External Support to Nonviolent Movements (EX-D)

DATA CODING PROTOCOL

Compiled by Erica Chenoweth
Harvard Kennedy School and Radcliffe Institute of Advanced Study
Harvard University
erica_chenoweth@hks.harvard.edu

Updated 18 November 2019

How to Cite this Dataset: Erica Chenoweth, JJ Janflone, Maria Lotito, Paul Kemp, and Maria Stephan. 2021. *External Support to Nonviolent Movements Dataset (EX-D).* Harvard University, Cambridge MA.

Acknowledgements: We gratefully acknowledge support from the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and Gary Hart for their generous financial support of this project. The authors are responsible for all contents, which do not necessarily reflect the views of the project supportrs. We also thank the many capable research assistants who contributed to this project: Christian Brunner, Sarah Chasin, Lee Cotton, John Dinges, Esra Dilek, Kaitlyn Dowd, Emma Dunn, Ned Feuer, Abby Harms, Laura Hosman, Duk Kyi, Christine Lazcano, Elise Mann, Patrick MacCormick, Drew Pederson, Patrick Pierson, Stacy Parson Stephens, Patrick Pierson, Diego Prados Bleifuss, Miranda Rivers, Evan Williams, and Melinda Zanner. For helpful comments on the data design during its early stages, we thank Deborah Avant, Alex Braithwaite, Cassy Dorff, Cullen Hendrix, and the participants in a workshop held at the University of Denver in 2014.

Project Description

Does external assistance help or hinder nonviolent resistance campaigns? This project aims to create a collection of the first systematic, global dataset identifying different forms of aid provided to civil resistance campaigns with maximalist goals.[1] We limit this study to protest movements whose peak years occurred within the 2000-2014 timeframe, which generated a sample of 68 maximalist campaigns. The ultimate outcome of this collection will be a comprehensive and nuanced analysis of the impacts of these different types of aid (or combinations of aid) on the short- and long-term outcomes of nonviolent campaigns.

The project will take account of all reported incidents of support, encouragement, or direct participation in civil resistance campaigns by international third parties. The resulting dataset will feature incident-level observations of external assistance provided to all known civil resistance campaigns occurring in our period of study, as defined in the NAVCO 2.1 dataset. Because we also capture support provided in each campaigns pre and post-phases, the dates of some observations will lie outside the 2000-2014 period.

We define external assistance as support for a movement that originated beyond the sovereign boundaries of the country in which the campaign operates. External supporters might include foreign governments, organizations, and individuals. We will also collect data on 5 randomly-selected cases where support was provided to create an "enabling environment," but where no campaigns emerged.

Research assistants will collect the data using a uniform search string on variety of news sources in LexisNexis to identify supporters and recipients of assistance occurring during each campaign. They will then supplement these search strings with searches of additional data sources to obtain further information about each incident of support. A separate team of coders will apply uniform filters to the AidData.org database in order to identify applicable instances of Official Development Assistance (ODA), and Other Official Flows (OOF).

[1] A maximalist campaign is one that aims to overthrow an existing regime, expel foreign occupations, or achieve self-determination (Chenoweth and Lewis 2013, 416).

Data Search Protocol

*Note: Each worksheet can reference multiple sources.

STEP 1. Conduct a focused search on Lexis-Nexis electronic wire service databases.

- From the Lexis Nexis Advanced Search Form, input [country name*] AND [campaign name] (e.g. Serbia AND Otpor). Do not use quotes.

- Select the appropriate date ranges, with the full calendar year (i.e. input 1/1/1990 as the start date of the search and 12/31/2014 as the end date of the search).

- In sources, enter the following sources: "Associated Press, The," "BBC Monitoring: International Reports," "Associated Press International," "Agence France Press – English," "Associated Press Online."

- Use the sorting button to display stories with newest first and proceed chronologically backward. Actors identified as relevant to the campaign should be catalogued for future reference. Each story should be ignored / discarded if irrelevant.

STEP 2. Broaden out to Google searches and/or Google Scholar searches. Wikipedia and Wikileaks are allowable as long as the specific item of data is documented / referenced, and you can confirm the reference. If you use Wikileaks, please take a screenshot of the referenced material and save it in the shared project Dropbox folder for easy recall.

STEP 3. Consult the following websites / online databases:

The Diplomat's Handbook.
http://www.diplomatshandbook.org/

An Outsider's Guide to Supporting Nonviolent Resistance to Dictatorship.
http://www.outsiders-guide.org/

Environmental Justice Atlas
http://www.ejatlas.org

Business and Human Rights Centre
http://business-humanrights.org

Swarthmore Global Nonviolent Action Database
http://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/

Minorities at Risk Data (global)
http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/data.asp

Minorities at Risk Organizational Behavior (Middle East and North Africa only)
http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/data.asp#quantitativemarob

Conflict Barometer
http://www.hiik.de/en/konfliktbarometer/index.html

Civil Resistance Bibliography and Case Studies
http://www.civilresistance.info/

Beyond Intractability: searchable website with a number of different types of resources
http://www.beyondintractability.org/

STEP 4. Broaden out to print sources, including (but not limited to) the following:

Revolutionary Movements in World History

History Behind the Headlines: The Origins of Conflicts Worldwide

Encyclopedia of Human Rights

Encyclopedia of Political Revolutions

Political Handbook of the World

World Encyclopedia of Political Parties and Systems, 2 vols.

Encyclopedia of Conflicts since WWII, 4 vols.

Various case studies, analysis, and reports related to the specific campaigns.

External Support Data Variables

ObservationID (numeric)
A unique identifier for each observation, assigned chronologically after sorting data in this order: NavcoID, AidData.org (Yes or No), Start Date, Supporting Country Correlates of War (COW) code.

AidDatayn (dichotomous)
Variable created post-merge of AidData.org and hand-coded observations to allow for easy filtering or subsetting between the two data collection modalities.

AidDataID (numeric)
Include the identification number assigned by AidData.org, if applicable.

SupporterText1 (text)
Type the specific name of the supporter here (if available).

SupporterText2 (text)
Type the title/office of the supporter here (if available).

SupporterText3 (text)
Type the Organization or Government Ministry/Department (if available).

