
Carter Center	Venezuela	2000	1	0		1	78
Carter Center	Zambia	2001	1	1	3	1	
UN	Angola	1992	0	0		1	12
UN	Cambodia	1993	0	0		1	21
UN	Cambodia	1998	1	1	2	0	
UN	El Salvador	1994	1	1	32	0	
UN	Fiji	2001	0	0		1	
UN	Haiti	1990	0	0		1	9
UN	Haiti	1995	0	0		1	15
UN	Liberia	1997	0	0		1	
UN	Mozambique	1994	0	0		1	20
UN	Namibia	1989	0	0		1	9
UN	S. Africa	1994	0	0		1	39
UN	Sierra Leone	1996	0	1	2	0	
OSCE	Albania	1992	0	0		1	2
OSCE	Albania	1996	0	0		1	12
OSCE	Albania	1997	0	1	2	1	12
OSCE	Albania	2001	0	1	20	1	22
OSCE	Armenia	1995	1	1	2	1	40
OSCE	Armenia	1996	0	1	3	1	14
OSCE	Armenia	1998	1	1	3	1	21
OSCE	Armenia	1999	0	1	3	1	28
OSCE	Armenia	2003	0	1	24	1	28
OSCE	Armenia	2003	0	1		1	26
OSCE	Azerbaijan	1993	0	0		1	2
OSCE	Azerbaijan	1995	0	1	2	1	25
OSCE	Azerbaijan	1998	0	1	8	1	26
OSCE	Azerbaijan	2000	0	1	8	1	28
OSCE	Azerbaijan	2003	0	1	9	1	29

OSCE	Belarus	1994	0	0		1	2
OSCE	Belarus	1995	0	1	1	1	4
OSCE	Belarus	2000	0	1	8	1	26
OSCE	Belarus	2001	0	1	15	1	31
OSCE	Belarus	2004	1	1	11	1	26
OSCE	Bosnia-Herz	1996	0	1	12	0	
OSCE	Bosnia-Herz	1998	0	0		1	33
OSCE	Bosnia-Herz	2002	0	1	8	1	25
OSCE	Bulgaria	1991	0	1		0	
OSCE	Bulgaria	1994	0	1	1	1	2
OSCE	Bulgaria	1996	0	1	5	0	
OSCE	Bulgaria	1997	0	1	2	1	16
OSCE	Bulgaria	2001	0	1	8	1	20
OSCE	Croatia	1995	0	0		1	7
OSCE	Croatia	1997	0	1	1	1	11
OSCE	Croatia	2000	0	1	4	1	22
OSCE	Croatia	2000	0	1	4	1	29
OSCE	Croatia	2003	0	1	5	1	20
OSCE	Czech Rep.	1998	0	0		1	20
OSCE	Czech Rep.	2002	0	1	2	1	18
OSCE	Estonia	1992	0	1	1	0	
OSCE	Estonia	1995	0	0		1	4
OSCE	Estonia	1999	0	1	3	1	16
OSCE	France	2002	0	0		1	10
OSCE	Georgia	1992	0	1	1	0	
OSCE	Georgia	1995	0	1	2	1	12
OSCE	Georgia	1999	0	1	5	1	30
OSCE	Georgia	2000	0	1	2	1	27
OSCE	Georgia	2003	1	1	11	1	26
OSCE	Georgia	2004	0	1	11	1	28
OSCE	Georgia	2004	0	1	12	1	24
OSCE	Hungary	1994	0	1	1	1	3
OSCE	Hungary	1998	1	1	3	1	23
OSCE	Hungary	2002	0	1	3	1	21
OSCE	Kazakhstan	1994	0	0		1	5
OSCE	Kazakhstan	1995	0	0		1	5
OSCE	Kazakhstan	1999	0	1	3	1	25
OSCE	Kazakhstan	1999	0	1	6	1	35
OSCE	Kazakhstan	2004	1	1	13	1	27
OSCE	Kyrgyzstan	1995	0	1	3	1	9
OSCE	Kyrgyzstan	1995	0	0		1	4
OSCE	Kyrgyzstan	2000	0	1	6	1	16
OSCE	Kyrgyzstan	2000	0	1	4	1	26
OSCE	Latvia	1993	0	0		1	2
OSCE	Latvia	1995	0	1	2	0	
OSCE	Latvia	1998	0	1	2	1	29
OSCE	Latvia	2002	0	1	7	1	23
OSCE	Lithuania	1992	0	0		0	
OSCE	Lithuania	1996	0	1	2	1	8
OSCE	Macedonia	1994	0	1	1	1	8

OSCE	Macedonia	1998	0	1	3	1	27
OSCE	Macedonia	1999	0	1	3	1	23
OSCE	Macedonia	2002	0	1	12	1	29
OSCE	Macedonia	2004	0	1	19	1	29
OSCE	Moldova	1994	0	0		0	
OSCE	Moldova	1996	0	1	3	1	
OSCE	Moldova	1998	0	1	4	1	16
OSCE	Moldova	2001	0	1	7	1	18
OSCE	Montenegro	1997	0	1	2	1	27
OSCE	Montenegro	1998	0	1	5	1	20
OSCE	Montenegro	2001	0	1	10	1	20
OSCE	Montenegro	2002	0	1	9	1	22
OSCE	Montenegro	2002	0	1	9	1	21
OSCE	Montenegro	2003	0	1	9	1	21
OSCE	Poland	1991	0	0		0	
OSCE	Romania	1992	0	0		1	2
OSCE	Romania	1996	0	1	2	1	16
OSCE	Romania	2000	0	1	6	1	23
OSCE	Romania	2004	0	1	2	1	35
OSCE	Russia	1993	0	0		1	4
OSCE	Russia	1995	0	0		1	6
OSCE	Russia	1996	0	1	10	1	8
OSCE	Russia	1999	0	1	4	1	37
OSCE	Russia	2000	0	1	4	1	33
OSCE	Russia	2003	0	0		0	
OSCE	Russia	2004	0	1	9	1	35
OSCE	Serbia	1992	0	0		1	5
OSCE	Serbia	1992	0	0		1	5
OSCE	Serbia	1997	0	1	4	1	18
OSCE	Serbia	1997	0	1	4	1	18
OSCE	Serbia	2000	0	1	6	1	19
OSCE	Serbia	2000	0	1	6	1	19
OSCE	Serbia	2002	0	1	25	1	24
OSCE	Serbia	2002	0	1	25	1	24
OSCE	Serbia	2003	0	1	9	1	22
OSCE	Serbia	2003	1	1	6	1	16
OSCE	Serbia	2003	0	1	9	1	22
OSCE	Serbia	2003	1	1	6	1	16
OSCE	Serbia	2004	1	1	1	1	22
OSCE	Serbia	2004	1	1	1	1	22
OSCE	Slovakia	1994	0	0		1	2
OSCE	Slovakia	1998	0	1	6	1	28
OSCE	Slovakia	1999	0	1	3	1	21
OSCE	Slovakia	2002	0	1	2	1	17
OSCE	Slovakia	2004	0	0		1	12
OSCE	Slovenia	1992	0	0		0	
OSCE	Spain	2004	0	0		1	14
OSCE	Tajikistan	2000	0	1	4	1	30
OSCE	Turkey	2002	0	0		1	15
OSCE	USA	2002	0	0		1	16

