Codebook for National Elections Across Democracy and Autocracy Dataset, 6.0

Susan D. Hyde[1] and Nikolay Marinov[2]

[1]Professor, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Houston

Version Released July 23, 2021; Last Updated July 23, 2021

Contents

Overview 2
Variables 3
CCODE 4
ELECTIONID 4
YEAR 4
TYPE 5
MMDD 5
NOTES 5
NELDA1 5
NELDA2 6
NELDA3 6
NELDA4 7
NELDA5 7
NELDA6 8
NELDA7 9
NELDA8 9
NELDA9 10
NELDA10 10
NELDA11 11
NELDA12 11
NELDA13 12
NELDA14 12
NELDA15 13
NELDA16 13
NELDA17 13
NELDA18 14
NELDA19 14
NELDA20 14
NELDA21 15
NELDA22 15
NELDA23 16
NELDA24 16
NELDA25 17
NELDA26 17
NELDA27 18
NELDA28 18
NELDA29 19
NELDA30 19
NELDA31 20
NELDA32 20
NELDA33 20
NELDA34 21
NELDA35 21
NELDA36 22
NELDA37 22
NELDA38 22
NELDA39 22
NELDA40 23
NELDA41 23
NELDA42 24
NELDA43 24
NELDA44 24
NELDA45 25
NELDA46 25
NELDA47 25
NELDA48 26
NELDA49 26
NELDA50 26
NELDA51 27
NELDA52 27
NELDA53 27
NELDA54 28
NELDA55 28
NELDA56 28
NELDA57 29
NELDA58 29
Countries Covered 30
Summary of Inter-Coder Reliability 34

Overview

The current version of the NELDA dataset is freely available by filling out a short form on the project's website. If you use the NELDA data, please cite: Susan D. Hyde and Nikolay Marinov, 2012. "Which Elections can be Lost?" *Political Analysis*, 20(2), 191-210 and this codebook to indicate the version used.

The National Elections across Democracy and Autocracy (NELDA) dataset provides detailed information on all election events from 1945-2020. To be included, elections must be for a national executive figure, such as a president, or for a national legislative body, such as a parliament, legislature, constituent assembly, or other directly elected representative bodies. In order for an election to be included, voters must directly elect the person or persons appearing on the ballot to the national post in question. Voting must also be direct, or "by the people" in the sense that mass voting takes place. Microstates are now included but were not part of NELDA Versions 1-4.

That voting is "by the people" does not imply anything about the extent of the franchise: some regimes may construe this to mean a small portion of the population. However, when voting takes place by committee, institution or a coterie, the election is not included. By-elections are not counted as elections for the purpose of this project, unless they take the form of midterm elections occurring within a pre-established schedule. In federal systems, only elections to national-level bodies are included. Cases in which a significant portion of the seats in a national legislative body are filled through voting are included, with some small exceptions including special elections held to replace suddenly vacated seats.

Beyond these basic requirements, elections may or may not be competitive, and may have any number of other ostensible flaws. The inclusion of flawed elections is a feature of the NELDA dataset. The unit of observation is the election round. All rounds of an election are coded as separate observations. When elections are rerun, the events are typically coded unless they are only rerun in a very small number of districts.

When deciding what counts as a new election rather than a follow-up round to an election already under way, we ask (1) whether the regime calls the election a new one; (2) whether candidates are allowed and/or required to register again. Positive answers imply a new election. By this rule, the rerun of the second round of the Ukrainian presidential election of 2004 counts as a third round: the set of candidates for the rerun was based on rounds one and two. In contrast, when the results of the November 2, 2003 legislative election in Georgia were cancelled, the legislative election of March of the following year is coded as a new election: new registration lists and candidates were allowed.

Indirect elections are not included. Thus, in the 1983 presidential election in the Arab Republic of Yemen, the president was re-elected for a second 5-year term at a meeting of the Constituent People's Assembly - causing us to exclude this election. We do not include Chinese legislative elections because the people do not vote directly on deputies. However, presidential elections which involve an electoral college such as those in the US and South Korea are included because the electoral college mechanically implements the outcome of a popular vote. An example of a special case is the 1970 presidential election in Chile, where the legislature elected Salvador Allende to the presidency after he won a plurality of the popular vote. The Chilean constitution required that if no candidate won a majority of the popular vote, the legislature would select between the top two vote-getting candidates, and tradition dictated that the legislature would select the candidate who received the largest number of votes. The 1970 Chilean election is included because a popular vote took place, and the indirect election within the legislature was determined by the popular vote.

Another borderline case is Kenya in the 1970s, where voters cast a ballot for a deputy to parliament knowing that each deputy supports a particular presidential candidate, and that the presidential candidate supported by a majority of elected parliamentarians would be confirmed as president. We counted this peculiar system as a direct election of both the president and the legislature, and we code this case as two separate events (in part, to distinguish the different choices voters may have had with respect to the lists of parliamentary and presidential candidates.) Borderline cases are the legislative elections in Oman, in which citizens vote directly for candidates to the national assembly. The top three vote-getting candidates from each district are forwarded to the Sultan, who then makes the final selection of who will serve in the legislative body. Because the top vote-getting candidate is nearly always selected to serve by the Sultan, we consider this a direct election, although a few minor changes could easily make it indirect.

Most referenda are not included as elections, with one important exception. Some referenda on continued rule are functionally equivalent to presidential elections in single-party regimes, which are included in this study. Therefore, we include referenda when they are direct votes on candidates, most commonly referenda on the continued rule of the incumbent president. If any referendum is a direct vote on the incumbent candidate's continued rule, it is included as an election. The 1988 referendum on the continued rule of Augusto Pinochet, therefore, counts as an election. Referenda that extend a leader's term in office but that are not leader-specific are not included as national elections. For example, we do not include constitutional referenda that change the length of term limits or that make some parties illegal. Thus, although there was a referendum on a new constitution in Equatorial Guinea on August 15, 1982 that also provided for an extension of the president's term in office, the event was not counted as a direct election in the NELDA data.

Sometimes, elections are cancelled immediately before, during or after election day, creating room for interpretation about whether or not an election takes place, and producing inconsistencies in existing data sources. We include elections if and only if voting on election day had commenced. This decision rule holds regardless of whether the balloting was not completed or was eventually cancelled, whether the results were never announced, or whether the election results were respected.

At present, all independent countries are covered, based on the Gleditsch and Ward List of Independent states, from 1945-2020. Further updates are likely.

Variables

In addition to basic attributes, there are 58 variables coded for each electionID. For all but three of the 58 variables, there are only four possible values: "yes," "no", "N/A", "unclear." Answering "unclear" means there was not enough information to answer the question, either because sources are unavailable, sparse, or the available information seems to conflict in ways that undermine both "yes" and "no" answers. "N/A" represents not applicable, and is used when the question does not make sense given the context of the election event, such as asking whether the incumbent won when the incumbent did not run. The 58 variables are labeled numerically as "nelda1," "nelda2", "nelda2," and so on. For each variable, there is a second associated variable that allows a free-text note clarifying the coding decision, if necessary. The note clarifying the variable nelda1 is named "neldaN1."

The only three variables that allow for free-text answers are nelda43, nelda44, and nelda54.

In multiple round elections, results from the very last round of that election are never coded in the previous round's variables. The variables coded for each election round should reflect only the status of the election at the point of that particular round. For example: nelda39, "Was the

incumbent replaced?" should reflect the status of the incumbent at the end of that particular round, not whether the incumbent was eventually replaced in a subsequent round of the election. Thus, the answer to whether the incumbent is replaced is usually "no" until the last round of the election, unless the incumbent has been formally succeeded by someone else at the conclusion of a non-final round. Some attributes do not change between rounds and are highly likely to be the same for all rounds. For example, in elections in which the government harasses the opposition, this variable is unlikely to change significantly between rounds, but the coding rules allow for this possibility.

Researchers who aggregate the data should pay careful attention to whether questions can vary by round or between other collapsible categories, such as presidential and legislative elections that occur on the same day.

CCODE:

CCODE refers to the three digit country code assigned by Gleditsch & Ward's List of Independent States.

ELECTIONID:

Unique for every observation in the dataset, ELECTIONID is the 16-character variable that identifies each election event by country, date, type, and round. It has four subcomponents, separated by a dash (-), defined as XXX-YYYY-MMDD-TR, where "XXX" represents a three digit country code, "YYYY" represents the year in which voting started for the entire election event, including all rounds, "MMDD" represents the month and day that the election event started (in the first round), and does not change in the ELECTIONID when there are multiple election rounds. This convention is used to collapse multi-round elections into one observation. "TR" denotes a letter-number combination, with T representing the type of national office being elected, and "R" represents the round number, with "1" representing the first round, "2" representing the second round, etc. The letter "P" stands for presidential or other direct executive elections, "L" stands for legislative or parliamentary elections, and "A" stands for constituent assembly elections.

In election events spanning multiple days or multiple rounds, we take the first day of voting as the month and day for the electionID. For example, the 1985 election in Burma began on October 6 and ended on October 20. The electionID as 775-1985-1006-L1, indicating that the first day of voting was October 6th.

For example, for electionIDs 100-1990-0311-A1 and 100-1990-0311-A2, the number 100 identifies the country as Colombia, the first day of the election event was March 11, 1990, the 'A' indicates that it was an election for constituent assembly, and the final digit indicates that it had two rounds. The day of voting for the first round took place on March 11, 1990, but note that the date of the second round cannot be extracted from the ELECTIONID variable (see the variable MMDD below).

Note that the electionID variable is particularly useful for aggregating the data into different units, as appropriate for different research questions. Common formats may include combining same-day election events into one observation, combining multiple rounds into one election event, or collapsing the data into country-year format.

YEAR:

YEAR indicates the year in which the election round took place.

TYPE:

TYPE codes the type of election that took place. All elections in this dataset are for national offices, including Presidential, Legislative and Parliamentary (which are combined), and Constituent Assembly. Some researchers may want to combine same-day legislative and executive elections, which are referred to as general elections (G). However, in the base dataset, even when executive and legislative elections occur on the same date, they are coded as two separate events, allowing variation in coding for specific national offices. In states with bicameral legislatures, when elections for both houses occur on the same day, these are coded as one election.

MMDD:

MMDD provides the month and day on which each election round took place. For first round elections MMDD and year are redundant to the information provided in the electionID. For elections with two or more rounds, YEAR and MMDD provide the actual date that voting started for the round of the election. If early or absentee voting is permitted, the official election day is used. If the month and date of an election cannot be determined, "0000" is used for MMDD.

NOTES:

NOTES is a free text field allowing for general remarks on the election being coded. Examples of such notes include "massive human rights abuses" and "first election in 20 years."

NELDA1

Were regular elections suspended before this election?

In democracies, elections take place at regular intervals or within a specified period of time. This question is specifically asking if regular elections were suspended preceding the election at hand, not if elections have ever been suspended. Therefore, if the previous round of elections had been suspended, or sometime after the last round an announcement was made that elections would not be held pending further notice, the answer to NELDA1 would be yes. Even if a regime disbands the elected legislature and says it is paving the way for fresh elections, the answer would be yes unless they follow through on the promise in a relatively short period of time (typically less than a year). Whether elections had been suspended one or more times in a country's history should not lead to a yes answer. What counts is the immediate past, i.e., the aftermath of the last balloting. It does not matter whether elections are held somewhat earlier or later than usual for this question, nor whether there was a regime change that affected the timing of the elections. Nor does it matter whether the freedom of elections changed. Suspending elections often means that the legislative body is also disbanded, and that the regime rules by decree. If a regime had never had elections, the answer is yes.

Examples of Yes: Dominican Republic - 42-1962-1220-L1; Following the death of the authoritarian leader, a transitional leadership was established to run elections. Niger - 436-1989-1212-L1 and 436-1989-1212-P1; Following a 1974 military coup, Niger held its first legislative and presidential elections in 1989. Comoros - 581-1990-0304-P1 and P2 581-1992-1122-L1 and L2; These were the first contested elections in Comoros. It previously had a one party state.

Examples of No: India 750-1991-0520-L1, L2, and L3; India has held elections since independence from Britain in 1950. Zambia - 551-1991-1031-L1 and P1; The 1991 elections marked Zambia's

transition to multiparty democracy. However "No" was coded because single-party elections had been held in Zambia since 1972. While the 1991 elections were early, previous elections had not been suspended.

Special Cases: India - 750-1991-0520-L4; India had suspended elections in one state in this round. However, since elections had not been suspended nationally, the case was coded as no.

NELDA2

Were these the first multiparty elections?

This indicates when a newly independent country is having its first elections, when a country holds the first multiparty elections after a significant period of non-democratic rule, or when a country transitions from single-party elections to multi-party elections. Multiparty means that more than one party is allowed to contest the election, and that at least some of the parties are both nominally and effectively independent of the ruling actors.

In countries with no political parties, this can be coded as "yes' only in cases in which there is clear competition between candidates, as in some microstates.

Examples of Yes: Fiji-950-1992-0523-L1; In 1992, Fiji held its first legislative elections since a military coup in 1987. Dominican Republic - 42-1962-1220-L1; An authoritarian regime was previously in place. After the death of the leader, multi-party elections with opposition were allowed. Egypt - 651-2005-0907-P1; The president initiated reforms and allowed multi-candidate elections that were decided by the people as opposed to solely by referendum as in the past.

Examples of No: Albania - 339-1974-1006-L1; Only one party, the Communist Democratic Front party, was legal, and thus these were not the first multiparty elections.

Special Cases: Mongolia - 712-1990-0729-L1 and 712-1993-0606-P1; Mongolia held its first multi-party legislative elections in 1990, but its first multi-party presidential elections did not take place until 1993. Both cases are coded as "yes."

NELDA3

Was opposition allowed?

This variable indicates whether at least one opposition political party existed to contest the election. Some countries have multiple government parties but no opposition political party. An opposition party is one that is not in the government, meaning it is not affiliated with the incumbent party in power. Note that if No is coded, other opposition questions (NELDA13, NELDA14, and NELDA15) may be coded as "N/A."

If there are no political parties, the answer is always "no" with the possible exception of countries in which parties do not exist but there are well defined groups of candidates that are distinguishable as affiliated with the government and opposition.

Examples of Yes: Egypt - 651-2005-0907-P1; The president initiated reforms and allowed opposition contestation; whereas past elections were uncontested and just reaffirmed the legislative assembly's choice for president by referendum, many candidates could run in this election. Dominican Republic - 42-1962-1220-L1; Following the death of an authoritarian leader, opposition parties were allowed to contest the election.

Examples of No: Syria - 652-1990-0522-L1; Opposition was not allowed and candidates were only permitted to run through parties associated with the National Progressive Front. Laos - 812-

1992-1220-L1; No opposition was allowed in the one-party state, and many opposition leaders fled into voluntary exile. Vietnam - 816-1992-0719-L1; Only one party was officially allowed, although a few "independent" candidates were permitted to run. Niger - 436-1965-0930-P1, 436-1965-1021-L1, 436-1970-1001-P1; In these elections, only the military-backed incumbent party was considered legal even though an opposition party was organized. Tunisia - 616-1994-0320-P1; There were no candidates other than incumbent Zine al-Abidine ben Ali. The other parties could not meet the required threshold for entry, which included the support of 30 mayors. The police effectively stopped opposition parties from meeting the legal requirements to participate in the election.

Special Cases: Iran - 630-1997-0523-P1; In cases of limited opposition party competition, but where some opposition parties are allowed to compete, the variable is coded as "yes." In this case, other political parties existed and some were allowed to run; however, it is worth noting that candidates for any election have to be approved by the country's Council of Guardians before they are allowed to run, and the Council usually only approves a very small fraction of applicants. Portugal - 235-1958-0608-P1; An independent candidate affiliated with the political opposition movement ran against the dictatorial regime's chosen candidate. However, opposition parties were officially banned. Thus, though there was an opposition movement, partially underground, and sometimes tolerated by the regime, "No" was coded because all opposition parties were banned.

NELDA4

Was more than one party legal?

This variable indicates whether multiple political parties were technically legal. The legalization of multiple parties need not necessarily mean the existence of a functioning opposition party, as there may be other non-legal barriers to the development of an opposition party. Similarly, a well organized opposition party may exist but may not be legal. In cases in which there are no political parties, the answer should be "no."

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1994-0821-P1; There were several legal parties in addition to the PRI, including the PAN. German Democratic Republic - 265-1971-1114-L1; There was no effective political opposition in the communist country, but some small "alliance" parties were permitted. They did not compete with the ruling Communist Party.

Examples of No: Haiti - 41-1979-0211-L1; Only one legal party existed in Haiti. Sudan - 625-1996-0306-L1; Political parties were officially banned.

NELDA5

Was there a choice of candidates on the ballot?

This variable indicates whether the voters were allowed to make a choice between candidates (or parties, in the case of closed-list PR systems) on the ballot, which is possible when the number of candidates competing for a slot exceeds the number of slots to be filled.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1966-0306-P1; Several candidates competed in the election to transfer power to a civilian president.

Examples of No: Egypt - 651-1993-1004-P1; Voters were only permitted to vote for or against the individual nominated by the legislative assembly for president. Niger - 436-1965-0930-P1, 436-1965-1021-L1, 436-1970-1001-P1; In these elections, only the military-backed incumbent party was

considered legal even though an opposition party existed. The leader of the incumbent party was the only presidential candidate on the ballot.

NELDA6

If regular, were these elections early or late relative to the date they were supposed to be held per established procedure?

If elections are regular, this variable indicates whether they were early or late compared to the date they were originally scheduled for. "Yes" means that elections were either delayed or took place earlier than scheduled, including cases of Westminister systems in which elections are often held "early" compared to the absolute last day on which they could be held by law or regulation. Cases in which the government previously delayed regularly scheduled elections without declaring an official future date at the time of delay are also coded as "Yes." In these cases, NELDA1 may also be coded as "Yes" since the delay functions effectively as a suspension of regularly scheduled elections. "No" means that elections took place according to their scheduled date. "N/A" codes for elections which are not regular in that domestic political actors have no shared expectation about when elections will be held. For second or subsequent round elections the decision about whether it was early or late should be coded independently of whether the first round was early or late.

Examples of Yes: Fiji - 950-1994-0218-L1; Fiji's 1994 legislative elections were held three years earlier than scheduled. Haiti - 41-1987-1129-L1; With the fall of the Duvalier regime, elections happened earlier than usual in order to establish a government. Turkey - 640-1995-1224-L1; The 1995 elections were held one year early because the ruling coalition had collapsed and a new government needed to be formed. India - 750-1991-0520-L2; The election was held several days after it was originally scheduled because the leader of one of the major parties was assassinated. Comoros - 581-1993-1212-L1, 581-1993-1212-L2; The president delayed elections, ostensibly because of financial and logistical reasons. However, international commentators said it was a ploy to give the government more time to harass the opposition.

Examples of No: Bulgaria - 355-2001-0617-L1; This parliamentary election took place four years after the previous parliamentary election, and its timing was consistent with the widely-known constitutional requirements.

Special Cases: Examples of "N/A": Zambia - 551-1991-1031-L1 and P1; These were election held during the transition to multiparty democracy. NELDA1 had been coded as a "No," noting that elections had been regularly held before 1991. However, this question was coded as an "N/A" because the 1991 transition elections themselves were not regular. NELDA1 need not always be "Yes" to produce an "N/A" in NELDA6. East Timor - 860-2002-0414-P1; These were the first elections in the newly independent state. Honduras - 91-1971-0328-L1, 91-1971-0328-P1, 91-1980-0420-A1; These were the first elections of a new regime. South Africa: 560-1984-0510-L1; Under the apartheid regime, elections were held separately for non-whites for set-aside seats in the legislature. Therefore, it is not a regular election, rather a special election for a subset of the population.

NELDA7

Before elections, were there clear indications that the incumbent had made a prior decision to give up power?

If, prior to an election that involves the incumbent, the incumbent signals that he or she will be giving up power by not running or stepping down, then a "Yes" is coded. This includes cases where the leader abides by a constitutional ban on further terms. If the incumbent declares his or her intention to run for re-election, the answer will be "no." "N/A" is coded for elections that do not involve contests for the chief executive (where NELDA20 is coded "no."), but otherwise this question should be answered "Yes" or "no." If the incumbent resigns in special circumstances just before the electoral period and elections are held by an explicitly interim government, we still count the incumbent as the individual who resigned, unless another leader is installed in office prior to the election and this leader is recognized in the Archigos dataset.

Examples of Yes: Bangladesh - 771-1991-0227-L1; The elections were held and administered by a neutral interim government. The interim Prime Minister banned all members of the interim leadership from running in the elections. The ousted leader of the previous military government ran in five districts. Because the incumbent is considered the leader of the government immediately preceding and during the elections, and the interim prime minister formally banned members of the interim government, including himself, from running, the variable was coded as "yes."

Examples of No: Fiji - 950-1992-0523-L1; Although Fiji held legislative elections for the first time after the 1987 military coup, the military leader did not step down, and ran as a candidate with the intent of regaining office through the elections.

Special Note: For nearly all elections, we consider the incumbent to be the leader listed in Archigos. Nevertheless, there is some debate about who should be considered the incumbent leader for the purposes of this data set in some special few cases. One special example is Iran, where presidential elections take place but the Ayatollah is considered the incumbent executive leader in Archigos data set (see NELDA43 and NELDA44 below). The Iranian presidential elections are included in the NELDA data, the elected president is used in reference to the incumbent questions except where otherwise noted explicitly. Another example of this ambiguity is Panama during General Manual Noriega's regime. In 1989, the Noriega government allowed elections for the presidency while keeping de facto presidential powers with Noriega (95-1989-0507-P1).

NELDA8

Did the incumbent reach his or her term limit?

