



Electoral Integrity Project

# Electoral Integrity Global Report 2019-2021

Holly Ann Garnett, Toby S. James  
& Madison MacGregor

PEI 8.0

[www.ElectoralIntegrityProject.com](http://www.ElectoralIntegrityProject.com)

May 2022

The Electoral Integrity Project  
c/o Dr. Holly Ann Garnett  
*Department of Political Science and Economics*  
**Royal Military College of Canada**  
PO Box 17000, Station Forces  
Kingston, Ontario, K7K 7B4  
CANADA



The Electoral Integrity Project  
c/o Professor Toby S. James  
*School of Politics, Philosophy, Language and  
Communication Studies*  
**University of East Anglia**  
Norwich Research Park  
Norwich, Norfolk, NR4 7TJ  
UK



Email: [electoralintegrity@gmail.com](mailto:electoralintegrity@gmail.com)  
Web: <http://www.electoralintegrityproject.com>  
Dataverse: <http://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/PEI>  
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/ElectIntegrity>  
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/electoralintegrity>

This codebook builds on work from 2012-2018 Perceptions of Electoral Integrity Index by Pippa Norris and colleagues.

How to cite: Garnett, Holly Ann, Toby S. James and Madison MacGregor. 2022. *Year in Elections Global Report: 2019-2021*. The Electoral Integrity Project.

Cover photo by [Jana Shnipelson](#) on [Unsplash](#).



## Table of Contents

<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Report Highlights .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Plan of the report.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Figure 1: Electoral integrity worldwide, Most Recent Election.....	6
<b>I. Data Highlights .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Regional comparisons .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Table 1: The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity Index by country and region .....	7
<b>Regime Types &amp; Economic Development .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Figure 2: Electoral integrity and types of regimes .....	10
Table 2: The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity Index by REgime Type .....	10
Figure 3: Electoral Integrity and GDP .....	12
<b>Scores across the electoral cycle.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Figure 4: Performance of elections across stages in the electoral cycle.....	13
Figure 5: Average change from first election studied to last election studied in the same country .....	14
<b>10 Years of PEI Data .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Figure 6: Electoral integrity worldwide, Change from First Election Studied to Most Recent Election .....	15
<b>II: Major Issues, 2019-2022 .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>COVID-19 and Elections.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Cyber-Security and Information Integrity.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Figure 7: Rotating Battery 2018-2019 .....	18
<b>A Decline in American Electoral Integrity? .....</b>	<b>18</b>
Figure 8: PEI Index over 5 American Election Years .....	19
Figure 9: Decline in ‘Results’ Section Over 5 Election Years in the United States.....	19
<b>III. Performance Worldwide.....</b>	<b>20</b>
Table 3: Summary Scores for All Elections, 2012-2021.....	20
<b>IV: Technical Appendix: Indicators, Coverage, and Methods.....</b>	<b>35</b>
Table 4: Country coverage .....	35
Table 5: PEI Core Survey Questions .....	37
<b>V: Acknowledgments.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>VI: Bibliography of Select EIP Publications .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Books .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Journal Articles .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Special issues.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Related Datasets.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>VII: Notes .....</b>	<b>44</b>

# Electoral Integrity Around the World

## Summary

In recent years, there have been concerns around the world that democracy has been backsliding. The United States hosted a Summit for Democracy at the end of 2021 to “set forth an affirmative agenda for democratic renewal and to tackle the greatest threats faced by democracies.”<sup>1</sup> Democracy defense coalitions have arisen in countries where democracy has long thought to be consolidated. Defending democracy has been at the center of new armed conflicts in Europe.

Elections are central to democracy. They enable citizens to hold their governments to account for their actions, bring peaceful transitions in power, ensure that policies are developed in the interests of the wider public, and can deepen civic engagement. Unfortunately, elections often fall short of these ideals. They can be marred by problems such as voter intimidation, post-election violence, low turnout, barriers to voting, fake news, and the under-representation of women and minority candidates.

The Electoral Integrity Project was founded in 2012 and has previously provided worldwide coverage of the quality of elections up to the end of 2018. This new report provides the latest update by covering the period up from 2019 until the end of 2021. It therefore includes some of the most dramatic moments in the recent history of elections, such as the storming of the US Capitol building in January 2021 and the violence against protestors following the Belarus elections in August 2020.

## REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Electoral integrity remains the highest in Nordic countries: Finland, Sweden, and Denmark. **Regional disparity** remains in electoral integrity, with some of the lowest scores found in Africa and Asia.
- Although electoral integrity continued to be generally higher in countries with much higher levels of **economic development**, quality elections were still delivered in lower-income countries such as Cape Verde, which had the highest ranked elections in Africa.
- **Electoral finance** remains the weakest area of the electoral cycle. The publishing of transparent financial accounts was the lowest sub-component. This demonstrates a need across the board for policymakers, candidates, and electoral authorities to improve reporting mechanisms to allow for maximum transparency in the use of money in elections.
- The areas of the electoral cycle that are strongest are the **vote counting and electoral procedures**.
- There is **little evidence for an aggregate decline** in the quality of electoral integrity globally between 2012-2021, albeit with some large decreases in specific countries, with more incremental increases in others. Among the countries we are watching for electoral decline:
  - Electoral integrity in the United States is ranked as 15th of the 29 states in the Americas and 59<sup>th</sup> worldwide, and is the lowest ranked liberal democracy. The main areas of weakness in the US include electoral boundaries, results, campaign finance, and voter registration.
  - Electoral integrity in Russia has seen a further decline, with only Belarus ranking lower in Europe.

## A call to action for policy makers

Data published alongside this report can be used by national governments, international organizations, campaigners, citizens, and political parties to identify strengths and weaknesses in specific countries. This can be used to enable the identification and sharing of good practices. It can also be used to initiate electoral reform efforts.



## METHODOLOGY

This report describes the Perceptions of Electoral Integrity dataset (PEI\_8.0). The dataset is drawn from a rolling survey of 4591 expert assessments of electoral integrity across 480 elections in 169 countries around the world. The cumulative study covers national presidential and parliamentary elections from July 1, 2012 to December 31, 2021.<sup>2</sup> This release covers three additional years of elections from the previous release, adding 143 national elections in 115 countries, from February 3, 2019 to December 31, 2021.


Perceptions of electoral integrity are measured by experts for each country one month after polls close.<sup>3</sup> Experts are asked to assess the quality of national elections on eleven sub-dimensions: electoral laws; electoral procedures; district boundaries; voter registration; party registration; media coverage; campaign finance; voting process; vote count; results; and electoral authorities. These items sum to an overall Electoral Integrity Index scored from 0 to 100. Full details are available in the codebook associated with this dataset. All electronic data can be downloaded, at the levels of experts, elections, and countries, from <http://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/PEI>.

## PLAN OF THE REPORT


Part I provides a snapshot of the results. Figure 1 presents the updated global map of electoral integrity, using the PEI Index scores for the most recent election studied in each country. The report also lists updated country election scores by global region and regime type, as well as across the electoral cycle. Part II examines major issues relating to electoral integrity that were noted during the period from 2019-2021. Part III describes the results. The final sections outline EIP's methods, country coverage, research design, and further publications.



FIGURE 1: ELECTORAL INTEGRITY WORLDWIDE, MOST RECENT ELECTION



Powered by Bing  
© Australian Bureau of Statistics, GeoNames, Microsoft, Navinfo, OpenStreetMap, TomTom, Wikipedia



**Source:** *The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0), most recent election reported.*



# I. Data Highlights

## REGIONAL COMPARISONS

Table 1 provides an overview of the state of electoral integrity around the world by region, presenting the PEI Index score for the most recent national elections held in each country from 2012-2021.

TABLE 1: THE PERCEPTIONS OF ELECTORAL INTEGRITY INDEX BY COUNTRY AND REGION

Africa	Americas	Asia	Europe	Oceania					
Cape Verde	73	Canada	83	Taiwan	82	Finland	88	New Zealand	77
South Africa	66	Uruguay	83	Cyprus	80	Sweden	85	Australia	66
Namibia	65	Chile	79	Japan	75	Denmark	85	Solomon Islands	65
Burkina Faso	65	Costa Rica	76	Republic of Korea	74	Estonia	84	Kiribati	63
Ghana	63	Panama	71	Bhutan	71	Switzerland	84	Vanuatu	61
Liberia	62	Peru	68	Israel	71	Austria	83	Micronesia	57
Gambia	61	Argentina	67	Timor-Leste	67	Germany	81	Fiji	56
Lesotho	61	Jamaica	67	Armenia	65	Norway	79	Samoa	51
Botswana	59	Barbados	66	Mongolia	64	Lithuania	79	Papua New Guinea	34
Rwanda	58	Ecuador	65	Qatar	62	Portugal	79	Tonga	29
Sao Tome and Principe	57	Dominican Republic	65	Oman	61	Czech Republic	79		
Morocco	55	Mexico	64	Nepal	59	Netherlands	78		
Côte d'Ivoire	54	El Salvador	61	Georgia	59	Slovakia	77		
Malawi	54	Brazil	60	Singapore	59	Luxembourg	76		
Mauritius	53	Trinidad & Tobago	59	Indonesia	58	Slovenia	75		
Nigeria	52	United States	57	Myanmar	57	Latvia	75		
Niger	52	Colombia	57	Kuwait	57	Ireland	75		
Guinea-Bissau	50	Grenada	57	Sri Lanka	57	Belgium	74		
Tunisia	50	Suriname	55	Maldives	55	France	74		
Sierra Leone	50	Bahamas	54	India	55	United Kingdom	73		
Kenya	47	Belize	53	Iraq	53	Bulgaria	73		
Benin	46	Bolivia	51	Philippines	48	Spain	73		
Ethiopia	44	Antigua and Barbuda	48	Laos	48	Italy	69		
Algeria	43	Guatemala	48	Kyrgyzstan	44	Croatia	67		
Sudan	43	Paraguay	44	Viet Nam	44	Iceland	67		
Senegal	43	Guyana	43	Pakistan	44	Poland	66		
Angola	42	Venezuela	36	Uzbekistan	44	Greece	64		
Madagascar	41	Haiti	35	Jordan	44	Malta	64		
Zimbabwe	41	Honduras	29	Bahrain	42	Moldova	60		



Africa	Americas	Asia	Europe	Oceania			
Zambia	38	Nicaragua	28	Lebanon	42	Romania	55
Swaziland	38			Kazakhstan	41	Montenegro	54
Egypt	35			Bangladesh	38	Ukraine	53
Djibouti	34			Thailand	38	Hungary	52
Burundi	33			Afghanistan	36	Macedonia	46
Togo	33			Turkey	35	Albania	41
Chad	31			Malaysia	34	Turkmenistan	40
Cameroon	31			Vietnam	34	Bosnia & Herzegovina	40
Mozambique	31			Iran	33	Azerbaijan	38
Tanzania	31			Cambodia	29	Serbia	33
Guinea	31			Tajikistan	27	Russia	32
Côte d'Ivoire	30			Syria	19	Belarus	26
Mali	29						
Mauritania	29						
Uganda	27						
Republic of Congo	26						
Gabon	26						
Equatorial Guinea	22						
Central African Republic	18						
Comoros	9						
<b>Area Mean</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>56</b>		

*Source: The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0), most recent election reported.*

The comparison within each of the regions demonstrates that the **Nordic region** had elections with the highest levels of integrity (over 80), with very positive evaluations of Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Iceland. This is not surprising; these are all affluent post-industrial societies, consensus democracies, and egalitarian welfare states, which commonly rank highly in many other measures of democratic governance, integrity, and human rights.