OSCE	USA	2004	1	1	11	1	26
OSCE	Ukraine	1994	0	0		1	4
OSCE	Ukraine	1994	0	0		1	3
OSCE	Ukraine	1998	0	1	4	1	23
OSCE	Ukraine	1999	0	1	5	1	44
OSCE	Ukraine	2002	0	1	12	1	27
OSCE	Ukraine	2004	1	1	14	1	46
OSCE	Ukraine	2004	1	1	44	1	44
OSCE	Uzbekistan	1994	0	0		1	6
OSCE	Uzbekistan	1999	0	1	5	1	16
OSCE	Uzbekistan	2004	0	1	3	1	18
EP	Belarus	2000	0	0		1	4
EP	Belarus	2001	0	1	3	0	
EP	Bosnia-Herz	2002	0	1	2	1	20
EP	Colombia	2002	0	0		1	10
EP	Congo	2002	0	0		1	5
EP	Ecuador	2002	0	0		1	11
EP	Ecuador	2002	0	1	2	1	11
EP	Georgia	2003	0	1		1	22
EP	Georgia	2004	0	1	1	1	22
EP	Georgia	2004	0	1	1	1	22
EP	Guatemala	2003	0	0		1	
EP	Indonesia	2004	0	0		1	8
EP	Kenya	2002	1	0		1	8
EP	Madagascar	2002	0	0		1	18
EP	Mexico	2000	0	0		1	10
EP	Mozambique	2004	0	1	6	1	11
EP	Pakistan	2002	0	1	5	1	18
EP	Peru	2001	0	0		1	17
EP	Russia	1999	0	0		1	20
EP	Rwanda	2003	0	1	6	1	4
EP	Sierra Leone	2002	0	0		1	9
EP	Solomon Is.	2001	0	1	3	1	6
EP	Ukraine	2002	0	0		1	14
EP	Ukraine	2004	0	0		1	14
EP	Ukraine	2004	0	1	15	1	12
EP	Zimbabwe	2000	0	0		1	14
HC	Albania	2001	0	0		1	9
HC	Armenia	1998	0	0		1	9
HC	Armenia	1999	0	0		1	8
HC	Azerbaijan	1998	0	0		1	8
HC	Belarus	1995	0	0		1	9
HC	Belarus	2001	0	0		1	11
HC	Bosnia-Herz	1998	0	0		1	15
HC	Georgia	2000	0	0		1	
HC	Macedonia	2002	0	0		1	13
HC	Turkey	2002	0	0		1	17
HC	Ukraine	1998	0	0		1	9

HC	Ukraine	2002	0	0		1	8
SADC	Botswana	2004	0	1	8	1	19
SADC	Lesotho	2002	0	1	3	1	29
SADC	Mauritius	2000	1	1	9	1	61
SADC	Mozambique	1999	0	0		1	53
SADC	Mozambique	2004	1	1	11	1	35
SADC	Namibia	2004	0	1	8	1	38
SADC	Tanzania	2000	0	1	3	1	66
SADC	Zambia	2001	0	1	5	1	46
SADC	Zimbabwe	2000	0	1	5	0	
SADC	Zimbabwe	2002	0	1	4	0	
EISA	Botswana	2004	0	1	5	1	52
EISA	Lesotho	1998	0	0		1	19
EISA	Malawi	2004	0	1	7	0	
EISA	Mozambique	2004	1	1	6	1	64
EISA	Namibia	2004	0	1	7	1	53
EISA	S. Africa	2004	0	1	6	1	44
EISA	Swaziland	1998	0	0		1	17
EISA	Zimbabwe	2002	0	0		1	66
OAS	Bolivia	1997	0	1		1	42
OAS	Bolivia	2002	0	1	2	1	30
OAS	Colombia	1994	0	0		1	23
OAS	Colombia	2002	0	0		0	
OAS	Colombia	2002	0	0		1	85
OAS	Costa Rica	1990	0	0		1	11
OAS	Dom. Rep.	1990	0	0		1	17
OAS	Dom. Rep.	1994	0	0		1	103
OAS	Dom. Rep.	1996	0	0		1	34
OAS	Dom. Rep.	1998	0	0		1	20
OAS	Dom. Rep.	2000	0	0		1	28
OAS	Dom. Rep.	2002	0	1	6	1	46
OAS	Dom. Rep.	2004	1	0		0	
OAS	Ecuador	1996	0	1		1	42
OAS	Ecuador	1998	0	0		1	72
OAS	Ecuador	2002	0	0		1	97
OAS	El Salvador	1991	0	1	18	1	12
OAS	El Salvador	1997	0	0		1	8
OAS	Grenada	1999	0	0		1	15
OAS	Grenada	2003	0	1	3	1	14
OAS	Guatemala	1995	0	0		1	125
OAS	Guatemala	1999	0	0		1	50
OAS	Guatemala	2003	1	1	16	0	
OAS	Guyana	1997	0	1	1	1	54
OAS	Guyana	2001	0	0		1	42
OAS	Haiti	1990	0	0		1	27
OAS	Haiti	1995	0	0		1	49
OAS	Haiti	1995	0	1		1	55
OAS	Haiti	2000	0	0		1	75