This variable indicates whether the incumbent executive had reached the end of his or her constitutional or legal term in office. In theory, once a leader has reached the maximum number of terms allowed in office, he or she is no longer eligible to run and must step down. A "Yes" is coded when the incumbent reaches his or her term limit. If the executive is allowed multiple terms in office and reaches the end of one of them, the answer is "no." If the executive is in office illegally or there are no constitutional terms, the answer is "no." Parliamentary systems where the leader is a member of the parliament typically allow unlimited terms in office, and are coded as "No." If the position of the leader is not contested (NELDA20 is "No"), this question is coded "N/A," but is otherwise coded on a "Yes"/"No" basis.

Examples of Yes: Iran - 630-1997-0523-P1; A "Yes" was coded for the 1997 presidential election in Iran because President Rafsanjani had already been in power for two terms and was barred by

the constitution from seeking a third term.

Guatemala - 90-1970-0301-P1; Under the existing Guatemalan constitution, presidents were limited to one four-year term, so the incumbent president was ineligible to run for re-election.

Examples of No: Belarus - 370-2001-0909-P1; According to the 1994 Constitution, Lukashenko's term should have ended in 1999. However, in 1996 Lukashenko pushed through a new constitution which stated that his term would not expire until 2001, and so he had not reached his term limit.

NELDA9

Had the incumbent extended his or her term in office or eligibility to run in elections at any point in the past?

The variable is coded as "Yes" if research indicates that the incumbent extended his or her term in office or eligibility to run again in an election (see NELDA43 on definition of the incumbent). A "No" indicates that the incumbent had not extended his or her term in office, while a "N/A" is coded when elections do not involve the executive office. For systems which impose no limit on the number of terms in office (e.g., most parliamentary systems), or that do not limit eligibility to run, the answer is "no." If the position of the leader is not contested (NELDA20 is "No"), this question is coded "N/A," but is otherwise coded on a "Yes"/"No" basis

Examples of Yes: Tunisia- 616-2004-1024-P1; Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali won presidential elections after he had amended the constitution such that he could run for an additional term.

Examples of No: Cyprus - 352-1993-0207-P2; the incumbent had not extended his term in office or eligibility to run in elections.

NELDA10

Was the country ruled by "transitional leadership" tasked with "holding elections"?

Yes indicates that an officially "transitional" leadership was appointed in order to organize and hold elections. This can include a "caretaker government," as long as it was appointed specifically to organize and oversee an election. An existing government cannot become "transitional leadership" simply by proclaiming itself to be transitional. Rather, major political actors must share the expectation that the main reason the interim government is appointed is to organize and hold an election.

Examples of Yes: Honduras - 91-1981-1129-L1 and 91-1981-1129-P1; Prior to these elections, Honduras had a provisional Constituent Assembly that wrote the new constitution and a provisional president appointed by the assembly to organize elections and govern the country until elections were held. Dominican Republic - 42-1962-1220-P1; With the fall of the previous authoritarian regime, a transitional leadership was established and tasked with holding elections. Ecuador -130-1968-0602-P1; The military had overthrown the president in 1961 and was managing a transition to civilian rule following a national referendum on whether elections should be held. Bangladesh - 771-2001-1001-L1; Based on a 1996 constitutional amendment, a caretaker government, headed by the Chief Justice, was appointed at the conclusion of the previous government's term. The explicit responsibility of this government was to organize and oversee the election, and top members of the caretaker government could not be members of political parties and did not contest the election.

Examples of No: Costa Rica - 094-1994-0206-P1; These elections were regular and the country was not ruled by a transitional leadership.

Special Cases: Greece - 350-1964-0216-L1; "Yes" was coded, though officially Greece was ruled by a caretaker government, not a transitional government. In the Greek case, the government would be taken over by a non-political caretaker government charged with preparing the nation for the election three months before the election-date. Though officially the leader of Greece was caretaker-head Parakevopoulos, a banker, the election race was viewed by all Greeks as a race between the incumbent party Centre Union and the opposition party National Radical Union and its allies. Thus, aside from this question (NELDA10) and the question regarding who was the leader in office before the election (NELDA43), the caretaker government is not coded as the incumbent. Rather, the incumbent related questions were all answered with respect to the Centre Union and its head, Panpandreou.

NELDA11

Before elections, are there significant concerns that elections will not be free and fair?

A "Yes" indicates that there was evidence of domestic or international concern that the election process was not going to be free or fair. A "Yes" is also coded when the elections were widely perceived to lack basic criteria for competitive elections, such as more than one political party.

Examples of Yes: Fiji - 950-1992-0523-L1; In the 1992 legislative election, there were widespread domestic concerns about the electoral process relating to the reservation of 37 of the 50 seats in Parliament for ethnic Fijians that ensured they would always have a majority in parliament.

Examples of No: Botswana - 571-2004-1030-L1; Botswana consistently had free and fair elections and there were no concerns that this election would be different.

Special Cases: During the 1970s, Kenya allowed a degree of competition in elections within the context of a one-party state. Because competition was overtly restricted, the question is still coded as a "yes."

NELDA12

Was the incumbent or ruling party confident of victory before elections?

A "Yes" indicates that the incumbent or ruling party made public statements expressing their confidence that they would win. A "Yes" may also indicate that the opposition parties stated that they were not likely to win. If the political situation in the country is such that the opposition had no chance of winning, a "Yes" is also coded. In cases in which the incumbent or ruling party has been dominant for a number of years and is projected to win in a landslide, NELDA12 is "yes," even if they do not make a statement to that effect. When a competitive election outcome is anticipated, a "No" is coded.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1974-0303-P1; The ruling MLN party was confident of victory prior to the election.

Algeria - 615-1997-0605-L1, 615-2002-0530-L1; The ruling party was assured of victory. The opposition parties boycotted, and many of the citizens who would have voted for the parties boycotting did not vote.

Examples of No: Slovakia - 317-2002-0920-L1; Pre-election polls showed the incumbent party trailing. *Examples of "N/A":* If there is no incumbent leader or party, such as in the first elections following military rule, this question can be coded as "N/A," where appropriate. Examples include

elections for the Constituent Assembly in Honduras - 091-1957-0922-A1, in which the military leadership did not run and were not affiliated with a party.

NELDA13

Were opposition leaders prevented from running?

A "Yes" was coded when at least some opposition leaders were prevented from running and contesting the elections. A decision to boycott the election was coded "Yes" here only if it was in response to the government preventing opposition figures from running. Cases where opposition was not allowed were also coded as "yes." Note that this question is similar to NELDA3 (was opposition allowed?), but is distinct in that it should be coded as "Yes" if any specific opposition party candidates are explicitly prevented from running. If NELDA3 is coded "No" this question is coded "N/A." If NELDA3 is "Yes" then is question is coded on a "Yes"/"No" basis.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala -90-1970-0301-P1; Communist and revolutionary groups were prevented from running candidates for president.

Iran - 630-1997-0523-P1; In the 1997 presidential election, only 4 out of 238 potential candidates were allowed to run by the Council of Guardians. Vietnam - 816-2002-0519-L1; The ruling party screened all candidates before they were put on the ballot, and prevented many candidates from running. Algeria - 615-1997-0605-L1; In the Algerian legislative elections of 1997, all three main opposition parties were banned.

Examples of No: Equatorial Guinea - 411-1996-0225-P1; Although opposition candidates were harassed during the campaign and many of their supporters were detained or tortured, they were not prevented from running.

NELDA14

Did some opposition leaders boycott the election?

If at least some opposition leaders announced and carried out a public boycott of the election, a "Yes" was coded. If not, a "No" was coded. A boycott implies an overt decision by a political party not to contest the election. Typically, these leaders also encourage their supporters to boycott the election by not voting. If opposition was banned, or if there was no opposition, (if NELDA3 is "No") then an "N/A" was coded.

Examples of Yes: El Salvador - 92-1962-0429-P1; All opposition parties boycotted the presidential election after complaining of fraud in the 1961 elections for the Constituent Assembly that wrote the new constitution and transformed itself into a legislative body. Sudan - 625-2000-1213-P1; In the Sudanese presidential election of 2000, all the main opposition parties boycotted the election. Sri Lanka - 780-1994-0816-L1; Election turnout was high with the exception of the area around Jaffna, where the LTTE opposition party called an electoral boycott. Morocco - 600-1993-0625-L1; Many parties boycotted Morocco's 1993 legislative elections. These were mostly leftist parties who were afraid that the government was going to manipulate the elections. The government had not held free elections since 1984 and elections were also postponed from 1989 to 1993 by the leader.

Examples of No: El Salvador - 092-1991-0310-L1; Opposition leaders did not boycott the election, in fact, this was the first election since 1979 in which the FMLN (main guerrilla group) did not boycott the elections.

Special Cases: Examples of N/A: Laos - 812-1992-1220-L1; "N/A" was coded because opposition was not allowed in the one-party state.

NELDA15

Is there evidence that the government harassed the opposition?

If there was evidence of intentional government harassment of the opposition, a "Yes" was coded. Harassment may include detaining opposition leaders, disrupting opposition political rallies with state forces, and shutting down opposition newspapers and offices. If opposition was banned, or if there was no opposition, (if NELDA3 is "No") then an "N/A" was coded. Harassment of the opposition by the police can count as government harassment.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1974-0303-P1; The opposition National Opposition Front was the target of violence perpetrated by the government and forces allied with the government. Immediately following the election, the government closed down three radio stations and occupied the headquarters of the Christian Democrats. Malaysia - 820-1999-1129-L1; The government monitored the opposition's speeches and filed lawsuits against them for slander. Philippines - 840-2001-0514-P1; Former President Estrada and his son were arrested on TV when they challenged President Arroyo's legitimacy.

Examples of No: Fiji - 950-2006-0506-L1; there is no evidence the government harassed the opposition.

NELDA16

In the run-up to the election, were there allegations of media bias in favor of the incumbent?

If there were reports by either domestic or outside actors of media bias in favor of the incumbent or ruling party, it is coded as a "yes." In cases where the media is totally controlled by the government, and/or no opposition is allowed, the answer is "yes." It is possible that the answer is "No" even if the political system is tightly controlled.

Examples of Yes: Singapore - 830-2001-1103-L1; The ruling party is widely understood to influence media coverage of politics, and opposition parties complain of media bias. Mauritius -590-1991-0915-L1, 590-1995-1220-L1, 590-2000-0911-L1; In the 1991, 1995, and 2001 legislative elections, the ruling party/government manipulated media coverage, and the media was accused of self-censorship.

Examples of No: Hungary - 310-2006-0409-L2; There were no allegations of media bias in favor of the incumbent.

NELDA17

Is economic growth in the country said to be good?

The answer to this question is based on perception, as reported by media sources. The coding is not based on data on economic growth, which may or may not correspond to perceptions of economic growth.

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1991-0818-L1; The Mexican economy was widely viewed as growing fast prior to the 1991 elections.

Examples of No: Malaysia - 820-1999-1129-L1; The country was described in the media as recovering from the Asian financial crisis. Algeria - 615-1999-0415-P1; In the period surrounding this election, the economy worsened, inflation was high, and unemployment was at 30%. This only exacerbated the civil war and public discontent.

NELDA18

Is country said to be in an economic crisis?

Like NELDA17, this question refers to perceptions of economic crisis rather than an objective measure of economic crisis. If newspapers and other sources referred to economic crisis, NELDA18 was coded as yes.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1985-1103-L1; Several sources described Guatemala's economy as being in crisis. Laos - 812-1997-1221-L1; Laos' currency was greatly affected by the Asian financial crisis in 1997, especially because Thailand was one of its major trading partners. Indonesia - 850-1992-0609-L1; The economy slowed, foreign aid dropped, and the country had a large level of debt. Sudan - 625-2000-1213-P1; Sudan in 2000 had a real GDP growth rate of around 5%, which suggests good economic growth, however, the country had been in a civil war for years that was especially bad in 2003. At this time, the country was perceived as being in an economic crisis, which included widespread starvation.

Examples of No: Algeria - 615-1999-0415-P1; In 1999 the Algerian economy was not considered to be in a crisis. The economic situation was poor, however, and it was cited as one of the reasons why the government cracked down on opposition groups and manipulated the election.

NELDA19

Is country said to be a large recipient of outside economic aid?

A "Yes" is coded if the country is a large recipient of outside economic aid, from either other countries or from international organizations.

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1985-0707-L1; Mexico was a large recipient of IMF and World Bank loans. Vietnam - 816-2002-0519-L1; Vietnam had one of the largest aid programs in the world, with economic aid from Western countries, Japan, IMF, and the World Bank.

Examples of No: Mexico - 070-2006-0702-L1; Mexico was not a large recipient of outside economic aid.

NELDA20

Was the office of the incumbent leader contested in this election?

If the office of the incumbent leader was contested in the election, such as in a presidential election or in a parliamentary election where the leader is the Prime Minister, then a "Yes" was coded. This question focuses on the de facto or genuine leader of the country, rather than whether there is an elected executive. The identity of the incumbent leader is based on Archigos, a data set of political leaders by Hein Goemans, Kristian Gleditsch, and Giacomo Chiozza, with very few exceptions. Where Archigos says the incumbent leader is someone other than the prime minister or president (such as a king or religious figure), the answer is "No". For observations that code legislative elections in which the executive is elected separately,the answer is "no" even when the executive

election takes place on the same day. For cases in which it is the first election post-independence or the first presidential election, the question is coded as "no."

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1994-0821-P1; The election was to replace the incumbent president. Turkey - 640-1999-0418-L1 ; Yes is coded because legislative elections can lead to a change in prime minister, who is considered the incumbent.

Examples of No: Congo - 484-1973-0624-L1; this was a legislative election and because the leader of the legislature was not the incumbent leader, the office of the incumbent leader was not contested and this question was coded as "no."

Special Cases: Togo 461-2005-0424-P1; The son of the recently deceased president attempted to assume power without an election, but was compelled by international pressure to step down and contest a presidential election as required by the constitution. During the election, the acting president was the former vice-president of the National Assembly and a puppet of the deceased president's son. We coded NELDA20 as "Yes" even though the person holding the office at that point of time was not necessarily the leader of the country, as coded by Archigos. This decision reflects that contenders perceived the Presidency as the paramount executive institution in the country at the time of the election.

Lebanon–1960-2006.The Archigos data set codes the office of the president as the incumbent leader, which is not directly elected. However, Lebanon also has a Prime Minister and, in this case, because the president is selected by the parliament after elections, we consider the office of the incumbent to be contested in all Lebanese parliamentary elections.

NELDA21

Did the incumbent run?

If the incumbent contested the election, a "Yes" was coded. If he or she did not, a "No" was coded. If this is an election that did not involve the leadership position, such as a legislative election in a presidential system, then "N/A" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Uganda - 500-2001-0312-P1; The incumbent, Yoweri Museveni, ran for re-election.

Examples of No: Bolivia - 145-1997-0601-P1; the incumbent president had reached his term limit and did not run in the election.

NELDA22

If no (NELDA21): was there a chosen successor?

If the incumbent leader did not contest the election but there was a clearly designated or "anointed" successor (who was understood to be the choice of the departing incumbent or ruling group), a "Yes" was coded. This is particularly applicable in cases where a candidate is widely understood as being "preordained" to be the next incumbent, or at least to take the incumbent's place within their party with little competition. A candidate who becomes the next leader of the ruling party in a parliamentary system, or a candidate who is chosen to represent a party through a primary process (unless the incumbent has a clear favorite), for instance, does not qualify as a "successor" for the purposes of this question. If the departing incumbent leader did not have a chosen successor, a "No" was coded. If the incumbent leader did run, or the election does not involve the leadership position, "N/A" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1994-0821-P1; The long-ruling PRI's chosen presidential successor was Ernesto Zedillo. Togo - 461-2005-0424-P1; The son of the recently deceased president attempted to assume power without an election, but was compelled by international pressure to step down and contest a Constitutionally-demanded presidential election. During the election, the acting president was the former vice-president of the National Assembly and a puppet of the dead president's son. This case was coded as "Yes" to reflect that the election was meant to arrange for the transfer of power from the interim leader to the son of the former president.

Examples of No: Liberia - 450-2005-1011-P2; the incumbent government was a transitional government, and no members of the government ran nor was there a chosen successor.

NELDA23

If yes (NELDA22): did a successor assume power as a result of the elections?

If there was a chosen successor (if a "Yes" was coded for NELDA22), and if the successor assumed power due to the elections, then a "Yes" was coded. If the successor did not assume power, then a "No" was coded. If the answer to NELDA22 was anything other than "Yes", then "N/A" was coded here. For multiround elections, this question should be coded only for the outcome of the election round.

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1994-0821-P1; The long-ruling PRI's chosen presidential successor, Ernesto Zedillo, won the election.

Examples of No: Costa Rica - 094-1970-0201-P1; Mario Echandi Jimenez, candidate of the incumbent National Unification Party, lost to a candidate of National Liberation Party.

Special Cases: Ukraine - 364-2004-1031-P2; "No" was coded though Yanukovych, the favored government candidate, won rigged elections in the second round of the Ukrainian presidential election. After the Ukrainian Election Commission declared Yanukovych the victor of the presidential race, international pressure and domestic protests, in tandem with the Ukrainian Supreme Court's invalidation of the presidential results, forced a rerun of the runoff election. Though Yanukovych won the presidential election, he did not take power and later lost the rerun election. Opposition candidate Yushchenko took power after the rerun (369-2004-1031-P3).

NELDA24

Did the incumbent's party lose?

If the party associated with the incumbent (per Archigos) lost, then a "Yes" is coded. If there is no party that is associated with the incumbent, or if the regime allows no parties, then "N/A" was coded. For legislative elections in a presidential system, this variable indicates whether the party affiliated with the incumbent executive (per Archigos) lost the election. If the election is for the executive office and the incumbent does not run, the question is coded as "Yes" if the candidate running from the incumbent's party loses.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1978-0305-P1; The incumbent's MLN party lost the election.

Examples of No: Vietnam - 816-2002-0519-L1; The country has only one official party.

Special Cases: Mongolia - 1993-0606-P1; The incumbent ran for re-election under a different party than the traditional ruling party, but still won. Although he ran under a new party, "No" is coded because there was no meaningful change or transfer in power.

Thailand - 800-1988-0724-L1; In the legislative election the primary party of the old coalition lost seats vis-à-vis other parties, notably the second largest party, in its coalition. Even though the incumbent party was no longer the largest party in the coalition, this election was widely seen as a victory for the incumbent coalition, so the answer coded was "no."

Bangladesh - 771-1991-0227-L1; The incumbent was the interim PM and he did not have a party since he was a politically neutral agent sent to restore political and economic stability. The pre-interim government leader vis-à-vis Jatiya party still won seats, but two opposition parties won a far greater number. However, because the incumbent had no political affiliation, the answer coded was "N/A."

NELDA25

Were there reliable polls that indicated popularity of ruling political party or of the candidates for office before elections?

If there were reports about the election which suggested that reliable polling data existed and indicated the popularity of the ruling party or of candidates, then a "Yes" was coded. This may mean that either domestic or international polling agencies were able to carry out and publish survey results.

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1994-0821-P1; Polling showed the PRI candidate, Ernesto Zedillo, to be the favorite.

Examples of No: Turkey - 640-1995-1224-L1; In Turkey there was a ban on publishing polling results. It is worth noting that observers did make predictions that were fairly reliable about the popularity of the candidates, but we cannot say that there were any reliable polls.

NELDA26

If yes (NELDA25): were they favorable for the incumbent?

If NELDA25 is coded as "Yes", then NELDA26 was coded "Yes" if the public opinion polls were favorable for the incumbent. If the polls were not favorable for the incumbent, or were sufficiently mixed that the incumbents would be uncertain about their popularity, then a "No" was coded. If no reliable polling data was found (if NELDA25 is coded "No"), "N/A" was coded. Incumbent here means the leader if the leader's office was contested and the ruling party/parties if the legislature was contested. Favorable usually means being in a position to win power.

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1994-0821-P1; Polling showed the candidate of the incumbent's PRI, Ernesto Zedillo, to be the favorite.

Examples of No: Myanmar (Burma) - 775-1990-0527-A1; pre-election polls were favorable to the opposition party, the National League for Democracy. Mexico - 070-2006-0702-L1; Polls right before the election showed the two main candidates, Calderon and Obrador, neck-and-neck. Since the polls were not favorable for the incumbent party's candidate, "No" was coded. Generally, in cases where the polls showed candidates in dead heat, "No" should be coded.

Special Cases: Guatemala - 90-1985-1103-L1: NELDA25=yes, NELDA26=N/A and Guatemala - 90-1985-1103-P1: NELDA25=yes, NELDA26=N/A. These two elections denoted a transition from military to civilian rule. Since the military leaders were not involved, despite accurate polling of the candidates, it is not possible to determine whether the polls were favorable to the incumbent or not.

NELDA27

Was the vote count a gain for the opposition?

If the election vote count displayed a gain from previous elections for the opposition (relative to the ruling party in the relevant branch of government), even if they did not win, "yes" is coded. If there was no gain in the vote by the opposition, a "no" is coded. If these were the first contested elections, then the answer is yes if the opposition gained some seats in parliament or representation in the office under contestation. In the case of a presidential election, vote count gains are coded in terms of victory, not in percentage of votes. So, if a losing candidate runs in two consecutive elections, but loses the second election by a smaller margin, it still cannot be said that the vote count was a "gain for the opposition."

This is different for legislative or parliamentary elections. In an election for seats in a legislative body, an opposition party may fail to become the majority party or join the majority coalition, but can still win more seats than the opposition parties won in a previous election, thereby making the vote count "a gain for the opposition." Also important is the perception of gain for the opposition, regardless of the precise numbers in the vote count (see *Special Cases* below). If opposition is not allowed or absent, the answer is "N/A." When coding for a multiple round election, the last round should refer to the election overall. Thus, we count a gain when there is a gain from the previous election (as opposed to a higher percentage of votes compared to the first round). For the 1st and interim rounds, if it is not absolutely obvious that the opposition will gain seats or lose seats as opposed to the last election, then a N/A is coded, but this depends on the electoral system.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1974-0303-L1; The opposition Christian Democrats scored a gain in seats in the election. Greece - 350-1977-1120-L1; The opposition picked up more seats than in previous elections. However, the ruling New Democracy party still won a majority of seats in the legislature. Mexico - 070-2006-0702-L1; In multiparty democracies, there may be an overall opposition loss of seats in a legislature (the ruling party increases its lead) that still leads to a "Yes" coding. This is when one opposition party increases its lead vis-a-vis others or when the media portrays the election as a success for an opposition party. In the Mexico case, the ruling PAN gained seats. While the opposition PRI lost many seats, the opposition PRD gained seats. "Yes" was coded with respect to the PRD.

Examples of No: Cameroon - 471-1997-0517-L1; the ruling RPDC party picked up even more seats in this election than in the previous election.

Special Cases: In legislative or parliamentary elections, a borderline case may occur when incumbent party retains the same number of seats as in the previous election but one or more opposition parties that are clearly *the* ideological opponents to the regime gain seats from other opposition parties, thereby producing a stronger and more ideologically opposed opposition coalition in the legislative body. To the extent that this very specific outcome is perceived as a rebuke of the legislative body's ruling party, then NELDA27 is considered "yes."

NELDA28

Is there evidence that reports critical of the government's handling of the election reached large numbers of people?

If there is evidence that reports critical of the government's handling of the election reached a large domestic audience, then a "Yes" was coded. If there were some critical reports, but they did not

reach a large domestic audience, then a "No" was coded. If there were no reports critical of the handling of the election, for example if the election was considered free and fair, a "N/A" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Philippines - 840-2004-0510-P1; The opposition alleged massive vote fraud in this election. Protests ensued. Mexico - 70-1985-0707-L1; The election was widely regarded as fraudulent by the population.

Examples of No: Cambodia - 811-1972-0604-P1; The government closed down many newspapers to prevent reports critical of the government's handling of the election from reaching the population.

Special Cases: North Korea-731-2003-0803-L1 In some countries freedom of expression is so strictly controlled, any criticism of the unfairness of an election cannot reach a wide audience domestically. For this and similar cases, the answer is "no."

NELDA29

Were there riots and protests after the election?

If so, a "Yes" is coded. The riots and protests should at least somewhat be related to the handling or outcome of the election.

Examples of Yes: Philippines - 840-2004-0510-P1; Demonstrators protested the handling of the election. India - 750-1998-0216-L2; The previous elections in 1996 resulted in a deadlocked parliament. New voting had to be called three years ahead of schedule after politicians spent the previous two years trying and failing to cobble together an enduring minority or coalition government. On February 22, 1998, the popular BJP candidate Vajpayee went on a hunger strike to protest the dismissal of his party's government in the Uttar Pradesh state. Many Hindu nationalists rioted as well.

Examples of No: Argentina - 160-2005-1023-L1; there were no protests or riots after the election.

NELDA30

If yes (NELDA29): did they involve allegations of vote fraud?

Question 30 was coded as "Yes" if the riots or protests are backed with allegations of vote fraud. If there are no allegations of vote fraud fueling the riots or protests, a "No" was coded. If question 29 is coded " no," "N/A" was coded here. For multiround elections, this question should be coded only for the outcome of the election round.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1982-0307-P1; The three losing opposition candidates led protests against what they viewed as fraudulent elections. Philippines - 840-2004-0510-P1; Opposition figures alleged massive vote fraud. Protests ensued. Algeria - 615-1999-0415-P1; In Algeria there are many riots and protests after elections. During the presidential election of 1999 the civil war was still going on and unrest was significant. In this election six candidates pulled out of the race because they thought the elections would not be free. The government harassed the Islamist parties and many people protested and rioted as a result.

Examples of No: Cambodia - 811-1972-0604-P1; Although there were protests, they were food riots and not related to vote fraud.

NELDA31

If yes (NELDA29): did the government use violence against demonstrators?

Question 31 was coded "Yes" if the government responded with violence against the protests or riots. If no violence was used, "No" was coded. If there was violence, but it was not associated with government actors, the answer is "no." If question 29 is coded "no," "N/A" was coded here.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1982-0307-P1; Protests were marked by violent clashes with police.

Examples of No: Armenia - 371-2003-0219-P1; thousands of people marched peacefully in the capital, but no violence was used against the demonstrators.

NELDA32

Were results that did not favor the incumbent canceled?

An election in which results favor the incumbent led to a "No" coding, whether cancelled or not. Results that did not favor the incumbent led to a "Yes" if canceled, and "No" if not canceled. In presidential elections where the incumbent or a figure favored by the incumbent ran, "favorable results" were decided on the basis of how that candidate performed. In a parliamentary election, a figure favored by the incumbent would typically be from the same party of the Prime Minister. In legislative elections where the leader's office is not contested, "favorable results" were decided on the basis of whether the incumbent executive, per Archigos, found the results unfavorable. In cases in which there is an incumbent party or ruling coalition in the legislature that is different from the party of the incumbent executive, the question is still coded based on the incumbent executive.

Examples of Yes: Iran - 630-1984-0415-L2; The Council of Guardians annulled results in 20 constituencies where results were not favorable to the incumbent, citing the "unhealthy atmospheres" in the constituencies concerned during the election campaign.

Examples of No: Czech Republic - 316-2002-1025-L2; the incumbent won the election and the results were not canceled.

Special Cases: Myanmar (Burma) - 775-1990-0527-A1; The election results were never officially canceled. However, the military regime delayed transfer of power to the elected party, eventually imprisoned or killed almost all of the elected opposition, and declared that new elections would need to be held, until the issue was largely forgotten. Because the government never officially issued a declaration canceling the results of the election, the answer coded was "No."

NELDA33

Was there significant violence involving civilian deaths immediately before, during, or after the election?

If there was any significant violence relating to the elections that resulted in civilian deaths, a "yes" is coded. These deaths should be at least plausibly related to the election, though sometimes it is difficult to be certain. Deaths related to civil war that are not intended to influence the election, and are not caused by the election, should not be counted.

Examples of Yes: Cambodia - 811-1993-0523-L1; The Khmer Rouge murdered members of rival political parties and marred the election campaign. Pakistan - 770-1993-1006-L1; The Montreal Gazette states, " Pakistan has a history of volatile politics, although this campaign, coming after

nearly a year of political chaos, has been more peaceful than most, with only about 50 people killed." Compared to previous elections, the number of deaths is quite minimal; however, because this question entails comparing the number of deaths to other countries, fifty deaths are considered a significant amount.

Examples of No: Costa-Rica - 094-2006-0205-P1; there was no evidence of significant violence involving civilian death. Syria - 652-1953-0710-P1; One bomb went off on election day and there were no deaths. This was counted as being relatively peaceful in Syria.

NELDA34

Were results that were favorable to the incumbent canceled?

In presidential elections where the incumbent or a figure favored by the incumbent ran, "favorable results" were decided on the basis of how that candidate did. In legislative elections where the leader's office is not contested, "favorable results" were decided on the basis of whether the incumbent (per Archigos) found the results favorable. Once this is established, results that did not favor the incumbent led to a "No" coding, whether canceled or not. Results that did favor the incumbent led to a "Yes" if canceled and "No" if left intact. For partial overturns of votes, "Yes" was coded only where results favorable to the incumbent were canceled and the overturn was deemed significant or substantial, in other words, if it tipped the power balance away from the government in power before the election. If the canceled results were minimal and seen as something of low local concern, then "No" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1982-0307-P1; The results were canceled by coup leaders who subsequently took over the government. Philippines - 840-1986-0207-P1; The Marcos government won the election through electoral fraud. International and domestic pressure forced Marcos to flee the country.

Examples of No: Albania - 339-2001-0624-L4; The results favored the incumbent, and were not canceled.

NELDA35

If yes (NELDA34): was this in part a result of wide-spread protests?

The case for the "Yes" answer is clear. If NELDA34 was coded "No," NELDA35 was coded "N/A." (If 34 was "unclear" , then 35 is "unclear" .)

Examples of Yes: Philippines - 840-1986-0207-P1; The Marcos government won the election through electoral fraud. The United States and the local Catholic Church both rejected the official results of the election, spurring wide-spread local protests. India - 750-1989-1122-L1; The original results in Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's district were overturned and voting had to be rerun due to fraud and intimidation. Gandhi subsequently won the election, but by a smaller margin.

Examples of No: Benin - 434-1968-0505-L1; All candidates were chosen by the incumbent military government. However, 74% of the population boycotted the election, thus causing the election results to be annulled. Though this was a boycott, it was not due to wide-spread protests after the election and was coded as "No."

NELDA36

If yes (NELDA34): was this in part a result of outside pressure?

The case for the "Yes" answer is clear. If question 34 was coded "No," NELDA36 was coded "N/A." (If NELDA34 was "unclear" , then NELDA36 is "unclear" .)

Examples of Yes: Philippines - 840-1986-0207-P1; The Marcos government won the election through electoral fraud. Under heavy pressure from the United States, Marcos went into voluntary exile in Hawaii.

Examples of No: Gabon- 481-1990-0916-L1 - Results of the election had been annulled by the supreme court in 32 out of 110 constituencies due to serious, government-recognized irregularities and the elections in theses constituencies were scheduled to be re-run, however this was not due to outside pressure.

NELDA37

If yes (NELDA34), was a new election held?

The case for the "Yes" answer is clear. If NELDA34 was coded "No," NELDA37 was coded "N/A." ? (If 34 was "unclear" , then 37 is "unclear" .)

Examples of Yes: India- 750-1998-0216-L1; The Indian Election Commission ordered a rerun of polling in 599 stations, which contained hundreds of thousands of citizens, due to the deaths of over two dozen people at some of these polling stations. However, since this was only a partial rerun, the answer coded was "No."

Examples of No: Pakistan - 770-1977-0307-L1 - Results were annulled due to widespread election manipulation, however new elections were not held as a military coup took place after the election.

NELDA38

If yes (NELDA37), did victory go to a different party or candidate than at the "initial" stage?

If NELDA37 was coded "Yes", and a different candidate or party won than in the previous stage, then "Yes" was coded. If the same candidate or party won, then "No" was coded. If NELDA37 was coded "No" or "N/A," NELDA38 was coded "N/A."

Examples of Yes: Bangladesh - 771-1996-0215-L1 - Due to irregularities in the voting process and protests by the main opposition parties, who boycotted these elections, the results were canceled, an interim government installed, and new elections held. The new election was held on June 12, 1996, and was won by the Awami League, one of the opposition parties that had boycotted these elections.

Examples of No: Burkina Faso - 439-1997-0511-L1 - The Supreme Court overturned the ruling CDP party's victories in 4 constituencies, but in the re-run, the CDP again won the seats.

NELDA39

Was the incumbent replaced?

If the incumbent leader of the country changed after the election, "Yes" was coded. A "Yes" was coded even if the election did not involve the leadership position but led to events that dislodged

the leader from power. Otherwise, if the election did not involve the leadership position, "N/A" was coded. Data for incumbents again come from the Archigos data set. If the incumbent changes "soon" after the elections but the change is not a consequence of the election or of election-related protests or other similar events, the coding is "No."

Examples of Yes: Mexico- 70-1988-0706-P1; The incumbent, de la Madrid, was replaced by Salinas. Indonesia - 850-2004-0705-P2; The incumbent lost the election and was replaced. Turkey - 640-1995-1224-L1; In Turkey's 1995 legislative election the majority party was replaced , and the prime minister was changed a few months later. The answer here was "Yes."

Examples of No: Albania - 339-1996-0526-L3; The incumbent leader, Sali Berisha, was not replaced in the election.

Special Cases: Iran - 630-1989-0728-P1; After the death of Ayatollah Khomeini, Khamenei resigned the presidency to become the Supreme Leader. Though this election is a presidential election, it was not the cause of the change of the leader in the country (the Supreme Leader is not elected). Lebanon–1960-2006; The Archigos dataset codes the office of the president as the incumbent leader, which is not directly elected. However, in this case, because the president is selected by the parliament after elections, we consider the office of the incumbent to be contested in all Lebanese parliamentary elections.

NELDA40

If yes (NELDA39), did the leader step down because the vote count gave victory to some other political actor?

If NELDA39 was "Yes" and if the leader was replaced due to victory by another political actor, NELDA40 was coded as "Yes." If the incumbent was replaced, but not by the vote count, then NELDA40 was coded "no." If NELDA39 was coded "No" or "N/A," the coding here is "N/A."

Examples of Yes: Mexico - 70-1988-0706-P1; The incumbent, de la Madrid, was replaced by Salinas, who won the election. Indonesia - 850-2004-0705-P2; The incumbent lost the election and was replaced. Peru - 135-2006-0409-P2; The incumbent president, Alejandro Toledo, did not contest this race. Alan Garcia of the opposition APRA party won the presidential election and Toledo stepped down.

Examples of No: Guatemala - 090-1982-0307-P1; The vote count did give victory to another political actor, but the leader actually stepped down as the result of coup before the elected leader could take office.

NELDA41

If yes (NELDA39), was the leader replaced as a result of widespread protests?

If NELDA39 was "Yes" and if the leader was replaced due to or partly due to protests, NELDA41 was coded "yes." If the incumbent was replaced but not by protests, NELDA41 was coded "No." If NELDA39 was coded "No" or "N/A," the coding here is "N/A."

Examples of Yes: Kyrgyzstan - 703-2005-0227-L2; The incumbent was replaced due to protests over a fraudulent legislative election.

Examples of No: Algeria: 615-1999-0415-P1; The new leader, Bouteflika, took his position without incident.

NELDA42

If yes (NELDA39), was there a coup that prevented the elected leader from taking office?

If there was a coup that overthrew the elected leader, NELDA42 was coded "Yes." If not, it was coded "No." If NELDA39 was coded "No" or "N/A," the coding here is "N/A." A coup takes place if sources have called the change a coup or if the change in leadership is a sudden, forcible, and illegal removal of a government, usually by the military or some part thereof.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1982-0307-P1; A military coup two weeks after the election prevented the winner of the presidential election from taking office.

Examples of No: Kyrgyzstan - 703-2005-0227-L2; The incumbent was replaced due to protests over a fraudulent legislative election, rather than a coup.

NELDA43

What was the name of the leader who was in office before the election?

A free-text answer field for the name of the leader prior to the election is coded here per Archigos. This question was answered regardless of whether the office of the incumbent was contested in the election or the incumbent was replaced, with a few small exceptions noted below.

Examples: Bahrain - 692-2006-1125-L2; The leader in office before the election was Hamad Isa ibn al-Khalifah

Special Cases: There are a small number of cases in which we do not follow Archigos, including Lebanon and Iran. In Lebanon between 1960 and 2006, the Archigos dataset codes the office of the president as the incumbent leader, who is not directly elected. However, in this case, because the prime minister is selected by the parliament after elections, we consider the office of the incumbent to be contested in all Lebanese parliamentary elections. Archigos codes the Ayatollah as the executive even after presidential elections begin in 1980. Although we do not disagree with this coding for the purposes of Archigos, we also code presidential elections for Iran, and consider the incumbent president to be the incumbent leader for NELDA-related questions.

NELDA44

What was the name leader who was in office after the election?

A free-text answer field for the name of the leader after the election is coded here per Archigos. This question was answered regardless of whether the office of the incumbent was contested in the election. The two names will be the same in NELDA43 and NELDA44 if there is no change. "After the election" is intended to capture any changes in leadership caused by the election. If this was a multi-round election, this question should reflect who is in power after each round, so, for example, there may be no change in leader until the last round.

Examples: Argentina, 160-1973-0311-L1; The leader after the election was Hector Campora.

Special Cases: See NELDA43.

NELDA45

Were international monitors present?

If evidence of one or more official delegations of foreign election monitors was found, "Yes" was coded. International observers are typically invited by the host government and are organized or sponsored by international organizations or international non-governmental organizations. Journalists, foreigners, or embassy staff giving personal accounts of the election are not to be considered international monitors in this context. Because international election monitoring is a relatively recent phenomenon, source material before the 1990s may not mention whether international observers were present or not. Thus, before the 1990s, if no reference was made to international monitors, the questions should most likely be coded as "no." If the source material is too sparse to make a judgment either way in the post-1990 period, unclear should be coded.

Examples of Yes: Turkey - 640-2002-1103-L1; Turkey invited election observer missions from the OSCE and the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly.

Examples of No: Benin - 434-1964-0119-L1; No international monitors were present at the election.

Special Cases: Myanmar (Burma) - 775-1990-0527-A1; The government banned all foreigners from entering the country before the election and denied formal requests for international monitoring. However, three days before the election (May 24, 1990), the government granted 60 visas to journalists for the election; the government also loosened the restrictions on Western diplomats to oversee parts of the elections and serve as international election observers. Because these Western diplomats witnessed some polling, as well as the vote counting, and issued formal statements about their observations, the answer coded was "yes."

NELDA46

If yes (NELDA45), were Western monitors present?

If international monitors in NELDA45 were primarily from Western countries (as defined by OECD membership) or Western international organizations, "Yes" was coded. If monitors were present, but not from Western countries, "No" was coded. If monitors were not present, NELDA45 is coded "No," and "N/A" was coded here.

Examples of Yes: Georgia - 372-1992-1011-L1; Monitors came from Britain, US, Canada, and European Parliament.

Examples of No: Sudan - 625-2000-1213-P1; The Arab League and the OAU sent monitors, but the West refused to due to expected irregularities in the vote.

NELDA47

If yes (NELDA46), were there allegations by Western monitors of significant vote-fraud?

If there were no Western monitors, or no international monitors, "N/A" was coded. If there were Western monitors present and there were allegations of significant vote-fraud by any Western monitors, then "Yes" was coded. If there were no allegations of fraud, "No" was coded. The word "fraud" is not required. Other forms of electoral malpractice like vote-buying are considered forms of fraud for the purposes of this question, as are any allegations of significant manipulation that undermine the credibility of the electoral process. International monitors sometimes use diplomatic language

to describe their concerns, so sharp outright criticism may not be necessary for a "Yes" to be coded here. Language expressing serious concerns about the credibility of the process or describing a process that failed to meet international standards should lead to a "Yes" being coded.

Examples of Yes: Sri Lanka - 780-1999-1221-P1; Several human rights groups and election monitoring groups noted vote-rigging and violence.

Examples of No: Indonesia - 850-2004-0705-P2; Monitors did not declare any vote fraud, and praised the quality of the election.

NELDA48

Were some monitors denied the opportunity to be present by the government holding elections?

If monitors were not allowed to be present by the government, "Yes" was coded. If no obstacle to monitors was present, "No" was coded, even if monitors did not attend the elections.

Examples of Yes: Moldova - 359-2005-0306-L1; The Moldovan government expelled Russian monitors, claiming they were conducting espionage. This was part of a larger trend of worsening relations with Russia. OSCE monitors were not expelled.

Examples of No: Senegal - 433-1978-0226-P1; There is no evidence that any international monitors were present.

NELDA49

Did any monitors refuse to go to an election because they believed that it would not be free and fair?

If monitors specifically did not attend an election because they did not think that it could be democratic, especially if they were invited to observe by the host government, "Yes" was coded. If there is no evidence that monitors refused to monitor the election because of pre-election concerns about the quality of the election, "No" was coded. If there is no evidence that any international monitors considered going to the election, "No" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Sudan - 625-1996-0306-P1; The West refused to send monitors due to concerns over the fairness of the elections.

Examples of No: Senegal - 433-1978-0226-P1 - The government did not request monitors observe the election.

NELDA50

Is country said to be in good relations with the US before the elections?

If the country holding elections was said to have good relations with the US prior to the elections, "Yes" was coded. A country is understood to have good relations with the US if it has a working, non-antagonistic relationship or better. If the country does not meet this threshold, "No" was coded. If there is no evidence of any substantial relationship, "No" was coded, unless sources were very poor, in which case "unclear" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1982-0307-L1; Guatemala was strongly supported by the US due to its staunch anti-Communist credentials and strategic location. Pakistan - 770-2002-1010-

L1 Before the election, Pakistan allied with the US to support the war on terrorism, and the US increased aid to Pakistan.

Examples of No: Iran - 630-1997-0523-P1; Iran was openly hostile to the US and bilateral relations were widely known to be poor, so a "No" is coded.

Bulgaria - 355-1976-0530-L1; Bulgaria was loyal to the USSR, and did not have relations with the US.

NELDA51

Is there a negative change in relations with the US after the election?

If the country had relations with the US (either good or bad) before the election and there was a negative change after the election, "Yes" was coded. If no negative change was observed, "No" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Bosnia-Herzegovina - 346-2002-1005-P1; Nationalist parties that the US opposed gained power in the election.

Examples of No: Bulgaria - 355-1976-0530-L1; Bulgaria was loyal to the USSR, and did not have relations with the US. This election did not lead to a change in relations.

NELDA52

Is there a positive change in relations with the US after the election?

If the country had relations with the US (either good or bad) before the election and there was a positive change after the election, "Yes" was coded. If no positive change was observed, "No" was coded. If any observed change was not connected the election or events surrounding the election, a "No" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Pakistan - 770-1993-1006-L1; After the newly elected Prime Minister Bhutto assumed power, Pakistan asserted that negotiations with the US about Pakistan's nuclear policy became more positive. Guatemala - 90-1984-0701-A1; Due to a new focus on human rights in US foreign policy, Guatemala's transition to democratic elections was hailed by the US government and led to better relations. Bulgaria - 355-1990-0610-L1, L2; The former Soviet satellite state held free elections in which the former communists won. Because the "G-24" (including the USA) promised economic aid to Eastern European states that held elections, relations with the US warmed. Cambodia - 811-1993-0523-L1; The US lifted its embargo against Cambodia at the beginning of 1992, normalizing economic relations with the country.

Examples of No: Bulgaria - 355-1976-0530-L1; Bulgaria was loyal to the USSR, and did not have relations with the US. This election did not lead to a change in relations.

NELDA53

Is the country said to have a substantial economic, military or political relationship with a Western country or Western IGO?

If the country had a substantial relationship with another Western country (as defined by membership in the OECD) or IGO, such as the World Bank or the IMF, "Yes" was coded. Only organizations that can provide substantial economic or military benefits count. The UN as a whole, for example, does not count, although a specialized and powerful UN body such as the International Atomic

Energy Agency may count if that agency played a large part in mediating the country's relations with the outside world.

Examples of Yes: Honduras - 91-1981-1129-P1; Honduras had close economic and political ties to the US and received significant military funding as well.

Indonesia - 850-2004-0705-P2; The United States had a strong security and strategic relationship with Indonesia. Turkey - 640-1991-1020-L1; Turkey had substantial relationships with the EU since it was under consideration for membership and had strong economic ties. It also had strong military relations with the US.

South Africa - 560-1966-0330-L1; South Africa had a substantial relationship with the United Kingdom, the country's former colonizer, who secretly dealt arms to South Africa despite UN voluntary arms embargo.

Examples of No: Syria - 652-1973-0525-L1; Syria was aligned with the USSR and did not have any significant relations with Western countries or IGOs.

NELDA54

If yes (NELDA53), which one?

If NELDA53 was "yes," NELDA54 is a free-text answer field for the name of the Western countries (as defined by membership in the OECD) or Western IGOs that the country had a relationship with. If NELDA53 was not "yes," the coding here was "N/A."

Example: Bahrain - 692-1972-1201-A1 –Bahrain was a former protectorate of the UK, which had a large presence in the area, and was one of Bahrain's main trading partners.

NELDA55

Is there a negative change in the country's economic, military or political relationship with a Western country or IGO after the election?

If a negative change was observed and it was causally connected to the election, a "Yes" was coded. Note that this question is coded without attention to the existence of a significant relationship per NELDA53: what matters is whether or not there is a negative change in an existing relationship with Western actors or IGOs, not whether the relationship is significant. For example, although Cuba and the US do not have a significant economic, military or political relationship, the relationship can, in theory, deteriorate even further as the result of an election.

Examples of Yes: Bosnia-Herzegovina - 346-2002-1005-L1; The US expressed its displeasure with gains by ultra-nationalist parties in the election.

Examples of No: Cameroon - 471-1965-0320-P1; Cameroon had close ties with France, and the election did not affect the relations.

NELDA56

Is there a positive change in the country's economic, military or political relationship with a Western country or IGO after the election?

Analogous to NELDA55, if a positive change was observed and it was causally connected to the election in some way, a "Yes" was coded. Again, this question is coded even if the relationship is not significant, per NELDA53.

Examples of Yes: Guatemala - 90-1984-0701-A1; Due to a new focus on human rights in US foreign policy, the transition to democratic elections was hailed by the American government and led to better relations. Cambodia - 811-1993-0523-L1; After Cambodia called its first multiparty elections following a suspension of regular elections, the US normalized economic and political relations with the country. Mongolia - 712-1990-0729-L1; After successful elections, the International Community applauded electoral reforms, and the IMF considered Mongolia's application for membership. Congo (Brazzaville) - 484-1961-0326-P1; In these elections, the first presidential elections after independence, France was pleased with the election of the incumbent leader, and contributed substantial and support towards building a new dam.

Examples of No: Bosnia-Herzegovina - 346-2002-1005-L1; There was a negative change in relations with the US and OSCE due to the parties that gained power.

NELDA57

Is aid cut-off, or threatened to be cut-off, by an outside actor at any point before or after the election?

If aid was cut off or there was a threat to cut off aid by an outside entity (Western or non-Western) before or after the election, "Yes" was coded. If no threat or cut off was found, "No" was coded. If a threat was unrelated to the election, a "No" was coded.

Examples of Yes: Bosnia-Herzegovina - 346-2000-1111-L1; Western officials implied that aid could be cut off if nationalist parties took power. Haiti - 041-1995-0625-L1; A US foreign aid bill passed by the House of Representatives on July 11, 1995, included the stipulation that Haiti would only receive aid if its electoral process met certain standards. Liberia - 450-1985-1015-L1; The US government, which is by far Liberia's largest foreign aid donor, paid careful attention to the election. Congress demanded that US assistance, $86 million this year, be withheld if the election was not found free and fair.

*Examples of No:*Albania - 339-1978-1112-L1; Though China had cut off aid to Albania in July of the same year, this was a reaction to Hoxha's improving relations with the West, and not connected to the election.

NELDA58

Did an outside actor attempt to influence the outcome of the election by making threats to withhold, or by withholding, something of value to the country?

If an external actor (Western or non-Western) attempted to influence the quality of the election, the way it was held, or its outcome by making threats to withhold something of value to the country, "Yes" was coded. In some cases, implicit threats also count, such as the Soviet Union's position toward many Eastern European states in 1945-1960. Potentially valued items include foreign aid, membership in or benefits associated with international organizations, trading relationships, investment, diplomatic relations, or other forms of external support. Attempting to influence the election may include efforts to improve the quality of the election by threatening to, for example, withdraw aid if election fraud takes place, but may also include threats conditioned on the loss or victory of a particular party or candidate.

Examples of Yes: Fiji - 950-1992-0523-L1; In the 1992 Fiji election, Australia withheld aid until democratic elections were held. Myanmar (Burma) - 775-1990-0527-A1; In 1988, when the

government used violence against pro-democracy demonstrators, all aid to the country was cut off by foreign states. The 1990 elections were held in part because of international pressure from foreign countries, and economic aid was withheld until Myanmar held elections. Nigeria - 475-1998-0425-L1; The Commonwealth warned Nigeria that unless it continued its transition to democracy, further international sanctions and expulsion from the Commonwealth were possible. Nigeria's suspension from the Commonwealth continued, however. Taiwan - 713-1995-1202-L1; China denounced the poll as a fraud, and mounted a pre-election campaign, including provocative military exercises for a possible invasion in an attempt to influence the outcome. Finland - 375-1962-0204-L1; the USSR engaged in a campaign intended to influence the outcome of the election.

Examples of No: Burundi - 516-1965-0510-L1; No evidence of outside actors attempting to influence the election. In addition, the election was not considered important as power was centered in the monarchy.

Countries Covered

The list of countries covered follows Gleditsch and Ward's List of Independent States. All states in existence for any period between 1945 and 2015 are listed below. If they have not been included in the NELDA database, the reason for exclusion is listed in the parenthetical following the country name. Microstates are defined as those countries with a population $<$ 500,000 citizens at the time of the election. Coverage dates follow each included country, and if the beginning year is not 1960, it is equal to the country's year of independence.

1. Abkhazia, 2008-2020
2. Afghanistan, 1945-2020
3. Albania, 1945-2020
4. Algeria, 1962-2020
5. Andorra, 1945-2020
6. Angola, 1975-2020
7. Antigua & Barbuda, 1981-2020
8. Argentina, 1945-2020
9. Armenia, 1991-2020
10. Australia, 1945-2020
11. Austria, 1945-2020
12. Azerbaijan, 1991-2020
13. Bahamas, 1973-2020
14. Bahrain, 1971-2020
15. Bangladesh, 1971-2020
16. Barbados, 1966-2020
17. Belarus, 1991-2020
18. Belgium, 1945-2020
19. Belize, 1981-2020
20. Benin, 1960-2020
21. Bhutan, 1949-2020
22. Bolivia, 1945-2020
23. Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1992-2020
24. Botswana, 1966-2020
25. Brazil, 1945-2020
26. Brunei (no elections)
27. Bulgaria, 1945-2020
28. Burkina Faso, 1960-2020
29. Burundi, 1962-2020
30. Cambodia, 1953-2020

31. Cameroon, 1960-2020
32. Canada, 1945-2020
33. Cape Verde, 1975-2020
34. Central African Republic, 1960-2020
35. Chad, 1960-2020
36. Chile, 1945-2020
37. China (indirect national elections)
38. Colombia, 1945-2020
39. Comoros, 1975-2020
40. Congo, 1960-2020
41. Congo, Democratic Rep. of (Zaire), 1960-2020
42. Costa Rica, 1945-2020
43. Cote d'Ivoire, 1960-2020
44. Croatia, 1991-2020
45. Cuba,1945-2020
46. Cyprus, 1960-2020
47. Czech Republic, 1993-2020
48. Czechoslovakia, 1945-1995
49. Denmark, 1945-2020
50. Djibouti, 1977-2020
51. Dominica, 1978-2020
52. Dominican Republic, 1945-2020
53. East Timor, 2002-2020
54. Ecuador, 1945-2020
55. Egypt, 1945-2020
56. El Salvador, 1945-2020
57. Equatorial Guinea, 1968-2020
58. Eritrea (no elections)
59. Estonia, 1991-2020
60. Ethiopia, 1945-2020
61. Federated States of Micronesia, 1986-2020
62. Fiji, 1970-2020
63. Finland, 1945-2020
64. France, 1945-2020
65. Gabon, 1960-2020
66. Gambia, 1965-2020
67. Georgia, 1991-2020
68. German Democratic Republic, 1949-1990
69. Germany (German Federal Republic), 1949-2020
70. Ghana, 1957-2020
71. Greece, 1945-2020
72. Grenada, 1974-2020
73. Guatemala, 1945-2020
74. Guinea, 1958-2020
75. Guinea-Bissau, 1974-2020
76. Guyana, 1966-2020
77. Haiti, 1945-2020
78. Honduras, 1945-2020
79. Hungary, 1945-2020
80. Iceland, 1945-2020
81. India, 1947-2020
82. Indonesia, 1945-2020
83. Iran, 1945-2020
84. Iraq, 1945-2020
85. Ireland, 1945-2020
86. Israel, 1948-2020
87. Italy, 1945-2020

