Dialogue and Negotiation Processes in Civil Resistance Transitions Codebook

January 2021

Designed and written by:

Jonathan Pinckney

With input and assistance from:

Basil Awartani

Juan Diaz-Prinz

Veronique Dudouet

Miranda Rivers

Maria Stephan

Tabatha Thompson

Rosarie Tucci

Data collection for this project was funded through the Program on Nonviolent Action at the United States Institute of Peace.

Introduction

This codebook describes the data collection process and coding rules for collecting date on dialogue, negotiation, and mediation processes during civil resistance transitions (transitions after nonviolent resistance movements) as part of a project on which characteristics of transitional dialogue processes after civil resistance facilitate successful transitions to democracy.

Our population of cases comes from the *Civil Resistance Transitions* dataset (Pinckney 2020), which contains information on 78 political transitions following nonviolent resistance movements worldwide from 1945 through 2011. We have expanded this set of transitions forward until 2018, including six additional civil resistance transitions for a total population of 84 transitions.

For each transition, a researcher investigated the main scholarly sources on that transition's dynamics and sought to identify every unique instance of a dialogue, negotiation, or mediation process (DNP) that (1) was publicly observable at the time and (2) concerned the key issues, dynamics, and outcomes of the transition. We had both theoretical and practical reasons for limiting our data collection in these two ways. Practically speaking, it is highly difficult to collect data on private negotiations systematically across a wide number of cases. Attempting to do so would have introduced non-systematic forms of bias into our data, for instance by including more dialogues in cases that have been extensively studied. We do not claim to have fully eliminated such bias, but by limiting ourselves to publicly-announced dialogues that are more likely to be captured systematically in media sources we seek to reduce it. We limited our data collection to DNPs that had to do with the transition to capture the dialogue or negotiation processes that were most likely to directly shape political institutions in the transition and would thus be most likely to impact post-transition levels of democracy.

Our data includes both formal negotiation processes such as national dialogues as well as more informal consultations and negotiations. Our unit of observation was the dialogue or negotiation *process* (DNP), a linked series of meetings between parties with similar participants, issues, and negotiation structures. While some dialogue or negotiation processes may consist of a single meeting, they may also consist of more long-term processes continuing for weeks, months, or (rarely) years.

For each transition, we collected data on several characteristics of the dialogue/negotiation process that took place during the transition from the old regime to the new regime. Our variables are in the following section. For each variable we present a question that researchers collecting the data asked as well as the categories of answers to the question that they could select from. For all variables we also record the specific sources from which we draw the variable, and the researcher had the opportunity to provide notes on their specific coding decision.

Multiple DNPs can (and do) take place during a single transition. When more than one DNP took place in a transition, we distinguished one DNP from another primarily based on the subjective contemporary descriptions of participants (if available). For instance, in Tunisia several dialogue and negotiation meetings took place in the years following the 2011 "Jasmine Revolution." Many of the same political parties and civil society groups participated in these meetings, and they often considered overlapping issues. However, the dialogue organizers and particular political import of the dialogue processes varied significantly, and was viewed as distinct by participants at the time. For instance, in 2013 one set of meetings were organized by the country's largest trade union – the UGTT – while another set

of meetings were organized by President Moncef Marzouki. Participants clearly viewed these sets of meetings as separate and distinct processes, and thus we treat them as separate observations (M'rad 2015). If there was little or no information about the subjective perceptions of the DNP at the time, then we distinguished DNPs based on common participants, issues, and time between meetings. Full descriptions of all coding decisions and sources are included in the complete dataset.

Coding Process (Instructions to Coders)

Check the spreadsheet with the list of civil resistance transitions for the start-year of the transition that you are coding. For many of these transitions, you will also find the name of the civil resistance campaign that initiated the transition, which may help while you are searching for sources.

Once you have selected the transition you will be working on, first do a search on Google Scholar and on your university library website for relevant books and articles that you can use to get a general overview of the events of the civil resistance campaign and the subsequent transition. Checking Wikipedia is actually often a good step as well, to get an overview and find additional sources. Also check the reports on the *Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative* website (www.inclusivepeace.org).

For each transition you will first need to identify and distinguish the dialogue/negotiation processes (DNPs) that took place during the transition. For our purposes, a DNP is a *linked series of meetings, discussions, or negotiations between the parties to or those affected by a socio-political conflict*. This is an intentionally broad definition, capturing everything from highly formalized nationwide national dialogues to informal exchanges between group leaders. We are interested in collecting data on all DNPs that related in some way to the transition initiated by the civil resistance campaign. You will have to use your judgment to determine whether some meetings are linked to others: common things to look for would be the same participants across meetings, the same issues discussed at meetings, or an expressed intention to meet again after one meeting that is then followed by another meeting.