OAS	Honduras	1989	0	0		1	5
OAS	Honduras	1993	0	0		1	28
OAS	Honduras	2001	0	0		1	57
OAS	Nicaragua	1990	0	0		1	70
OAS	Nicaragua	1996	0	0		1	100
OAS	Nicaragua	2001	0	0		1	76
OAS	Panama	1994	1	0		1	35
OAS	Panama	1999	0	0		1	43
OAS	Panama	2004	0	0		1	48
OAS	Paraguay	1993	1	1	1	1	245
OAS	Paraguay	1998	0	0		0	
OAS	Paraguay	2000	0	0		1	9
OAS	Peru	1992	0	0		1	163
OAS	Peru	1995	0	0		1	147
OAS	Peru	2000	0	0		1	71
OAS	Peru	2001	0	0		1	56
OAS	Suriname	1991	0	0		1	112
OAS	Suriname	1996	0	0		1	65
OAS	Suriname	2000	0	0		1	49
OAS	Venezuela	1998	0	0		1	66
OAS	Venezuela	2000	0	0		1	44
CS	Bangladesh	1991	0	0		1	29
CS	Bangladesh	1996	0	1	1	1	61
CS	Cameroon	1997	0	1		1	60
CS	Cameroon	2004	0	0		1	50
CS	Fiji	2001	0	1	1	1	42
CS	Gambia	2001	0	1	1	1	32
CS	Ghana	1992	0	1	3	1	144
CS	Ghana	1996	0	0		1	30
CS	Guyana	1992	0	1		1	40
CS	Guyana	1997	0	1	1	1	31
CS	Guyana	2001	0	1	1	1	68
CS	Kenya	1992	0	1		1	71
CS	Kenya	2002	0	1	1	1	43
CS	Lesotho	1993	0	1		1	61
CS	Lesotho	1998	1	1		1	38
CS	Lesotho	2002	0	0		1	41
CS	Malawi	1994	0	1	1	1	66
CS	Malawi	2004	0	1	1	1	60
CS	Malaysia	1990	0	1	1	1	46
CS	Mozambique	1999	0	1	1	1	46
CS	Mozambique	2004	0	1		1	65
CS	Namibia	1994	0	1	2	1	
CS	Nigeria	1999	0	1		1	93
CS	Nigeria	1999	0	1		1	93
CS	Nigeria	2003	0	1	2	1	50
CS	P. N. Guinea	1997	0	1	1	1	33
CS	Pakistan	1993	0	1	1	1	64

CS	Pakistan	1997	1	1	2	1	40
CS	Pakistan	2002	0	1	3	1	50
CS	S. Africa	1994	0	1	2	1	124
CS	S. Africa	1999	0	1	2	1	67
CS	Sierra Leone	1996	0	1	3	1	65
CS	Sierra Leone	2002	0	1	2	1	35
CS	Solomon Is.	2001	0	1	1	1	32
CS	Sri Lanka	2004	0	1	1	1	44
CS	Swaziland	2003	0	1	2	1	47
CS	Tanzania	1995	0	1		1	64
CS	Tanzania	2000	0	1	1	1	35
CS	Trinidad- Tobago	2000	0	1	2	1	50
CS	Uganda	1980	0	1	4	1	33
CS	Zambia	1991	0	1	2	1	62
CS	Zimbabwe	2000	0	1	2	1	50
CS	Zimbabwe	2002	0	1	2	1	72
CoE	Albania	1991	0	0		1	20
CoE	Albania	1992	0	1	1	1	25
CoE	Albania	1997	0	0		1	15
CoE	Albania	2001	0	1	2	1	9
CoE	Armenia	1998	0	0		1	10
CoE	Armenia	1999	0	1	2	1	13
CoE	Armenia	2003	0	1	1	1	11
CoE	Armenia	2003	0	1	1	1	14
CoE	Azerbaijan	1995	0	1	2	1	16
CoE	Azerbaijan	1998	0	0		1	10
CoE	Azerbaijan	2000	0	1	2	1	18
CoE	Azerbaijan	2003	0	1	1	1	11
CoE	Belarus	1995	0	1	1	1	7
CoE	Belarus	1995	0	0		1	11
CoE	Belarus	2001	0	1	2	1	22
CoE	Bosnia-Herz	1996	0	1	1	1	9
CoE	Bosnia-Herz	1997	0	0		1	8
CoE	Bosnia-Herz	1998	0	1	1	1	9
CoE	Bosnia-Herz	2000	0	1	3	1	13
CoE	Bosnia-Herz	2002	0	1	2	1	11
CoE	Bulgaria	1990	0	1	2	1	16
CoE	Bulgaria	1991	0	1	1	1	10
CoE	Bulgaria	1997	0	1	2	1	8
CoE	Bulgaria	2001	0	1	1	1	7
CoE	Croatia	1992	0	0		1	7
CoE	Croatia	1995	0	0		1	16
CoE	Croatia	2000	0	1	2	1	13
CoE	Croatia	2000	0	1	1	1	15
CoE	Czech Rep.	1990	0	1	1	1	8
CoE	Estonia	1992	0	0		1	9
CoE	GDR	1990	0	0		1	16
CoE	Georgia	1995	0	0		1	16
CoE	Georgia	1999	0	1	2	1	18
CoE	Georgia	2000	0	0		1	10

CoE	Georgia	2003	0	1	1	1	10
CoE	Georgia	2004	1	1	1	1	14
CoE	Georgia	2004	0	1	1	1	9
CoE	Hungary	1990	0	0		1	13
CoE	Kazakhstan	2004	0	1	1	1	9
CoE	Latvia	1993	0	1	1	1	13
CoE	Latvia	1998	0	1	1	1	10
CoE	Latvia	2002	0	0		1	9
CoE	Lithuania	1992	0	1	2	1	19
CoE	Macedonia	1994	0	1	2	1	13
CoE	Macedonia	1998	0	0		0	
CoE	Macedonia	1999	0	0		0	
CoE	Macedonia	2002	0	1	2	1	15
CoE	Moldova	1994	0	1	1	1	18
CoE	Moldova	1996	0	0		1	8
CoE	Moldova	1998	0	1	1	1	6
CoE	Moldova	2001	0	0		1	6
CoE	Poland	1991	0	0		1	9
CoE	Romania	1990	0	0		1	15
CoE	Romania	1992	0	0		1	21
CoE	Romania	1996	0	0		1	11
CoE	Russia	1993	0	0		1	16
CoE	Russia	1995	0	1	2	1	28
CoE	Russia	1996	0	1	1	1	4
CoE	Russia	1999	0	1	2	1	22
CoE	Russia	2000	0	1	2	1	11
CoE	Russia	2003	0	1	1	1	20
CoE	Russia	2004	0	1	1	1	11
CoE	Serbia	2000	0	1	2	1	10
CoE	Serbia	2000	0	1	2	1	10
CoE	Serbia	2001	0	1	2	1	9
CoE	Serbia	2001	0	1	2	1	9
CoE	Serbia	2003	0	1	2	1	10
CoE	Serbia	2003	0	1	2	1	10
CoE	Slovakia	1998	0	0		1	7
CoE	Slovenia	1992	0	1	1	1	13
CoE	Turkey	2002	0	0		1	5
CoE	Ukraine	1994	0	0		1	20
CoE	Ukraine	1998	0	1	1	1	7
CoE	Ukraine	1999	0	0		1	10
CoE	Ukraine	2002	0	1	2	1	20
CoE	Ukraine	2004	1	1	1	1	10
CoE	Ukraine	2004	0	1	2	1	10
EU	Bangladesh	2001	0	1	2	1	21
EU	Cambodia	1998	0	0		0	
EU	Cambodia	2003	0	1	5	1	
EU	Congo	2002	1	1		1	
EU	Cote d'Ivoire	2000	0	0		0	
EU	Ecuador	2002	0	0		1	31

EU	Guatemala	2003	0	1		1	35
EU	Guyana	2001	0	1	6	0	
EU	Indonesia	1999	0	1		1	90
EU	Indonesia	2004	0	0		1	63
EU	Indonesia	2004	0	0		1	63
EU	Kenya	2002	0	1	2	1	102
EU	Madagascar	2002	0	1	46	1	4
EU	Malawi	2004	0	1	6	1	41
EU	Mozambique	1999	0	0		1	8
EU	Mozambique	2004	0	1	10	1	25
EU	Nicaragua	1996	0	0		1	
EU	Nicaragua	2001	0	0		1	28
EU	Nigeria	2003	0	1	3	1	77
EU	Pakistan	2002	0	1	5	1	99
EU	Peru	2001	0	0		1	53
EU	Russia	1996	0	1		1	7
EU	Rwanda	2003	0	1		1	
EU	Rwanda	2003	1	0		1	75
EU	S. Africa	1994	0	1	2	1	123
EU	Sierra Leone	2002	0	1	4	1	52
EU	Sri Lanka	2000	0	1	3	1	77
EU	Sri Lanka	2001	0	1	3	1	24
EU	Sri Lanka	2004	0	1	6	1	67
EU	Timor-Leste	2001	0	1	2	1	90
EU	Timor-Leste	2002	0	1		1	
EU	Togo	1998	1	1		1	
EU	Zambia	2001	0	1	4	0	
EU	Zimbabwe	2000	0	1	4	1	26
ANFREL	Afghanistan	2004	1	1	6	1	217
ANFREL	Bangladesh	2001	1	1		1	63
ANFREL	Cambodia	1998	1	0		1	123
ANFREL	Cambodia	2003	1	1	4	1	116
ANFREL	Indonesia	1999	1	1		1	151
ANFREL	Indonesia	2004	1	0		0	
ANFREL	Indonesia	2004	1	1	5	1	149
ANFREL	Malaysia	1999	0	1		1	80
ANFREL	Pakistan	2002	1	1	7	1	85
ANFREL	Taiwan	2004	0	1	8	1	182
ANFREL	Thailand	2001	0	1		1	104
IHRLG	Argentina	1983	0	0		1	24
IHRLG	Chile	1989	1	1		0	
IHRLG	Grenada	1984	1	0		1	37
IHRLG	Guatemala	1985	0	1	4	1	79
IHRLG	Mongolia	1990	0	0		1	
IHRLG	Nicaragua	1984	0	1	2	1	60
IHRLG	Nicaragua	1990	0	1	5	0	
IHRLG	S. Africa	1989	0	1	4	1	88
IHRLG	Uruguay	1984	0	1	2	1	45
IHRLG	Zimbabwe	1985	0	0		1	132

ECF	Botswana	1999	1	1	1	1	43
ECF	Mozambique	1999	1	1	3	0	
ECF	Namibia	1999	0	0		1	54
ECF	S. Africa	1999	0	0		1	59
ECF	Tanzania	2000	0	0		1	91
ECF	Zimbabwe	2000	1	1	4	1	84
NDI/IRI joint	Mexico	1994	0	1	7	0	
NDI/CC joint	Nigeria	1999	0	0		1	36
NDI/CC joint	Nigeria	1999	0	1	4	1	36
NDI/CC joint	Peru	2000	1	1	4	1	38
NDI/CC joint	Zambia	1991	0	1		1	
OSCE/EP joint	Albania	2001	0	1		1	28
OSCE/EP joint	Macedonia	2002	0	1	12	0	
Average			0.14	0.62	4.71	0.88	39.35
Total			86	370	1533	520	19796

Total number of pages coded, assuming pre-election statements are 1 page long (underestimate)= 21415

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ANFREL	The Asian Network for Free Elections
AU	The African Union (formerly the Organization of African Unity)
CC	The Carter Center
CIS	The Commonwealth of Independent States
CoE	The Council of Europe
CW	The Commonwealth Secretariat
ECF	The Electoral Commissions Forum of SADC
ECOWAS	The Economic Community of West African States
EISA	The Electoral Institute of South Africa
EP	The European Parliament
EU	The European Union
IFES	The International Foundation for Election Systems
IHRLG	The International Human Rights Law Group
IRI	The International Republican Institute
NDI	The National Democratic Institute
NHC	The Norwegian Helsinki Center
OAS	The Organization of American States
OIF	The Organisation internationale de la Francophonie
OSCE	The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (formerly the Conference on Co-operation and Security in Europe)
SADC	The South African Development Community
UN	The United Nations

CODING MANUAL

General instructions:

If the report covers both an election and a run-off election, or in other ways cover more than one election day, separate the report out into two different coding sheets, trying to keep information separate for the different elections. Depending on the format of the report, this may not be possible, but if the report is written in a segmented format, do separate the information.

If there are multiple reports from one organization from the same election, fill out only one coding sheet in which the most final evaluations override earlier evaluations if they were conflicting. Note any conflicts in the notes at the bottom of page 1.

Code the last page of the coding sheet first. This allows you to read just the conclusion and introduction and any press statements and code only those materials as the basis for the overall observer assessment.

You must reread this coding manual at regular intervals to refresh your memory of it. Always keep it handy when coding.

Remember throughout the coding that you are not recording your personal opinion of the election. You must shed your priors about a given country if you have any. Your job is to record what the report says, not what you think it should say.

Throughout the report, put in the page number of the report from which certain information is garnered (for final reports that are sizable enough to have page numbers) so that it makes it easier for myself and others to find out quickly where you've gotten the information. Some examples include:

- Where the word 'transitional' is written
- Where the margin of victory for the presidential elections is stated
- Where the number of parties contesting and the number of viable parties is / are stated
- Where the observer organizations are stated (both domestic and foreign)
- Where the number of domestic observers is stated
- Where the dates of short term and long term delegations are stated
- Where the number of short term and long term observers are noted
- Where the activities of the observation team is noted
- Where other special activities are noted
- Where the source of the 'comments' were obtained
- Any references in the MAIN SPECIFIC CRITICISMS page
- Any references in the ELECTION OBSERVER ASSESSMENT page

Further, highlight in the report itself information which you are using to make your assessment. Please do not write comments in the margins in pen, but only use a light highlighting color for marking text.

House keeping:

Documents coded: check type of document (write number of total pages, including attachments, in parenthesis)

- ___ Pre-election statement ()
- ___ Post-election statement ()
- ___ Press release ()
- ___ Interim report ()
- ___ Final ()
- ___ Other:

Date: write the data of issuance of the document (Day/Month/Year)

Election observer assessment

1. Identify any overall assessment the organization provides. This should be found either in an executive summary, in the introduction, or in a summary or conclusion. It may also be found in press statements or other ways the organization projects an overall assessment. Note this assessment does not draw on the final report. It is not your personal assessment of the mission based on reading the whole report. It draws ONLY on the text of the introduction, summary, conclusion and press statements.
2. Determine which of the descriptions in the left columns below most resemble the overall assessment. Highlight or otherwise mark that description. You may mark multiple comments if that applies. You may write in a particular phrasing if you cannot find an approximate match. Write on the sheet or HIGHLIGHT the sentences in the final report that are the most representative for your conclusion.
3. Circle a coding in the scale of assessment in the two right columns (must circle as existing pair as illustrated)
4. Note: if an organization is ambiguous and does NOT say whether an election represented the will of the people, you may code this as ambiguous. IF HOWEVER, it is possible to code the extent of the problems, do put a number for that in the box, ranging from 1-3 (though 0 would presumably not be relevant)

<i>Comment</i>	<i>Does NOT</i>	<i>Extent of</i>
----------------	-----------------	------------------

	<i>Represent will of people</i>	<i>problems</i>
<p>Free and fair, no criticisms in conclusion or overall assessment (may be in report) Reflects the will of the people Free and Fair Properly/Impartially carried out Met or exceeded all requirements Elections were held in compliance with international standards Elections were transparent Elections were not marred by disturbances Witnessed no evidence of fraud <i>Other:</i></p>	0	0
<p>Free and Fair, minor issues Conducted with only minor difficulties Assertions of fraud were negligible Did not affect the outcome of the election Absence of major problems Generally adequate manner Some minor issues , but represents the will of the people <i>Other:</i></p>	0	1
<p>Reflected the will of the people, major issues Reflected the will of the people, but marred by serious problem/irregularities Fell short of internationally accepted norms/ commitments, but... (proceeds to list some positive features). Elections constitute significant progress, but... (some negative aspects)...</p>	0	2
<p>Fraudulent, but moderate criticism Serious concerns about the existence of an environment of democratic institutions Does not represent the will of the people Calls into question the validity of the elections Fell short of internationally accepted norms/ commitments, and...(proceeds to list negative features). Not free and fair/ Fraudulent <i>Other:</i></p>	1	2
<p>Fraudulent, strong criticism <i>as above, but in addition:</i> (list of criticisms in actual conclusion or summary is very long and grave in nature) (The conclusion lists few redeeming values of the election at all) Marred by gross/grave/blatant violation, manipulation etc/ substantial bias....etc. <i>Other:</i></p>	1	3

<p>Ambiguity/ no clear conclusion /unsure if it represented the will of the people (Issues no overall assessment on whether or not the will of the people was represented, or whether fraud it tipped the election) (Organization enumerates multiple problems, but it issues no clear judgment of the elections) We are unable to access the validity of the elections/ it is uncertain if these problems tipped the outcome of the election... Describe:</p>	N/A	Problems: Circle: 1, 2 or 3
--	-----	-----------------------------------

Country: Name of the country

Date: Date of election observed (Day/Month/Year) (write abbreviated name of month to be clear)

Presidential: was the election to a president?

Legislative: was the election legislative?

Note, if both legislative and presidential elections were held on the same day, check BOTH but fill out only ONE coding sheet.

Run- off: was the election a run off election? If so, note date? Normally the report will use the language of a run-off election. If it does not but you never the less have reason to believe it is a run-off election, place a question mark and page reference so the information can be double checked.

Transitional election: does the report state that this as a transitional election? Unless you can find the word transitional in there, it does not get coded as a transitional election here. This is because we are looking for the monitors' own assessment of whether this was transitional.

First free multi party election: does the report state that this was the first multi-party election. This will also be checked if the report states that this is the first multi-party elections in a considerable time, even if that country had multi party elections in a much earlier era. Rule: if the report STATES it was a first multi-party election, code it as such, if not, don't. This is because we are looking for the monitors' own assessment of whether this was a first multi-party election.

HIGH PROFILE: was there a significant amount of international attention on this election? Only check this box if the report uses language like “landmark” or highly significant, or notes that the “eyes of the world” was following the election, or otherwise stresses that this election was not ordinary. If you mark this box, you should note the page number and the sentence that prompted you to mark it.

Change of presidential party/prime ministerial party: YES_____ NO_____ No information_____

According to the report, did the election result in a change of presidential party or prime ministerial party? Head of state refers not to the person *per se*, but to the party affiliation of the head of state. Underline or circle which were or were not changed.

Margin of victory in presidential elections: The percentage points lead of the winning candidate over the runner-up. If loses, then negative.

Number of parties/viable parties: For legislative elections a party gets counted if it is mentioned, but only gets counted as viable if it wins at least one seat. For presidential elections: Parties get mentioned if they field a candidate, but they are not rated as viable unless they receive min. five percent of the vote. The number of parties is determined by participation in the first round of an election. Voting blocks are coded as a one party as long as voters choose that block on the ballot rather than individual parties that are members of that block.

Observer Organization: write the name

For DELEGATION 1 through 3: write down the start and end dates of each group and the number of members in the delegation. Delegations are groups that are present on Election Day, but they may have different arrival times. For example, for elections held on Oct 6, 2005, they following may occur:

Visits:

- March 5-April 19 – this is an assessment visit since the group leaves before the election is held. It therefore does not get marked as a delegation, but gets counted under assessment visits later. That is, for visits that arrive and depart before elections, we do not actually record the dates but merely mark it as an incidence of a pre-election visit later under the coding of activities undertaken by the organization the pre-election period.
- August 10- Oct 10 – this is delegation 1. In the space for DELEGATION 1 you would enter the number of people in this delegation, the dates and calculate the total number of days spend by that one delegation
- Sept 9- Oct 10 – this is delegation 2
- Oct 3- Oct 8 – this is delegation 3

When counting dates, include both start and end date. A convenient way to count the total days can be found at the website: <http://www.timeanddate.com/date/duration.html> - For example, this counter allows you to determine that August 10 to October 10, 2002 would constitute “It is 62 days from the start date to the end date, end date included.”

A member of a delegation is *anyone officially participating in the mission*. Thus staff and official observers get counted equally as long as they are working for the organization.

See Appendix for Observer Organization specifics on delegations. The appendix often contains itineraries with helpful dates.

Total number of observers: This number should be the number specifically reported in the document, but many times they do not give a total, in which case you can sum delegations that were present on the day. If they give a total that varies from what would otherwise be the sum of the delegations that they have indicated are present, note the discrepancy by taking down that number but indicating that it does not cohere with the summing of the delegations.

Mention of other observers: This refers to other international observers. Write in any mention of other observers, including names or organizations and numbers

Domestic observers: Note # if possible or just whether present, and names of organizations if given.

Domestic capacity building:

Pre-election day (all time before election, not including the Election Day itself):

Pre-election assessment visit: note the number of such visits described in report

Media monitoring: Does the report say that the organization in any way systematically paid attention to the content of the media? Code as follows:

0= not much attention to media (can be a brief one or two line mention, but no effort at assessing or evaluating,

1= informal overview/meetings with media/attention paid to the role of the media/made and assessment. To receive this coding there must be at least a paragraph somewhere in the report that focuses exclusively on the media. There may be more than one paragraph, but the distinguishing difference from a 2 coding here is that there is NOT any numbers, counts, percentages that would indicate a systematic analysis.

2 = extensive, formal overview/quantitative, systematic analysis. To receive this coding, the analysis must report results of a more academic analysis of the content of media. To receive a coding of '2' on media monitoring there must be a specific 'sub-section' of the report devoted to the media, with its own heading. Several interviews with media people is not systematic. There must be emphasis on systematic analysis of content either in the form of space provided in the press, or time on the television or radio, as well as analysis of biases and access to media outlets. To receive this coding there should be quantitative analysis, indicating share of coverage, percentages, counts or other ways of breaking down the coverage into numbers that were then clearly analyzed. This coding is likely to require at least two pages and frequently more of a discussion.

Training of domestic monitors: Does the report note that the organization trained domestic monitors? If the report itself uses the word training, then the activity qualifies as such. If the report discusses official sessions in which domestic monitors are taught skills, then it qualifies as training. Do NOT tick this mark if the election observing organization e.g. the Carter Center, provided training for its own monitoring team (usually recruited from locals, especially medium and long term monitoring staff). The training refers to observers OTHER THAN the Carter Center's own employed monitoring staff.

Legal advice regarding election administration:

Note: this activity must involve recommendations to change laws and regulations pertaining to the election, not just discussions of how to improve the running or implementation of the election.

Note further: advice given as recommendations after the election does not qualify. It must be engagement on these legal and administrative issues *before* the election. An example would be the Council of Europe making specific recommendations before the election to change the provisions of the election law, or an organizations recommending before the election that the legal rules underpinning the independence of the electoral commission be changed.

Examples:

- Did the organization work with the authorities to change election related laws and administration leading up the election?
- Did they give legal advice in pre-election statements? To code this, look in the pre-election statements or summaries of pre-election visits included in a final report and see if these make recommendations as to certain legal changes or if there is discussion in these pre-election reports of the organization providing such advice to the government.
- Any recommendations before the election as to legal changes to the administrative framework qualify.

Civic Education: Did the organization conduct voter education or other forms of civic education? Mark this if the report itself uses words like civic education or voter education, or information campaigns. Also note this if the organization reports that it undertook activities that clearly fall into the above categories:

Held meetings for voters, produced media (TV, radio, newspaper) programs, or printed and distributed leaflets to voters about:

- where to vote or how to read the ballot,
- the offices for which the election would be held, about the importance of voting,
- what is proper procedures for voting (secrecy, not marking name on ballot etc),
- not having group or family voting,
- not taking money for votes and so on.

Observing campaign rallies: does group note having specifically observed campaign rallies. A great way to see this is on the itinerary in the appendices, but it may also merely be discussed in the text.

Election and post election (day of election and post election):

Quick count: Does the report discuss a quick-count and if so, was the organization in charge of it? Only mark this if the report uses the word QUICK COUNT and if the organization was in charge of it. If the organization was not in charge of it, simply note the presence of the quick count in the comment but do NOT give it a 1 here. Only give a one if the organization itself conducted the quick count.

Logistical support:

- Did the organization provide support such as ballot printing/design?
- Did they help in the transport of ballots or provide any other logistical support that normally would be done by the electoral administration of a country?
- Did they provide technical support?

This means that only activities that are operationally/practically part of the election are considered logistical support. Naturally, merely observing an election or even meeting with officials to discuss the election is secondary and not part of the administrative process. Logistical support only gets marked as 1 if the organization actually provided practical support.

Press statements issued: Number of press statements the organization issued? Look in the appendix for such statements or discussion of them in the text. Pre and post election statements that are brief and presumably directed at the press for distribution should be coded as press statements.

observe counting: oversee the counting of ballots. Did the organization observe the counting of ballots in some districts?

Mediation: Is there discussion in the report of the organization or an official from the organization performing mediatory functions to calm tensions and resolve problems during and especially after the election. An example would be Jimmy Carter stepping in to convince a losing incumbent to step down from power or an observer mission helping to provide a solution on the day of elections to a group of protesting people who claim they have been prevented from voting.

Other: Write in any other special activities

Examples:

- Organized a forum on comparative democratic experiences, which included candidates, human rights activists, and members of the military
- Consulting with parties to develop conflict resolution committees
- Provided funding to local organizations

Comments: Here you should note any of the following:

Conditionality? – does the report mention that there was external pressure to hold free and fair elections? Describe the type of pressure if known.

Boycotts? – does the report mention any boycotts. If so, does it say they were few or widespread?

Funding? – does the report mention the budget of the observer mission? If so, note it down. Does the report mention any additional sources of funding for the election monitoring initiative?

Note any other significant comments you may have after reading the report. Did something particularly interesting about the effects (good or bad) of monitors strike you? Any extraordinary circumstances?

MAIN Specific criticisms: Note in this table the type of violations highlighted in the report or any accompanying material such as pre-election reports. This includes all sections of the report, including the introduction, conclusion and the main body. (See below for specific wording for each category)

BEWARE OF DOUBLE COUNTING. FOR EXAMPLE: IF A GOVERNMENT MISUSES THE MEDIA, THIS GETS COUNTED AS MISUSE OF THE MEDIA, BUT NOT AS A MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT RESOURCES. IF THE MEDIA IS RESTRICTED, THIS CLEARLY INFLUENCES THE FREEDOM TO CAMPAIGN, BUT GETS CODED AS A MEDIA PROBLEM.

reminder: In each box in this table, if you indicate a certain violation occurred, please put page numbers in parenthesis to reference the source of your observation and highlight the text.

RemindeR: you are recording what the report explicitly states, not your personal view of the election.

Overview of this table:

Note, these 3 categories are not mutually exclusive, and it may be common to find problems both prior to and on the day of an election. The table provides for an opportunity to record that. For example, you may observe violence in both periods. However, we want to indicate the periods during which the problems were present.

Present: In this column, make a checkmark or “x” if the violation was observed. Leave blank otherwise.

MAIN Specific criticisms: (SAMPLE CODINGS)

Structural Complaints	Rating				Overall
	Good	Low	Mod.	High	
Legal framework not up to standards/problematic	x				Low
Limiting scope and jurisdiction of elective offices	x				
Unreasonably limits of who can run for office		x			
Other:	na				

Pre-election	Rating				Overall
	Good	Low	Mod.	High	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of explicit cheating 					medium
Improper use of public funds/ Unfair use of government resources				x	
Lack of freedom to campaign	x				
Restrictions on media	x				
Intimidation: opposition candidates/opposition supporters/international observers/etc	x				na
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of insufficient capacity 					
Voter registration problems	na				
Complaints about electoral commission conduct	na				
'Voter information' problems and 'procedural problems' in the pre-election capacity (i.e. failure to provide info about electoral rules, failure to provide info about polling places, etc)	na				
voter technical/procedural difficulties in pre-election capacity box (e.g. misprinted ballots)	na				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Violence and unrest 	x				good
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other: 					

Election period (day and after)	Overall rating				Overall
	Good	Low	Mod.	High	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of explicit cheating 					High
Vote padding: inflated vote count/ballot stuffing/ tampering with ballot box/etc		x			
Voter fraud: voter impersonation/ double voting /vote buying/etc				x	
Intimidation: opposition candidates/opposition supporters/international observers/etc			x		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of insufficient capacity 					Medium
Informational insufficiencies: voters don't understand rules/confusion about where to vote/etc		x			
Administrative insufficiencies: lax polling booth officials/long waits/faulty procedures/faulty equipment/etc	x				
Problems in voters list/registration		x			
Complaints about electoral commission conduct			x		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Election day Violence and unrest 		x			Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other: 					

Examples of text for Specific Concerns:

Structural complaints

Note: These are NOT exhaustive lists, but or indicative types of criticisms by monitors.

Legal framework not up to standards/ problematic

- Vague wording that can be interpreted in multiple ways
- 'Constitutional issues': Uncertainty in the role of a caretaker government, when or who can call elections or dissolve parliament etc.
- Some citizens, such as women, are not allowed to vote
- Any restrictions on who can vote that are not in the standard range of 18-21 years of age and citizen.
- Clauses that are clearly questionable- - prohibition against campaigning through the private media 30 days before, etc.
- Giving full authority to a group that is obviously tied to the incumbent
- Law promotes ethnic divides
- Held under old laws that had been proven to be flawed
- Serious omissions
- Composition of electoral commissions - for example: members of the election commission are political appointees which takes opposing sides when the rules of the game are at stake.
- Does not provide the necessary conditions for free elections if applied
- Setting high minimum % of votes needed and therefore affecting minority parties
- High threshold for parties to get registered
- Law makes people identify themselves by their ethnic group in order to participate in election
- Undemocratic legal provisions
- Allowing for multiple repeated elections
- Can elect people who have been charged with war crimes

Limiting scope and jurisdiction of elective offices

Note: this pertains to the office for which elections are being held. If presidential: does the president really have any power. If legislative elections, do the elected politicians really have any power once in office? This does NOT pertain to the election commission or other administrative offices that are appointed positions.

- Legislatures or heads of states are elected, but the legal framework effectively limits the power they will have once in office
- Some seats in the legislature are appointed. Decisions cannot be made without the consent of these officials.
- The elected head of state is a figure head with no real implementation powers

Unreasonable limits of who can run for office

- Certain subgroups of the population such as women or minorities are not allowed to run for office
- Certain skills, such as language requirements or literacy skills, prevent some citizens from running for office
- Law has ambiguous requirements such as a prerequisite being that a citizen is honorable, or of good character, or patriotic
- There are official tests or educational requirements for running for office

Pre-election

Improper use of public funds/ unfair use of government resources

This category is sometimes difficult to assess given that all incumbents have certain advantages. However, the issue is whether the organization points out this particular category as an area of concern.

- Substantial public campaign funding enjoyed by the party in power compared to other parties
- Misuse of public infrastructure for campaigning
- Distribution of humanitarian aid for campaigning purposes
- Interference by executive authorities – refusal to allow public meetings
- 'Promises of funding / development that is contingent on incumbent winning'
- Use of public employees in campaign activities

Lack of freedom to campaign

- Constraints on freedom of movement
- Disruption of party meetings
- Political pressure on candidates
- Abuses of rules on freedom of association
- Representatives have not been allowed freedom of movement
- Limiting candidates possibilities for public debates, meetings and demonstrations
- Not allowing opposition to rent office

Restrictions on media/ Misuse of the media

Note: all violations pertaining to the media should be coded under this heading. Thus, if an incumbent misuses his resources to influence or curtail the media freedom, this goes under this coding.

- Imprisonment of journalists
- Candidates had no direct contact with the press
- Newspapers closed
- Only permitted media outlets are biased
- Journalists being sued for libel during elections or legal action being taken against journalists
- Can only use state owned media
- Not fair, not clean and not honest media coverage
- Harassment from tax inspectors and safety inspectorates
- Threats of losing privileges, including media licenses

Intimidation

- Aggressive behavior of some party representatives
- Political pressure on voters
- Extraordinary tax inspections
- Administrative fines
- Dismissal from employment

- Declaration of martial law on day of election
- Threats made by some parties to voters in general or to groups in particular villages etc.
- Intimidation of candidates- trying to get them to drop out of the race
- Detention of election commission members/ police interference
- Arrest or detention of voters taking political initiatives

Problems in voter lists/ registration

- Many people had to add their names to special lists- tendered ballots
- Missing names
- Dead people still on lists
- Duplicate voter cards issued
- Not delivering voter cards in time
- Incomplete/ inaccurate
- Out of date
- Voters unable to get their names on the list

Complaints about electoral commission conduct

- Irregularities in nomination of district election commission
- Composition/ Appointment unfair or questionable
- Exclusion of political party participation
- Fail to establish a credible and consistent procedure to verify signatures
- Arbitrary decision making
- Uneven enforcement
- The commission does not function in a transparent manner

Voter Information problems and procedural problems

- Failure to provide information about the electoral rules
- Failure to provide information about polling places

Voter technical/procedural difficulties in pre-election capacity

- Misprinted ballots
- Misinformation
- Falsifying signatures in order to qualify a party/candidate

Violence and Unrest

- Security concerns
- Grenades
- Murders
- Physical Assaults/abuse
- Mentions of protests turned violent
- Ongoing civil conflict or war in isolated areas

Election period (day and after)

Vote padding/Inflated Vote Count/ Ballot stuffing / tampering with ballots or ballot box

This category is different from voter fraud, in that this relates to the PROCESSING of the vote and count. These are acts that primarily involve the participation of officials.

- Falsification of election protocols
- Voter turn out higher than 100%
- Suspicious high turn out figures
- Evidence of attempts to tamper with the ballot boxes
- Problems in the counting, invalidated too many ballots for simple reasons
- problems in vote tabulation

Voter Fraud: Voter Impersonation/ Double Voting/ Vote buying

This category is different from the above Vote padding etc, in that it relates to the CASTING of the votes. These are acts that involve the participation of actual voters.

- Vehicles were observed taking voters to multiple polling places
- Voters reported having been offered payments
- Parties were observed distributing favors
- Voters had fake IDs
- Voters were physically obstructed from reaching the polling booths (note, not intimidated, but actually prevented)
- Voters were denied access to polling station (again, not intimidated, but actually just denied entry)
- Forbid or Limit # of domestic observers allowed

Intimidation

- Aggressive behavior of some party representatives
- Having to show ballots to prison/military/hospital staff
- Political pressure on voters in the vicinity of the polling booth
- Presence of unauthorized people at the voting station (particularly police, secret police, military, militia)
- Detention of election commission members/ police interference
- Arbitrary arrests

Informational insufficiencies

- Large Crowds
- Long Waits
- Not enough information
- Confusion
- Failure to inform voters how to use the ballot of equipment
- Polling places poorly marked
- Complicated ballots- numerous, long, etc.
- Not bilingual ballots

Administrative insufficiencies

- Lax polling booth officials/ procedures
- Inadequate lighting at polling stations
- Polling booths opening late
- Fictitious polling places
- Defective organization, inadequate provision of voting cabins
- Family voting (widespread) / husband voting for the rest of the family
- Unfamiliarity with elections laws by officials present
- Officials do not look at people's IDs
- Some lack of supervision of ballot boxes, not properly sealed (but no sign that this is systematic or intentional as much as it is neglect)
- Not signing/ stamping all ballot papers properly (non-intentional)
- Lack of training
- Incompetence
- Insufficient number of polling stations
- General issues of secrecy - ballot paper too thin, ballot papers not put into envelopes in clear ballot boxes, numbering ballots according to how people enter the polling station
- Electronic voting causes problems such as the lack of a paper trail
- Too many party observers leads to overcrowding
- Quality of materials, e.g. ink

Problems in voter lists/ registration

- Missing names
- Dead people still on lists
- Not delivering voter cards in time
- Lists Not in polling stations on time
- Incomplete/ inaccurate
- Out of date
- Voters turned away because they were not on the lists

Violence and unrest

Note: this differs from intimidation which is based on threats. It has to involve physical abuses, overall violent clashes, or manhandling of persons.

- Security was a concern
- Grenades
- Murders
- Physical Assaults/abuse
- Mentions of protests turned violent

Rating: Rank each of the violation from low to high. MAKE SURE TO MARK PAGES THAT ARE RELEVANT AND HIGHLIGHT RELEVANT TEXT. Again, this is as the

report describes it, not as you perceive the violations. See discussion of low, medium and high below.

Examples of what may constitute different level ratings:

Low: The reports mentions problems once or twice in passing but do not voice the issues in terms of a complaint. Words like rare, uncommon, unusual, exceptional, singular, “few and far between,” sporadic, or infrequent may be used. The report does not dwell on it or elaborate or direct criticism of this towards the government. They note that the incident or violation only occurred in some limited or isolated cases of minor proportion. The report does not indicate that this was something the organization was concerned about. There is no sense that this was a ubiquitous practice. Important: under low, also include problems that were discussed in the report but the organization dismisses as unfounded or stresses that they have not been able to substantiate. *However, if the only reason for a low coding is unsubstantiated allegations, note this in the margin of the coding sheet.*

Medium: The report provides some detailed discussion of the particular problem and expresses some dissatisfaction and concern about the effect on the complaint on the election. The report does not go so far as to say that these were serious problems or that they threw into doubt the validity of the elections. It does not use terminology like serious, widespread, prevalent, rife, pervasive, common, extensive, severe, grave or similar words that would indicate the magnitude of the violation was of a high level. Rather, the report tends to use terms like several, “more than a few”, “in a considerable number of cases,” “it was not uncommon,” or other phrases that indicate that the situation was not negligible, but that it was also not egregious.

High: The report elaborates and substantiates extensively on the problem. It expresses serious concerns that the violations mar the election. It uses terminology such as serious, widespread, prevalent, rife, pervasive, common, extensive, severe, grave or similar words that would indicate the magnitude of the violation was of a high level. It notes that the observers are very concerned, troubled, uneasy, worried or disturbed about the issue.

Overall: Make an overall assessment about the umbrella category. Write the word LOW, MEDIUM or HIGH in the box. For example, you may check “lack of freedom to campaign” and “improper use of government funds” each as low in the ratings box, and then assess the pre-election fraud for the category “**Complaints of explicit cheating**” as overall low, or even moderate if you judge that although each item was low in level, it amounts to a moderate level in aggregate. If none of the categories mentioned occur, there should be no mark anywhere in the box, not even in the overall rating. The overall rating is for the composite of the individual complaints in a given sub-category. That does not mean that even if there was only one category of complaint that the overall assessment cannot be coded as medium or high -- that will depend on the severity of the issue overall. For example, if the only **Complaints of explicit cheating on the election day** is that a soldier held a gun to the head of every voter, then intimidation may have been the only complaint, but this would still be rated as high if it was done extensively. Thus, if there is

a category where the complaint is really high, even if it is the only type of violation in that sub-category, it will be coded high for that entire subcategory. However, high codings may also represent multiple sub categories and oftentimes multiple low ratings may be assessed to add up to a higher level of violations than low.