88. Jamaica, 1962-2020
89. Japan, 1945-2020
90. Jordan, 1946-2020
91. Kazakhstan, 1991-2020
92. Kenya, 1963-2020
93. Kiribati, 1979-2020
94. Korea, People's Republic of, 1948-2020
95. Korea, Republic of, 1948-2020
96. Kosovo, 2008-2020
97. Kuwait, 1961-2020
98. Kyrgyz Republic, 1991-2020
99. Laos, 1954-2020
100. Latvia, 1991-2020
101. Lebanon, 1945-2020
102. Lesotho, 1966-2020
103. Liberia, 1945-2020
104. Libya, 1951-2020
105. Liechtenstein, 1945-2020
106. Lithuania, 1991-2020
107. Luxembourg, 1945-2020
108. Macedonia (FYROM), 1991-2020
109. Madagascar, 1960-2020
110. Malawi, 1964-2020
111. Malaysia, 1957-2020
112. Maldives, 1965-2020
113. Mali, 1960-2020
114. Malta, 1964-2020
115. Marshall Islands, 1986-2020
116. Mauritania, 1960-2020
117. Mauritius, 1968-2020
118. Mexico, 1945-2020
119. Moldova, 1991-2020
120. Monaco, 1945-2020
121. Mongolia, 1945-2020
122. Montenegro 2006-2020
123. Morocco, 1956-2020
124. Mozambique, 1975-2020
125. Myanmar (Burma), 1948-2020
126. Namibia, 1990-2020
127. Nauru, 1968-2020
128. Nepal, 1945-2020
129. Netherlands, 1945-2020
130. New Zealand, 1945-2020
131. Nicaragua, 1945-2020
132. Niger, 1960-2020
133. Nigeria, 1960-2020
134. Norway, 1945-2020
135. Oman, 1945-2020
136. Pakistan, 1947-2020
137. Palau, 1994-2020
138. Panama, 1945-2020
139. Papua New Guinea, 1975-2020
140. Paraguay, 1945-2020
141. Peru, 1945-2020
142. Philippines, 1946-2020
143. Poland, 1945-2020
144. Portugal, 1945-2020
145. Qatar (no elections)

146. Romania, 1945-2020
147. Russia (Soviet Union), 1945-2020
148. Rwanda, 1962-2020
149. Saint Kitts and Nevis, 1983-2020
150. Saint Lucia, 1979-2020
151. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, 1979-2020
152. Samoa/Western Samoa, 1962-2020
153. San Marino, 1945-2020
154. Sao Tome and Principe, 1975-2020
155. Saudi Arabia (no elections)
156. Senegal, 1960-2020
157. Seychelles, 1976-2020
158. Sierra Leone, 1961-2020
159. Singapore, 1965-2020
160. Slovakia, 1993-2020
161. Slovenia, 1991-2020
162. Solomon Islands 1978-2020
163. Somalia, 1960-1990
164. South Africa, 1945-2020
165. South Ossetia, 2008-2020
166. South Sudan, 2011-2020
167. Spain, 1945-2020
168. Sri Lanka, 1948-2020
169. Sudan, 1956-2020
170. Surinam, 1975-2020
171. Swaziland, 1968-2020
172. Sweden, 1945-2020
173. Switzerland, 1945-2020
174. Syria, 1946-2020
175. Taiwan, 1949-2020
176. Tajikistan, 1991-2020
177. Tanzania, 1961-2020
178. Thailand, 1945-2020
179. Togo, 1960-2020
180. Tonga, 1970-2020
181. Trinidad and Tobago, 1962-2020
182. Tunisia, 1956-2020
183. Turkey, 1945-2020
184. Turkmenistan, 1991-2020
185. Tuvalu, 1978-2020
186. Uganda, 1962-2020
187. Ukraine, 1991-2020
188. United Arab Emirates (no elections)
189. United Kingdom, 1945-2020
190. United States of America, 1945-2020
191. Uruguay, 1945-2020
192. Uzbekistan, 1991-2020
193. Vanuatu, 1980-2020
194. Venezuela, 1945-2020
195. Vietnam, Democratic Republic of, 1954-2020
196. Vietnam, Republic of, 1954-1975
197. Yemen, 1990-2020
198. Yemen (Arab Republic of Yemen), 1945-1990
199. Yemen, People's Republic of, 1967-1990
200. Yugoslavia (Serbia), 1945-2020
201. Zambia, 1964-2020
202. Zanzibar, 1963-1964 (no elections during independence)
203. Zimbabwe, 1965-2020

Summary of Inter-Coder Reliablity (1945-2020)

Approximately twenty percent of country-years were coded by two separate coders. Coders were not told which case was the "real" case and which was the duplicate. Rates of agreement were then computed for all possible response categories and all conditional on whether both coders answered yes or no, and can be thought of as the rate of agreement when the relevant information is available and straightforward. Total number of duplicate elections coded for the purposes of ICR tests=1,195)

NELDA1 Were regular elections suspended before this election?

Overall rate of agreement: 92% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 93% (N=1,191).

NELDA2 Were these the first multi-party elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 93% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 94% (N=1,185).

NELDA3 Was opposition allowed?

Overall rate of agreement: 95% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 95% (N=1,118).

NELDA4 Was more than one party legal?

Overall rate of agreement: 93% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 95% (N=1,178).

NELDA5 Was there a choice of candidates on the ballot?

Overall rate of agreement: 97% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 98% (N=1,193).

NELDA6 If regular, were these elections early or late relative to the date they were supposed to be held per established procedure?

Overall rate of agreement: 81% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 88% (N=989).

NELDA7 Before elections, are there clear indications that incumbent made a prior decision to give up power?

Overall rate of agreement: 81% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 91% (N=611).

NELDA8 Did the incumbent reach their term limit?

Overall rate of agreement: 79% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 92% (N=613).

NELDA9 Had the incumbent extended their term in office or eligibility to run in elections at any point in the past?

Overall rate of agreement: 81% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 96% (N=611).

NELDA10 Was country ruled by a "transitional leadership" tasked with "holding elections" ?

Overall rate of agreement: 94% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 94% (N=1,193).

NELDA11 Before elections, were there significant concerns that the elections would not be free and fair?

Overall rate of agreement: 76% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 80% (N=1,138).

NELDA12 Was the incumbent or ruling party confident of victory before elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 62% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 72% (N=983).

NELDA13 Were opposition leaders prevented from running?

Overall rate of agreement: 85% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 90% (N=1,068).

NELDA14 Did some opposition leaders boycott the election?

Overall rate of agreement: 84% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 92% (N=1,032).

NELDA15 Is there evidence that the government harassed the opposition?

Overall rate of agreement: 78% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 85% (N=1,024).

NELDA16 In the run-up to the election, were there allegations of media bias in favor of the incumbent?

Overall rate of agreement: 71% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 79% (N=1,064).

NELDA17 Was the economic situation (growth and stability) in the country said to be good?

Overall rate of agreement: 66% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 70% (N=1,107).

NELDA18 Was the country said to be in an economic crisis?

Overall rate of agreement: 76% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 80% (N=1,133).

NELDA19 Was the country said to be a large recipient of outside economic aid?

Overall rate of agreement: 78% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 81% (N=1,159).

NELDA20 Was the office of the incumbent leader contested in this election?

Overall rate of agreement: 87% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 87% (N=1,194).

NELDA21 Did the incumbent run?

Overall rate of agreement: 84% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 93% (N=575).

NELDA22 If no: was there a chosen successor?

Overall rate of agreement: 90% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 69% (N=136).

NELDA23 If yes: did a successor assume power as a result of the election?

Overall rate of agreement: 90% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 94% (N=53).

NELDA24 Did the incumbent's party lose?

Overall rate of agreement: 73% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 89% (N=872).

NELDA25 Were there reliable polls that indicated popularity of ruling party candidates for office before elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 69% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 75% (N=1,096).

NELDA26 If yes: were they favorable for the incumbent?

Overall rate of agreement: 67% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 76% (N=268).

NELDA27 Was the vote count a gain for the opposition?

Overall rate of agreement: 72% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 81% (N=957).

NELDA28 Is there evidence that reports of the government's handling of the election reached large numbers of people?

Overall rate of agreement: 57% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 76% (N=558).

NELDA29 Were there riots and protests after the election?

Overall rate of agreement: 85% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 89% (N=1,150).

NELDA30 If yes: did they involve allegations of vote fraud?

Overall rate of agreement: 86% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 91% (N=98).

NELDA31 If yes: did the governments use violence against demonstrators?

Overall rate of agreement: 83% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 75% (N=84).

NELDA32 Were results that did not favor the incumbent canceled?

Overall rate of agreement: 97% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 98% (N=1,183).

NELDA33 Was there significant violence involving civilian deaths immediately before, during, or after the election?

Overall rate of agreement: 84% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 87% (N=1,148).

NELDA34 Were results that were favorable to the incumbent canceled?

Overall rate of agreement: 98% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 98% (N=1,191).

NELDA35 If yes: was this in part a result of wide-spread protests?

Overall rate of agreement: 98% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 100% (N=4).

NELDA36 If yes: was this in part a result of outside pressure?

Overall rate of agreement: 98% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 0.5% (N=4).

NELDA37 If yes: was a new election held?

Overall rate of agreement: 98% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 100% (N=4).

NELDA38 If yes: did victory go to a different party or candidate than at the "initial" stage?

Overall rate of agreement: 98% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 100% (N=2).

NELDA39 Was the incumbent replaced?

Overall rate of agreement: 74% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 93% (N=655).

NELDA40 If yes: did leader step down because the vote count gave victory to some other political actor?

Overall rate of agreement: 87% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 84% (N=261).

NELDA41 If yes: was leader replaced as a result of wide-spread protests?

Overall rate of agreement: 89% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 98% (N=259).

NELDA42 If yes: was there a coup that prevented the elected leader from taking office?

Overall rate of agreement: 89% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 98% (N=260).

NELDA45 Were international monitors present?

Overall rate of agreement: 83% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 87% (N=1,149).

NELDA46 If yes: were Western monitors present?

Overall rate of agreement: 80% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 93% (N=379).

NELDA47 If yes: were there allegations by Western monitors of significant vote-fraud?

Overall rate of agreement: 80% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 87% (N=329).

NELDA48 Were some monitors denied the opportunity to be present by the government holding elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 91% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 97% (N=1,112).

NELDA49 Did any monitors refuse to go to an election because they believed that it will not be free and fair?

Overall rate of agreement: 92% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 98% (N=1,115).

NELDA50 Was the country said to be in good relations with the US before elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 80% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 84% (N=1,053).

NELDA51 If yes: Was there a negative change in relations with the US after the elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 87% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 95% (N=1,086).

NELDA52 If yes: Was there a positive change in relations with the US after the elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 81% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 88% (N=1086).

NELDA53 Was country said to have a substantial economic, military or political relationship with a Western country or IGO?

Overall rate of agreement: 81% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 84% (N=1,157).

NELDA55 Was there a negative change in relations after the elections?

Overall rate of agreement: 76% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 93% (N=950).

NELDA56 Was there a positive change in relations after the election?

Overall rate of agreement: 71% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 87% (N=952).

NELDA57 Was aid cut-off, or threatened to be cut-off by an outside actor at any point before or after the election?

Overall rate of agreement: 89% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 92% (N=1,152).

NELDA58 Did an outside actor attempt to influence the outcome of the election by making threats to withhold or by withholding something of value to the country?

Overall rate of agreement: 87% (N=1,195).
Rate of agreement given that both coders answered yes or no: 91% (N=1,134).