As you read the books and articles on the transition, create a list of all the DNPs you are able to identify during the transitional period. Then, for each DNP, fill out the data entry form (link on the previous page).

Fill out as much of the information as you can based on scholarly books or articles you are able to find through searching on Google Scholar or your university library website. If you are unable to find information to answer some of the questions on the form using these sources, then you can search media sources on the FACTIVA database (available through most university library websites).

A good initial search string to run on FACTIVA is *countryname* AND (*dialogue* OR *negotiation* OR *transition* OR *constitution).* You can also try more specific search strings (for instance with the name of the movement or specific actors that you know participated in a particular DNP. Make sure to set the dates you are searching for to a close range around the dates when you believe the DNP took place.

If you are unable to find information to answer all the questions on the form based on either scholarly resources or FACTIVA, then you can do some broader online searches using Google or other standard search engines. Do your best to answer all the questions, but if you can't find any information

then you can also leave a question blank. For any questions left blank make sure to note that you were unable to find any details on this variable despite going through our full search procedure.

Dialogue Variables

Formal Negotiation Process

Question: Is this dialogue/negotiation process a formal negotiation process with clear, publicly-stated guidelines and rules?

Details: For this question we are interested in whether this dialogue/negotiation process followed a pre-defined formal or informal structure. When formally stated, this structure is typically captured in specific rules (such as public statements describing who may or may not participate) or general guidelines. Examples of these would be a publicly-stated list of topics that would be part of the negotiation, or a public commitment to engage in negotiation for a specified period of time. Informal rules, guidelines, or norms are more difficult to identify. These are things that may not be formally or publicly stated but for which you can find clear evidence in the historical record. For example, the same group of leaders may always participate in the negotiation, even though this is never explicitly or publicly stated as a rule for the negotiation process. If you are unable to find evidence of either formal rules or informal rules, guidelines, or norms, then select choice 3.

Choices

1. Yes, there were formal, publicly-stated guidelines and rules for this dialogue/negotiation process.
2. No, but there is evidence of informal rules, guidelines, or regular norms that structured the dialogue/negotiation process.
3. No clear guidelines, rules, or norms could be identified

Role of Opposition and Elites in Negotiations

Question: Were the negotiations dominated by old elites or by new leaders (such as representatives of the civil resistance campaign)?

Details: For the purposes of this project, “domination” refers to the degree to which the actor in question was able to control the agenda, dynamics, and outcome of the dialogue/negotiation process. Empirical indicators of domination would include, for example, numerical superiority at the negotiating table, voting arrangements that gave an advantage to one side over the other, or *de facto* ability to define the agenda of meetings.

Choices

1. The negotiations were entirely dominated by the old regime.
2. The negotiations were mostly dominated by the old regime, but there was some meaningful participation by the civil resistance campaign.
3. The negotiations had relatively equal participation from both members of the old regime and the civil resistance campaign.
4. The negotiations were mostly dominated by the civil resistance campaign, but there was some meaningful participation by members of the old regime.
5. The negotiations were entirely dominated by members of the civil resistance campaign.

Participant Selection Procedures

Question: How were participants in the dialogue/negotiation process selected?

Details: Choose all of the options that were used for this particular DNP – more than one option

1. Participants were elected.
2. Participants were appointed by previously-existing groups
3. Participants were the leaders of existing groups
4. Participants were selected by the government.
5. I could not find evidence of a specific selection process.

Decision-Making Procedures

Question: What were the decision-making procedures for this dialogue/negotiation process?

Details: Choose the option below that best characterizes how the parties in the dialogue or negotiation process committed to make decisions. If the dialogue process did not have making decisions as a core purpose (for instance a more informal dialogue process intended to increase inter-group understanding) then select option 4.

Choices

1. Decisions required consensus from all parties/opposition or minority groups had veto rights.
2. Decisions were made on the basis of majority vote.
3. Decisions were made by agreement between a small group of leaders.
4. No clear decision-making procedures

Scope and Authority

Question: What was the scope of issues and policies over which the dialogue/negotiation process had authority to decide?

Details: For this question we are interested in the dialogue/negotiation process's mandate, what was "on the table" during the process. The outcome of the negotiations may or may not have actually enacted such changes. The four categories below go from the most extensive mandate to the least extensive. "Revolutionary changes" are those that transform the basic *institutions* of a country, political, social, or economic (Institutions include the government structure, economic system, military, etc…). For instance, one example of a process with a *revolutionary* mandate would be Nepal's constituent assembly, which had the authority to change the country from a Monarchy to a Republic, from a Hindu state to a secular state, and from a unitary state to a federal state. An example of a process with a *constitutional* would be a one-party state holding a dialogue process about whether to change its constitution to legalize other political parties. A process with a *policy* mandate would, for instance, consider changing specific laws but not have any authority beyond that. If a dialogue process had no authority to make decisions, or its authority did not rise to the level of policy changes, then select the fourth option.

Choices

1. **Revolutionary change**: authority to make decisions that would fundamentally reshape the basic political, social, and economic institutions of the country.
2. **Constitutional change:** authority to make decisions that would change basic legal and political structures, but that would not fundamentally reshape basic political, social, and economic institutions.
3. **Policy Change:** authority to make decisions that would change major government policies, but would not change basic legal and political structures.
4. **No major mandate for change:** the dialogue process did not have authority to make any significant political or social changes.

Length of the Negotiation Process

Question: What were the start and end dates of the negotiation process?

Details: Note that negotiations do not have to continue every day during a dialogue/negotiation process. This is the first day that a particular process began and the day that it ended. If you are unable to identify the specific start or end day but can identify the month, select the middle date of that month. If you can only identify the year, select the middle date of the year (July 2nd). For more formal negotiation processes, the start and end dates should be straightforward to identify. If the process is more informal, then include the first date and last date on which you were able to identify a specific meeting.

Formal Agreement

Question: Did the dialogue/negotiation process result in an agreement?

Details: Agreements are a broad category, and can include many different kinds of outcomes. For the purposes of this variable this would include everything from a temporary or transitional agreement to a

comprehensive and permanent agreement. We code other variables for more specific characteristics of the agreement.

Choices

1. Yes, there was a formal agreement between the parties at the end of the negotiation process.
2. No, but there is evidence of informal understandings coming out of the negotiation process.
3. No, there was no agreement at the end of the negotiation process.

Specific Provisions of an Agreement

Question: for each of the following specific provisions, mark whether the formal agreement at the end of the negotiation process included that provision. Skip these questions if there was no formal agreement.

Details: For our purposes, we define confidence-building measures (CBMs) as "gestures of goodwill made by one party to another...for the purpose of gaining the trust of that party" (Landau and Landau 1997, p. 97).

1. Were there formal guarantees protecting the political or economic interests of old regime elites? (**Yes/No)**
2. Were there formal guarantees to promote the participation of civil resistance campaign leaders in the transitional or post-transition institutions? **(Yes/No)**
3. Were there formally-defined mechanisms for sharing power between political groups? (**Yes/No**)
4. Was there a clear implementation process for the agreement and checkpoints at which implementers could be held accountable? (**Yes/No)**
5. Were the campaign's key issues represented in the agreement (**Yes/No**)
6. Was there a mechanism for getting the general populace to approve of the agreement (i.e. a referendum) (**Yes/No)**
7. Were there formal measures to build confidence between the negotiating parties? (**Yes/No)**

Specific Groups Included in the Negotiation Process

Question: for each of the following groups, mark whether they were explicitly included in the negotiation process as a group.

1. Opposition political parties
2. Civil society groups (including social movements)

3. Religious groups
4. Organizations representing ethnic or racial minorities, or tribal or traditional groups.
5. The military or other security forces
6. Pro-government political parties
7. Armed non-governmental factions

Women's Inclusion

Question: were women included in the negotiation process?

Choices

1. Yes, there were spots in the negotiation/dialogue process specifically set aside for women.
2. Yes, but women only participated in their roles as members of other groups/organizations.
3. Yes, but the only evidence of participation I was able to find was purely informal.
4. No, I could not find any evidence of women participating in the negotiation process.

Insider Mediation

Question: Was there any mediation or facilitation of the dialogue process by domestic "third parties" (**Yes/No**)

If the answer to the first question is yes, please write a brief (one or two word) description of the mediating actors (i.e. "religious leaders," "traditional elders," etc…)

Outside Mediation/Facilitation

Question: Was there any mediation or facilitation of the dialogue process by international actors?

Choices

1. Yes, international actors had a formal role and could enforce decisions.
2. Yes, international actors had a formal role, but only as a facilitator/mediator.
3. Yes, but international actors only had an informal role.
4. No, but there is evidence of participants consulting with international actors.
4. No evidence of any involvement by international actors.

International Technical Support

Question: Did international actors provide dialogue participants representing the civil resistance campaign with any technical support to help them perform well in the process?

Details: For our purposes, “technical support” is any training, logistical support, or funds provided to actors to help them perform well in the DNP.

Choices

1. Yes, there was extensive technical support provided to more than one participant.
1. Yes, there was extensive technical support to one participant.
2. Yes, but the support was minimal
5. No evidence of international technical support.