Perceptions of Electoral Integrity (PEI)
US 2018 subnational study
dataset

Release: PEI_US_2018
April 2019

CODEBOOK

Pippa Norris, Max Grömping, and Holly Ann Garnett

The Electoral Integrity Project
Why Elections Fail And What We Can Do About It

The Electoral Integrity Project

Department of Government and International Relations
Merewether Building, HO4
University of Sydney
Sydney NSW, 2006, Australia

John F. Kennedy School of Government
79 JFK Street
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Phone:	+61(2) 9351 2147
Email:	electoral.integrity@sydney.edu.au
Web:	http://www.electoralintegrityproject.com
Dataverse:	http://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/PEI
Twitter:	https://twitter.com/ElectIntegrity
Facebook:	https://www.facebook.com/electoralintegrity
Blogger:	http://electoralintegrity.blogspot.com.au/

Copyright © Pippa Norris, Max Grömping, and Holly AnnGarnett 2019. All rights reserved.

How to cite: Norris, Pippa, Max Grömping, and Holly Ann Garnett 2019. *Codebook – The expert survey of Perceptions of Electoral Integrity, US 2018 subnational study, (PEI_US_2018).* The Electoral Integrity Project, University of Sydney.

Introduction to the dataset

This codebook describes a dataset drawn from an online survey of US-based political scientists. The survey asks respondents to evaluate electoral integrity in relation to how the US congressional election on 6 November 2018 was conducted in each of the 50 US states plus the District of Columbia. The study is conducted by Pippa Norris, Max Grömping, and Holly Ann Garnett for the Electoral Integrity Project based at the Universities of Sydney and Harvard.

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 survey 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 one 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. In 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, or anthropology) 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 twenty experts were contacted for each US state.

Respondents were initially contacted on December 4th, 2018, four weeks after the midterm election. Three reminders were sent (11 Dec, 18 Dec, and 25 Dec). Respondents completed an online questionnaire lasting approximately 12 minutes.

Data release

PEI_US_2018 compiles the responses of 574 experts. A total of 4096 experts were contacted. The overall response rate is 14%. The response rate by state varies from 3.6% (Washington) to 36.8% (Maine).

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 R, Stata, SPSS and tab-delimited formats, and to find further technical details about the research design, codebook and questionnaire.

Two files are released in PEI_US_2018:

1. An expert-level file (with individual-level results for 574 experts); [Marked 'X' in the codebook]
2. A state-level file (with results aggregated for each of 50 states plus DC); [Marked 'S' in the codebook]; Unless otherwise noted in the codebook, the same variable name in the state-level data denotes the mean of the variable across experts answering for that state

In this codebook we present all the variables, how they were constructed and labeled. Since many variables appear in all three datasets, we differentiate between them in the last three 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; and when there is a C, the variable is included at the country level.

Citation

Use of the dataset should be acknowledged and cited as:

Norris, Pippa, Max Grömping, and Holly Ann Garnett. 2019. The expert survey of Perceptions of Electoral Integrity, US 2018 subnational study (PEI_US_2018), April 2019: www.electoralintegrityproject.com.

Variable Name	Variable Label	Answer Label		
expert	Expert Reference number	Open ended	X	
state	State	Open ended	X	S
stateabbr	State abbreviation	Open ended	X	S
statecode	State 3-digit	Open ended	X	S
election	Election code Election identifier in the format of the cross-national PEI study: Three-letter ISO abbreviation for the name of the country, followed by the date of the election (DD-MM-YYYY), the type of election (Presidential, P, or Legislative, L), and the round (1 or 2).	Open ended	X	S
year	Year of election	Open ended	X	S
wave	Survey wave	Open ended	X	S
numresponses	PEI expert responses, by state The number of responses for a particular state.	Open ended		S
contacted	PEI experts invited, by state The number of experts contacted for a particular state.	Open ended		S
responserate	PEI response rate, by state The response rate for each state, calculated by dividing the number of responses per state by the number of experts contacted per state.	Open ended		S
OVERALLINTEGRITY	SECTION: OVERALL INTEGRITY	Open ended	X	S
PEIIndexp	PEI index of electoral integrity, individual 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.	Open ended	X	S
PEIIndexp_lci	PEI Index (raw individual), low ci The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.	Open ended		S
PEIIndexp_hci	PEI Index (raw individual), high ci The upper bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.	Open ended		S
PEIIndexi	PEI index of electoral integrity, imputed 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 (PEIIndex) PEIIndexi is imputed and thus fully observed for all experts and states. The imputation process was conducted in the following manner using Stata 13 at the expert unit of analysis. 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 expert background characteristics (sex, agegroup, supported, lived, leftrightscale) and three fully observed state characteristics (turnout_vep, density, incomepc). 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. 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. The additive procedure has a very high reliability (Cronbach alpha= 0.9203) and the obtained scale is very strongly correlated (R= 0.9873*) with the first underlying dimension extracted with Principal Component Analysis. 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.	Open ended	X	S
PEIIndexi_lci	PEI Index (imputed), low ci The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.	Open ended		S
PEIIndexi_lci	PEI Index (imputed), high ci	Open ended		S