They are closely followed in **Western Europe** by Germany and the Netherlands. Many other states in this region also have very high levels of electoral integrity, according to experts, such as France and Ireland. At the same time, it is noteworthy that Greece, the UK, and Malta were evaluated less positively, with PEI scores of 65-66, a full twenty-points less than the world-leader of Denmark. Following a series of problematic contests under President Erdogan, Turkey is ranked as low in integrity.

In the **Americas**, it may be no surprise that Canadian elections are well-rated by experts, but so are contests in middle-income Costa Rica and Uruguay. Latin America shows varied scores. Moreover, the US was given an overall rating of 61, lower than any other long-established democracy and affluent society. Further analysis reveals that the average expert ratings of American elections are significantly pulled down



by electoral laws, voter registration, and district boundaries issues.<sup>4</sup> The region also contains the highly problematic cases of Venezuela, as well as Honduras, Nicaragua, and Haiti.

Other world regions display a similar varied pattern of electoral integrity; in **Central and Eastern Europe**, countries such as Estonia, Lithuania, and Slovenia have held a series of free and fair contests since emerging from Communist rule, rated as positively as many equivalent contests in Western Europe. At the same time, several Eurasian autocracies held elections with numerous serious flaws, exemplified by Tajikistan and Turkmenistan.

**Asia-Pacific** is equally varied in the quality of its elections, ranging from high integrity in New Zealand, South Korea, Taiwan, and Australia, in contrast to fundamental weaknesses in elections in Afghanistan, Vietnam, and Cambodia.


The **Middle East and North Africa** display elections that show marked contrasts, with Israel and Tunisia rated most highly compared with façade elections held by the Syrian regime. **Sub-Saharan Africa** is also varied, from positive ratings in Cape Verde compared with the lowest rating of any elections around the world in Burundi, Equatorial Guinea, and Ethiopia.

The exact reasons why contests are flawed or fail differ from one state to another, but it commonly involves processes of corruption in kleptocratic states ruled by clientelism, contests disrupted by outbreaks of violence and civil conflict, and state repression of opposition forces and fundamental human rights, as well as lack of state capacity in poorer developing societies.<sup>5</sup> Understanding the reasons requires breaking down the summary PEI Index scores in far more detail, including by problems occurring at different stages of the election, and also by comparing changes in successive elections in each country.

## REGIME TYPES & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Previous research has demonstrated that electoral integrity is notably influenced by regime type and levels of economic development.<sup>6</sup> The most recent data support these conclusions. Figure 2 demonstrates a clear correlation between PEI Index in the most recent election and the quality of Liberal Democracy (as measured by VDem) in the corresponding year (Corr: 0.86,  $P < 0.001$ ). The general trend indicates a clear positive relationship between Liberal Democracy and elections, which are a central component thereof.

FIGURE 2: ELECTORAL INTEGRITY AND TYPES OF REGIMES



**Note:** Corr 0.86,  $p < 0.01$

**Source:** The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey 8.0, election-level, most recent election reported. The classification draws on Regimes in the World from Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) V9 ([www.VDem.net](http://www.VDem.net)) for corresponding year. V-Dem Data missing for: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Kiribati, Micronesia, Samoa, Tonga.

This relationship is further demonstrated in Table 2, which shows four major regime types. It is worth noting though that each regime type does span a range of electoral integrity scores, with even Liberal Democracies on the list facing serious challenges to electoral integrity.

TABLE 2: THE PERCEPTIONS OF ELECTORAL INTEGRITY INDEX BY REGIME TYPE

Closed Autocracy	Closed Democracy	Electoral Democracy	Liberal Democracy				
Qatar	62	Burkina Faso	65	Lithuania	79	Finland	88
Oman	61	Gambia	61	Portugal	79	Sweden	85
Kuwait	57	Singapore	59	Czech Republic	79	Denmark	85
Morocco	55	Rwanda	58	Slovakia	77	Estonia	84
Laos	48	Myanmar	57	Cape Verde	73	Switzerland	84
Viet Nam	44	Fiji	56	Bulgaria	73	Canada	83
Uzbekistan	44	India	55	Panama	71	Uruguay	83
Jordan	44	Montenegro	54	Bhutan	71	Austria	83
Bahrain	42	Iraq	53	Peru	68	Taiwan	82
Thailand	38	Ukraine	53	Argentina	67	Germany	81
Swaziland	38	Hungary	52	Croatia	67	Cyprus	80
Vietnam	34	Bolivia	51	Timor-Leste	67	Norway	79
Syria	19	Philippines	48	Jamaica	67	Chile	79
		Kenya	47	Poland	66	Netherlands	78



Closed Autocracy	Closed Democracy	Electoral Democracy	Liberal Democracy			
	Benin	46	South Africa	66	New Zealand	77
	Kyrgyzstan	44	Namibia	65	Luxembourg	76
	Ethiopia	44	Ecuador	65	Costa Rica	76
	Pakistan	44	Solomon Islands	65	Slovenia	75
	Algeria	43	Armenia	65	Japan	75
	Sudan	43	Dominican Republic	65	Latvia	75
	Lebanon	42	Mongolia	64	Ireland	75
	Angola	42	Mexico	64	Belgium	74
	Albania	41	Greece	64	Republic of Korea	74
	Kazakhstan	41	Malta	64	France	74
	Madagascar	41	Liberia	62	United Kingdom	73
	Zimbabwe	41	Vanuatu	61	Spain	73
	Turkmenistan	40	El Salvador	61	Israel	71
	Bangladesh	38	Lesotho	61	Italy	69
	Azerbaijan	38	Moldova	60	Iceland	67
	Zambia	38	Brazil	60	Barbados	66
	Afghanistan	36	Nepal	59	Australia	66
	Venezuela	36	Georgia	59	Ghana	63
	Egypt	35	Indonesia	58	Botswana	59
	Turkey	35	Colombia	57	Trinidad & Tobago	59
	Haiti	35	Sao Tome and Principe	57	United States	57
	Papua New Guinea	34	Sri Lanka	57		
	Malaysia	34	Romania	55		
	Djibouti	34	Maldives	55		
	Burundi	33	Suriname	55		
	Iran	33	Côte d'Ivoire	54		
	Serbia	33	Malawi	54		
	Togo	33	Mauritius	53		
	Russia	32	Nigeria	52		
	Chad	31	Niger	52		
	Cameroon	31	Guinea-Bissau	50		
	Mozambique	31	Tunisia	50		
	Tanzania	31	Sierra Leone	50		
	Guinea	31	Guatemala	48		
	Côte d'Ivoire	30	Macedonia	46		
	Honduras	29	Paraguay	44		
	Cambodia	29	Guyana	43		
	Mali	29	Senegal	43		
	Mauritania	29	Bosnia & Herzegovina	40		
	Nicaragua	28				
	Uganda	27				




Closed Autocracy	Closed Democracy	Electoral Democracy	Liberal Democracy
	Tajikistan	27	
	Republic of Congo	26	
	Gabon	26	
	Belarus	26	
	Equatorial Guinea	22	
	Central African Republic	18	
	Comoros	9	
<b>Regime Mean</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>61</b>
			<b>75</b>

**Source:** The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey 8.0, election-level, most recent election reported. The classification draws on Regimes in the World from Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) V9 ([www.VDem.net](http://www.VDem.net)) for corresponding year. V-Dem Data missing for: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Kiribati, Micronesia, Samoa, Tonga.

We see a similar positive relationship between economic development (here measured by GDP) and PEI scores. Again, there is a strong correlation (Corr 0.56,  $P < 0.01$ ), though the relationship is not consistent across all cases. Two countries with high GDP but lower PEI scores are Singapore and Qatar. Conversely, among the countries with the lowest GDPs, they range from the lowest PEI Index Score (Comoros, 2020), and a quite high PEI score (Niger, 2021).

**FIGURE 3: ELECTORAL INTEGRITY AND GDP**




**Note:** Corr 0.58,  $p < 0.01$

**Source:** The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0), most recent election reported.

## SCORES ACROSS THE ELECTORAL CYCLE

The PEI's 11-stage electoral cycle approach allows for comparisons between stages of the electoral cycle, from the pre-electoral period to election day. Figure 4 describes expert scores across the eleven dimensions of the electoral cycle, from the legal framework to the role of the electoral authorities.

FIGURE 4: PERFORMANCE OF ELECTIONS ACROSS STAGES IN THE ELECTORAL CYCLE




**Source:** *The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0), most recent election reported.*

As in previous releases of these data, the campaign finance section has, by far, the lowest scores of any stage of the electoral cycle. This stage includes issues such as equitable access to public subsidies and political donations, the influence of wealth and wealthy donors, the publishing of transparent financial accounts, and the proper use of state resources. Each of these areas scored relatively low, with the publishing of transparent financial accounts the lowest indicator. This demonstrates a need across the board for policymakers, candidates, and electoral authorities to improve reporting mechanisms to allow for maximum transparency in the use of money in elections. The highest ranking election within the campaign finance dimension was Canada's 2021 parliamentary elections. Canada's system of campaign finance regulation includes strict contribution limits, and transparent reporting requirements for all candidates and political parties, which are published online.

Considering changes over time, three stages of the electoral cycle have seen increases in quality (Figure 5), albeit only slightly, with the voter registration stage seeing the greatest increases at 1.6 points on average. There are decreases seen in the vote count, results, and EMB dimensions of electoral integrity, suggesting serious challenge to the post-electoral stage of the cycle in recent years.

FIGURE 5: AVERAGE CHANGE FROM FIRST ELECTION STUDIED TO LAST ELECTION STUDIED IN THE SAME COUNTRY



**Source:** *The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0). Change from first to last election studied within each country. Countries with only one election studied are dropped.*


## 10 YEARS OF PEI DATA

With 10 years of PEI datasets now available, there is data from multiple elections in most countries, making it possible to broadly discern changes over time in the quality of elections around the globe. There was an average .80 drop in the overall Perception of Electoral Integrity Index, though this is quite small considering it is measured on a 100-point scale. More interestingly, we can consider the changes within specific countries. We note the highest decreases in PEI Index score between Comoros (2015-2019) and Tonga (2014-2021) at approximately 40-point drop for both.<sup>7</sup>

While Comoros has a long history of fraught electoral politics, the drop can perhaps be explained by the passing of a 2018 referendum replacing the previous presidential system with a new system that limits some of the constitutional checks on presidential power. This includes changing the presidential mandate from one 5-year term to two, and does away with a power-balancing system in which the presidential seat rotates between each of the nation’s three islands every term.<sup>8</sup> In Tonga, a precipitous 40-point drop in score between 2017 and 2021 is perhaps due to the culmination of in-fighting within the major political parties; the inability of voters stuck abroad due to COVID-19 travel restrictions to vote; an unexpected COVID-19 lockdown a week before the election; and relatively high-profile corruption cases occurring directly before the election.<sup>9</sup>

Increases in PEI scores are also present, albeit less dramatic, with more incremental increases noted.


FIGURE 6: ELECTORAL INTEGRITY WORLDWIDE, CHANGE FROM FIRST ELECTION STUDIED TO MOST RECENT ELECTION



**Source:** *The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0). Change from first to last election studied within each country. Countries with only one election studied are dropped.*

## II: Major Issues, 2019-2022

### COVID-19 AND ELECTIONS



The COVID-19 pandemic has presented one of the greatest ever challenges to the running of elections and electoral integrity.

The Electoral Integrity Project partnered with International IDEA to run a project that has commissioned 26 country case studies, collected comparative data on practices, and undertaken a poll worker survey in the UK. The project is run by Toby S. James (University of East Anglia), Alistair Clark (Newcastle University), and Erik Asplund (International IDEA). The next release of data will also include additional thematic data on how the pandemic affected the elections.

Case studies can be downloaded through the links below:

[Argentina \(coming soon\)](#)

[Australia](#)

[Brazil](#)

[Britain](#)

[Canada](#)

[Cape Verde](#)

[Chile](#)

[Ethiopia](#)

[France](#)

[Germany](#)

[Ghana](#)

[India \(Bihar\)](#)

[India](#)

[Israel](#)

[Jordan](#)

[Mali](#)

[Myanmar](#)

[Netherlands](#)

[Nigeria](#)

[Poland](#)

[Portugal](#)

[Russia](#)

[South Korea](#)

[Spain](#)

[Uganda](#)

[USA](#)



### Summary of Results: How to protect electoral integrity during the pandemic

1. Many elections have been postponed around the world in response to COVID-19, but the vast majority have now been held or re-scheduled.
2. Postponing an election is not always an undemocratic option because electoral integrity is likely to be undermined during a pandemic, and there is also a humanitarian case for short-term postponements.
3. The cost of holding elections during the pandemic is significantly rising, so policy makers will need to invest further resources.
4. A low-tech solution such as early voting provides one way in which elections can still be held because it spreads the voting traffic across several days – thereby enabling social distancing.
5. Postal voting can be used to enable vulnerable citizens to vote. The case study from South Korea shows how extending this can be effective. The case study from Poland shows, however, that there are dangers of moving to all-postal elections, however, where electoral officials have no prior experience of the system.
6. Policy makers should consider the impact of Covid on the whole electoral cycle and not just election day.
7. Late legislation should be avoided, where possible, to provide certainty about the rules of the game so that they are deliverable by electoral officials.
8. There is a danger of inaction owing to partisan disagreements – so cross-party working should be encouraged.
9. There should be wide consultation of citizens and stakeholder groups to identify the needs of vulnerable groups, and to build confidence and transparency.
10. Deadlines will often have to be extended to enable electoral officials to deliver the election.

Research on COVID-19 and elections is ongoing from EIP co-director Toby James (UEA), Alistair Clark (Newcastle University), and Erik Asplund (International IDEA). See:

- Toby S. James and Sead Alihodzic (2020) '[When is it democratic to postpone an election? Elections during natural disasters, COVID-19 and emergency situations](#)', *Election Law Journal*, 19(3), pp. 344-362.
- [Elections and COVID-19 research](#) on the Electoral Integrity Project website
- [Global overview of COVID-19: Impact on elections](#), International IDEA


## CYBER-SECURITY AND INFORMATION INTEGRITY

Another major issue in elections in recent years has been the cyber-security of elections. The rotating battery between 2018-2019 focused on these issues.

As Figure 7 demonstrates, the major issues within this time-period are not necessarily cyber-security of voting records themselves. Instead, experts noted greatest concerns regarding the integrity of information and journalism regarding the election and campaign. The challenge of 'fake news,' alternatively described as mis- or disinformation in some academic literature, sits as the most critical challenge to electoral integrity in this sphere.



FIGURE 7: ROTATING BATTERY 2018-2019



**Note:** Negative questions reverse coded so higher scores consistently denote higher electoral integrity for all questions.

**Source:** *The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0), means of 2018-2019 rotating battery questions.*

Research is ongoing regarding cyber-security and information threats to elections. See work by co-director Holly Ann Garnett:


- Garnett, Holly Ann, and Michael Pal, eds. 2022. [Cyber-Threats to Canadian Democracy](#). Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press
- Garnett, Holly Ann and Toby S. James. 2020. “[Cyber-Elections](#).” Special Issue of *Election Law Journal*. 19(2).

## A DECLINE IN AMERICAN ELECTORAL INTEGRITY?

A question of a decline in American electoral integrity has been the focus of significant academic and public commentary in recent years. PEI 8.0 includes data from five American elections between 2012-2020, including three presidential contests. It is noted that these presidential contests do tend to have lower scores than the intervening midterm elections. We do not see a wholesale decline in the overall PEI Index in the United States in aggregate. While there have been many challenges to American democracy in recent years in some states, these may be tempered by other moves to enhance accessibility in others.




FIGURE 8: PEI INDEX OVER 5 AMERICAN ELECTION YEARS



**Source:** *The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0). United States of America only.*

No section has seen quite the drop that the ‘results’ section did in 2020, related to the challenges to the results of the election, and extending even to the events of the January 6, 2021 insurrection on the US Capitol building. However, it is important to note that a shift was already seen in 2016, as calling into question the results of an election became part of the toolkit for sowing distrust in election results.

FIGURE 9: DECLINE IN ‘RESULTS’ SECTION OVER 5 ELECTION YEARS IN THE UNITED STATES.



**Source:** *The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity expert survey, election-level (PEI 8.0), United States of America only.*

For more on American democracy, see recent work by EIP founding director Pippa Norris:

- Pippa Norris, Holly Ann Garnett & Max Grömping. 2020. [The paranoid style of American elections: explaining perceptions of electoral integrity in an age of populism](#). *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 30:1, 105-125.
- Pippa Norris. 2020. [Electoral Integrity in the 2020 American Elections \(PEI-US-2020\)](#). Electoral Integrity Project: Cambridge, MA.
- Pippa Norris & Ronald Inglehart. 2019. [Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit and Authoritarian Populism](#). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pippa Norris, Sarah Cameron & Thomas Wynter Eds. 2019. [Electoral integrity in America: Securing Democracy](#). New York: Oxford University Press.

### III. Performance Worldwide

Table 3 lists the summary scores for PEI across the 11 dimensions for all elections covered from 2012-2021.

Each election was assigned a unique code consisting of the three-letter ISO abbreviation for the name of the country, followed by the date of the election (DD-MM-YYYY), the type of election (Presidential, P, or Legislative, L), and the round (1 or 2). For example, the second round of Presidential elections in Guatemala on August 11, 2019, would be coded as “GTM\_11082019\_P2.” The first round of Legislative elections in Morocco that occurred September 8, 2021 would be coded as “MAR\_08092021\_L1.”

TABLE 3: SUMMARY SCORES FOR ALL ELECTIONS, 2012-2021

Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
AFG_14062014_P2	Pres	2014	32	47	24	48	19	32	61	22	28	23	26	26	6	14%
AFG_20102018_L1	Leg	2018	36	38	28	43	20	55	70	30	24	27	38	22	8	16%
AFG_28092019_P1	Pres	2019	36	42	31	53	17	63	75	19	25	28	19	31	2*	5%
AGO_23082017_L1	Leg	2017	42	45	39	51	30	50	30	33	47	41	49	40	12	28%
AGO_31082012_L1	Leg	2012	36	28	38	51	23	47	31	22	38	37	44	35	11	30%
ALB_23062013_L1	Leg	2013	54	52	65	59	60	49	47	27	46	76	78	56	19	23%
ALB_25042021_L1	Leg	2021	41	14	41	32	62	54	31	21	42	57	47	51	7	18%
ALB_25062017_L1	Leg	2017	53	38	64	49	67	51	48	39	45	67	71	57	17	24%
ARG_14112021_L1	Leg	2021	67	82	82	65	74	76	53	44	56	77	83	71	9	24%
ARG_22102017_L1	Leg	2017	65	71	78	64	67	64	45	41	63	79	84	72	18	37%
ARG_22112015_L1	Leg	2015	63	68	74	63	65	71	55	35	61	70	76	66	21	47%
ARG_27102013_L1	Leg	2013	66	70	83	66	65	70	55	42	61	78	77	70	16	35%
ARG_27102019_P1	Pres	2019	70	82	89	79	79	69	45	45	60	85	86	79	10	25%
ARM_02042017_L1	Leg	2017	51	51	44	63	52	58	57	29	43	59	64	51	12	29%
ARM_02122018_L1	Leg	2018	70	61	82	60	66	74	70	61	57	84	78	79	14	31%
ARM_18022013_P1	Pres	2013	44	54	49	50	27	50	50	31	38	60	30	41	11	32%
ARM_20062021_L1	Leg	2021	65	74	77	67	63	60	57	52	55	83	66	71	6	14%
ATG_21032018_L1	Leg	2018	48	50	72	38	53	43	44	4	39	79	79	41	2*	6%
AUS_02072016_L1	Leg	2016	70	66	88	74	60	78	45	50	72	82	74	87	17	43%
AUS_07092013_L1	Leg	2013	70	65	89	68	58	69	47	57	72	82	75	88	16	38%
AUS_18052019_L1	Leg	2019	66	55	86	62	61	71	36	40	75	79	74	79	5	13%
AUT_04122016_P2	Pres	2016	80	80	87	75	79	77	69	73	80	92	81	85	17	44%
AUT_15102017_L1	Leg	2017	77	80	88	72	86	74	54	59	82	90	78	88	21	51%
AUT_22052016_P2	Pres	2016	76	91	67	71	77	79	63	76	81	86	66	73	16	39%
AUT_29092013_L1	Leg	2013	77	78	90	77	84	70	59	55	80	91	84	88	16	46%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
AUT_29092019_L1	Leg	2019	83	78	98	69	90	80	53	60	86	100	73	94	3	8%
AZE_01112015_L1	Leg	2015	29	26	24	32	39	34	16	10	38	36	57	12	7	18%
AZE_09102013_P1	Pres	2013	41	44	37	58	45	42	32	31	43	45	45	40	10	28%
AZE_11042018_P1	Pres	2018	38	31	37	53	39	36	33	32	43	42	51	21	5	17%
BDI_20042020_P1	Pres	2020	33	38	31	34	41	34	36	29	31	30	41	30	4	8%
BDI_21072015_P1	Pres	2015	22	25	13	36	21	20	26	7	23	42	15	17	3	7%
BDI_29062015_L1	Leg	2015	27	30	19	33	15	38	25	15	28	34	33	25	8	20%
BEL_25052014_L1	Leg	2014	71	66	81	60	75	73	64	64	67	79	79	77	12	32%
BEL_26052019_L1	Leg	2019	74	68	94	69	73	68	64	62	71	78	83	96	10	25%
BEN_11042021_P1	Pres	2021	46	24	58	47	36	46	42	31	45	73	43	56	4	10%
BEN_20032016_P2	Pres	2016	71	86	88	80	54	74	62	37	58	96	75	87	7	20%
BEN_26042015_L1	Leg	2015	69	83	77	73	50	65	70	40	58	85	80	88	4	11%
BEN_28042019_L1	Leg	2019		17	44		25	40	40	13		80	25	38	2*	5%
BFA_02122012_L1	Leg	2012	41	53	56	19	44	52	55	8	32	55	40	48	3	8%
BFA_29112015_P2	Pres	2015	65	73	85	67	50	54	67	45	47	85	82	82	9	23%
BGD_05012014_L1	Leg	2014	38	42	46	42	46	38	49	23	26	49	40	36	16	48%
BGR_05102014_L1	Leg	2014	63	76	65	67	50	66	50	40	60	81	72	71	12	30%
BGR_11072021_L2	Leg	2021	73	83	84	79	50	78	60	63	60	83	95	81	2*	6%
BGR_12052013_L1	Leg	2013	50	51	52	50	31	62	45	33	51	67	40	54	20	51%
BGR_13112016_P2	Pres	2016	60	63	71	63	43	69	46	42	51	74	79	66	17	40%
BGR_26032017_L1	Leg	2017	58	53	70	63	43	61	41	44	48	81	79	65	11	29%
BHR_01122018_L2	Leg	2018	42	31	55	25	37	34	41	33	49	51	54	43	5	12%
BHR_29112014_L2	Leg	2014	38	18	44	21	36	39	35	27	46	53	55	31	6	17%
BHS_10052017_L1	Leg	2017	54	43	60	43	39	46	59	47	50	69	71	61	6	17%
BIH_07102018_P1	Pres	2018	40	31	41	47	26	47	41	25	48	41	52	33	16	35%
BIH_12102014_P1	Pres	2014	52	39	68	41	51	41	45	35	50	66	73	66	9	23%
BLR_09082020_P1	Pres	2020	26	10	20	64	24	35	27	26	35	13	11	16	5	13%
BLR_11092016_L1	Leg	2016	47	39	54	72	43	48	36	36	51	44	52	44	8	20%
BLR_11102015_P1	Pres	2015	40	29	41	57	44	43	27	27	48	34	62	32	11	27%
BLR_17112019_L1	Leg	2019	36	37	17	60	47	30	26	29	40	18	44	23	3	8%
BLR_23092012_L1	Leg	2012	32	14	37	45	46	32	24	22	41	22	52	16	7	18%
BLZ_04112015_L1	Leg	2015	53	42	62	42	42	58	54	30	50	67	64	70	8	21%
BOL_12102014_P1	Pres	2014	56	55	63	57	46	61	54	34	58	62	70	52	11	28%
BOL_18102020_P1	Pres	2020	51	62	64	45	47	56	46	35	48	57	51	55	9	23%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
BOL_20102019_P1	Pres	2019	50	53	46	59	57	64	54	40	54	51	24	41	8	20%
BRA_26102014_P2	Pres	2014	68	74	87	73	75	63	48	38	65	92	64	82	13	34%
BRA_28102018_P2	Pres	2018	60	66	69	67	72	47	44	36	59	85	68	57	37	42%
BRB_21022013_L1	Leg	2013	63	67	69	65	58	58	64	31	57	84	79	73	3	8%
BRB_24052018_L1	Leg	2018	66	74	73	77	45	83	49	35	64	75	92	72	8	23%
BTN_13072013_L2	Leg	2013	61	53	75	62	45	45	66	56	57	65	69	74	11	30%
BTN_18102018_L2	Leg	2018	71	70	81	61	71	62	65	61	68	83	86	72	9	22%
BWA_23102019_P1	Pres	2019	59	38	80	48	66	65	48	37	60	78	56	66	4	7%
BWA_24102014_L1	Leg	2014	58	38	83	48	58	67	36	17	62	75	77	75	15	39%
CAF_14022016_P2	Pres	2016	53	64	52	41	34	43	57	50	47	69	69	55	4	15%
CAF_27122020_P1	Pres	2020	18	0	25	50	8	5	30	5	16	50	25	44	2*	5%
CAN_19102015_L1	Leg	2015	75	51	90	78	58	74	63	68	73	89	87	89	24	60%
CAN_20092021_L1	Leg	2021	83	65	94	82	74	84	70	82	80	96	91	96	6	15%
CAN_21102019_L1	Leg	2019	82	64	93	75	81	79	73	74	83	94	86	94	6	8%
CHE_18102015_L1	Leg	2015	79	77	89	72	88	81	63	40	82	93	92	91	20	54%
CHE_20102019_L1	Leg	2019	84	88	98	72	97	87	74	56	74	97	94	100	8	16%
CHL_15122013_P2	Pres	2013	67	54	89	58	55	65	53	48	53	89	90	88	19	43%
CHL_17122017_P2	Pres	2017	75	82	89	61	69	71	53	66	69	93	93	87	19	37%
CHL_21112021_P1	Pres	2021	79	86	95	65	70	76	66	70	71	96	89	91	8	20%
CIV_18122016_L1	Leg	2016	54	65	72	38	43	58	42	34	49	72	61	63	11	30%
CIV_25102015_P1	Pres	2015	59	68	73	44	57	67	46	33	54	76	71	64	8	24%
CIV_31102020_L1	Leg	2020	30	8	17	39	14	25	43	15	40	48	38	17	3	8%
CMR_07102018_P1	Pres	2018	34	22	33	40	25	31	30	11	36	39	30	38	9	20%
CMR_09022020_L1	Leg	2020	31	22	34	36	19	37	25	12	41	41	29	35	5	13%
CMR_30092013_L1	Leg	2013	46	47	59	37	43	49	39	22	37	67	52	63	6	18%
COG_05082012_L2	Leg	2012	31	28	38	42	17	33	27	8	44	27	50	23	3	9%
COG_20032016_P1	Pres	2016	25	17	14	33	19	44	23	13	31	37	17	15	9	29%
COG_21032021_P1	Pres	2021	26	8	25	67	38	30	28	5	19	28	58	6	2*	5%
COG_30072017_L2	Leg	2017	32	7	19	24	9	29	28	27	43	51	46	40	2*	6%
COL_09032014_L1	Leg	2014	61	68	71	67	47	72	57	42	42	79	72	77	8	22%
COL_11032018_L1	Leg	2018	61	72	67	70	58	58	56	44	44	81	75	68	8	19%
COL_15062014_P2	Pres	2014	59	61	79	54	36	57	44	34	54	79	74	77	7	17%
COL_17062018_P2	Pres	2018	57	52	74	58	61	53	47	36	50	68	79	64	5	13%
COM_10042016_P2	Leg	2016	40	67	34	53	25	52	52	23	25	65	31	31	2*	5%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
COM_22022015_L2	Leg	2015	50	65	59	50	31	56	52	27	38	67	59	61	5	13%
COM_24032019_P1	Pres	2019	9	0	0	37	0	15	28	0	0	20	0	6	2*	5%
CPV_02102016_P1	Pres	2016	70	81	85	65	57	73	66	56	59	82	84	77	6	19%
CPV_17102021_P1	Pres	2021	73	82	89	56	75	69	62	43	69	93	92	86	5	13%
CPV_20032016_L1	Leg	2016	72	79	88	53	63	73	71	57	69	78	77	79	8	20%
CPV_31032021_L1	Leg	2021	69	72	83	68	82	59	62	40	69	83	79	75	3	8%
CRI_01042018_P2	Pres	2018	76	85	93	78	83	72	59	61	61	92	89	92	9	21%
CRI_06042014_P2	Pres	2014	81	80	97	67	76	79	57	65	82	99	94	97	8	21%
CYP_04022018_P2	Pres	2018	68	70	85	68	70	66	50	48	62	88	87	69	11	25%
CYP_22052016_L1	Leg	2016	67	58	84	66	66	61	48	48	63	86	85	77	13	33%
CYP_23052021_L1	Leg	2021	80	89	94	71	86	83	49	46	83	97	89	99	3	8%
CYP_24022013_P2	Pres	2013	73	83	87	67	76	71	58	51	71	87	88	80	14	37%
CZE_08102021_L1	Leg	2021	79	82	88	81	87	77	62	69	71	91	84	88	8	20%
CZE_13102012_L1	Leg	2012	76	77	90	67	84	74	59	66	68	93	86	84	22	58%
CZE_21102017_L1	Leg	2017	75	79	82	73	91	80	55	63	70	86	80	83	30	60%
CZE_25012013_P2	Pres	2013	74	80	75	76	92	82	53	57	68	93	79	77	19	48%
CZE_25102013_L1	Leg	2013	77	85	90	75	87	77	58	55	72	94	89	87	31	74%
CZE_27012018_P2	Pres	2018	74	84	82	74	83	81	54	54	71	88	78	84	23	47%
DEU_22092013_L1	Leg	2013	80	77	89	74	82	83	67	70	78	94	88	84	27	64%
DEU_24092017_L1	Leg	2017	81	81	97	72	81	76	68	71	80	96	83	91	21	50%
DEU_26092021_L1	Leg	2021	81	86	88	82	85	79	67	67	77	91	89	85	11	28%
DJI_08042016_P1	Pres	2016	35	26	47	42	26	29	33	17	37	45	46	36	6	20%
DJI_22022013_L1	Leg	2013	25	18	24	44	24	20	26	16	31	23	33	20	5	14%
DJI_23022018_L1	Leg	2018	34	17	41	35	33	33	30	20	36	46	44	34	3	8%
DJI_30042021_P1	Pres	2021	34	22	44	37	33	30	23	17	35	46	53	31	3	8%
DNK_05062019_L1	Leg	2019	85	89	94	86	91	91	71	68	76	95	90	94	9	17%
DNK_18062015_L1	Leg	2015	86	91	98	83	93	90	72	72	79	98	93	93	18	49%
DOM_05062020_P1	Pres	2020	65	73	75	79	65	73	53	38	51	78	83	67	4	8%
DOM_15052016_P1	Pres	2016	44	44	51	60	55	50	39	18	45	54	39	45	10	28%
DZA_04052017_L1	Leg	2017	43	36	49	51	41	44	46	26	48	46	49	37	12	26%
DZA_17042014_P1	Pres	2014	43	25	48	46	43	35	44	26	52	60	49	35	8	23%
ECU_02042017_P2	Pres	2017	45	33	51	45	39	51	41	34	59	50	34	41	13	28%
ECU_11042021_P2	Pres	2021	65	78	83	58	44	60	60	57	64	73	77	60	3	8%
ECU_17022013_P1	Pres	2013	55	42	65	39	57	57	43	37	62	68	67	52	13	35%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
EGY_02122015_L1	Leg	2015	45	27	59	37	53	56	32	25	48	56	57	46	6	14%
EGY_26052014_P1	Pres	2014	40	29	50	48	29	21	30	23	50	54	56	41	6	15%
EGY_28032018_P1	Pres	2018	35	33	41	48	42	22	25	17	42	37	59	33	7	14%
ESP_10112019_L2	Leg	2019	73	59	80	65	89	70	60	58	70	85	91	80	11	26%
ESP_20122015_L1	Leg	2015	69	37	83	56	76	73	47	52	65	91	93	82	25	60%
ESP_26062016_L1	Leg	2016	69	42	84	61	74	75	52	54	61	91	90	81	16	40%
ESP_28042019_L1	Leg	2019	79	77	94	72	93	60	64	69	72	98	94	89	5	13%
EST_01032015_L1	Leg	2015	79	75	84	70	88	76	68	59	89	87	85	83	18	50%
EST_03032019_L1	Leg	2019	84	83	93	70	91	85	74	72	92	89	88	88	10	25%
ETH_21062021_L1	Leg	2021	44	60	47	38	42	42	36	44	34	48	48	63	4	11%
ETH_24052015_L1	Leg	2015	24	14	21	38	31	28	22	19	23	18	41	13	19	40%
FIN_14042019_L1	Leg	2019	88	94	98	80	96	95	75	68	82	100	96	97	9	19%
FIN_19042015_L1	Leg	2015	86	80	98	72	95	93	70	70	83	99	96	96	16	42%
FIN_28012018_P1	Pres	2018	84	86	96	73	96	86	66	70	79	97	95	94	20	42%
FJI_14112018_L1	Leg	2018	56	30	75	72	56	54	42	39	65	64	57	61	8	15%
FJI_17092014_L1	Leg	2014	53	30	73	49	58	48	37	32	62	64	59	63	17	43%
FRA_07052017_P2	Pres	2017	76	70	92	68	62	79	63	69	72	93	74	87	19	42%
FRA_18062017_L2	Leg	2017	74	68	94	69	65	72	63	66	70	89	71	83	14	29%
FSM_03032015_L1	Leg	2015	58	61	67	59	39	63	55	26	60	68	69	68	4	10%
FSM_05032013_L1	Leg	2013	63	62	70	73	51	77	61	37	60	68	68	67	4	10%
FSM_07032017_L1	Leg	2017	57	72	56	68	37	67	42	43	56	68	61	64	3	10%
GAB_27102018_L2	Leg	2018	26	29	21	35	26	39	30	4	30	25	33	17	4	9%
GBN_27082016_P2	Pres	2016	34	33	34	38	49	62	26	18	38	34	21	19	9	24%
GBR_07052015_L1	Leg	2015	65	37	85	43	61	65	39	58	71	86	73	80	10	28%
GBR_08062017_L1	Leg	2017	68	43	87	51	40	74	49	51	75	91	79	82	43	31%
GBR_12122019_L1	Leg	2019	73	51	89	57	61	69	57	64	74	85	87	85	7	18%
GEO_01102012_L1	Leg	2012	53	56	62	52	45	54	42	27	53	75	69	57	8	17%
GEO_08102016_L1	Leg	2016	61	53	77	52	62	57	58	46	59	71	72	70	8	20%
GEO_27102013_P1	Pres	2013	64	76	72	57	60	56	57	51	59	82	78	71	9	20%
GEO_28112018_P2	Pres	2018	53	58	51	61	52	64	48	33	56	67	41	54	10	21%
GEO_31102020_L1	Leg	2020	59	88	58	71	65	75	53	49	57	69	30	46	4	10%
GHA_07122012_P1	Pres	2012	57	77	63	59	47	74	55	32	48	80	46	61	14	40%
GHA_07122016_P1	Pres	2016	73	83	79	73	57	88	70	45	61	89	84	85	10	23%
GHA_07122020_P1	Pres	2020	63	79	80	83	44	88	78	31	46	80	28	75	4	10%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
GIN_11102015_P1	Pres	2015	41	40	46	42	26	47	40	25	39	60	41	45	8	21%
GIN_18102020_P1	Pres	2020	31	28	28	37	24	34	35	26	30	31	38	25	2*	5%
GIN_28092013_L1	Leg	2013	43	50	28	39	21	64	55	19	44	56	55	34	4	11%
GMB_01122016_P1	Pres	2016	48	25	76	54	39	53	30	28	45	66	42	69	9	22%
GMB_04122021_P1	Pres	2021	61	68	79	69	60	58	66	28	51	88	59	66	5	13%
GMB_06042017_L1	Leg	2017	52	46	68	39	35	52	47	23	45	77	68	69	6	14%
GNB_18052014_P2	Pres	2014	54	63	65	53	50	55	54	30	52	66	57	60	8	19%
GNB_29122019_P2	Pres	2019	50	59	67	51	32	60	46	26	52	56	46	57	4	8%
GNQ_12112017_L1	Leg	2017	22	16	19	36	22	13	13	11	26	26	46	15	11	37%
GNQ_24042016_P1	Pres	2016	27	19	21	38	31	27	14	13	29	33	57	25	7	20%
GNQ_26052013_L1	Leg	2013	24	13	23	36	23	29	12	15	24	27	49	13	10	25%
GRC_07072019_L1	Leg	2019	64	53	84	77	69	67	48	37	52	83	88	68	6	15%
GRC_20092015_L1	Leg	2015	62	44	88	49	57	59	47	39	56	84	85	75	19	48%
GRC_25012015_L1	Leg	2015	71	50	93	60	76	71	54	50	65	91	89	86	14	33%
GRD_13032018_L1	Leg	2018	57	48	68	55	46	69	43	25	57	76	77	56	6	16%
GRD_19022013_L1	Leg	2013	66	62	93	58	55	80	41	21	57	92	91	88	6	16%
GTM_11082019_P2	Pres	2019	50	53	50	73	68	38	48	40	47	57	50	47	3	7%
GTM_16062019_L1	Leg	2019	48	50	44	54	55	25	53	30	40	73	65	50	3	7%
GTM_25102015_P2	Pres	2015	48	46	62	61	32	38	42	20	36	76	63	67	9	20%
GUY_02032020_L1	Leg	2020	43	39	47	55	38	68	68	35	39	38	30	22	3	8%
GUY_11052015_L1	Leg	2015	53	43	77	50	60	63	36	30	47	66	44	74	7	18%
HND_24112013_P1	Pres	2013	45	38	51	46	41	58	36	30	46	68	30	45	5	14%
HND_26112017_P1	Pres	2017	29	20	24	49	24	51	32	18	37	17	28	15	7	19%
HRV_05012020_P2	Pres	2020	69	84	79	63	47	75	51	55	63	85	92	66	10	25%
HRV_05062020_L1	Leg	2020	67	68	83	46	57	67	54	59	61	85	90	68	7	18%
HRV_08112015_L1	Leg	2015	68	60	80	55	57	68	53	59	64	88	87	77	12	32%
HRV_11012015_P2	Pres	2015	65	63	77	53	54	64	48	60	63	80	78	72	7	18%
HRV_11092016_L1	Leg	2016	61	63	67	46	50	57	48	50	59	82	86	66	10	29%
HTI_20112016_P1	Pres	2016	35	42	38	42	27	33	49	26	29	39	27	39	6	14%
HTI_25102015_L2	Leg	2015	28	41	14	51	19	43	55	7	14	37	21	22	7	16%
HUN_06042014_L1	Leg	2014	56	30	69	30	67	58	33	38	65	81	73	58	16	44%
HUN_08042018_L1	Leg	2018	52	36	61	34	64	67	29	35	63	64	51	49	19	53%
IDN_09042014_L1	Leg	2014	53	58	57	65	38	62	53	23	52	63	57	63	14	39%
IDN_09072014_P1	Pres	2014	60	64	68	62	42	67	54	44	61	74	51	72	12	30%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
IDN_17042019_P1	Pres	2019	58	42	75	58	54	63	45	48	59	68	47	75	2*	5%
IND_12052014_L1	Leg	2014	59	72	72	58	40	57	55	33	53	72	67	76	12	30%
IND_19052019_L1	Leg	2019	55	62	68	69	44	54	42	30	54	69	66	60	26	20%
IRL_26022016_L1	Leg	2016	71	77	90	70	31	82	60	57	60	89	86	77	31	49%
IRL_26102018_P1	Pres	2018	75	78	93	66	36	79	66	71	63	89	92	85	18	34%
IRN_11092020_L2	Leg	2020	31	2	41	66	53	9	31	11	26	32	75	19	2*	3%
IRN_14062013_P1	Pres	2013	55	36	73	52	63	20	56	47	57	62	81	59	9	24%
IRN_18062021_P1	Pres	2021	33	6	46	46	40	0	22	10	42	47	75	31	3	8%
IRN_19052017_P1	Pres	2017	47	25	66	34	48	31	48	37	50	59	62	52	7	15%
IRN_26022016_L1	Leg	2016	46	28	63	50	65	30	37	22	47	53	71	46	7	19%
IRQ_10102021_L1	Leg	2021	53	61	75	61	37	47	45	31	56	65	37	75	3	7%
IRQ_12052018_L1	Leg	2018	32	34	22	32	24	52	35	17	35	26	39	27	8	19%
IRQ_30042014_L1	Leg	2014	44	44	53	41	38	45	46	18	48	50	53	46	9	24%
ISL_25062016_P1	Pres	2016	86	89	96	72	96	84	67	76	85	100	94	96	12	32%
ISL_25092021_L1	Leg	2021	67	60	52	66	98	88	61	56	78	54	57	58	7	21%
ISL_27042013_L1	Leg	2013	78	69	94	57	87	82	64	60	81	91	88	82	16	44%
ISL_27062020_P1	Pres	2020	80	58	85	75	100	93	77	70	78	83	84	78	3	9%
ISL_28102017_L1	Leg	2017	77	64	91	60	94	82	58	61	79	91	86	82	11	28%
ISL_29102016_L1	Leg	2016	85	79	73	80	95	90	70	79	85	99	92	91	8	26%
ISR_02032020_L1	Leg	2020	63	71	72	61	69	63	53	51	52	57	72	88	2*	5%
ISR_09042019_L1	Leg	2019	68	64	88	70	86	68	59	60	47	71	71	88	3	15%
ISR_17032015_L1	Leg	2015	73	74	89	65	78	77	50	61	59	92	89	84	14	33%
ISR_22012013_L1	Leg	2013	75	79	94	65	79	75	66	62	56	89	86	89	12	32%
ISR_23032021_L1	Leg	2021	71	83	92	61	85	67	55	65	58	68	72	96	3	8%
ITA_04032018_L1	Leg	2018	69	65	79	72	81	59	52	58	63	80	84	78	36	59%
ITA_24022013_L1	Leg	2013	66	44	86	65	73	66	53	49	63	80	76	79	18	44%
JAM_25022016_L1	Leg	2016	67	72	87	68	59	73	61	45	46	85	76	82	11	31%
JOR_10112020_L1	Leg	2020	44	21	50	21	25	48	50	43	53	48	31	63	2*	5%
JOR_20092016_L1	Leg	2016	53	46	78	50	48	60	54	36	46	56	48	64	4	11%
JOR_23012013_L1	Leg	2013	46	30	57	21	45	55	45	28	47	57	46	63	12	34%
JPN_10072016_L1	Leg	2016	67	48	79	63	79	69	50	59	59	86	74	75	13	33%
JPN_14122014_L1	Leg	2014	71	67	86	54	77	75	57	64	64	77	86	78	12	32%
JPN_16122012_L1	Leg	2012	67	53	83	52	74	63	59	59	66	81	77	72	15	38%
JPN_21072013_L1	Leg	2013	67	51	89	46	72	66	49	55	66	86	75	74	12	31%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
JPN_21072019_L1	Leg	2019	61	25	78	42	88	75	30	40	58	87	66	84	2*	5%
JPN_22102017_L1	Leg	2017	66	46	82	43	68	61	52	58	66	82	78	81	20	29%
JPN_31102021_L1	Leg	2021	75	46	94	65	90	76	65	70	67	95	76	81	4	10%
KAZ_09062019_P1	Pres	2019	41	0	58	42	31	37	40	37	52	53	38	42	3	8%
KAZ_20032016_L1	Leg	2016	48	35	58	56	50	39	38	36	53	52	65	43	7	21%
KAZ_26042015_P1	Pres	2015	43	29	48	46	49	35	27	32	48	56	62	40	9	24%
KEN_04032013_P1	Pres	2013	41	70	31	51	18	57	63	20	34	37	55	27	9	24%
KEN_08082017_P1	Pres	2017	47	64	41	60	34	63	53	23	49	56	38	41	12	21%
KEN_26102017_P1	Pres	2017	41	59	38	49	40	58	54	16	28	57	26	36	10	20%
KGZ_04102015_L1	Leg	2015	54	54	64	55	44	43	52	38	52	72	65	59	7	18%
KGZ_04102020_L2	Leg	2020	37	48	34	64	38	26	38	24	46	51	14	27	4	10%
KGZ_10012021_P1	Pres	2021	44	30	47	32	46	38	45	25	46	66	56	51	5	13%
KGZ_15102017_P1	Pres	2017	52	57	57	55	45	51	48	30	50	67	60	52	6	16%
KGZ_28112021_L1	Leg	2021	41	47	39	45	41	45	53	23	35	45	45	36	5	14%
KHM_28072013_L1	Leg	2013	32	29	38	32	13	38	28	18	34	57	25	28	15	39%
KHM_29072018_L1	Leg	2018	29	21	42	39	27	23	21	13	29	32	58	23	15	39%
KIR_04142020_L1	Leg	2020	63	88	91	67	83	80	70	40	50	85	75	78	2*	8%
KOR_09052017_P1	Pres	2017	72	54	87	60	76	68	56	66	72	85	76	83	12	23%
KOR_13042016_L1	Leg	2016	71	46	85	55	80	66	54	62	75	90	81	83	10	24%
KOR_15042020_L1	Leg	2020	74	29	91	50	100	81	58	55	81	98	66	88	2*	5%
KOR_19122012_P1	Pres	2012	77	59	88	69	86	77	57	65	78	96	85	83	8	24%
KWT_01122012_L1	Leg	2012	50	37	63	38	67	52	52	21	60	73	29	51	9	24%
KWT_05122020_L1	Leg	2020	57	41	74	52	67	38	59	52	52	61	76	59	5	13%
KWT_26112016_L1	Leg	2016	52	30	64	56	59	46	48	24	55	67	67	57	8	21%
KWT_27072013_L1	Leg	2013	58	47	80	51	54	70	53	33	51	73	63	69	6	16%
LAO_20032016_L1	Leg	2016	48	17	67	62	55	42	26	40	44	57	86	38	4	15%
LBN_06052018_L1	Leg	2018	42	33	44	23	52	52	39	17	46	56	50	43	11	27%
LBR_08122020_L1	Leg	2020	62	88	75	71	46	65	56	28	50	85	63	72	2*	5%
LBR_26122017_P2	Pres	2017	54	81	63	55	33	64	49	29	47	67	56	67	3	7%
LKA_05082020_L1	Leg	2020	57	75	78	46	54	51	44	28	54	73	56	76	5	13%
LKA_08012015_P1	Pres	2015	51	57	69	50	49	45	34	28	46	65	61	68	10	24%
LKA_16112019_P1	Pres	2019	57	69	80	56	59	50	40	29	52	76	61	68	8	9%
LKA_17082015_L1	Leg	2015	53	59	73	46	46	52	41	22	50	74	54	69	6	18%
LSO_03062017_L1	Leg	2017	61	76	74	66	45	62	53	35	50	79	70	75	12	29%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
LSO_28022015_L1	Leg	2015	64	80	82	71	48	59	49	40	56	77	77	78	11	29%
LTU_09102016_L1	Leg	2016	78	83	85	80	81	86	70	63	72	83	88	79	12	35%
LTU_25052014_P2	Pres	2014	82	92	91	73	75	84	67	75	79	94	90	86	8	19%
LTU_26052019_P1	Pres	2019	79	80	84	75	85	87	65	64	77	89	92	75	8	14%
LTU_28102012_L2	Leg	2012	73	86	69	77	75	85	65	55	69	85	70	72	11	31%
LUX_14102018_L1	Leg	2018	76	67	90	73	85	73	59	72	72	90	77	89	6	15%
LVA_04102014_L1	Leg	2014	72	72	83	69	66	72	60	56	69	88	77	78	16	40%
LVA_06102018_L1	Leg	2018	75	77	85	74	75	76	66	59	75	89	79	75	11	28%
MAR_07102016_L1	Leg	2016	57	74	69	63	42	50	60	42	41	73	72	56	4	10%
MAR_08092021_L1	Leg	2021	55	42	53	42	50	77	60	43	51	65	69	41	2*	6%
MDA_13112016_P2	Pres	2016	55	44	64	52	46	68	36	34	58	78	58	62	6	16%
MDA_15112020_P2	Pres	2020	60	58	75	56	43	68	37	45	53	90	72	68	2*	4%
MDA_30112014_L1	Leg	2014	56	58	64	64	57	47	48	32	57	79	59	58	9	25%
MDG_19122018_P2	Pres	2018	44	33	59	65	15	57	57	30	32	53	38	52	2*	5%
MDG_20122013_P2	Pres	2013	40	36	41	36	18	48	44	20	37	58	45	49	16	37%
MDG_26052019_L1	Leg	2019	41	50	39	50	21	53	35	20	40	59	44	39	4	9%
MDV_06042019_L1	Leg	2019	55	54	81	54	50	41	51	43	53	63	59	63	2*	5%
MDV_16112013_P2	Pres	2013	54	58	64	61	45	61	47	32	53	68	65	48	5	14%
MDV_22032014_L1	Leg	2014	59	60	75	47	51	58	58	49	59	63	76	56	5	14%
MDV_23092018_P1	Pres	2018	44	28	55	56	44	24	44	17	50	64	50	46	12	29%
MEX_01072012_P1	Pres	2012	62	58	75	70	76	59	56	44	57	85	48	67	14	35%
MEX_01072018_P1	Pres	2018	67	77	82	73	71	57	61	49	56	85	76	74	13	17%
MEX_06062021_L1	Leg	2021	64	63	81	68	73	51	52	42	52	88	75	82	8	20%
MEX_07062015_L1	Leg	2015	52	49	66	58	62	46	44	34	43	73	53	62	22	49%
MKD_05052019_P1	Pres	2019	44	28	60	47	25	50	47	42	39	58	67	50	3	8%
MKD_11122016_L1	Leg	2016	48	44	56	52	32	55	37	32	49	60	55	47	18	40%
MKD_15072020_L1	Leg	2020	46	32	49	43	28	56	43	41	48	49	55	45	5	13%
MKD_27042014_P2	Pres	2014	47	48	56	43	23	56	28	30	51	72	50	54	9	28%
MLI_11082013_P2	Pres	2013	52	62	62	48	25	50	54	39	45	69	67	58	11	27%
MLI_12082018_P2	Pres	2018	33	36	40	39	2	53	38	18	30	29	42	33	3	9%
MLI_29032020_L1	Leg	2020	29	58	22	47	16	19	25	8	37	43	31	19	2*	5%
MLT_03062017_L1	Leg	2017	64	47	84	54	70	65	40	37	63	87	83	79	10	23%
MLT_09032013_L1	Leg	2013	65	49	86	55	64	68	45	38	65	89	79	78	10	31%
MMR_08112015_L1	Leg	2015	54	42	72	54	30	40	49	34	55	74	69	69	16	41%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
MMR_08112020_L1	Leg	2020	57	53	68	61	47	46	55	48	59	66	44	64	10	22%
MNE_07042013_P1	Pres	2013	41	52	48	53	31	56	33	23	43	45	35	33	8	23%
MNE_14102012_L1	Leg	2012	61	81	71	61	47	62	60	22	55	88	79	60	3	9%
MNE_15042018_P1	Pres	2018	54	50	55	56	44	61	49	33	48	74	72	49	5	16%
MNE_16102016_L1	Leg	2016	51	59	52	57	40	61	39	31	54	67	50	46	14	37%
MNE_30082020_L1	Leg	2020	54	54	75	58	29	63	43	30	53	75	59	56	2*	5%
MNG_07072017_P2	Pres	2017	63	40	80	45	69	50	61	43	63	87	71	73	4	10%
MNG_09062021_P1	Pres	2021	64	67	82	44	44	53	60	37	68	85	75	85	2*	5%
MNG_24062020_L1	Leg	2020	55	53	72	44	39	51	56	30	54	74	69	58	3	7%
MNG_26062013_P1	Pres	2013	64	56	78	62	60	66	48	46	64	84	70	71	9	25%
MNG_26062016_L1	Leg	2016	64	50	69	50	68	62	61	40	64	92	76	69	5	13%
MOZ_15102014_P1	Pres	2014	35	36	38	46	25	43	33	20	39	32	37	33	8	20%
MOZ_15102019_P1	Pres	2019	31	26	20	43	19	33	48	27	38	28	30	19	4	10%
MRT_15092018_L2	Leg	2018	29	21	28	54	15	38	37	5	23	31	44	28	2*	6%
MRT_21062014_P1	Pres	2014	46	53	38	61	25	45	52	36	51	56	35	48	3	8%
MRT_21122013_L2	Leg	2013	41	50	56	29	26	40	48	21	38	41	46	56	2*	6%
MUS_07112019_L1	Leg	2019	53	63	50	38	39	53	51	28	53	73	54	67	4	10%
MUS_10122014_L1	Leg	2014	64	64	90	55	72	60	47	31	58	87	78	79	10	27%
MWI_20052014_P1	Pres	2014	48	70	49	61	31	69	49	18	42	49	45	55	15	38%
MWI_21052019_P1	Pres	2019	38	58	34	39	34	53	57	10	41	43	27	28	4	10%
MWI_23062020_P1	Pres	2020	54	61	84	38	40	60	45	16	41	77	62	77	6	15%
MYS_05052013_L1	Leg	2013	35	15	43	10	21	48	22	21	56	43	42	32	17	43%
MYS_09052018_L1	Leg	2018	34	15	46	12	26	39	26	16	50	30	67	25	13	29%
NAM_27112019_P1	Pres	2019	65	71	75	55	46	72	68	42	64	80	69	66	4	9%
NAM_28112014_P1	Pres	2014	60	67	62	70	53	69	52	35	56	63	79	68	7	19%
NER_20032016_P2	Pres	2016	52	75	56	64	35	43	44	32	50	74	43	66	4	10%
NGA_23022019_P1	Pres	2019	52	67	78	38	35	42	55	30	36	69	54	73	4	8%
NGA_28032015_L1	Leg	2015	53	75	66	62	42	60	49	20	31	73	67	70	18	43%
NIC_06112016_P1	Pres	2016	36	31	41	49	42	36	47	27	32	35	43	26	7	19%
NIC_07112021_P1	Pres	2021	28	17	27	34	37	30	29	21	25	29	43	25	10	29%
NLD_12092012_L1	Leg	2012	78	91	91	67	84	78	61	62	75	88	88	88	24	56%
NLD_15032017_L1	Leg	2017	82	94	91	73	86	81	75	70	72	91	93	90	17	40%
NLD_17032021_L1	Leg	2021	78	91	86	65	89	80	61	65	78	95	81	87	10	25%
NOR_09092013_L1	Leg	2013	83	81	92	71	87	84	67	74	81	97	93	91	13	31%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
NOR_09112017_L1	Leg	2017	83	79	90	73	90	82	66	77	84	94	92	93	16	44%
NOR_13092021_L1	Leg	2021	79	75	95	64	83	89	54	67	75	85	94	95	5	13%
NPL_07122017_L1	Leg	2017	59	75	73	58	58	64	58	26	44	79	73	68	10	29%
NPL_19112013_L1	Leg	2013	53	73	63	56	44	57	53	35	42	66	46	65	18	51%
NZL_17102020_L1	Leg	2020	77	81	96	73	65	77	59	67	79	75	84	92	6	15%
NZL_20092014_L1	Leg	2014	75	71	95	63	54	83	56	54	78	87	89	88	13	33%
NZL_23092017_L1	Leg	2017	75	70	93	77	63	85	47	61	77	88	81	88	11	26%
OMN_25102015_L1	Leg	2015	61	52	79	52	58	56	54	41	62	74	78	59	12	33%
OMN_27102019_L1	Leg	2019	61	51	77	55	64	51	51	46	67	69	78	60	8	21%
PAK_11052013_L1	Leg	2013	50	68	57	51	53	38	59	36	37	62	45	60	36	29%
PAK_25072018_L1	Leg	2018	44	59	52	52	49	33	48	31	45	42	41	47	24	28%
PAN_04052014_P1	Pres	2014	61	55	78	56	65	65	54	24	63	75	64	71	8	20%
PAN_05052019_P1	Pres	2019	71	63	83	74	79	71	59	38	59	91	92	89	4	10%
PER_05062016_P2	Pres	2016	65	71	56	57	77	55	56	49	66	88	76	71	13	33%
PER_10042016_L1	Leg	2016	60	58	44	66	70	63	51	40	59	80	73	56	11	28%
PER_11042021_P1	Pres	2021	68	96	80	66	83	68	38	51	69	83	46	86	8	20%
PER_26012020_L1	Leg	2020	72	74	90	72	87	63	46	50	69	92	74	90	5	13%
PHL_09052016_P1	Pres	2016	55	52	68	54	41	62	57	25	50	76	52	66	27	43%
PHL_13052013_L1	Leg	2013	48	61	60	51	27	63	51	20	38	60	51	55	14	37%
PHL_13052019_L1	Leg	2019	48	47	65	36	35	45	58	22	42	66	52	63	8	18%
PNG_08072017_L1	Leg	2017	34	40	21	45	11	55	49	16	26	35	37	43	13	27%
POL_12072020_P2	Pres	2020	66	75	67	61	79	72	37	42	71	86	71	77	3	8%
POL_13102019_L1	Leg	2019	66	61	78	69	57	70	44	52	71	80	73	70	11	22%
POL_24052015_P2	Pres	2015	74	79	82	72	75	76	55	61	74	82	80	80	16	43%
POL_25102015_L1	Leg	2015	75	79	87	78	76	74	52	63	74	87	85	82	15	41%
PRT_04102015_L1	Leg	2015	72	71	85	66	46	72	58	59	73	89	84	80	19	48%
PRT_06102019_L1	Leg	2019	78	81	94	75	61	76	63	55	75	99	91	92	7	16%
PRT_24012016_P1	Pres	2016	77	83	93	66	52	86	57	65	72	95	92	90	20	53%
PRT_24012021_P1	Pres	2021	79	69	94	68	58	76	69	67	78	97	92	93	6	15%
PRY_21042013_P1	Pres	2013	55	63	70	59	46	54	40	24	51	74	79	57	12	34%
PRY_22042018_P1	Pres	2018	44	36	47	59	48	49	43	20	47	56	45	41	14	41%
QAT_02102021_L1	Leg	2021	62	30	81	27	45	68	70	57	60	86	67	67	4	11%
ROU_06122020_L1	Leg	2020	55	53	65	55	48	54	35	48	59	70	68	54	12	32%
ROU_09122012_L1	Leg	2012	48	46	59	37	28	58	32	32	46	67	68	50	13	33%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
ROU_11122016_L1	Leg	2016	65	61	79	54	43	58	50	57	65	82	82	77	17	40%
ROU_16112014_P2	Pres	2014	53	40	54	50	29	66	41	43	46	80	72	56	18	50%
ROU_24112019_P2	Pres	2019	54	54	66	43	49	60	39	29	51	71	67	65	4	10%
RUS_18032018_P1	Pres	2018	50	34	61	48	59	49	35	39	55	52	62	45	13	23%
RUS_18092016_L1	Leg	2016	44	35	43	48	53	43	33	34	55	39	63	40	13	32%
RUS_19092021_L1	Leg	2021	32	14	23	36	38	32	32	20	56	22	46	18	3	8%
RWA_03092018_L1	Leg	2018	58	43	67	46	62	53	52	47	55	76	68	63	7	21%
RWA_04082017_P1	Pres	2017	51	28	58	50	73	48	31	35	47	61	83	56	5	14%
RWA_16092013_L1	Leg	2013	64	62	71	61	72	60	54	59	61	70	77	65	7	19%
SDN_13042015_P1	Pres	2015	43	28	49	41	39	46	37	27	45	57	59	43	10	26%
SEN_30072017_L1	Leg	2017	43	32	48	58	13	49	41	19	39	68	55	50	3	8%
SGP_10072020_L1	Leg	2020	59	28	77	13	76	56	33	55	65	78	88	57	7	18%
SGP_11092015_L1	Leg	2015	53	27	76	14	77	46	33	35	60	69	75	58	14	34%
SLB_03042019_L1	Leg	2019	65	86	73	78	59	65	65	30	57	82	56	79	3	7%
SLB_19112014_L1	Leg	2014	57	74	67	71	41	59	62	29	40	72	63	68	8	20%
SLE_17112012_P1	Pres	2012	57	67	78	46	66	64	30	33	54	63	63	72	2*	6%
SLE_31032018_P2	Pres	2018	50	60	67	50	50	43	41	33	44	64	40	67	3	8%
SLV_01032015_L1	Leg	2015	49	53	44	57	53	60	49	38	47	49	53	42	9	22%
SLV_03022019_P1	Pres	2019	61	79	74	68	48	62	47	36	55	73	75	69	7	18%
SLV_04032018_L1	Leg	2018	53	69	61	56	42	54	48	38	42	64	67	61	9	26%
SLV_09032014_P2	Pres	2014	59	60	80	61	47	60	44	34	61	85	43	74	14	37%
SRB_02042017_P1	Pres	2017	43	47	53	57	26	49	17	29	54	53	40	40	9	31%
SRB_16032014_L1	Leg	2014	57	54	74	55	38	57	36	35	57	79	79	67	13	33%
SRB_21062020_L1	Leg	2020	33	54	28	64	19	45	18	16	41	35	42	8	4	10%
SRB_24042016_L1	Leg	2016	46	42	53	54	33	53	37	37	51	53	45	43	9	24%
STP_07082016_P2	Pres	2016	47	55	63	49	41	48	39	24	50	55	51	51	7	22%
STP_07102018_L1	Leg	2018	51	71	63	37	67	73	33	21	48	58	53	53	2*	6%
STP_12102014_L1	Leg	2014	58	73	80	55	51	68	43	28	45	72	71	72	5	13%
STP_18072021_P1	Pres	2021	57	67	70	48	48	61	63	29	57	67	58	60	3	9%
SUR_25042020_L1	Leg	2020	55	58	60	54	44	62	65	32	54	55	55	63	5	13%
SUR_25052015_L1	Leg	2015	51	50	65	52	46	61	37	27	48	57	64	54	13	33%
SVK_05032016_L1	Leg	2016	74	70	85	63	83	74	67	56	77	81	84	78	13	31%
SVK_29022020_L1	Leg	2020	77	79	94	53	88	78	59	56	75	91	86	93	4	8%
SVK_29032014_P2	Pres	2014	74	72	83	65	75	87	63	55	65	92	86	82	12	32%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
SVK_30032019_P1	Pres	2019	77	79	96	74	86	87	60	65	64	90	72	91	6	12%
SVN_02122012_P2	Pres	2012	75	69	88	65	88	70	50	57	79	92	80	86	11	30%
SVN_03072018_L1	Leg	2018	75	71	88	68	90	76	47	60	78	90	84	78	13	33%
SVN_12112017_P2	Pres	2017	81	85	94	72	85	87	59	69	81	93	88	87	15	33%
SVN_13072014_L1	Leg	2014	79	78	78	65	93	77	69	69	80	94	76	87	7	18%
SWE_09092018_L1	Leg	2018	85	87	93	71	90	86	75	72	83	95	92	93	23	53%
SWE_14092014_L1	Leg	2014	80	79	90	74	88	79	60	66	79	93	88	94	21	53%
SWZ_20092013_L1	Leg	2013	45	24	64	30	48	32	47	36	45	62	56	49	7	18%
SWZ_21092018_L1	Leg	2018	38	15	55	47	43	36	35	24	37	51	44	38	8	20%
SYR_03062014_P1	Pres	2014	26	9	29	36	20	18	17	12	27	37	59	27	8	19%
SYR_13042016_L1	Leg	2016	23	10	19	31	15	25	16	7	22	24	66	16	8	19%
SYR_19072020_L1	Leg	2020	20	8	17	43	8	15	9	8	22	25	49	11	6	13%
SYR_26052021_P1	Pres	2021	19	23	8	10	19	19	24	13	25	13	36	12	5	13%
TCD_10042016_P1	Pres	2016	31	42	19	41	33	34	27	10	39	35	35	33	3	11%
TGO_22022020_P1	Pres	2020	33	22	50	8	28	57	37	8	36	43	23	31	3	8%
TGO_25042015_P1	Pres	2015	38	43	42	26	27	51	49	28	38	39	33	32	6	16%
TGO_25072013_L1	Leg	2013	38	25	39	29	18	43	47	25	43	42	40	48	4	11%
THA_02022014_L1	Leg	2014	51	76	43	70	58	53	47	49	49	60	34	34	15	38%
THA_24032019_L1	Leg	2019	38	13	42	61	48	29	43	29	42	47	39	27	4	8%
TJK_01032015_L1	Leg	2015	35	19	46	37	28	26	30	18	38	46	54	36	8	19%
TJK_01032020_L1	Leg	2020	27	13	22	17	30	13	18	5	52	30	69	13	2*	5%
TJK_06112013_P1	Pres	2013	36	16	40	45	21	29	32	28	36	50	58	34	8	24%
TKM_12022017_P1	Pres	2017	31	25	37	43	34	20	9	19	35	31	75	22	10	30%
TKM_15122013_L1	Leg	2013	37	20	53	45	40	30	20	24	37	45	71	34	8	20%
TKM_25032018_L1	Leg	2018	40	20	51	47	54	22	34	30	40	46	83	24	4	11%
TLS_12052018_L1	Leg	2018	67	67	86	60	56	62	56	45	61	92	72	88	8	20%
TLS_20032017_P1	Pres	2017	61	65	75	53	54	63	50	35	59	76	77	69	15	38%
TLS_22072017_L1	Leg	2017	63	55	80	62	47	58	53	41	61	81	76	76	9	20%
TON_16112017_L1	Leg	2017	62	65	77	56	51	62	49	43	58	73	70	79	7	21%
TON_18112021_L1	Leg	2021	29	25	50	27	40	19	20	16	25	35	47	31	2*	6%
TON_27112014_L1	Leg	2014	67	71	67	70	58	75	56	45	69	85	65	78	4	13%
TTO_10082020_L1	Leg	2020	59	67	75	46	51	71	53	44	50	63	64	68	7	18%
TUN_06102019_L1	Leg	2019	57	52	61	53	60	56	38	34	60	74	60	69	5	13%
TUN_13102019_P2	Pres	2019	50	39	68	40	50	60	48	29	50	55	58	53	3	8%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
TUN_21122014_P2	Pres	2014	69	78	86	77	54	74	53	46	68	87	60	86	4	10%
TUN_26102014_L1	Leg	2014	66	75	75	68	45	73	59	47	59	78	81	71	13	34%
TUR_01112015_L1	Leg	2015	44	28	60	45	51	43	25	24	43	61	68	45	20	49%
TUR_07062015_L1	Leg	2015	47	22	68	38	49	48	28	26	46	71	69	52	12	30%
TUR_10082014_P1	Pres	2014	51	43	62	56	58	51	27	29	53	68	68	53	12	27%
TUR_24062018_P1	Pres	2018	35	19	35	35	54	26	15	22	48	44	60	29	15	36%
TWN_11012020_P1	Pres	2020	82	83	97	69	100	94	65	69	60	100	89	100	4	10%
TWN_16012016_P1	Pres	2016	73	65	94	64	84	83	61	51	54	94	86	88	14	36%
TZA_25102015_P1	Pres	2015	44	33	60	44	33	54	43	23	43	56	40	46	14	38%
TZA_28102020_P1	Pres	2020	31	13	31	42	26	32	30	26	38	30	39	26	5	13%
UGA_14012021_P1	Pres	2021	27	17	28	52	12	40	40	13	22	25	19	38	2*	5%
UGA_18022016_P1	Pres	2016	37	33	35	30	33	52	42	14	32	56	41	41	12	22%
UKR_11042019_P2	Pres	2019	53	64	66	58	37	57	46	32	48	64	63	58	10	18%
UKR_25052014_P1	Pres	2014	59	70	70	53	40	63	57	39	50	70	78	71	13	33%
UKR_26102014_L1	Leg	2014	53	59	64	51	45	53	49	34	48	65	66	59	13	33%
UKR_28102012_L1	Leg	2012	39	38	42	42	32	41	38	23	51	39	40	39	14	42%
URY_24112019_P2	Pres	2019	73	86	92	72	92	75	49	55	57	78	89	88	3	8%
URY_27102019_P1	Pres	2019	83	99	100	83	94	83	65	70	63	97	93	94	16	19%
URY_30112014_P2	Pres	2014	75	91	94	72	78	72	65	58	57	92	94	84	16	42%
USA_03112020_P1	Pres	2020	57	50	88	18	32	65	56	37	66	78	23	85	5	13%
USA_04112014_L1	Leg	2014	62	31	75	11	35	80	69	47	67	76	77	72	9	24%
USA_06112012_P1	Pres	2012	63	38	70	16	41	74	64	44	68	85	84	75	15	39%
USA_06112018_L1	Leg	2018	65	49	79	37	52	75	62	56	67	77	73	72	40	14%
USA_08112016_P1	Pres	2016	59	39	72	16	43	80	46	54	69	76	46	70	10	26%
UZB_04012015_L2	Leg	2015	38	28	54	57	37	30	26	22	42	42	66	24	5	13%
UZB_04122016_P1	Pres	2016	38	24	57	44	41	20	17	22	37	51	86	28	6	15%
UZB_24102021_P1	Pres	2021	44	13	66	37	58	31	19	28	47	72	78	38	2*	5%
UZB_29032015_P1	Pres	2015	39	27	50	40	35	30	25	26	43	48	73	36	12	27%
VEN_06122015_L1	Leg	2015	42	33	49	36	43	51	27	22	47	50	65	40	22	48%
VEN_06122020_L1	Leg	2020	36	5	16	40	56	16	31	11	31	33	56	13	5	13%
VEN_07102012_P1	Pres	2012	54	48	61	51	58	67	30	22	61	69	79	49	11	29%
VEN_14042013_P1	Pres	2013	40	33	37	41	42	58	38	25	46	39	38	31	14	37%
VEN_20052018_P1	Pres	2018	26	12	16	34	22	29	28	17	33	28	45	19	17	45%
VNM_22052016_L1	Leg	2016	34	14	41	34	32	27	20	25	41	41	55	35	8	21%



Election Code	Type	Year	PEI Index	Electoral laws	Electoral procedures	Voting district boundaries	Voter registration	Party and candidate registration	Media coverage	Campaign finance	Voting process	Vote count	Results index	Electoral authorities	Number of Responses	Response Rate
VNM_23052021_L1	Leg	2021	44	28	67	36	48	45	33	50	43	37	56	44	3	8%
VUT_19032020_L1	Leg	2020	61	82	76	60	33	65	64	40	52	70	73	70	5	13%
VUT_22012016_L1	Leg	2016	62	75	69	56	24	72	67	38	58	73	72	78	8	19%
WSM_04032016_L1	Leg	2016	53	33	67	60	35	54	58	30	50	68	60	66	6	15%
WSM_04092021_L1	Leg	2021	51	33	55	50	57	49	46	41	58	62	44	61	4	10%
ZAF_07052014_L1	Leg	2014	63	72	78	69	52	60	56	35	62	75	73	71	16	41%
ZAF_08052019_L1	Leg	2019	66	72	83	67	46	69	59	41	61	82	73	77	10	23%
ZMB_11082016_P1	Pres	2016	45	60	50	58	42	55	32	27	45	50	33	57	12	31%
ZMB_12082021_P1	Pres	2021	38	4	38	54	26	48	30	13	36	65	72	25	2*	5%
ZMB_20012015_P1	Pres	2015	44	53	54	62	31	49	30	27	34	58	55	50	9	24%
ZWE_30072018_P1	Pres	2018	41	33	46	47	32	56	43	16	44	51	34	43	10	26%
ZWE_31072013_L1	Leg	2013	35	27	29	31	15	50	33	25	36	46	49	32	13	39%

\* In certain cases, marked in Table 3 with an \*, the number of responses was very low, with large confidence intervals, and these results should be treated with due caution.



## IV: Technical Appendix: Indicators, Coverage, and Methods

**Concepts:** The idea of electoral integrity is defined by the project to refer to agreed international conventions and global norms, applying universally to all countries worldwide through the election cycle, including during the pre-election period, the campaign, on polling day, and its aftermath.<sup>10</sup>

**Measurement:** To measure this concept, the PEI survey questionnaire includes 49 items on electoral integrity (see Table 5) ranging over the whole electoral cycle. These items fell into eleven sequential sub-dimensions. The PEI Codebook provides detailed description of all variables and imputation procedures for these data. A copy and all the data can be downloaded from <https://thedata.harvard.edu/dataverse/PEI>.

**Global Coverage:** The PEI survey of electoral integrity covers independent nation-states around the world which have held direct (popular) elections for the national parliament or presidential elections. The criteria for inclusion are listed below. The present data release adds to these results 730 experts evaluating 143 national elections in 115 countries, from February 3, 2019, to December 31, 2021. In total, PEI 8.0 covers 480 elections in 169 countries.

TABLE 4: COUNTRY COVERAGE

Criteria for inclusion in the survey	#	Definition and source
Total number of independent nation-states	194	Membership of the United Nations (plus Taiwan)
<b>Excluded categories</b>		
Micro-states	11	Population less than 100,000 as of 2013: Andorra, Dominica, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Nauru, Palau, San Marino, Seychelles, St. Kitts and Nevis, and Tuvalu.
Without de jure direct (popular) elections for the lower house of the national legislature	5	Brunei Darussalam, China, Qatar, UAE, and Saudi Arabia
State has constitutional provisions for direct (popular) elections for the lower house of the national legislature, but none have been held since independence or within the last 30 years ( <i>de facto</i> ).	3	Eritrea, Somalia, and South Sudan
State has direct elections for the lower house of the national legislature but only candidates for the ruling party have ballot access, excluding independents and candidates for any other party.	2	North Korea, Cuba
Not yet included in the survey	7	Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kiribati, Libya, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (Dropped for low response rates), Yemen. <sup>11</sup>
Covered to date in the PEI 8.0 dataset (from mid-2012 to end-2021)	169	

**Respondents:** The project identified around forty experts per election, defined as a political scientist (or other social scientist in a related discipline) who had demonstrated knowledge of the electoral process in a particular country (such as through publications, membership of a relevant research group or network, or university employment). In total, 4,590 completed responses were received in the survey, representing a response rate of 23%. In certain cases, marked in Table 3 with an \*, the number of responses was very low, with large confidence intervals, and these results should be treated with due caution.

The electoral integrity items in the survey were recoded so that a higher score consistently represents a more positive evaluation. Missing data was estimated based on multiple imputation by chained equations in groups composing of the eleven sub-dimensions. The Perceptions of Electoral Integrity (PEI) Index is an



additive function of the 49 imputed variables, standardized to 100-points. Sub-indices of the eleven sub-dimensions in the electoral cycle are summations of the imputed individual variables.<sup>12</sup>

**Validity and reliability tests:** For further information regarding validity and reliability, please see: Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank, and Ferran Martínez i Coma. 2014. "Measuring Electoral Integrity around the World: A New Dataset." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47 (4):789-798. doi: 10.1017/S1049096514001061 and Martínez i Coma, Ferran and Carolien Van Ham. 2015. "Can experts judge elections? Testing the validity of expert judgments for measuring election integrity." *European Journal of Political Research* 54(2) 305-325. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12084.



TABLE 5: PEI CORE SURVEY QUESTIONS

	Sections	Performance indicators	Direction
PRE-ELECTION	<b>1. Electoral laws</b>	1-1 Electoral laws were unfair to smaller parties	N
		1-2 Electoral laws favored the governing party or parties	N
		1-3 Election laws restricted citizens' rights	N
	<b>2. Electoral procedures</b>	2-1 Elections were well managed	P
		2-2 Information about voting procedures was widely available	P
		2-3 Election officials were fair	P
		2-4 Elections were conducted in accordance with the law	P
	<b>3. Boundaries</b>	3-1 Boundaries discriminated against some parties	N
		3-2 Boundaries favored incumbents	N
		3-3 Boundaries were impartial	P
	<b>4. Voter registration</b>	4-1 Some citizens were not listed in the register	N
		4-2 The electoral register was inaccurate	N
		4-3 Some ineligible electors were registered	N
	<b>5. Party registration</b>	5-1 Some opposition candidates were prevented from running	N
		5-2 Women had equal opportunities to run for office	P
		5-3 Ethnic and national minorities had equal opportunities to run for office	P
		5-4 Only top party leaders selected candidates	N
5-5 Some parties/candidates were restricted from holding campaign rallies		N	
CAMPAIGN	<b>6. Campaign media</b>	6-1 Newspapers provided balanced election news	P
		6-2 TV news favored the governing party	N
		6-3 Parties/candidates had fair access to political broadcasts and advertising	P
		6-4 Journalists provided fair coverage of the elections	P
		6-5 Social media were used to expose electoral fraud	P
	<b>7. Campaign finance</b>	7-1 Parties/candidates had equitable access to public subsidies	P
		7-2 Parties/candidates had equitable access to political donations	P
		7-3 Parties/candidates publish transparent financial accounts	P
		7-4 Rich people buy elections	N
		7-5 Some state resources were improperly used for campaigning	N
ELECTION DAY	<b>8. Voting process</b>	8-1 Some voters were threatened with violence at the polls	N
		8-2 Some fraudulent votes were cast	N
		8-3 The process of voting was easy	P
		8-4 Voters were offered a genuine choice at the ballot box	P
		8-5 Postal ballots were available	P
		8-6 Special voting facilities were available for the disabled	P
		8-7 National citizens living abroad could vote	P
		8-8 Some form of internet voting was available	P
POST-ELECTION	<b>9. Vote count</b>	9-1 Ballot boxes were secure	P
		9-2 The results were announced without undue delay	P
		9-3 Votes were counted fairly	P
		9-4 International election monitors were restricted	N
		9-5 Domestic election monitors were restricted	N
	<b>10. Results</b>	10-1 Parties/candidates challenged the results	N
		10-2 The election led to peaceful protests	N
		10-3 The election triggered violent protests	N
		10-4 Any disputes were resolved through legal channels	P
	<b>11. Electoral authorities</b>	11-1 The election authorities were impartial	P
		11-2 The authorities distributed information to citizens	P
		11-3 The authorities allowed public scrutiny of their performance	P
		11-4 The election authorities performed well	P

**Note:** The direction of the original items P=positive, N=negative. Core items are repeated each year.

Source: [www.electoralintegrityproject.com](http://www.electoralintegrityproject.com)



## V: Acknowledgments

The dataset and report have been produced by the Electoral Integrity Project (EIP), based at the Royal Military College/Queen's University and the University of East Anglia. The research would not have been possible without the contribution of all the thousands of experts who kindly spent time and effort in responding to our requests for information.

The EIP is currently supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada's Partnership Development Grants. From 2012-2018, it was generously supported by the award of the Kathleen Fitzpatrick Australian Laureate from the Australian Research Council (ARC ref: FL110100093).

The authors would like to acknowledge Pippa Norris, founding director of the Electoral Integrity Project, and all previous authors of the PEI datasets for their invaluable work creating the original PEI dataset. They would also like to express our gratitude for all RAs that worked on this data set: Aimee McCurdy (Project Coordinator, January 2021–June 2021), Callum Wright (Intern), Charlotte Goldberger (Research Assistant), Jamie Underwood (Intern), Josephine Makepeace (Intern), Marcella Morris (Research Assistant), Matilda Adams (Intern), Matthew Musindi (Intern), Mikolaj Szajkowski (Intern), Miriam Hussein (Intern), and Tom Barton (Data Assistant). Finally, they acknowledge the assistance of former PEI survey managers Richard Frank, Max Grömping, Alessandro Nai, Sarah Cameron and Ferran Martinez i Coma in responding to our technical questions regarding these data.











The full dataset and codebook are available for download from <http://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/PEI>.

## VI: Bibliography of Select EIP Publications

### BOOKS

- Garnett, