THE ELECTORAL INTEGRITY PROJECT

WHY ELECTIONS FAIL AND WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT IT

PERCEPTIONS OF ELECTORAL INTEGRITY MEXICO SUBNATIONAL STUDY 2016 CODEBOOK

Pippa Norris, Ferran Martínez i Coma, Alessandro Nai and Max Grömping

Mexico Team: Nicolás Loza and Irma Méndez

Contact for queries:
The Electoral Integrity Project
Department of Government and International Relations
Merewether Building (H.04), University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, 2006
www.electoralintegrityproject.com
electoral.integrity@sydney.edu.au

Contents

PERCEPTIONS OF ELECTORAL INTEGRITY 1
MEXICO SUBNATIONAL STUDY 2016 CODEBOOK 1
Overview and core concepts 11
Mexican Data release 12
Citation 12
Further readings 12
Variables **13**
examplevariable **13**
expert **13**
expert2 ..... **13**
estado **13**
election **14**
year **14**
Eleccin **14**
Ganador **14**
participation **14**
population **14**
GDP **14**
GDPpc **14**
numresponses **14**
contacted **15**
responserate **15**
OVERALLINTEGRITY **15**
PEIIndexp **15**
PEIIndexp_lci **15**
PEIIndexp_hci **15**
PEIIndexi **15**
PEIIndexi_lci **15**
PEIIndexi_hci **15**
PEIIndex_rank **16**
PEItype **16**
rating **16**
rating_lci **16**
rating_hci **16**
LAWS **16**

lawsunfair **16**
lawsunfair2 ..... **16**
favoredincumbent **16**
favoredincumbent2 ..... **16**
citizens **16**
citizens2 ..... **16**
laws **16**
lawsi **16**
PROCEDURES **17**
managed **17**
votinginfo **17**
fairofficials **17**
legalelections **17**
procedures **17**
proceduresi **17**
BOUNDARIES **17**
bdiscrim **18**
bdiscrim2 ..... **18**
bfavored **18**
bfavored2 ..... **18**
bimpartial **18**
boundaries **18**
boundariesi **18**
VOTERREGISTRATION **18**
reglisted **18**
reglisted2 ..... **18**
reginaccurate **18**
reginaccurate2 ..... **18**
ineligible **19**
ineligible2 ..... **19**
votereg **19**
voteregi **19**
PARTYREGISTRATION **19**
oppprevent **19**
oppprevent2 ..... **19**

womenopp 19
minorityopp 19
leaderselect 19
leaderselect2 19
rallies 19
rallies2 20
partyreg 20
partyregi 20
MEDIACOVERAGE 20
newspapers 20
tv 20
tv2 20
fairaccess 20
faircoverage 20
socialmedia 20
media 20
mediai 21
CAMPAIGNFINANCE 21
subsidies 21
donations 21
accounts 21
rich 21
rich2 21
resources 21
resources2 21
finance 21
financei 21
VOTING PROCESS 21
violence 22
violence2 22
fraudulent 22
fraudulent2 22
easy 22
choice 22
postal 22

disabled 22
expats 22
internet 22
voting 22
votingi 23
VOTE COUNT 23
secure 23
delay 23
faircount 23
intlmonitors 23
intlmonitors2 23
domesticmonitors 23
domesticmonitors2 23
count 23
counti 23
VOTING RESULTS 23
challenged 24
challenged2 24
protestspeace 24
protestspeace2 24
protestsviolent 24
protestsviolent2 24
disputes 24
results 24
resultsi 24
ELECTION AUTHORITIES 24
impartial 25
info 25
scrutiny 25
performance 25
EMBs 25
EMBsi 25
GENERALQUESTIONS 25
familiarity 25
important 25

ORGCONFIDENCE 25
courts 26
gobernador 26
localdips 26
armyforces 26
statepolice 26
localelecauth 26
statetv 26
statepress 26
stateparties 26
BACKGROUND 26
employment 26
public 27
university 27
nonprofit 27
agency 27
private 27
occupation 27
agegroup 27
sex 27
education 27
born 27
lived 27
candidate 27
rep 27
activist 27
ngo 28
voted 28
norole 28
natelecmonitor 28
monitorint 28
elecofficial 28
citizen 28
supported 28
leftrightscale 28

difficulty 28
VIGNETTES 28
vignetteA 28
vignetteB 29
vignetteC 29
STATEPOLITICS 30
votePAN 30
voteperPAN 30
votePRI 30
voteperPRI 30
votePRD 31
voteperPRD 31
votePRDPAN 31
voteperPRDPAN 31
votePVEM 31
voteperPVEM 31
voteMorena 31
voteperMorena 31
voteMC 31
voteperMC 31
voteNA 31
voteperNA 31
votePES 31
voteperPES 31
votePT 31
voteperPT 31
votePT_MC_Morena 31
voteperPT_MC_Morena 31
votePH 31
voteperPH 31
voteIndep 31
voteperIndep 32
voteLocalpart 32
voteperLocalpart 32
voteNonregvote 32

voteperNonregvote **32**
voteNullvotes **32**
voteperNullvotes **32**
voteValidvotes **32**
voteTotal **32**
nominalist **32**
homicides **32**
homicides100m **32**
pubspending **32**
nummunicip **32**
nummunpartgob **32**
popgobparty **32**
poppergobparty **32**
sizecongress **32**
numdipgob **32**
numdipgobcoal **32**
unemployment **32**
urbanpopstate **32**
poverty **33**
moderpoverty **33**
extrempoverty **33**
localresources **33**
genpartfund **33**
genpartfundpc **33**
yearprevlocelec **33**
ganadort1 ..... **33**
votePANt1 ..... **33**
voteperPANt1 ..... **33**
votePRIt1 ..... **33**
voteperPRIt1 ..... **33**
votePRDt1 ..... **33**
voteperPRDt1 ..... **33**
votePRDPANt1 ..... **33**
voteperPRDPANt1 ..... **33**
votePVEMt1 ..... **33**

voteperPVEMt1 33
voteMorenat1 33
voteperMorenat1 33
voteMCt1 33
voteperMCt1 33
voteNAt1 34
voteperNAt1 34
votePESt1 34
voteperPESt1 34
votePTt1 34
voteperPTt1 34
votePT_MC_Morenat1 34
voteperPT_MC_Morenat1 34
votePHt1 34
voteperPHt1 34
voteIndept1 34
voteperIndept1 34
voteLocalpartt1 34
voteperLocalpartt1 34
voteNonregvotet1 34
voteperNonregvotet1 34
voteNullvotest1 34
voteperNullvotest1 34
voteValidvotest1 34
voteTotalt1 34
nominalistt1 34
participationt1 34
populationt1 35
GDPt1 35
GDPpct1 35
homicidest1 35
homicides100mt1 35
pubspendingt1 35
nummunicipt1 35
nummunpartgobt1 35

popgobpartyt1 ..... **35**
poppergobpartyt1 ..... **35**
sizecongresst1 ..... **35**
numdipgobt1 ..... **35**
numdipgobcoalt1 ..... **35**
unemploymentt1 ..... **35**
urbanpopstatet1 ..... **35**
povertyt1 ..... **35**
moderpovertyt1 ..... **35**
extrempovertyt1 ..... **35**
localresourcest1 ..... **35**
genpartfundt1 ..... **36**
genpartfundpct1 ..... **36**
Appendix A. Elections and States included in Mexico Sub-National Studies 36

Overview and core concepts

This codebook describes a subnational expert survey on Perceptions of Electoral Integrity (PEI). This study is conducted by Pippa Norris, Ferran Martínez i Coma, Alessandro Nai and Max Grömping for the Electoral Integrity Project based at the Universities of Sydney and Harvard and by Irma Mendez de Hoyos and Nicolas Loza Otero from FLACSO-Mexico.

The PEI asks experts to evaluate electoral integrity. This codebook describes all variables included in the dataset.

Conceptual framework

The concept of '*electoral integrity*' refers to international standards and global norms governing the appropriate conduct of elections.

These standards have been endorsed in a series of authoritative conventions, treaties, protocols, and guidelines by agencies of the international community, notably by the decisions of the UN General Assembly, by regional bodies such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Organization of American States (OAS), and the African Union (AU), and by member states in the United Nations. Following endorsement, these standards apply universally to all countries throughout the electoral cycle, including during the pre-electoral period, the campaign, on polling day, and in its aftermath.

Measurement

To operationalize this notion, the PEI asks experts to evaluate elections using 49 indicators, grouped into eleven categories reflecting the whole electoral cycle. The dataset also includes a summary 100-point PEI Index based on summing all 49 indicators. The PEI index provides a way to summarize the overall integrity of the election. Alternatively, analysts can examine indices for each of the eleven dimensions, or use the disaggregated scores for each of the 49 individual indicators. This way, data can be re-aggregated flexibly to construct any measure which is preferred conceptually. The PEI dataset is designed to provide a comprehensive, systematic and reliable way to monitor the quality of elections worldwide.

There are many ways to define an election expert. An *expert* is defined in this survey as a political scientist (or social scientist in a related discipline such as law, sociology, economics, anthropology, mathematics, or statistics) who has published on (or who has other demonstrated knowledge of) the electoral process in a particular country. Specifically, demonstrated knowledge is defined by the following criteria: (1) membership of a relevant research group, professional network, or organized section of such a group; (2) existing publications on electoral or other country-specific topics in books, academic journals, or conference papers; and (3) employment at a university or college as a teacher. At least forty experts per state were contacted for each election.

In order to reach the experts, we relied on a variety of sources. The first source that the Mexican team relied on was the directory generated by FLACSO Mexico from the project "*Encuesta a expertos en política estatal en México, 2001-2012".* This directory gathered 232 experts of the 32 Mexican states. Those members of the directory that fitted EIP's expert definition were included in the sample. The second source is the Mexican Association of Political Science (AMECIP) that registered 863 members for the 2012-2015 period.[1] Given that the research areas of AMECIP members are very varied, only those that matched the definition of expert were included. The distribution of experts by states was uneven. The third source is the directory of the members of the Mexican Society of Electoral Studies (SOMEE).[2] This list is composed of 268 persons. However, many of them could not be included given the absence of contact information, or the difficulty of verifying them following our criteria. Again, the distribution of experts by states was uneven. Following the criteria outlined above, we obtained 148 responses.

We relied on a fourth source, provided by the National Electoral Institute (INE). In Mexico, aspiring candidates for positions of local electoral president and counselor are publicly known[3] and every state publishes a list of these aspiring candidates. This list includes those 25 men and 25 women that obtained the highest grade in the standardized test implemented as a part of the counselor selection process. After the list was made public, the Mexican team reviewed the curricula of those 50 aspiring candidates, incorporating the relevant data for those who followed our expert criteria and discarding those who did not match the criteria. From this fourth source, we obtained 144 responses. Since those experts

are slightly different from our usual definition, we have created the variable 'expert2' (see below).

Mexican Data release

Data are available at: http://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/PEI. This Dataverse facility allows users to generate analysis using the online data, to download in Stata, SPSS and tab-delimited formats, and to find further technical details about the research design, codebook and questionnaire.

The first Mexican data release covered 17 elections held on June 7th 2015 in 16 states and on July 19th in Chiapas. Nine contests were Gubernatorial. Those contests were in the states of: Baja California Sur, Campeche, Colima, Guerrero, Michoacán, Nuevo León, Querétaro, San Luis Potosí and Sonora. The other seven contests we cover are for Local Congress and Municipalities. Those contests were in the states of: Chiapas, Distrito Federal, Estado de Mexico, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Morelos and Tabasco. The second data release covered the 14 elections that were held on the July 5th in the states of Durango, Aguascalientes, Puebla, Sinaloa, Tlaxcala, Zacatecas, Quintana Roo, Hidalgo, Baja California, Oaxaca, Distrito Federal, Tamaulipas, Chihuahua and Veracruz. All contests were for the Governor office but Baja California (state MPs) and Distrito Federal (Constituent Assembly).

PEI_Mexico 1.0 included the responses for 292 experts for 17 elections in 17 states. PEI_Mexico 2.0 includes the responses for 502 experts in 31 elections.

Two files are released in PEI_Mexico:

1. An expert-level file (with individual-level results for 502 experts); [Marked **'X'** in the codebook]
2. An election-level file (with results aggregated for each of the 31 separate contests); [Marked **'E'** in the codebook]

In this codebook we present all the variables, how they were constructed and labeled. Since many variables appear in the two datasets, we differentiate between them in the last two columns. If there is an **X**, the variable is included at the expert level; if there is an **E**, the variable is included at the election level.

Citation

Use of the dataset should be acknowledged and cited as:

Pippa Norris, Ferran Martínez i Coma, Alessandro Nai and Max Grömping. 2016. *The expert survey of Perceptions of Electoral Integrity, Mexico Subnational Study 2015*: www.electoralintegrityproject.com.

Further readings

Martínez i Coma, Ferran and Carolien Van Ham. 2015. 'Can Experts Judge Elections? Testing the Validity of Expert Judgments for Measuring Election Integrity'. *European Journal of Political Research* doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12084

Martínez i Coma, Ferran and Richard W. Frank. 2014. 'Expert Judgments.' Chapter 4 in Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank and Ferran Martínez i Coma (Eds). *Advancing Electoral Integrity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Norris, Pippa, Ferran Martínez i Coma, and Richard W. Frank. 2013. 'Assessing the quality of elections.' *Journal of Democracy.* 24(4): 124-135.

Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank and Ferran Martínez i Coma. 2014. *Advancing Electoral Integrity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank and Ferran Martínez i Coma. 2014. "Measuring Electoral Integrity around the World: A New Dataset" *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47 (4): 789-798.

Norris, Pippa. 2013. 'Does the world agree about standards of electoral integrity? Evidence for the diffusion of global norms' Special issue of *Electoral Studies* 32(4):576-588.

Norris, Pippa. 2013. 'The new research agenda studying electoral integrity'. Special issue of *Electoral Studies* 32(4): 563-

575.

Norris, Pippa. 2014. 'Electoral integrity and political legitimacy.' In *Comparing Democracies 4*, eds. Lawrence LeDuc, Richard Niemi and Pippa Norris. London: Sage.

Norris, Pippa, Jorgen Elklit and Andrew Reynolds. 2014. 'Methods and evidence'. Chapter 3 in Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank and Ferran Martínez i Coma (Eds). *Advancing Electoral Integrity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Norris, Pippa. 2014. *Why electoral integrity matters*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, Pippa. 2015. *Why elections fail*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Variables

examplevariable	***Variable label***	**X**	**E**
	Variable description		
	SECTION I. ELECTION DATA		
expert	**Expert reference number**	**X**	
	An anonymized expert reference number.		
expert2	**EIP experts (1) and electoral experts (0)**	**X**	
	This variable has two categories. Value 1, is an expert that strictly follows EIP definition. Value 0 signifies experts that were derived from the National Electoral Institute (INE) list (see page 11 above).		
estado	**State of the election**	**X**	**E**
	This string variable is the name of the states included in the study. The survey includes 31 Mexican states that held elections on June 7th 2015, July 19th 2015 and 5th June 2016.		



election	**Election code**	**X**	**E**
	An election is defined as a state-wide contest either for the Governor office or the local legislature where electors vote directly for the person (or party) on the ballot, excluding appointment indirectly by a committee or institutions such as the legislature. Table 1 in the appendix provides basic information about the elections included in the study. This string variable is composed of the standard three-letter ISO 3166-2 abbreviation for the name of the state, followed by the date of the election (DDMMYYYY), the type of election (Governor, G, or local MP, D), and the round (1). Examples: Governor election in Baja California Sur on 7 June 2015: "BCS_07062015_G1" Tabasco Legislative election on 7 June 2015: "TAB_07062015_D1"		
year	**Election year**	**X**	**E**
	Year of the election.		
	SECTION II. STATE DATA	**X**	**E**
Eleccin	**Election: Governor or Local MP**	**X**	**E**
	Election to Governor (Gobernador) or to the local MPs (Diputados).		
Ganador	**Winner of the election**	**X**	**E**
	The party that won the election in that state		
participation	**% of citizen participation**	**X**	**E**
	Voter turnout rate at the state-level.		
population	**Population, by state, Census data**	**X**	**E**
	People that live in the state at the time of the measurement. Source: INEGI. http://www.inegi.org.mx/default.aspx		
GDP	**State's Gross Domestic Product**	**X**	**E**
	State's Gross Domestic Product. Constant prices 2008. Data 2009-2013. Millions of Mexican pesos. Source: http://www.inegi.org.mx/default.aspx		
GDPpc	**State's Gross Domestic Product per capita**	**X**	**E**
	State's Gross Domestic Product per capita. Constant prices 2008. Data 2009-2013. Millions of Mexican pesos.		
numresponses	**Number of PEI expert responses**		**E**
	The number of responses for either a particular election or state.		

contacted	**PEI experts contacted**		**E**
	The number of experts contacted in each state.		
responserate	**PEI response rate**		**E**
	The overall response rate calculated by taking the number of responses divided by the number of experts contacted per election. This variable ranges from 0.1 to .66.		
OVERALLINTEGRITY	**SECTION III. OVERALL INTEGRITY MEASURES**		
PEIIndexp	**Perceptions of Electoral Integrity Index (individual level)**	**X**	**E**
	The PEI index is designed to provide an overall summary evaluation of expert perceptions that an election meets international standards and global norms. It is generated at the individual level using experts' answers to the 49 substantive variables below. Therefore, an Index score is missing if an expert does not answer a question. The 49 scores are summed and then standardized to a 100 point scale.		
PEIIndexp_lci	**PEI Index (raw individual) , low ci**		**E**
	The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for either the election or the country level.		
PEIIndexp_hci	**PEI Index (raw individual) , high ci**		**E**
	The higher bound of the 95% confidence interval for either the election or the country level.		
PEIIndexi	**Perceptions of Electoral Integrity Index (individual level imputed)**	**X**	**E**
	The PEI index is designed to provide an overall summary evaluation of expert perceptions that an election meets international standards and global norms. It is generated at the individual level. Unlike the individual index (PEIIndexp) PEIIndexi is imputed and thus fully observed for all elections and countries. The imputation process was conducted in the following manner using Stata 13 at the expert unit of analysis. First, all 'Don't Knows' and 'Not Applicables' were replaced by missing values. The data were then imputed using multiple imputation and chained equations by section. The other variables in a section were thus used in the imputation equation along with five fully observed expert background characteristics (whether the expert was born in the state; whether the expert lived all his/her life in the state; his/her sex; his/her age group; whether the expert is a citizen of the state; the participation rate; the population of the state and the GDP per capita). Twenty imputed values were then created for each variable taking 200 iterations after a 10 model burn-in. These values were collapsed to their mean value. Then in an identical manner used to generate PEIIndexp, the values for the 49 substantive variables were summed and standardized into a 0-100 point scale. For more detail on the multiple imputation procedure see Royston, Patrick. 2004. "Multiple imputation of missing values." *Stata Journal* 4: 227–241 and *Stata Multiple-Imputation Reference Manual: Release 13*. College Station, TX: Stata Press, 137-164.		
PEIIndexi_lci	**PEI Index (imputed), low ci**		**E**
	The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for either the election or the country level.		
PEIIndexi_hci	**PEI Index (imputed), high ci**		**E**
	The higher bound of the 95% confidence interval for either the election or the country level.		

PEIIndex_rank	**Rank of election according to PEI experts**		**E**
	The position in the ranking of states based on the PEI Index.		
PEItype	**PEI Index type (high, medium, low)**		**E**
	Classification of the PEI Index on three categories (high, medium or low) based on the absolute values.		
rating	**12-1. Rate electoral integrity of the election (1=very poor->10=very good)**	**X**	**E**
	"Overall how would you rate the integrity of this election on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 10 (very good)?"		
rating_lci	**Rating, low ci**		**E**
	The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for either the election or the country level.		
rating_hci	**Rating, high ci**		**E**
	The higher bound of the 95% confidence interval for either the election or the country level.		
LAWS	**SECTION IV. ELECTORAL LAWS**	**X**	**E**
	In the electoral law questions, all respondents read this header:[4] "When thinking about the electoral laws used in the last election in this state, do you agree or disagree with the following statements? 1. Electoral laws were unfair to smaller parties. 2. Electoral laws favored the governing party or parties. 3. Elections laws restricted citizens' rights." The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
lawsunfair	**1-1a. Electoral laws were unfair to smaller parties (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
lawsunfair2	**1-1b. Electoral laws were unfair to smaller parties (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'lawsunfair' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
favoredincumbent	**1-2a. Electoral laws favored the governing party or parties (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
favoredincumbent2	**1-2b. Electoral laws favored the governing party or parties (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'favoredincumbent' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
citizens	**1-3a. Elections laws restricted citizens' rights (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
citizens2	**1-3b. Elections laws restricted citizens' rights (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'citizens' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
laws	**1-4. Electoral laws index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale created by summing the three previous variables (lawsunfari2, favoredincumbent2, citizens2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
lawsi	**1-4i. Electoral laws index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**

	This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the three previous variables (lawsunfari2, favoredincumbent2, citizens2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
PROCEDURES	**SECTION V. ELECTORAL PROCEDURES SECTION**	**X**	**E**
	In the procedures section, all respondents read this header: "In terms of electoral procedures... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? 4. Elections were well managed. 5. Information about voting procedures was widely available. 6. Election officials were fair. 7. Elections were conducted in accordance with the law." The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
managed	**2-1. Elections were well managed (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
votinginfo	**2-2. Information about voting procedures was widely available (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
fairofficials	**2-3. Election officials were fair (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
legalelections	**2-4: Elections were conducted in accordance with the law (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
procedures	**2-5. Electoral procedures index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale created by summing the four previous variables (managed, votinginfo, fairofficials, legalelections) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
proceduresi	**2-5i. Electoral procedures index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the four previous variables (managed, votinginfo, fairofficials, legalelections) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
BOUNDARIES	**SECTION VI. BOUNDARIES FOR DISTRICTS SECTION**	**X**	**E**
	In the boundaries section, all respondents read this header: "In some countries the electoral district boundaries are re-defined at intervals, a process also known as 'redistricting'. If this does not apply, please reply 'not applicable'. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements: 8. Boundaries discriminated against some parties. 9. Boundaries favored incumbents. 10. Boundaries were impartial."		

	The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
bdiscrim	**3-1a. Boundaries discriminated against some parties (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
bdiscrim2	**3-1b. Boundaries discriminated against some parties (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'bdiscrim' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
bfavored	**3-2a. Boundaries favored incumbents (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
bfavored2	**3-2b. Boundaries favored incumbents (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'bfavored' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
bimpartial	**3-3. Boundaries were impartial (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
boundaries	**3-4. Voting district boundaries index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale created by summing the four previous variables (managed, bdiscrim2, bfavored, boundaries) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
boundariesi	**3-4i. Voting district boundaries index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the four previous variables (managed, bdiscrim2, bfavored, boundaries) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
VOTERREGISTRATION	**SECTION VII. VOTER REGISTRATION**	**X**	**E**
	In the voter registration section, all respondents read this header: "Turning to voter registration... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements 11. Some citizens were not listed in the register 12. The electoral register was inaccurate 13. Some ineligible electors were registered" The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
reglisted	**4-1a. Some citizens were not listed in the register (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
reglisted2	**4-1b. Some citizens were not listed in the register (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'reglisted' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
reginaccurate	**4-2a. The electoral register was inaccurate (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
reginaccurate2	**4-2b. The electoral register was inaccurate (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**

	'reginaccurate' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
ineligible	**4-3a. Some ineligible electors were registered (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
ineligible2	**4-3b. Some ineligible electors were registered (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'inelegible' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
votereg	**4-4. Voter registration index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the three previous variables (reglisted2, reginaccurate2, inelegible2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
voteregi	**4-4i. Voter registration index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the three previous variables (reglisted2, reginaccurate2, inelegible2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
PARTYREGISTRATION	**SECTION VIII. PARTY AND CANDIDATE REGISTRATION**	**X**	**E**
	In the party and candidate registration section, all respondents read this header: "Thinking about the registration process for parties and candidates to get on the ballot... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements: 14. Some opposition candidates were prevented from running 15. Women had equal opportunities to run for office 16. Ethnic and national minorities had equal opportunities to run for office 17. Only top party leaders selected candidates 18. Some parties/candidates were restricted from holding campaign rallies" The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
oppprevent	**5-1a. Some opposition candidates were prevented from running (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
oppprevent2	**5-1b. Some opposition candidates were prevented from running (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'oppprevent' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
womenopp	**5-2. Women had equal opportunities to run for office (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
minorityopp	**5-3. Ethnic and national minorities had equal opportunities to run for office (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
leaderselect	**5-4a. Only top party leaders selected candidates (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
leaderselect2	**5-4b. Only top party leaders selected candidates (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'leaderselect' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
rallies	**5-5a. Some parties/candidates were restricted from holding campaign rallies (1-5)**	**X**	**E**

	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
rallies2	**5-5b. Some parties/candidates were restricted from holding campaign rallies (Reversed coding)**	X	E
	'rallies' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
partyreg	**5-6. Party and candidate registration index (20-100)**	X	E
	This is an additive scale conformed by the three previous variables (oppprevent2, womenopp, minorityopp, leaderselect2, rallies2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
partyregi	**5-6i. Party and candidate registration index (0-100), imputed**	X	E
	This is an additive scale conformed by the five previous variables (oppprevent2, womenopp, minorityopp, leaderselect2, rallies2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
MEDIACOVERAGE	**SECTION IX. MEDIA COVERAGE**	X	E
	In the media coverage section, all respondents read this header: "Thinking about the media's coverage of these elections, do you agree or disagree with the following statements: 19. Newspapers provided balanced election news. 20. TV news favored the governing party. 21. Parties/candidates had fair access to political broadcasts and advertising. 22. Journalists provided fair coverage of the elections. 23. Social media were used to expose electoral fraud." The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
newspapers	**6-1. Newspapers provided balanced election news (1-5)**	X	E
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
tv	**6-2a. TV news favored the governing party (1-5)**	X	E
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
tv2	**6-2b. TV news favored the governing party (Reversed coding)**	X	E
	'tv' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
fairaccess	**6-3. Parties/candidates had fair access to political broadcasts and advertising (1-5)**	X	E
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
faircoverage	**6-4. Journalists provided fair coverage of the elections (1-5)**	X	E
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
socialmedia	**6-5. Social media were used to expose electoral fraud (1-5)**	X	E
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
media	**6-6. Media coverage index (20-100)**	X	E
	This is an additive scale conformed by the five previous variables (newspapers, tv2, fairaccess, faircoverage, socialmedia) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		

mediai	**6-6i. Media coverage index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the five previous variables (newspapers, tv2, fairaccess, faircoverage, socialmedia) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
CAMPAIGNFINANCE	**SECTION X. CAMPAIGN FINANCE**	**X**	**E**
	In the campaign finance section, all respondents read this header: "Another issue concerns campaign finance, do you agree or disagree with the following statements... 24. Parties/candidates had equitable access to public political subsidies. 25. Parties/candidates had equitable access to political donations. 26. Parties/candidates publish transparent financial accounts. 27. Rich people buy elections. 28. Some state resources were improperly used for campaigning". The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
subsidies	**7-1. Parties/candidates had equitable access to public political subsidies (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
donations	**7-2. Parties/candidates had equitable access to political donations (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
accounts	**7-3. Parties/candidates publish transparent financial accounts (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
rich	**7-4a. Rich people buy elections (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
rich2	**7-4b. Rich people buy elections (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'rich' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
resources	**7-5a. Some state resources were improperly used for campaigning (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Were some state resources improperly used for campaigning? Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
resources2	**7-5b. Some state resources were improperly used for campaigning (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'resources' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
finance	**7-6. Campaign finance index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the five previous variables (subsidies, donations, accounts, rich2,resources2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
financei	**7-6i. Campaign finance index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the five previous variables (subsidies, donations, accounts, rich2,resources2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
VOTING PROCESS	**SECTION XI. VOTING PROCESS**	**X**	**E**

	In the voting process section, all respondents read this header: "When voting, do you agree or disagree with the following statements... 29. Some voters were threatened with violence at the polls. 30. Some fraudulent votes were cast. 31. The process of voting was easy. 32. Voters were offered a genuine choice at the ballot box. 33. Postal ballots were available. 34. Special voting facilities were available for the disabled. 35. National citizens living abroad could vote. 36. Some form of internet voting was available". The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
violence	**8-1a. Some voters were threatened with violence at the polls (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
violence2	**8-1b. Some voters were threatened with violence at the polls (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'violence' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
fraudulent	**8-2a. Some fraudulent votes were cast (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
fraudulent2	**8-2b. Some fraudulent votes were cast (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'fraudulent' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
easy	**8-3. The process of voting was easy (1-1)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
choice	**8-4. Voters were offered a genuine choice at the ballot box (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
postal	**8-5. Postal ballots were available (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
disabled	**8-6. Special voting facilities were available for the disabled (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
expats	**8-7. National citizens living abroad could vote (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
internet	**8-8. Some form of internet voting was available (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
voting	**8-9. Voting process index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the eight previous variables (violence2,		

	fraudulent2, easy, choice, postal, disabled, expats, internet) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
votingi	**8-9i. Voting process index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the eight previous variables (violence2, fraudulent2, easy, choice, postal, disabled, expats, internet) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
VOTE COUNT	**SECTION XII. VOTE COUNT**	**X**	**E**
	In the vote counting section, all respondents read this header: "Thinking about after the polls closed... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements... 37. Ballot boxes were secure. 38. The results were announced without undue delay. 39. Votes were counted fairly. 40. International election monitors were restricted. 41. Domestic election monitors were restricted". The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
secure	**9-1. Ballot boxes were secure (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
delay	**9-2. The results were announced without undue delay (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
faircount	**9-3. Votes were counted fairly (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
intlmonitors	**9-4a. Int'l election monitors were restricted (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
intlmonitors2	**9-4b. Int'l election monitors were restricted (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'intlmonitors' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
domesticmonitors	**9-5a. Domestic election monitors were restricted (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
domesticmonitors2	**9-5b. Domestic election monitors were restricted (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'domesticmonitors' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
count	**9-6. Vote count index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the five previous variables (secure, delay, faircount, intlmonitors2, domesticmonitors2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
counti	**9-6i. Vote count index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the five previous variables (secure, delay, faircount, intlmonitors2, domesticmonitors2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
VOTING RESULTS	**SECTION XIII. VOTING RESULTS**	**X**	**E**

	In the announcement of the results section, all respondents read this header: "After the official results were announced, do you agree or disagree with the following statements... 42. Parties/candidates challenged the results. 43. The election led to peaceful protests. 44. The election triggered violent protests. 45. Any disputes were resolved through legal channels." The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
challenged	**10-1a. Parties/candidates challenged the results (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
challenged2	**10-1b. Parties/candidates challenged the results (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'challenged' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
protestspeace	**10-2a. The election led to peaceful protests (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
protestspeace2	**10-2b. The election led to peaceful protests (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'protestspeace' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
protestsviolent	**10-3a. The election triggered violent protests (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
protestsviolent2	**10-3b. The election triggered violent protests (Reversed coding)**	**X**	**E**
	'protestsviolent' reversed coding: Strongly Disagree, 5; Disagree, 4; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 2; Strongly Agree, 1.		
disputes	**10-4. Any disputes were resolved through legal channels (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
results	**10-5. Results index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the four previous variables (challenged2, protestspeace2, protestviolent2, disputes) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
resultsi	**10-5i. Results index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the four previous variables (challenged2, protestspeace2, protestviolent2, disputes) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
ELECTION AUTHORITIES	**SECTION XIV. ELECTORAL AUTHORITIES**	**X**	**E**
	In the electoral authorities section, all respondents read this header: "Thinking about the electoral authorities administering elections, in your view... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements...		

	46. The election authorities were impartial. 47. The authorities distributed information to citizens. 48. The authorities allowed public scrutiny of their performance. 49. The election authorities performed well." The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
impartial	**11-1. The election authorities were impartial (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
info	**11-2. The authorities distributed information to citizens (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
scrutiny	**11-3. The authorities allowed public scrutiny of their performance (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
performance	**11-4. The election authorities performed well (1-5)**	**X**	**E**
	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
EMBs	**11-5. Electoral authorities index (20-100)**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the four previous variables (impartial, info, scrutiny, performance) and standardized to a 100 point scale.		
EMBsi	**11-5i. Electoral authorities index (0-100), imputed**	**X**	**E**
	This is an additive scale conformed by the four previous variables (impartial, info, scrutiny, performance) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.		
GENERALQUESTIONS	**SECTION XV. GENERAL ELECTION**	**X**	**E**
	In this section, all respondents read the following questions: "Overall, how familiar are you with elections in this country, on a scale from 1 (not familiar) to 10 (very familiar)? If there was more than one election held simultaneously, which one do you consider the most important?"		
familiarity	**13-1. How familiar are you with elections in this country?**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks the expert to rate her familiarity with the election on a one to ten scale, where 1 is not familiar and 10 is very familiar.		
important	**13-2. Which election (if more than one) was most important?**	**X**	**E**
	In many countries elections for different offices are held in the same day. For instance, in the United States, the Presidential election on 6 November of 2012 was held jointly with Congressional elections for the House and the Senate. Since the survey asks experts to provide their evaluation of only one contest, the respondents can point out which election they consider is more important.		
ORGCONFIDENCE	**SECTION XVI. ORGANIZATIONAL CONFIDENCE**	**X**	**E**
	In the organizational confidence section, all respondents read this header:		

	"Lastly, we are interested in your views about organizations. For each one, could you please rate how much confidence you have in those organizations in this country, from a 1 (no confidence at all) to 10 (a great deal of confidence) scale? The Courts/ The Government/ Parliament/ The armed forces/The police/ Electoral authorities/ Television/ The press/ Political parties".		
courts	**14-1. Confidence in the courts (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the courts of the state in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
gobernador	**14-2. Confidence in the gobernador (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the Governor of the State in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
localdips	**14-3. Confidence in the state parliament (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the legislative chamber of the state in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
armyforces	**14-4. Confidence in the armed forces (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the armed forces of the country. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
statepolice	**14-5. Confidence in the local or state police (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the local or state police of the state in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
localelecauth	**14-6. Confidence in the local election authorities (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the local electoral authorities of the state in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
statetv	**14-7. Confidence in television (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the television of the state in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
statepress	**14-8. Confidence in the press (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the press of the state in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
stateparties	**14-9. Confidence in political parties (1=none - 10=a great deal)**	**X**	**E**
	This categorical variable asks about degree of confidence that the respondent has on the parties of the state in which the election was celebrated. It ranges from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (a great deal of confidence).		
BACKGROUND	**SECTION XVII. EXPERT BACKGROUND**	**X**	**E**
	In this section, all experts are asked various questions about their background.		
employment	**15-1. Employment type**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Are you currently in full or part-time paid employment? Respondents had three options: Not currently in paid employment, 1; Part-time, 2; and Full time 3.		

public	**15-2. Works (or has worked) in the government public sector**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Do you work, or have you worked, in the public sector? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
university	**15-3. Works (or has worked) in a university**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Do you work, or have you worked, in university? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
nonprofit	**15-4. Works (or has worked) in private non-profit sector/NGOs**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Do you work, or have you worked, in the private non-profit sector/NGOs? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
agency	**15-5. Works (or has worked) in an international agency**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Do you work, or have you worked, in an international agency? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
private	**15-6. Works (or has worked) in a private business or industry**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Do you work, or have you worked, in a private business or industry? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
occupation	**15-7. Most recent occupation**	**X**	**E**
	Question: What is (or was) your most recent primary employment? Respondents most recent occupation was coded as: Civil servant/local government (1), Electoral official (2), International official or consultant (3), Journalist/reporter/broadcaster/blogger/citizen journalist (4), Lawyer/legal profession (5), Scholar/teacher/researcher/academic (6), Manager or professional (7), Elected representative/politician (8), Not applicable/don't know (9).		
agegroup	**15-8a. Expert's age group (by decade)**	**X**	**E**
	Expert of the age recoded by the decade the expert was born.		
sex	**15-9. Sex**	**X**	**E**
	Question: What is your sex? It is a dichotomous variable: male (0), female (1).		
education	**15-10. Highest level of education**	**X**	**E**
	Question: What is your highest level of educational qualification? The response categories for the educational attainment are: No formal education (1), Primary school (2), Secondary school (3), University-level education with under-graduate degree (4), University-level education, with post-graduate degree (5).		
born	**15-11. Were you born in this country?**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Were you born in this country? It is a dichotomous variable: no (0), yes (1)		
lived	**15-12. Number years lived in this country**	**X**	**E**
	Question: How long have you lived in this country, if at all? Respondents had five response categories: Never lived in this country (0), Less than 12 months (1), 1-4 years (2), 5-9 years (3), 10 years or more (4), all my life (5).		
candidate	**15-13. Expert was a candidate for elected office**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as an elected representative? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
rep	**15-14. Expert was an elected representative**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as an elected representative? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
activist	**15-15. Expert was an election activist**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as an election activist? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		

ngo	**15-16. Expert was election NGO watch personnel**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as an election NGO watch? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
voted	**15-17. Expert voted in this election**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as a voter? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
norole	**15-18. Expert did not participate in any role in this election**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country in any of the following roles? No, I did not participate in any of these roles Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
natelecmonitor	**15-19. Expert was a national official electoral monitor**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as a national official elector monitor? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
monitorint	**15-19a. Expert was an international official electoral monitor**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as an international official elector monitor? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
elecofficial	**15-20. Expert was an election official**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Did you participate in the last national election of this country as an election official? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
citizen	**15-21. Expert is a citizen of this country (0/1)**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Are you a citizen of this country? Respondents had two options: no, 0; yes,1.		
supported	**15-22. Support the winning or losing side**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Which political party, if any, did you support in the last national election? Experts responded the parties they voted. Their answers were recoded into 7 categories: winner (1), loser (2), no party (3), did not vote (4), decline to answer (5), independent (6), no answer (7).		
leftrightscale	**15-23. Political views on 10pt left/right scale**	**X**	**E**
	Question: Below is a 10 point scale on which the political views are arranged from very left to very right. Where would you place your views on this scale? Respondents used the left/right scale to place their personal ideological stance, one being very left and 10 very right.		
difficulty	**How difficult did you find the survey**	**X**	
	Question: Overall, how easy or difficult did you find the questions? On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means the questionnaire was 'very difficult to understand' and 10 means the questionnaire was 'very easy to understand'. Respondents had to evaluate in a scale of from 1 to 10.		
VIGNETTES	**SECTION XVIII. VIGNETTES**	**X**	**E**
	In the organizational confidence section, all respondents read this header: "Here we are interested in learning your views more generally about situations which can occur in different contests."		
vignetteA	**16-1. Vignette A (Queues)**	**X**	**E**

	Question: How seriously do you think that electoral integrity is undermined if in COUNTRY A some voters had to wait in long lines to vote? Respondents were asked to give their opinion in a 1 to 10 scale were 1 means that electoral integrity is not seriously undermined and 10 means that electoral integrity is seriously undermined.		
vignetteB	**16-2. Vignette B (Boycotts)**	**X**	**E**
	Question: How seriously do you think that electoral integrity is undermined in COUNTRY B if the opposition decides to boycott an election, so that the government wins most seats by default? Respondents were asked to give their opinion in a 1 to 10 scale were 1 means that electoral integrity is not seriously undermined and 10 means that electoral integrity is seriously undermined.		
vignetteC	**16-3. Vignette C (Violence)**	**X**	**E**
	Question: How seriously do you think that electoral integrity is undermined in COUNTRY C election results lead to widespread violence throughout the country? Respondents were asked to give their opinion in a 1 to 10 scale were 1 means that electoral integrity is not seriously undermined and 10 means that electoral integrity is seriously undermined.		
EXTRA			
	In this section, the sub-national team included a series of specific questions for the country. Such questions are just for this country. All respondents read this header: "For the Mexican case, we have included a few additional questions that we would appreciate you to answer. In relation with the possible intervention of the organized crime and the presence of violence in the elections,... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements... Extra 1. In the election for governor, the organized crime influenced through the selection of at least one candidate. Extra 2. In the election for governor, the organized crime influenced by threatening at least one of the candidates. Extra 3. In the election for governor, the organized crime influenced by financing at least one candidate. Extra 4. In the election for governor, the presence of organized crime hindered electoral participation. Extra 5. In the election for governor, the presence of organized crime influenced the decisions of the voters. Extra 6. In the last local elections, the organized crime defined the result in a number of cities that concentrate half or more of the state's population. The respondents gave their opinion in a five point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Respondents also had the possibility to answer "Don't know" and "Not applicable".		
inflorgcrime	**Extra 1. El crimen organizado influyó a través de selección de un candidato**	**X**	
	Question: In the election for governor, the organized crime influenced through the selection of at least one candidate.		

	Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
inflamenaza	**Extra 2. El crimen organizado influyó a través de la amenaza a un candidato**	X	
	Question: In the election for governor, the organized crime influenced by threatening at least one of the candidates. Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
inflfinanciamiento	**Extra 3. crimen organizado influyó a través del financiamiento a un candidato**	X	
	Question: In the election for governor, the organized crime influenced by financing at least one candidate. Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
orgcrimpart	**Extra 4. crimen organizado inhibió la participacion**	X	
	Question: In the election for governor, the presence of organized crime hindered electoral participation. Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
orgcrimdecvoter	**Extra 5. crimen organizado influyó en decisiones de los votantes**	X	
	Question: In the election for governor, the presence of organized crime influenced the decisions of the voters. Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
orgcrimmunic	**Extra 6. crimen organizado definió el resultado en municipios con**	X	
	Question: In the last local elections, the organized crime defined the result in a number of cities that concentrate half or more of the state's population Coded: Strongly Disagree, 1; Disagree, 2; Neither agree nor disagree, 3; Agree, 4; Strongly Agree, 5.		
weight		X	
	Given that the number of emails sent in some states was over 40 and in other states was below such figure, we have created a variable that weights by the number of contact emails sent.		
STATEPOLITICS	**SECTION XIX. GENERAL POLITICAL STATE DATA**		
	In this section we provide information about the election itself. Sources include INE, INEGI, Electoral State Institutes, FUNDAR, CONEVAL and CIEP.		
votePAN	**Number of votes PAN**		E
	Number of votes the Partido de Accion Nacional (PAN) obtained in the election		
voteperPAN	**Percentage of votes PAN**		E
	Percentage of votes PAN obtained in the election		
votePRI	**Number of votes PRI**		E
	Number of votes the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) obtained in the election		
voteperPRI	**Percentage of votes PRI**		E

	Percentage of votes PRI obtained in the election		
votePRD	**Number of votes PRD**		**E**
	Number of votes the Partido de la Revolucion Democratica (PRD) obtained in the election		
voteperPRD	**Percentage of votes PRD**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PRD obtained in the election		
votePRDPAN	**Number of votes PRDPAN**		**E**
	Addition of absolute votes of PRD and PAN		
voteperPRDPAN	**Percentage of votes PRDPAN**		**E**
	Percentage of vote of PRD and PAN		
votePVEM	**Number of votes PVEM**		**E**
	Number of votes the Partido Verde Ecologista de Mexico (PVEM) obtained in the election		
voteperPVEM	**Percentage of votes PVEM**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PVEM obtained in the election		
voteMorena	**Number of votes Morena**		**E**
	Number of votes the Movimiento Regeneracion Nacional (MORENA) obtained in the election		
voteperMorena	**Percentage of votes Morena**		**E**
	Percentage of votes MORENA obtained in the election		
voteMC	**Number of votes MC**		**E**
	Number of votes the Movimiento Ciudadano (MC) obtained in the election		
voteperMC	**Percentage of votes MC**		**E**
	Percentage of votes MC obtained in the election		
voteNA	**Number of votes NA**		**E**
	Number of votes of Nueva Alianza (NA) obtained in the election		
voteperNA	**Percentage of votes NA**		**E**
	Percentage of votes NA obtained in the election		
votePES	**Number of votes PES**		**E**
	Number of votes the Partido Encuentro Social (PES) obtained in the election		
voteperPES	**Percentage of votes PES**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PES obtained in the election		
votePT	**Number of votes PT**		**E**
	Number of votes the Partido del Trabajo (PT) obtained in the election		
voteperPT	**Percentage of votes PT**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PT obtained in the election		
votePT_MC_Morena	**Number of votes PT+MC+Morena**		**E**
	Number of votes the PT, MC and MORENA obtained in the election		
voteperPT_MC_Morena	**Percentage of votes PT+MC+Morena**		**E**
	Percentage of votes the PT, MC and MORENA obtained in the election		
votePH	**Number of votes PH**		**E**
	Number of votes the Partido Humanista (PH) obtained in the election		
voteperPH	**Percentage of votes PH**		**E**
	Percentage of votes the PH obtained in the election		
voteIndep	**Number of votes Independents**		**E**
	Number of votes of the Independent parties (IP) obtained in the election		

voteperIndep	**Percentage of votes Independents**		**E**
	Percentage of votes the Independent parties obtained in the election		
voteLocalpart	**Number of votes Local parties**		**E**
	Number of votes of the local parties obtained in the election		
voteperLocalpart	**Percentage of votes Local parties**		**E**
	Percentage of votes for the local parties obtained in the election		
voteNonregvote	**Number of non registered votes**		**E**
	Number of votes for non-registered candidates		
voteperNonregvote	**Percentage of non registered votes**		**E**
	Percentage of votes for non-registered candidates		
voteNullvotes	**Number of Null votes**		**E**
	Number of null votes		
voteperNullvotes	**Percentage of null votes**		**E**
	Percentage of null votes		
voteValidvotes	**Number of valid votes**		
	Number of valid votes. All the votes minus null votes and non registered votes		**E**
voteTotal	**Number of total votes**		**E**
	Number of total votes		
nominalist	**Nominal List. Electoral Roll**		**E**
	Nominal list. Relation of the number of citizens, address, district and electoral section of the citizens that have the identification card to vote and that are included in the electoral roll.		
homicides	**Number of homicides per state**		**E**
	Number of homicides per states.		
homicides100m	**Number of homicides per 100000 inhabitants**		**E**
	Number of homicides per each 100000 inhabitants		
pubspending	**State's public spending**		**E**
	State public spending by state. Current prices. Millions of pesos.		
nummunicip	**Number of Municipalities by state**		**E**
	Number of municipalities by state		
nummunpartgob	**Municipalities governed by the governor's party**		**E**
	Number of municipalities by governor’s party		
popgobparty	**Population governed by the party of the Governor**		**E**
	Population governed by the party of the Governor		
poppergobparty	**% of population governed by the party of the Governor**		**E**
	Proportion of population governed by the party of the Governor		
sizecongress	**Size of local congress**		**E**
	Size of local congress (number of total MPs)		
numdipgob	**Number of MP of the governor's party**		**E**
	Number of MP of the governor’s party		
numdipgobcoal	**Number of MP allied to the governor's party**		**E**
	Number of MP allied to the governor's party		
unemployment	**Unemployment rate previous year**		**E**
	Unemployment rate previous year. Estimation over state population		
urbanpopstate	**% of population in urban state areas**		**E**
	Percentage of population in state urban areas. Data from 2005 and 2010		

poverty	**Poverty (% of people in the state)**		**E**
	Poverty (% of people in the state). Data 2010-2014.		
moderpoverty	**Moderate poverty (% of people in the state)**		**E**
	Moderate poverty (% of people in the state). Data 2010-2014.		
extrempoverty	**Extreme poverty (% of people in the state)**		**E**
	Extreme poverty (% of people in the state). Data 2010-2014.		
localresources	**Resources assigned to municipalities**		**E**
	Resources assigned to municipalities. Data series 2007-2011 and 2012. Thousands of pesos.		
genpartfund	**General Participation Fund 2009-2014**		**E**
	General Participation Fund 2009-2014 (transfer from the Federation to the States). Data 2009-2014. Thousands of pesos.		
genpartfundpc	**General Participation Fund 2009-2014, per capita**		**E**
	General Participation Fund 2009-2014 per capita (transfer from the Federation to the States). Estimation on population by state. Data 2009-2014.		
yearprevlocelec	**Year previous local election**		**E**
	Year of previous local election		
ganadort1	**Previous party winner**		**E**
	Party that won in the previous election		
votePANt1	**Number of votes PAN previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes the PAN obtained in the previous election		
voteperPANt1	**Percentage of votes PAN previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PAN obtained in the previous election		
votePRIt1	**Number of votes PRI previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes the PRI obtained in the previous election		
voteperPRIt1	**Percentage of votes PRI previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PRI obtained in the previous election		
votePRDt1	**Number of votes PRD previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes the PRD obtained in the previous election		
voteperPRDt1	**Percentage of votes PRD previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PRD obtained in the previous election		
votePRDPANt1	**Number of votes PRDPAN previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes PRDPAN obtained in the previous election		
voteperPRDPANt1	**Percentage of votes PRDPAN previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PRDPAN obtained in the previous election		
votePVEMt1	**Number of votes PVEM previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes PVEM obtained in the previous election		
voteperPVEMt1	**Percentage of votes PVEM previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PVEM obtained in the previous election		
voteMorenat1	**Number of votes Morena previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes MORENA obtained in the previous election		
voteperMorenat1	**Percentage of votes Morena previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes MORENA obtained in the previous election		
voteMCt1	**Number of votes MC previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes MC obtained in the previous election		
voteperMCt1	**Percentage of votes MC previous election**		**E**

	Percentage of votes MC obtained in the previous election		
voteNAt1	**Number of votes NA previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes NA obtained in the previous election		
voteperNAt1	**Percentage of votes NA previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes NA obtained in the previous election		
votePESt1	**Number of votes PES previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes PES obtained in the previous election		
voteperPESt1	**Percentage of votes PER previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PES obtained in the previous election		
votePTt1	**Number of votes PT previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes PT obtained in the previous election		
voteperPTt1	**Percentage of votes PT previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PT obtained in the previous election		
votePT_MC_Morenat1	**Number of votes PT+MC+Morena previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes PT, MC and MORENA obtained in the previous election		
voteperPT_MC_Morenat1	**Percentage of votes PT+MC+Morena previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PT, MC and MORENA obtained in the previous election		
votePHt1	**Number of votes PH previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes PH obtained in the previous election		
voteperPHt1	**Percentage of votes PH previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes PH obtained in the previous election		
voteIndept1	**Number of votes Independents previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes Independents obtained in the previous election		
voteperIndept1	**Percentage of votes Independents previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes Independents obtained in the previous election		
voteLocalpartt1	**Number of votes Local parties previous election**		**E**
	Number of votes Local parties obtained in the previous election		
voteperLocalpartt1	**Percentage of votes Independents previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of votes Local parties obtained in the previous election		
voteNonregvotet1	**Number of non-registered votes previous election**		**E**
	Number of non-registered votes in the previous election		
voteperNonregvotet1	**Percentage of non-registered votes previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of non-registered obtained in the previous election		
voteNullvotest1	**Number of Null votes previous election**		**E**
	Number of null votes in the previous election		
voteperNullvotest1	**Percentage of null votes previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of null votes obtained in the previous election		
voteValidvotest1	**Number of valid votes previous election**		**E**
	Number of valid votes in the previous election		
voteTotalt1	**Number of total votes previous election**		**E**
	Number of total votes in the previous election		
nominalistt1	**Nominal List. Electoral Roll previous election**		**E**
	Nominal list in the previous election. Relation of the number of citizens, address, district and electoral section of the citizens that have the identification card to vote and that are included in the electoral roll.		
participationt1	**% of citizen participation previous election**		**E**

	Turnout rate at the state in the previous election		
populationt1	**Population-Census previous election**		**E**
	People that live in the state at the time of the measurement in the previous election. Source: INEGI. http://www.inegi.org.mx/default.aspx		
GDPt1	**State's Gross Domestic Product previous election**		**E**
	State's Gross Domestic Product in the previous election. Constant prices 2008. Data 2009-2013. Thousands of Mexican pesos. Source: http://www.inegi.org.mx/default.aspx		
GDPpct1	**Per capita state's Gross Domestic Product previous election**		**E**
	State's Gross Domestic Product per capita in the previous election. Constant prices 2008. Data 2009-2013. Thousands of Mexican pesos.		
homicidest1	**Number of homicides per state previous election**		**E**
	Number of homicides per state in the previous election.		
homicides100mt1	**Number of homicides per 100000 inhabitants previous elections**		**E**
	Number of homicides per each 100000 inhabitants		
pubspendingt1	**State's public spending previous election**		**E**
	State public spending by state in the previous election. Current prices. Millions of pesos.		
nummunicipt1	**Number of Municipalities by state previous election**		**E**
	Number of municipalities by state in the previous election.		
nummunpartgobt1	**Municipalities governed by the governor's party previous election**		**E**
	Number of municipalities by governor's party in the previous election		
popgobpartyt1	**Population governed by the party of the Governor previous election**		**E**
	Population governed by the party of the Governor in the previous election		
poppergobpartyt1	**%Population governed by the party of the Governor previous election**		**E**
	Proportion of population governed by the party of the Governor in the previous election		
sizecongresst1	**Size of local congress previous election**		**E**
	Size of local congress (number of total MPs) in the previous election		
numdipgobt1	**Number of MP of the governor's party previous election**		**E**
	Number of MP of the governor's party in the previous election		
numdipgobcoalt1	**Number of MP allied to the governor's party previous election**		**E**
	Number of MP allied to the governor's party in the previous election		
unemploymentt1	**Unemployment rate previous election**		**E**
	Unemployment rate previous year in the previous election. Estimation over state population		
urbanpopstatet1	**% of population in urban state areas previous election**		**E**
	Percentage of population in state urban areas in the previous election. Data from 2005 and 2010		
povertyt1	**poverty (% of people in the state) previous election**		**E**
	Poverty (% of people in the state) in the previous election. Data 2010-2014.		
moderpovertyt1	**moderate poverty (% of people in the state) previous election**		**E**
	Moderate poverty (% of people in the state) in the previous election. Data 2010-2014.		
extrempovertyt1	**extreme poverty (% of people in the state) previous elections**		**E**
	Extreme poverty (% of people in the state) in the previous election. Data 2010-2014.		
localresourcest1	**Resources assigned to municipalities previous elections**		**E**
	Resources assigned to municipalities in the previous election. Data series 2007-		

	2011 and 2012. Thousands of pesos.		
genpartfundt1	**General Participation Fund 2009-2014 previous election**		**E**
	General Participation Fund 2009-2014 (transfer from the Federation to the States) in the previous election. Data 2009-2014. Thousands of pesos.		
genpartfundpct1	**General Participation Fund 2009-2014, per capita previous election**		**E**
	General Participation Fund 2009-2014 per capita (transfer from the Federation to the States) in the previous election. Estimation on population by state. Data 2009-2014.		

Appendix A. Elections and States included in Mexico Sub-National Studies

State	Election Date	Election type
Baja California Sur	June 7th 2015	Governor
Campeche	June 7th 2015	Governor
Chiapas	July 19th 2015	Local MP
Colima	June 7th 2015	Governor
DF	June 7th 2015	Local MP
Estado de Mexico	June 7th 2015	Local MP
Guanajuato	June 7th 2015	Local MP
Guerrero	June 7th 2015	Governor
Jalisco	June 7th 2015	Local MP
Michoacán	June 7th 2015	Governor
Morelos	June 7th 2015	Local MP
Nuevo León	June 7th 2015	Governor
Querétaro	June 7th 2015	Governor
San Luis Potosí	June 7th 2015	Governor
Sonora	June 7th 2015	Governor
Tabasco	June 7th 2015	Local MP
Durango	June 5th 2016	Governor
Aguascalientes	June 5th 2016	Governor
Puebla	June 5th 2016	Governor
Sinaloa	June 5th 2016	Governor
Tlaxcala	June 5th 2016	Governor
Zacatecas	June 5th 2016	Governor
Quintana Roo	June 5th 2016	Governor
Hidalgo	June 5th 2016	Governor
Baja California	June 5th 2016	Local MP
Oaxaca	July 5th 2016	Governor
DF	June 5th 2016	Constituent Assembly
Tamaulipas	June 5th 2016	Governor
Chihuahua	June 5th 2016	Governor
Veracruz	June 5th 2016	Governor

[1] We thank AMECIP for sharing such information.
[2] We thank SOMEE for sharing such information.
[3] They are accessible at http://www.ine.mx/archivos2/portal/Estados/OPL/index.html
[4] Please note that all survey questions were administered in Spanish.