	The upper bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.			
PEIIndex_rank	Rank of state according to PEI experts	Open ended		S
PEItype	PEI Index type Classification of the PEI Index on five categories:	1. Very Low (less than 40) 2. Low (40-49) 3. Moderate (50-59) 4. High (60-69) 5. Very High (70 or more)		S
ratingstate	Electoral integrity rating in state (1=very poor -> 10=very good) "Overall, how would you rate the integrity of the [ELECTION] as it was conducted in [STATE] on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 10 (very good)?"	Open ended	X	S
ratingstate_lci	Integrity rating, state, low ci The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.	Open ended		S
ratingstate_hci	Integrity rating, state, high ci The upper bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.	Open ended		S
ratingcountry	Electoral integrity rating in country (1=very poor -> 10=very good) "Overall, how would you rate the integrity of the [ELECTION] on average across all US states on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 10 (very good)?"	Open ended	X	S
ratingcountry_lci	Integrity rating, nationwide, low ci The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.	Open ended		S
ratingcountry_hci	Integrity rating, nationwide, high ci The upper bound of the 95% confidence interval for the state level.	Open ended		S
LAWS	ELECTORAL LAWS SECTION In the electoral law questions, all respondents read this header: 1/16 When thinking about the electoral laws used in the [ELECTION] in [STATE]. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?	Open ended	X	
lawsunfair	1-1a. Electoral laws were unfair to smaller parties (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
lawsunfair2	1-1b. Electoral laws were unfair to smaller parties (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
favoredincumbent	1-2a. Electoral laws favored the governing party or parties (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
favoredincumbent2	1-2b. Electoral laws favored the governing party or parties (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree	X	S

		.d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
citizens	1-3a. Elections laws restricted citizens' rights (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
citizens2	1-3b. Elections laws restricted citizens' rights (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
laws	1-4. Electoral laws index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the three previous variables (lawsunfari2, favoredincumbent2, citizens2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
lawsi	1-4i. Electoral laws index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the three previous variables (lawsunfair2, favoredincumbent2, citizens2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
PROCEDURES	ELECTORAL PROCEDURES SECTION In the electoral procedures section, all respondents read this header: 2/16 In terms of electoral procedures... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?	Open ended	X	S
managed	2-1. Elections were well managed (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
votinginfo	2-2. Information about voting procedures was widely available (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
fairofficials	2-3. Election officials were fair (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
legalelections	2-4. Elections were conducted in accordance with the law (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree	X	S

		4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
procedures	2-5. Electoral procedures index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the four previous variables (managed, votinginfo, fairofficials, legalelections) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
proceduresi	2-5i. Electoral procedures index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the four previous variables (managed, votinginfo, fairofficials, legalelections) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
BOUNDARIES	BOUNDARIES FOR VOTING DISTRICTS SECTION In the electoral procedures section, all respondents read this header: “3/16 Turning to the process of drawing boundaries for voting districts in [STATE]... In some countries the electoral district boundaries are re-defined at intervals, a process also known as 'redistricting'. If this does not apply in [STATE], please reply 'not applicable'. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?“	Open ended	X	S
bdiscrim	3-1a. Boundaries discriminated against some parties (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
bdiscrim2	3-1b. Boundaries discriminated against some parties (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
bfavored	3-2a. Boundaries favored incumbents (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
bfavored2	3-2b. Boundaries favored incumbents (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
bimpartial	3-3. Boundaries were impartial (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S

boundaries	3-4. Voting district boundaries index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the three previous variables (bdiscrim2, bfavored2, bimpartial) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
boundariesi	3-4i. Voting district boundaries index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the three previous variables (bdiscrim2, bfavored2, bimpartial) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
VOTERREGISTRATION	VOTER REGISTRATION SECTION In the voter registration section, all respondents read this header: “ 4/16 Turning to voter registration in [STATE]... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
reglisted	4-1a. Some citizens were not listed in the register (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
reglisted2	4-1b. Some citizens were not listed in the register (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
reginaccurate	4-2a. The electoral register was inaccurate (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
reginaccurate2	4-2b. The electoral register was inaccurate (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
ineligible	4-3a. Some ineligible electors were registered (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
ineligible2	4-3b. Some ineligible electors were registered (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know	X	S

		.n. Not Applicable		
votereg	4-4. Voter registration index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the three previous variables (reglisted2, reginaccurate2, ineligible2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
voteregi	4-4i. Voter registration index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the three previous variables (reglisted2, reginaccurate2, ineligible2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
PARTYREGISTRATION	PARTY AND CANDIDATE REGISTRATION SECTION In the registration process section for parties and voters, all respondents read this header: "5/16 Thinking about the registration process for candidates to get on the ballot for the [ELECTION] in [STATE]... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
oppprevent	5-1a. Some opposition candidates were prevented from running (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
oppprevent2	5-1b. Some opposition candidates were prevented from running (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
womenopp	5-2. Women had equal opportunities to run for office (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
minorityopp	5-3. Ethnic and national minorities had equal opportunities to run for office (1	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
leaderselect	5-4a. Only top party leaders selected candidates (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
leaderselect2	5-4b. Only top party leaders selected candidates (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree	X	S

		5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
rallies	5-5a. Some parties/candidates were restricted from holding campaign rallies (1-5	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
rallies2	5-5b. Some parties/candidates were restricted from holding campaign rallies (Rev	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
partyreg	5-6. Party and candidate registration index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the five previous variables (opprevent2, womenopp, minorityopp, leaderselect2, rallies2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
partyregi	5-6i. Party and candidate registration index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the five previous variables (opprevent2, womenopp, minorityopp, leaderselect2, rallies2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
MEDIACOVERAGE	MEDIA COVERAGE SECTION In the media coverage section, all respondents read this header: “6/16 Thinking about the local media’s coverage of the [ELECTION] in [STATE]… Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
newspapers	6-1. Newspapers provided balanced election news (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
tv	6-2a. TV news favored the governing party (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
tv2	6-2b. TV news favored the governing party (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
fairaccess	6-3. Parties/candidates had fair access to political broadcasts and advertising	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree	X	S

		4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
faircoverage	6-4. Journalists provided fair coverage of the elections (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
socialmedia	6-5. Social media were used to expose electoral fraud (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
media	6-6. Media coverage index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the five previous variables (newspapers, tv2, fairaccess, faircoverage, socialmedia) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
mediai	6-6i. Media coverage index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the five previous variables (newspapers, tv2, fairaccess, faircoverage, socialmedia) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
CAMPAIGNFINANCE	CAMPAIGN FINANCE SECTION In the campaign finance section, all respondents read this header: “7/16 Another issue concerns campaign finance in [STATE]… Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
subsidies	7-1. Parties/candidates had equitable access to public political subsidies(1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
donations	7-2. Parties/candidates had equitable access to political donations(1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
accounts	7-3. Parties/candidates publish transparent financial accounts(1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
rich	7-4a. Rich people buy elections (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree	X	S

		4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
rich2	7-4b. Rich people buy elections (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
resources	7-5a. Some state resources were improperly used for campaigning (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
resources2	7-5b. Some state resources were improperly used for campaigning (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
finance	7-6. Campaign finance index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the five previous variables (subsidies, donations, accounts, rich2, resources2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
financei	7-6i. Campaign finance index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the five previous variables (subsidies, donations, accounts, rich2, resources2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
VOTINGPROCESS	VOTING PROCESS SECTION In the voting section, all respondents read this header: “8/16 When voting in the [ELECTION] in [STATE]... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
violence	8-1a. Some voters were threatened with violence at the polls(1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
violence2	8-1b. Some voters were threatened with violence at the polls (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
fraudulent	8-2a. Some fraudulent votes were cast (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree	X	S