SupporterCountryID (text)
The supporter's country or territory. This should be the central location (e.g. if Human Rights Watch is providing support to an Egyptian group through its office in Cairo, enter "USA" rather than "Egypt"). If the supporter is truly multinational or transnational (e.g. the United Nations), enter "transnational."

SupporterCountryCcode (numerical)
The Correlates of War Country Code for the entity coded in *SupporterCountryID* drawn from http://correlatesofwar.org/data-sets/cow-country-codes. If the supporter is truly multinational or transnational (e.g. the United Nations), enter "0."

Movement ID (text)
The movement toward whom the assistance is relevant / whom the assistance is intended to benefit

Navco2ID (numeric)
The unique movement identifier drawn from Navco 2.1. This information was added during the data cleaning process. Control cases have been assigned repeating 5-digit identification numbers in the following way:

11111 – Cuba
22222 – Guatemala
33333 – Kenya
44444 – Malaysia

55555 – Zimbabwe
66666 – Ghana (formerly Anti-Rawlings Campaign)
77777 – Croatia (formerly Croatian Institutional Reform Campaign)[2]

MovementCountryID (text)
The movement's country or territory. This information was added during the data cleaning process.

LinkedID (text)
Identify an arbitrary, unique, numerical ID to demonstrate that the incident occurred in simultaneous coordination with another incident (e.g. Aid provided by a group of Croatian activists, human rights workers, and Swedish diplomats to the Bulldozer revolution would be coded as three separate incidents from three distinct supporters; however, the three incidents would be coded as linked, such as "srbBld123," to demonstrate that they occurred in concert). The necessary format is as follows: country abbreviation (lower case), Campaign name abbreviation (first letter upper case, rest of letters lower case), worksheet number. For example, a linked ID for a worksheet numbered 123 on Serbia related to the Bulldozer Revolution would be "srbBld123."

SupporterType (categorical)
The type of supporter delivering the assistance. Select only one supporter per incident. If several supporters deliver assistance in a combined fashion, create a new entry for each supporter.

1 = **International nongovernmental organization (INGO).** Formal, private organization that undertakes activities to assist people in other countries. Can include advocacy organizations (e.g. Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Nonviolent Peaceforce, International Fellowship of Reconciliation), foundations and philanthropic organizations (e.g. Open Society, International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, Nonviolence International), humanitarian organizations (e.g. International Red Cross and Red Crescent), educational or training groups (e.g. CANVAS, Rhize), and adjuncts to religious groups (e.g. Catholic Relief Workers).
2 = **Diaspora group**. A collection of people living abroad who engage in advocacy on behalf of people living in their home countries (e.g. Tamils in Canada, Sudanese in the United States).
3 = **University / student group.** Formal or informal groups of students, educators and intellectuals who engage in advocacy (e.g. Indonesian students advocating on behalf of Timorese activists).
4 = **Transnational solidarity network (TAN).** Formal or informal collections of activists who mobilize in support of struggles in other countries. Often (but not always) involves groups in the Global North mobilizing on behalf of groups in the Global South (e.g. American celebrities mobilizing in support of the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa; Egyptian activists sending food to protestors in Wisconsin). Includes external movements (e.g. Egyptian April 6 activists who sent pizza to Wisconsin labor

[2] The Ghana Anti-Rawlings Campaign and the Croatian Institutional Reform campaign were dropped from Navco 2.1

activists in 2011). Excludes transnational unions or organized labor groups, which are coded separately (see below).

5 = **Individual.** A person acting in her/his individual capacity (e.g. a Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, celebrity advocate, a financier, etc.). Excludes people acting as part of their roles in an organized group in any other category.

6 = **International governmental organization (IGO).** A multilateral governmental organization, such as the United Nations, World Bank, International Labor Organization, or International Criminal Court. Includes regional IGOs such as the European Union.

7 = **Corporation.** A company or firm. Typically a multinational corporation, such as Shell Oil, General Motors, AT&T, or Nike.

8 = **Foreign government.** A foreign government (e.g. the United States Government), an agency within a government (e.g. the US State Department), or an individual acting on behalf of a government (e.g. the US Secretary of State).

9 = **Transnational labor organization / union.** A transnational non-governmental labor group (e.g. the AFL-CIO). Excludes the International Labor Organization, which is an IGO.

10 = **Rebel / paramilitary / militia group.** An armed non-state or semi-state actor from within or without the country (e.g. Vietnamese insurgents giving advice to South Africa anti-apartheid activists).

11 = **Media**. A formal or informal media organization providing direct coverage of the movement.

12 = **Unspecified.** There is evidence of support, but the available information regarding the support is too general to specify the supporter.

13 = **Other.** All others not listed above.

RecipText1 (text)
Type the name of the recipient of the support here. Be as specific as possible. The recipient should always be a movement-related actor.

RecipText2 (text)
Type the title/office of the recipient here (if available).

RecipText3 (text)
Type the Organization or Government Ministry/Department (if available).

RecipType (categorical)
The type of recipient. Select only one per incident. If a supporter delivers assistance to more than one recipient in a combined fashion, create a new entry for each recipient.

1 = **Civil society organization (CSO).** Formal civil society organizations. Can include local or transnational advocacy organizations (e.g. Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Nonviolent Peaceforce, International Fellowship of Reconciliation), foundations and philanthropic organizations (e.g. Open Society, International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, Nonviolence International), humanitarian organizations (e.g. International Red Cross and Red Crescent), educational or training groups (e.g.

CANVAS, Rhize), and adjuncts to religious groups (e.g. Catholic Relief Workers). Can include state-run or independent CSOs.

2 = **University / student group.** Formal or informal groups of students, educators and intellectuals who engage in advocacy (e.g. Indonesian students advocating for human rights).

3 = **Individual.** A person acting in her/his individual capacity (e.g. a Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, celebrity advocate, a financier, etc.). Excludes people acting as part of their roles in an organized group in any other category.

4 = **Business or corporation.** A local company or firm. Typically small- and medium-sized enterprises located in the country in which the movement is involved. Can be state-owned or independent.

5 = **Government.** Governments or elements of the government (e.g. the Egyptian Government), an agency within a government (e.g. the Egyptian military), or an individual acting on behalf of a government (e.g. the chief of staff of the Egyptian military).

6 = **Labor organization / union.** Organized labor groups (e.g. unions). Can be state-owned or independent.