		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
fraudulent2	8-2b. Some fraudulent votes were cast (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree	X	S
		2. Agree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Disagree		
		5. Strongly Disagree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
easy	8-3. The process of voting was easy (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
choice	8-4. Voters were offered a genuine choice at the ballot box (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
postal	8-5. Postal ballots were available (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
disabled	8-6. Special voting facilities were available for the disabled (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
expats	8-7. National citizens living abroad could vote (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
internet	8-8. Some form of internet voting was available (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		

voting	8-9. Voting process index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the eight previous variables (violence2, fraudulent2, easy, choice, postal, disabled, expats, internet) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
votingi	8-9i. Voting process index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the eight previous variables (violence2, fraudulent2, easy, choice, postal, disabled, expats, internet) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
VOTECOUNT	THE VOTE COUNT SECTION In the vote counting section, all respondents read this header: “9/16 Thinking about after the polls closed in [STATE]... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
secure	9-1. Ballot boxes were secure (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
delay	9-2. The results were announced without undue delay (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
faircount	9-3. Votes were counted fairly (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
intlmonitors	9-4a. Int'l election monitors were restricted (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
intlmonitors2	9-4b. Int'l election monitors were restricted (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
domesticmonitors	9-5a. Domestic election monitors were restricted (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S

domesticmonitors2	9-5b. Domestic election monitors were restricted (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
count	9-6. Vote count index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the five previous variables (secure, delay, faircount, intlmonitors2, domesticmonitors2) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
counti	9-6i. Vote count index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the five previous variables (secure, delay, faircount, intlmonitors2, domesticmonitors2) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
VOTINGRESULTS	VOTING RESULTS SECTION In the results section, all respondents read this header: “10/16 After the official results of the [ELECTION] were announced... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
challenged	10-1a. Parties/candidates in [STATE] challenged the results (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
challenged2	10-1b. Parties/candidates in [STATE] challenged the results (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
protestspeace	10-2a. The election led to peaceful protests in [STATE] (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
protestspeace2	10-2b. The election led to peaceful protests in [STATE] (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
protestsviolent	10-3a. The election triggered violent protests in [STATE] (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S

protestsviolent2	10-3b. The election triggered violent protests in [STATE] (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
disputes	10-4. Any disputes in [STATE] were resolved through legal channels (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
results	10-5. Results index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing the four previous variables (challenged2, protestpeace2, protestviolent2, disputes) and standardized to a 100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
resultsi	10-5i. Results index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the four previous variables (challenged2, protestpeace2, protestviolent2, disputes) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
ELECTIONAUTHORITIES	ELECTORAL AUTHORITIES SECTION In the electoral authorities section, all respondents read this header: "11/16 Thinking about the electoral authorities administering elections in [STATE], in your view ... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
impartial	11-1. The election authorities were impartial (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
info	11-2. The authorities distributed information to citizens (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
scrutiny	11-3. The authorities allowed public scrutiny of their performance (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
performance	11-4. The election authorities performed well (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know	X	S