7 = **Rebel / paramilitary / militia group.** An armed non-state or semi-state actor from within or without the country (e.g. Vietnamese insurgents giving advice to South Africa anti-apartheid activists).

8 = **Local media**. A formal or informal media organization providing direct coverage of the movement. Can be state-owned or independent.

9 = **Formal opposition parties.** Legal opposition political parties operating in the country.

10 = **Movement activists.** Civilians, including activists, movement leaders, and grassroots groups who receive direct assistance outside of the context of any of the categories above.

11 = **Unspecified.** There is evidence of support, but the available information regarding the support is too general to specify the recipient.

12 = **Other.** All others not listed above.

StateOwned (dichotomous) – Omitted from Released Dataset

If recipient is a state-formed CSO, university, business or corporation, labor organization, paramilitary group, media, or formal opposition, (a 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, or 9), identifies whether the recipient is state-owned/state-operated. A state-owned entity is a legal entity created by a government to partake in commercial or political activities on the government's behalf. This distinction should be reserved for those organizations / parties / entities that are seen to be "pro-government" in their orientation, at least at the time the support was delivered (e.g. a think tank, NGO, or state media organization typically viewed as pro-government). In other words, code this as a "1" if the recipient is widely viewed as an agent of the state.

0= no.

1 = yes.

-99 = unknown.

-77 = n/a (the recipient is in a different category than those named above)

StartDate
If known, list the day, month, and year in DD/MM/YYYY format for when the support begins. If the exact day cannot be identified, this is the best approximation of the start date or date range.

EndDate
If known, list the day, month, and year in DD/MM/YYYY format for when the support ends. If the exact day cannot be identified, this is the best approximation of the end date. If a date range was entered into *Start Date*, leave *End Date* blank. If the support is ongoing through the current coding, code the end date as 999.

Camp_PreStart
The calendar year marking the beginning year pre-campaign observations were collected.

Camp_ActiveStart
The calendar year marking the beginning of the active campaign-phase.

Camp_ActiveEnd
The calendar year marking the end of the active campaign-phase.

Camp_PostEnd
The calendar year marking the last year post-campaign observations were collected.

Duration (continuous)
The number of days the support lasted, if known.

PreCampaign (dichotomous)
A dummy variable coded as "1" if the observation occurs in the 5-year period before the campaign begins.[3]

0 = no
1 = yes

ActiveCampYr (dichotomous)
A dummy variable coded as "1" if the observation occurs during a campaign peak year.

0 = no
1 = yes

[3] We define the pre- campaign period as 5 years before the first active campaign year although there are deviations to this rule, which resulted in missing data for some years. Changes to the defined active campaign period were made after data collection was underway, due to revisions of campaign phase periods in NAVCO 2.1. Deviations and implications for the pre- and post- years are listed in the table of differences below.

PostCampaign (dichotomous)
A dummy variable coded as "1" if the observation occurs in the 5-year period after the campaign ends.[4]

0 = no
1 = yes

Stype (categorical)
A categorical variable indicating the type of assistance received. Select all that apply:

1 = **Financial.** Direct monetary assistance (e.g. small or large grants, scholarships, cash, loans, strike funds, legal funds, food, medicine, debt relief, etc.).
2 = **Moral / symbolic.** Nonviolent solidarity actions (e.g. digital campaigning or advocacy, mobilization on behalf of group in one's own country, showcasing activist cause and work, providing awards, visiting the country, directly participating in the campaign in the country, like U.S. Ambassador Robert Ford marching with Syrians in July 2011).
3 = **Technical.** Assistance with planning, logistics, intelligence, coordination, convening activists, conducting and delivering background research, and the implementation of campaign-related tasks (e.g. putting activists in touch with one another, providing warnings of impending repression, providing physical space for training and organization without necessarily conducting the training, and providing a strategic analysis of the situation, providing direct legal assistance, providing direct medial assistance). Provision of equipment (e.g. cell phones, computers, cameras), printing, books and articles, translations. Relationship-building / convening for the purposes of relationship-building.
4 = **Training.** The provision of leadership training, organizational capacity-building, labor organizing, nonviolence or movement training, legal training, medical training. Note that this category explicitly requires the supporter to train the activists (not just provide space for training, which is coded as technical support).
5 = **Nonviolent civilian protection.** Protective accompaniment, nonviolent interpositioning, monitoring, mediation between conflict participants, monitoring regime behavior, ceasefires, and other local conditions.
6 = **Sanctions against regime.** Issuing active sanctions (e.g. tangible bilateral or multilateral penalties) in direct response to regime's actions toward the campaign. Includes travel bans, exclusion from meetings, freezing assets, imposing arms embargoes, or other measures (e.g., multinational corporations withdrawing from South Africa in opposition to apartheid, etc.).
7 = **Safe passage for defectors.** Providing asylum, amnesty, "golden parachutes," or other incentives for regime elites to concede to the campaign or leave the country.
8 = **Preventing / mitigating repression.** Providing safe havens for activists, granting asylum or refugee status to activists, demanding activist release from prison, calling out / issuing demarches in response to abuses of activists, issuing indictments, arresting / trying war criminals, etc), blocking or stalling on military aid shipments, etc.

[4] We define the post-campaign phase as 5 years after the last active year campaign. As with the pre-campaign phase, there are deviations from this rule.

9 = **Unspecified.** There is evidence of support, but the available information regarding the support is too general to specify the type.
10 = **Other.** Any other form of assistance not identified above.

RemoveSupport
If *SupporterType* is coded as a foreign government (8) or an IGO (6)[5] and *Stype* is coded as a "sanctions against the regime" or "preventing / mitigating repression" (items 6 or 8, respectively), *RemoveSupport* identifies whether the sanction represented the withdrawal of an erstwhile ally's tangible support for the opponent (e.g., U.S. President Reagan threatening to reduce aid to the Philippines under Marcos, the U.S. withholding aid from Egypt in mid-2013). If an ally abandons a client in a material way by withholding or withdrawing aid, this is coded this as a 1. Otherwise, it is coded either as a 0 (if the supporter was a neutral or rival state) or as a –77 if there was no possibility of withdrawal of support because the assistance provided to the movement was not a 6 or 8 (n/a). Assigning this variable a 1 should be reserved for those cases in which foreign aid is tangibly withdrawn from the regime. In other words, it is an act of omission rather than an act of commission.

0 = no; the regime target was already the supporter's rival
1 = yes; the regime target was the supporter's ally
-99 = unknown
-77 = n/a (i.e. *Stype* was coded as different from the above categories)
-66 = n/a (Observation is an AidData.org observation, so information on whether support was removed is unavailable)

StypeSpecific (text)
A text description of the assistance available for each support type. Document as much information as possible, including (if applicable) the amount of support provided, who in civil society or the movement received the support, and the mechanism of delivery.

SConditions (dichotomous)
Are there reported conditions or "strings attached" to the assistance?

0 = no
1 = yes

SConditionsText (text)
Describe any reported conditions or "strings" attached to the assistance.

Target1_posture (dummy variable series)
The primary regime target's immediate reaction to the event. Check all that apply. (AidData.org observations automatically earn -66 for these variables.)

0 = No detected response.
1 = Blame foreigners / outsiders.
2 = Label campaign participants as traitors, coup plotters, hooligans, etc.

[5] The condition of RemoveSupport being applicable only in cases of support from a foreign government or IGO was clarified during the coding process and is described in the coding supplement.

3 = Impose legislative / bureaucratic reforms / shut down NGOs.
4 = Counter-mobilize own supporters.
5 = Reported use of plain-clothes police or agents provocateurs.
6 = Censor media.
7 = Remove independent / foreign journalists.
8 = Solicit support from external allies.
9 = Nonlethal coercion.
10 = Lethal coercion.
11 = Accommodation and concessions.
12 = Unspecified repression reported.
13 = Other.
-99 = Unknown.

Target2_posture (dummy variable series)
The primary regime target's longer-term (within one year) reaction to the event. Check all that apply. (AidData.org observations automatically earn -66 for these variables.)

0 = No detected response.
1 = Blame foreigners / outsiders.
2 = Label campaign participants as traitors, coup plotters, hooligans, etc.
3 = Impose legislative / bureaucratic reforms / shut down NGOs.
4 = Counter-mobilize own supporters.
5 = Reported use of plain-clothes police or agents provocateurs.
6 = Censor media.
7 = Remove independent / foreign journalists.
8 = Solicit support from external allies.
9 = Nonlethal coercion.
10 = Lethal coercion.
11 = Accommodation and concessions.
12 = Unspecified repression reported.
13 = Other.
-99 = Unknown.

Impact (text)
Open text field to write in analyses of the impact of the support.

Notes (text)
Additional information about the support. It lists any irregularities in the case, difficulties in coding, discrepancies between sources, salient quotations or materials providing context, etc.

Sources (text)
Please list the sources you used to code this support incident here.

Coder ID (text)
Please code initials of the coder.

worksheetID (text)
Identifier of word document associated with this observation.

AidDatayn (dichotomous)
Variable created post-merge of AidData.org and hand-coded observations to allow for easy filtering or subsetting between the two data collection modalities.

AidDataID (numeric)
Include the identification number assigned by AidData.org, if applicable.

EX-D Coverage Differences with NAVCO 2.1

NAVCO ID	NAVCO name	EX-D name	NAVCO 2.1 Active Campaign dates	EX-D Active Campaign dates	Campaign Pre/Post - phase Implication
194	Second People Power Movement	Second People Power Movement	2000-2001	2001	Pre-Campaign years only available 4 years prior
118	Kifaya	Kifaya	2003-2005	2000-2005	Pre-Campaign years available 8 years prior
130	Madagascar pro-democracy	Madagascar pro-democracy Movement	2002	2002-2003	Post Campaign years available 6 years after
39	Belarus Pro-Democracy Campaign	Denim Revolution	2006-2013	2006-2011	Post Campaign years available 3 years after
242	West Papuan self-determination campaign	West Papua anti-occupation	1964-2013*	2000-2006	No Change in EX-D
255	Anti-King Hamad Campaign	Bahrain Anti-King Hamad Campaign	2011-2013*	2011-2014	
290	Dance with Me Campaign	Dance with Me	2013*	2013-2014	
295	Pro-Morsi Protests	Pro-Morsi Protests	2013*	2013-2014	

297	Anti-Aristide	Anti-Aristide Campaign 2004	2002-2004	2003-2004	Pre-Campaign years available 4 years prior
300	Kyrgyz Anti-Interim Government	N/A	2010	N/A	N/A
308	Civil Movement for Democracy	Civil Movement for Democracy	2013*	2013-2014	
312	Anti-Islamist Government Protests	Anti-Islamist Government Protests	2013*	2013-2014	
313	Anti-Erdogan	Anti-Erdogan	2013*	2013-2014	
314	Euromaidan	Euromaiden	2013*	2013-2014	
318	Armenian Opposition Protest/March 1st Movement	Armenian Opposition Protest/March 1st Movement	2008-2009	2007-2009	Pre-Campaign years available 6 years prior
324	Red Shirt Campaign	Red Shirt Campaign	2009-2011	2008-2010	Pre-Campaign years available 6 years prior, Post Campaign years available 4 years after
332	Anti-Shashkvilli Campaign	Anti-Shashkvilli Campaign	2007-2013	2007-2011	Post Campaign years available 3 years after
335	Anti-Putin/ "Snow Revolution"	Snow Revolution	2010-2013*	2010-2014	
338	Pro-Aristide Campaign	Pro-Aristide Campaign	2005-2011	2005-2010	Post Campaign years available 4 years after
339	Anti-Aziz Protests	Anti-Aziz Protests	2008-2013*	2009-2014	Pre-Campaign years available 4 years prior

340	Western Sahara Independence Movement	Renewed Western Sahara Independence Protests	1999-2013*	2010-2013	
266	Frente Nacionalæde Resistencia Popular (FNRP)	Frente Nacionalæde Resistencia Popular (FNRP)	2009-2011	2009	Post Campaign years available 3 years after
211	South Africa Second Defiance Campaign	South Africa Second Defiance Campaign	1980-1994	1984-1994	Pre-Campaign years available 1 years prior

* End-year dates are 2014 in NAVCO 1.2, which covers aggregate campaign-level data.

Dropped from NAVCO 2.1 but included as control cases in EX-D

Anti-Rawlings (Ghana) - 2000

Croatian Institutional Reform Campaign (Croatia) – 1999-2000

Coding Supplement

Compiled by Paul Kemp and Mario Lotito, Project Managers
Last Updated November 2, 2016

This coding supplement records clarifications and adjustments to the coding protocol made while data collection was in progress. We added to this document over the course of the project as new requests for clarification arose among research assistance and project managers. The questions originated from research assistants, and answers were provided by project managers and approved by Chenoweth.

Search Methodology and Source Citations

Should we record used search strings that deviate from the standard one provided in the codebook?

For some campaigns it has been necessary to stray from the standardized search string in the codebook, either because it was too restrictive (~100 observations) or too inclusive (~3000 observations). Because of this reality, we need to record carefully the search strings used for each campaign to track our methodology. Carefully recording used search strings is required for data replicability. The philosophy is that anyone should be able to follow our exact coding process and get the same data as we did.

For each campaign (even if unique search strings weren't used), the coder will create a word document named "Search String_[Campaign name]," and save it to a newly created "Source Metafile" folder that will go in each campaign data file in Dropbox. Any search string used in the data collection process should be copied exactly into this document and be matched with the relevant date range. For thoroughness, include the number of observations the search yielded and any filtering techniques you used. Additionally, in this document coders can include notes on their search methodology which would include: thoughts on why a search string modification was necessary, thoughts on why search results were extremely low or high in number, etc. Please see the Serbia or Saffron Revolution campaign data files for the required format. Coders need to ensure that all campaign files match this.

What else should we include in the campaign Metafile?

In addition to the search string files, the Source Metafile should include PDFs of all the non-LexisNexis or online articles that you used, such as academic papers, or other reports. If you cannot retrieve downloadable pdfs, include a detailed list of the documents, cited in Chicago format, inclusive of exact URLs.

What other options exist to make Lexis Nexis more user friendly?

Sometimes Lexis Nexis can give the researcher a "proxy error." If this appears, try clearing out your browser's cache and cookies. If this doesn't work, call the LexisNexis help desk (1-800-543-6862).

One way to reduce risk of LexisNexis errors is to run your search and then use the small disk icon in the upper right of the search results list to download complete articles into a consolidated word document. This document can then be saved to the campaign Source Metafile, or to your DU Onedrive so that coders aren't occupying too much hard drive space on their personal computers.

Finally, the LexisNexis filter tool could expedite the identification of articles that specifically mention external actors. By choosing the "Geography" group on the side bar, you can filter results based on their mention of external actors. It's an easy way to look at only the results that mention actors from other geographical areas. In the case that this filter option was used, indicate this in detail in the Search String word document. Include, if possible, the total number of observations you were getting and how many observations the filter allowed you to eliminate. This option should only be used if the coder is faced with thousands of observations and s/he is confident that observations are not being missed.

Using search strings that only use the campaign name make it difficult to find observations in the pre-campaign phase given that the campaign did not yet exist by its later-known name. How should we deal with this?

Pre-campaign instances of support will often emerge in post-hoc academic analyses or NGO reports of these campaigns. In the event that the resources provided in the codebook do not yield pre-campaign observations, a coder has the option of searching LexisNexis by "Country" AND "Actor" for the pre-campaign years where the "Actor" is an organization that we know to have become a main driving force for the movement. If such search strings are used, they must be copied into the Search String word document mentioned above.

How shall we code the names of organizations that changed their names over the course of a campaign? For example, say an actor went by one name in the pre-campaign phase, but re-branded during the peak phase.

Use the most recent name of that organization. For example: if a supporter at the time of support was the Lawyers' Committee on Human Rights but later became Human Rights First, for the purposes of this study, coders would use Human Rights First in all references to this actor. Coders will use the notes section to indicate that the name was different earlier.

One last question about LexisNexis. Under Advanced Options, after entering the specific sources listed from the protocol, we have the option to check boxes under "Content Type." Should we have any checkmarks there?

No. All of those boxes under Content Type should be left unchecked. Otherwise your search would provide articles from sources in addition to the ones you specified in the "Source" field. For example, by checking 'newspapers' in this section, your search would then call up matches from the LexisNexis ALLNWS group file in addition to the sources already specified. Checking those boxes essentially overrides the source specification you made in the "Source" field.

The coding protocol lists Aiddata.org as a required source to consult. How should we use this data?

Don't worry about this source, actually. Because it's already listed systematically in a formal database, it is easier for the project managers to take this data and convert it to the main project frame for all campaigns. Project managers will also compare the aid data information to RAs worksheet observations to check for any overlaps or repetition.

How should a coder respond when a LexisNexis article mentions an external source that would have additional information on the observation in question?

We highly encourage the coder to conduct additional, focused research on the event to fill in missing fields and cite the additional source in the observation worksheet.

Is there a desired format for source citations?

Yes. Coders should use the below format for all source citations:

Grewal, Sandeep Singh. 2011. Bahraini protesters urge UN team to look into human rights violations. BBC Monitoring Middle East (December 15). Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic October 1, 2015.

If a source does not list an author, it should be cited with the title first, and the year of publication second, as follows:

Bahraini protesters urge UN team to look into human rights violations. 2011. BBC Monitoring Middle East (December 15). Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic October 1, 2015.

Code-worthy Events

How should we handle "alleged" external support for the resistance movement? In the case of Sudan, the government in Khartoum regularly accused a host of countries (US, EU, Uganda, Ethiopia, etc.) of supporting rebels and opposition parties. However, most of this is undocumented.

The best approach is to create a separate log of these incidents (perhaps a word document that consolidates the full text of the articles in question), and then only code them as observations if corroborating, unbiased information turns up. Because of the bias inherent to the source of the information it wouldn't make sense to hold such accusations at the same level of credibility as we would an accredited periodical or academic piece. As a researcher goes through all the material, s/he will get a better idea of whether these accusations seem to have a basis or not. Once at the end of the material, the researcher will be able to a) feel comfortable that the instances of support Khartoum was alleging were indeed coded, but from better sources, or b) s/he will at least be able to make a more educated judgment on whether the accusations had any basis or not. Coders should convey any doubts in the notes section of the observation for further review by project managers.

How should we handle support to a movement that was nonviolent at its peak, but then turned violent during its post-campaign phase?

Even if the movement turned violent in its post-campaign phase, we should still code instances of support to it as long as we can make an argument that support is going directly to the same actors that were formerly nonviolent. To be relevant for this study, movements must have been primarily nonviolent during their peak year(s) at a minimum. Violence during the post-campaign phase is an interesting development of a nonviolent movement - not necessarily a disqualifying factor. U.S. support to the Syrian rebels following the mass protests in that country, for example, would not be code-worthy. This is because we can argue that the rebels and the nonviolent movement participants comprised tangibly different actors.

What exactly counts as code-worthy in the post-campaign stage?

External support in the post phase is code-worthy as long as it goes to the same actors identified with the non-violent movement during the peak phase. This applies whether or not the movement succeeded. So in some cases, the recipient in the post phase may be a disorganized and loose coalition that could only be coded as the "unspecified" remnants of a defeated campaign. In other cases, the nonviolent activists of the peak phase may have actually come to occupy official positions of power, and would be coded as "government."

Consider the case where participants in the nonviolent campaign end up taking control of the government. In this case, nearly any instance of support to the new government, whether or not it has to do with the original campaign objectives, is code worthy. The rationale for this is that the "post-campaign" support measures are there for us to ultimately understand whether assistance to those who participated in the NV campaign (whether they are now in power or not) affects the country's long-term trajectory with regard to peace, stability, democracy, development, etc. The idea is that if erstwhile supporters of these campaigns disengage once the campaign is over, the country may be more susceptible to problems than if the erstwhile supporters remain engaged.

Do we code each news story and coverage piece as an observation? It could be reasoned that international media coverage of a movement publicizes its activities, which could be seen as external support.

No. We only code journalist coverage as support when it specifically editorializes in favor of the event and/or the journalist is explicitly supporting / advocating for the movement, or state media employees defect and shift their loyalty to the movement, for example. Furthermore, when journalists deviate from the socially-accepted standard in the country in ways that advantage or benefit the campaign, we would consider this a form of advocacy. Therefore, such an event would be coded as moral/symbolic support.

The case of Al Jazeera presents a good example. In Al Jazeera's case, it provided support in the form of allowing resistance leaders to appear on their network, presenting more sympathetic coverage than any other regional or Egyptian state-run networks, etc. This is code worthy given the extra efforts the news organization made to provide activists with a platform.

Do we code instances of support that a recipient claimed not to want?

Yes. Unwanted support is still support. Additionally, there's always the possibility that the recipient feels compelled to publicly repudiate foreign support so as to deflect regime accusations that opponents are "pawns of foreign influence." If a recipient claims that external support was unwanted, the coder should indicate this in the Notes section of the worksheet.

When an external actor makes what appears to be a "neutral" call for peace/resolution between a movement and a target regime, should this be considered code-worthy?

No. Our inference here is that such a call tends to privilege the status-quo over the interests of the nonviolent movement in question.

What if an external supporter expresses solidarity with more than one group? For example, Human Rights Watch condemned the suppression of peaceful protest that had affected Kifaya, Muslim Brotherhood, and other. Is the support classified as directed toward "Egyptian Revolution" or do we create a distinct record for each "movement within the movement" that is impacted?

We create a distinct record for each actor within the movement. From the codebook, it specifies that coders should select only one recipient per incident. If a supporter delivers assistance to more than one recipient in a combined fashion, coders should create a new entry for each recipient and include a linkedID.

Coding Categories

What type of information is desired in the SupporterType and RecipType worksheet fields?

These fields should contain information that is as detailed as provided in the original source. Ideally, the field would include individual name, position and organization (in that order) wherever provided and relevant. Naturally, unspecified supporters and recipients will lack all of this information. An example of fully identified supporter would be John Kerry, US Secretary of State, US State Department. An example of a fully identified recipient would be John Smith, Head of Media Relations, Otpor. Again, information at this level of detail won't be available or relevant in all cases.

For the RecipType category, how should a researcher distinguish between "Movement Activists" and "Unspecified"?

The "movement activists" category should be used when an instance of support is directed towards participants in the nonviolent campaign at any level. For example, "Movement Activists" during the peak phase would include protesters and members of activist organizations, and any other participants that showed up to participate. In the post-phase "Movement Activists" would include those same participants, as well as individuals that might have been arrested or abused during the movement.

The "unspecified" category refers to instances of support or encouragement where the Supporter refers to human rights or democracy in the target country on a broad and general level. Additionally, "unspecified" would be used when support is expressed for the campaign in general, rather than the campaigners. For example, a Supporter might declare "change is necessary in the country," or "I support the right of the democratic opposition to express itself." Such instances would be codeable as support to an "unspecified" recipient.

Under what circumstances would we code an individual as acting on his/her own, or on behalf of an organization?

Wherever we have information that an individual worked for a specific organization we would code the Supporter as the individual's organization. We are not going to try to infer whether the person was or was not acting on behalf of the organization. Based on their professional affiliation, we will assume that they were unless very explicitly mentioned in the source material. Coders should state any doubts in the notes sections for further review.

Should we code legal and illegal opposition groups similarly?

No. Legal opposition groups should be coded as (9) Formal Opposition Parties. Illegal, or banned opposition groups should be coded as (1) Civil Society Organizations.

Stype

For Stype, how shall we code instances of violent support of non-violent movements?

Violent support of non-violent movements usually will be coded as "other," except in the case of a no-fly zone which would be coded as "preventing/mitigating repression." Remember that anytime the "other" option is used, the coder should use the "notes" section to describe in detail why none of the other categories could accurately be used.

If a researcher codes an instance of support as "preventing/mitigating repression" are we alleging that repression was in fact prevented or mitigated? A similar question would apply toward the other Stypes, as well (i.e. nonviolent civilian protection – were civilians in fact protected?)

No. Each of the categorical variables are meant to convey the *intent* of the support, rather than confirmed impact. For example, just because, Amnesty International provided technical training to

activists, we can't confirm/deny with that one observation that technical skills were actually imparted. This is the motivation behind a large-N study that includes thousands of observations of intended support. Our key mission is to test whether the intent matched the outcome, statistically.

Say a movement is successful to the degree that its main actors become government officials. How should we code a foreign government's official restoration of diplomatic ties with the new administration?

In the case that actors such as the United States, the European Union, or the World Bank restore diplomatic ties with a government that was formerly a target regime, we would code this gesture as 'moral/symbolic support.' In many cases, such a gesture would be followed with foreign aid, loans, or military support and such instances must be coded separately and according to their appropriate category.

How should we code instances of support from organizations that were active in a target country over many years and conducted many (hundreds) instances of support? For example, one NGO was involved in 300 different trainings over a period of years. Can I lump these trainings together?

Observations can be lumped together only in the instance that they share the exact same Supporter, Recipient and Stype. The multiple occurrences of these instances of support will then be reflected in the support duration. As another example, in Myanmar, the Assistance Association for Political Prisoners constantly monitored the number and welfare of political prisoners in the country. The organization would regularly report their numbers to the press. Rather than creating a separate worksheet for each time the organization's work was mentioned in the press, the correct approach would be to consolidate such mentions into one worksheet, indicating support over the period of years such monitoring took place. The single worksheet would then cite various articles over time as evidence that the support was ongoing.

How should we code instances where outside organizations like human rights organizations or NGOs that document the activities and achievements of a movement, as well as the repression they face.

Such support is captured under item 3 ("technical") if it was background information or monitoring and evaluating movement effectiveness, public opinion, etc. It would be coded at item 5 ("nonviolent civil protection") if it is specifically documenting/monitoring behavior toward the movement.

How should we code an instance of support where a foreign government makes a general call for the target government to exercise tolerance toward protesters and to respect human rights?

This qualifies as mitigating repression, which including calling out or issuing demarches in response to regime repression.

How would we code a U.S. congressional resolution condemning the actions of a regime?

This would qualify as mitigating repression, akin to issuing public demarches, etc. This wouldn't count as sanctions, as those are tangible. We wouldn't call it moral support, since the action is directed at the opponent regime instead of at the movement per se.

How would we code a case where a supporter excluded a target regime from a meeting, or a supporting canceling its attendance of a meeting in the target regime's country as a form of protest? Would these count as sanctions, or as shows of moral support?

These actions count as withdrawing support, and therefore, a sanction. They are tangible actions of omissions against the regime.

Consider the following case: People & Power wanted to find out… but getting into Algeria is difficult - not least because Al Jazeera has been denied official access to the country since 2004. Nevertheless, when our requests for journalist visas were ignored, our filmmakers managed to get in unofficially and were able to work discreetly....To start with, the military and intelligence people, the DRS, are omnipresent, so meetings had to be arranged surreptitiously. On one occasion, for example, a contact identified himself at a street corner by using pre-arranged code words. Then he asked us to follow him very discreetly and at a distance to the Metro, past the police and the surveillance cameras, onto a train and out to his tiny apartment in the suburbs. Only when safely behind closed doors did he feel able to speak freely about the repression and the many economic problems the country faces...

This support qualifies as moral support / solidarity. The media broke the law / committed an act of disobedience to gain access to the movement. This deviates from the socially acceptable standard in that AJ explicitly broke the law. They weren't doing it to deter any government repression against civilians, at least tactically. They were doing it to give the civilians voice after the investigation was complete, and they were willing to sacrifice their own continued access to the country to do so.

SupporterType

How should coder categorize public protests in other countries?

We code protests undertaking in solidarity with movements as transnational advocacy networks (TAN).

StateOwned

What is the difference between yes/no/unknown for StateOwned?

In order to code a 'no' for state owned, we must know with confidence that the Recipient is not state owned. Coding 'unknown' means that the coder looked into this and couldn't find the answer. A blank answer would mean that the data is missing, and/or the coder did not pursue an answer (either by error or due to time constraints). Coders should use the notes section to expand on this variable if s/he has doubts or feels additional explanation is necessary.

A formal opposition party would seem to be opposed to the target regime by definition, which would imply that it should always receive a "no" for the StateOwned variable.

While this is typically the case, an exception would be when an established party merely *pretends* to be opposed to the regime in order to get support (for example, "democracy development aid") from gullible external actors. In such a situation, the "formal opposition party" should in fact be regarded as "an agent of the state," and should receive a 'yes' for the *StateOwned* variable. Explanation and source citation should be included in the notes.

Dates

How exactly should we input the dates from the case management table into LexisNexis?

If a coder aims to search in LexisNexis for the entire range of the campaign (pre/peak/post), and the pre-campaign beginning is 1999, whereas the post-campaign end is 2010, the LexisNexis dates would be 1/1/1999 to 12/31/2010.

If a coder aims to search only for peak years and the "peak beginning" is 2012, interpret that as 1/1/2012. If "peak end" is also 2012, interpret that as 12/31/2012.

What if the peak of a movement only lasts for a part of the year?

Even if the peak of a movement only last for part of a year, we still consider the entire year as 'peak campaign.' For the purposes of this data set we are treating the phases of the campaigns in full year increments. This makes coding these periods more consistent across coders. It's likely that there will be a margin of error on both sides of each campaign that will normalize across the thousands of observations. Additionally, even if a campaign lasts only four months, it's reasonable to assume that support throughout the rest of the year was given because of the intensity of campaign activity that year.

How should we deal with campaigns whose post-campaign phase extends into the future?

Code through the current time (e.g. December 2015), whenever applicable. Gather information from whatever contemporary period provides the most background and context. If peak or post-campaign support is ongoing through the current time, collect information as currently as possible. However, code "End Date" as 999 to designate it as ongoing as of coding.

How should we code the duration of support in the form of a technical report (i.e. a report written by and International NGO, such as Human Rights Watch).

Code both the start and end dates of the support as the date of the report's release.

RemoveSupport

The hypothesis we're testing here is whether an ally's withdrawal of support is more consequential than a rival/neutral states' actions against a target regime. So for this variable, if an ally abandons a client in a material way by withholding or withdrawing aid or substantive international exchanges, you'd code this as a 1 (yes). Otherwise, you'd code it either as a 0 (no) (if they were neutral or rival states) or as a –77 if there was no withdrawal of support (n/a). This variable is trying to get more at the nature of the relationship between the sender and the target in the case of sanctions/mitigating repression: were they allies or not?

Note that this variable will get a 1 or 0 only if the supporter is a foreign government or an international government organization (which is comprised of foreign governments). Additionally, 1s and 0s only apply if that government is supporting the movement in question with a 'sanction,' or by 'preventing/mitigating repression.' In all other cases, this variable will be coded as -77 (n/a).

Then, the 'unknown' option would apply if you have information on a foreign government issuing a sanction, or preventing/mitigating repression, but we do not know the status of the relationship between the supporter foreign government and the target regime.