		.n. Not Applicable		
EMBs	11-5. Electoral authorities index (0-100) This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the four previous variables (impartial, info, scrutiny, performance) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
EMBsi	11-5i. Electoral authorities index (0-100), imputed This is an additive scale created by summing imputed versions of the four previous variables (impartial, info, scrutiny, performance) and standardized to a 0-100 point scale.	Open ended	X	S
GENERALQUESTIONS	GENERAL ELECTION QUESTIONS	Open ended	X	S
familiarity	13-1. How familiar are you with elections in this country? “Overall, how familiar are you with elections in this country, on a scale from 1 (not familiar) to 10 (very familiar)?"	Open ended	X	S
important	13-2. Which election (if more than 1) was most important "If there was more than one election held simultaneously, which one do you consider the most important?"	1. Presidential 2. The lower (first) house of parliament 3. The upper (second) house of parliament 4. State Governor 5. State legislative 6. Local 7. Regional 8. Other combination	X	S
ORGCONFIDENCE	ORGANIZATIONAL CONFIDENCE SECTION 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?	Open ended	X	S
courts	14-1. Confidence in the courts (1=none - 10=a great deal)	Open ended	X	S
government	14-2. Confidence in the government (1=none - 10=a great deal)	Open ended	X	S
parliament	14-3. Confidence in the parliament (1=none - 10=a great deal)	Open ended	X	S
police	14-5. Confidence in the police (1=none - 10=a great deal)	Open ended	X	S
electoralauth	14-6. Confidence in the elect.authorities (1=none - 10=a great deal)	Open ended	X	S
BACKGROUND	EXPERT BACKGROUND SECTION	Open ended	X	S
employment	15-1. Employment type	1. Not currently in paid employment 2. Part-time paid employment (less than 30 hours/week) 3. Full-time	X	S
public	15-2. Works (or has worked) in the government public sector	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
university	15-3. Works (or has worked) in a university	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
nonprofit	15-4. Works (or has worked) in private non-profit sector/NGOs	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
agency	15-5. Works (or has worked) in International agency	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
private	15-6. Works (or has worked) in an private business or industry	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
occupation	15-7. Most recent occupation	1. Civil Servant/local government 2. Election Official 3. Intrnational official or consultant 4. Journalist	X	S

		5. Professional 6. Academic 7. Lawyer 8. Politician .n. Not applicable/don't know		
agegroup	15-8. Age group (by decade)	1. 20-29 2. 30-39 3. 40-49 4. 50-59 5. 60-69 6. 70-79 7. 80-89 .d. unknown	X	S
sex	15-9. Sex	0. Male 1. Female .d. Unknown	X	S
education	15-10. Highest level of education	1. No formal education 2. Primary school 3. Secondary school 4. Under-graduate degree 5. Post-graduate degree .d "Don't Know"	X	S
born	15-11. Were you born in this state?	0. No 1. Yes	X	S
lived	15-12. # years lived in this state “How long have you lived in [STATE], if at all?“	0. Never 1. Less1Yr 2. 1to4Yrs 3. 5to9Yrs 4. 10Yrsormore 5. Life .d. Don't Know	X	S
rep	15-13. Expert was an elected representative Prompt: "Did you participate in the [ELECTION] in [STATE] in any of the following roles? Check as many as applicable"	0. not selected 1. yes	X	S
candidate	15-14. Expert was a candidate for elected office	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
activist	15-15. Expert was an election activist	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
official	15-16. Expert was an election official	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
monitor	15-17a. Expert was a national official electoral monitor	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
monitorint	15-17 Expert was an international official electoral monitor	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
ngo	15-18. Expert was election NGO watch personnel	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
voted	15-19. Expert voted in this election	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
norole	15-20. Expert did not participate in any role in this election	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
citizen	15-21. Expert is a US citizen (0/1)	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
supported	15-22. Support the winning or losing side	1. Winner 2. Loser	X	S

	2016 presidential election: Recoded from open ended question. Based on electoral college outcome (Trump = winning side, Clinton = losing side, Stein = independent) 2018 midterms: Based on gains in House election (Democrats = winning side). Recoded from variable 'partyid' (1,2, and 3 = losing side; 4=independent; 5,6,7=winning side)	3. None 4. Didn't vote 5. Decline to state 6. Independent 7. No answer		
leftrightscale	15-23. Political views on 10pt left/right scale "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."	Open ended	X	S
partyid	15-24. Party identification "Generally speaking, how do you usually think of yourself?"	1. Strong Republcan 2. Weak Republican 3. Independent leaning Republican 4. Independent 5. Independent leaning Democrat 6. Weak Democrat 7. Strong Democrat 8. Other/none	X	S
difficulty	How difficult did you find the survey? "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'"	Open ended	X	S
VIGNETTES	VIGNETTES SECTION Prompt: "Here we are interested in learning your views more generally about situations which can occur in different contests."	Open ended	X	S
vignetteA	16-1. Vignette A (Queues) Question: How seriously do you think that electoral integrity is undermined if in STATE 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.	Open ended	X	S
vignetteB	16-2. Vignette B (Boycotts) Question: How seriously do you think that electoral integrity is undermined in STATE 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.	Open ended	X	S
vignetteC	16-3. Vignette C (Violence) Question: How seriously do you think that electoral integrity is undermined in STATE 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.	Open ended	X	S
EXTRA	EXTRA SECTION In this section, respondents were prompted as follows:: "We would also like to ask you some final questions about the [ELECTION] as it was conducted in [STATE]. Thinking about that election, in your view ... Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?"	Open ended	X	S
rigged	17-1a. The election was rigged (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree	X	S

		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
rigged2	17-1b. The election was rigged (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree	X	S
		2. Agree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Disagree		
		5. Strongly Disagree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
machinesaccurate	17-2a. Voting machines were accurate (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
recordssecure	17-3a. Official voting records were secure (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
waited	17-4a. Many people waited in line to vote for more than 30 minutes (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
waited2	17-4b. Many people waited in line to vote for more than 30 minutes (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree	X	S
		2. Agree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Disagree		
		5. Strongly Disagree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
multiple	17-5a. Some people voted more than once (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree	X	S
		2. Disagree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Agree		
		5. Strongly Agree		
		.d. Don't know		
		.n. Not Applicable		
multiple2	17-5b. Some people voted more than once (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree	X	S
		2. Agree		
		3. Neither agree nor disagree		
		4. Disagree		
		5. Strongly Disagree		
		.d. Don't know		

		.n. Not Applicable		
regrestrictive	17-6a. Registration deadlines were too restricted (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
regrestrictive2	17-6b. Registration deadlines were too restricted (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
obsintimidate	17-7a. Observers intimidated some voters (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
obsintimidate2	17-7b. Observers intimidated some voters (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
popularwill	17-8a. The outcome of the election reflected the popular will (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
timely	17-9a. The ballot was counted in a timely fashion (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
disinformation	17-10a. Social media spread disinformation (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
Disinformation2	17-10b. Social media spread disinformation (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree	X	S

		5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
hack	17-11a. Official election records were vulnerable to hacking (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
hack2	17-11b. Official election records were vulnerable to hacking (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
meddle	17-12a. Foreigners meddled in the contest (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
meddle2	17-12b. Foreigners meddled in the contest (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
countdispute	17-13a. The vote count was disputed by the parties and candidates (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
countdispute2	17-13b. The vote count was disputed by the parties and candidates (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
illegalvote	17-14a The election saw widespread attempts at illegal voting (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
illegalvote2	17-14b The election saw widespread attempts at illegal voting (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree	X	S

		2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
legalcount	17-15a All legal ballots were counted (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
votersuppress	17-16a The election saw widespread attempts at voter suppression (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
votersuppress2	17-16b The election saw widespread attempts at voter suppression (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
design	17-17a The ballot papers were clear and well-designed (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
candidatethreat	17-18a Some candidates were threatened by violence (1-5)[N]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
candidatethreat2	17-18b Some candidates were threatened by violence (Reversed coding)	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
sufficient	17-19a Polling places had a sufficient number of paper ballots (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree	X	S

		.d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable		
audit	17-20a Voting results were subject to a post-election audit (1-5)[P]	1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree .d. Don't know .n. Not Applicable	X	S
SUBFIELD	SUBFIELD SECTION Respondents were prompted as follows: "Which of the following disciplines represent fields in which you have expertise? (select as many as appropriate) "	Open ended	X	S
elections	18-1. Expert's field: Elections and electoral behaviour	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
ampol	18-2. Expert's field: American Politics	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
statepol	18-3. Expert's field: State/Local Politics	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
comparative	18-4. Expert's field: Comparative Politics	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
inter	18-5. Expert's field: International Relations	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
polcomm	18-6. Expert's field: Political Communication/Media Studies/Journalism	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
theory	18-7. Expert's field: Political Theory	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
publicadmin	18-8. Expert's field: Public Administration	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
publicpol	18-9. Expert's field: Public Policy	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S
methods	18-10. Expert's field: Methods and Research design	0. no 1. selected	X	S
socio	18-11. Expert's field: Sociology and Anthropology	0. not selected 1. selected	X	S