Furthermore, this variable should not only be coded for the removal of foreign aid but also for the removal of tangible cooperation (as long as it fits within the category of sanctions/preventing and mitigating repression). For example, a sanction *not* involving foreign aid such as in the case of a U.S. official canceling attendance at an official meeting in Cairo would be coded as 1 because it was a tangible withdrawal of cooperation; and because the U.S. and Egypt were allies.

Finally, after the first instance of "yes" indicating a removal of support, any sanctions thereafter would get a "no." Upon the first instance of a removal of support we consider the two countries rivals, unless we can show a reconciliation of some sort.

In practice there are four steps to coding remove support

1) Is the SupporterType and Stype coded as either as 6 or 8? if not, enter -77. if so, postpone judgment and move on to step 2.

2) Are the regimes rivals or neutrals at the time of the event? If so, enter 0. if not (i.e., if the regimes are - or have been - allies up to the time of the event), postpone judgment and move on to step 3.

3) Did the external/movement-supporting regime "tangibly withdraw" aid from its (hitherto) ally? if so, enter 1. if not, postpone judgment and move on to step 4. (Note that "sanctions against regime" are, by definition, "tangible withdrawal," so one would only go on to step 4 if we were dealing with "preventing/mitigating repression")

4) Can we unequivocally say that the external/movement-supporting regime did not withdraw support in any tangible way from its ally (despite the fact that it also "prevented/mitigated repression" of the movement in its ally regime's country)? is so, enter -77. if we cannot say this unequivocally - for example, if there is evidence to suggest that the alliance is being compromised and the movement-supporting regime is beginning to abandon the target regime - then enter -99.

America's initial reaction to the anti-Mubarak uprising provides a good illustration of step 4. In the early days, the US made some tentative gestures of "preventing/mitigating repression" by calling on the regime to respect the rights of protestors, yet there appeared to be no evidence that the US was tangibly withdrawing aid from Mubarak. That would merit a -77 (assuming the coder did their due diligence to make sure there was no evidence). Then, as the days went on, and if evidence began to suggest that the US was reconsidering its relationship or otherwise intimating a withdrawal of aid from Egypt, a -99 would be appropriate.

For the purposes of the RemoveSupport variable, can the UN ever be considered a rival or an ally?

Because of the unique nature of the UN as an all-encompassing IGO, we have decided that the UN should always receive a -77 (even when it issues condemnations or sanctions against a target regime)

SConditions

How do we know whether to use "no" for this variable?

In many cases, it will be difficult to discern whether or not a recipient incurred any "strings" by accepting support. However, if no conditions are reported, this variable should be coded as "no."

Sometimes when an external actor issues sanctions against a target regime, it provides certain conditions by which the target regime can re-qualify for aid. Should we use the SConditions variable and text to express such conditions for reinstating aid to a target regime?

No, an affirmative answer for this variable should be reserved for *conditions placed on direct aid to the movement actors*. Remember that sanctions against a target regime are an indirect form of external support; true, there might be "conditions" involved in the external actor's interaction with the target regime, but these are of a different class than the conditions we wish to capture with this variable.

Target1_posture and Target2_posture

What is the difference between "no detected response" and "unknown" when coding this variable?

Coders will indicate "no detected response" when there is no evidence in the source document on whether the government responded to the provided support. Additionally, such sources provide no indication that it would be fruitful to consult additional sources to discover a response. Coders will use the "unknown" category when the source material has some evidence/indication of a government response, but s/he does not have details on what the response was.

How should we code an instance where a target government cuts off the internet in response to support being received by nonviolent movements?

This should be coded as "Censor Media."

How should we code responses that include arrests/detentions of movement participants?

This should be coded as "Nonviolent Coercion." Also, coders will bear in mind that the Target Posture variable should indicate only responses in direct response to support given by external actors.

What if a coder finds a source that indicates a government responded in a routine way towards external support?

Sometimes a target regime adopts a consistent posture/rhetoric towards the opposition movement in question. For example, the regime might reflexively blame foreigners and/or label campaign participants as traitors. While the regime may not issue an official statement condemning each and every act of external support, the Target2_posture should be coded according to the general policy/rhetoric of the regime. (The reasoning here is that a regime will often condemn external support *en masse* while selectively responding to specific incidents. Though it may fail to respond to a particular incident in the short term (Target1_posture), its policy implies an ongoing reaction that we want to capture.) If an immediate response *is* indicated in the source, this should be coded in the Target1_Posture in addition to the general policy coded in the Target2_Posture. The sources documenting the general policy should be indicated in the Source Metafile (in the case of a pdf long-form report) and cited in every applicable worksheet.

How should we code a target response where the regime states that "foreigners should not get involved with internal matters?"

We should code this as target posture 1, "Blame foreigners/outsiders."

Impact

When should we include an impact statement?

The impact field is not for coders to insert their own assessments of whether or not an instance of support had impact. Rather this field is to convey whether *source material* indicated impact, or a lack of impact. Any statement of impact must be accompanied with a relevant source citation. In some cases, coders may come across source material at a later time that refers impact to previous instance of support. In this case, the coder can update the relevant worksheet by typing in the impact and including an additional source.

Impact should be left blank when a long-term impact of support cannot be gauged via sources. Coders should not conduct specific research to track down sources that speak specifically to long-term impact.

Notes

What are other ways to use the Notes section?

Coders should use this section to specify details of any selection of "other," or as already mentioned, to convey any doubts, or possible discrepancies to be looked into in detail during the quality control phase.

Finishing Up a Campaign

How does a coder know if s/he is done with a campaign?

A coder will know they are finished with the campaign when s/he has exhausted all the resources listed in the codebook AND s/he is no longer coming across new information. Say you've gone through Lexis Nexis, you've gone through the list of additional sources in the codebook, and you've gone through the other sources that you discovered on your own. At this point if you're not finding new observations, there's a good chance that you're finished.

How should we handle observations that may apply to more than one campaign in the same country?

Some instances of support may be directed to multiple campaigns that take place in the same country. If this is the case, a separate worksheet should be generated for that observation for each campaign, and placed in the relevant campaign folder with a campaign-relevant file name. The coder should indicate in the notes section of each observation that it is a duplicated (or triplicated) observation that applies to multiple campaigns.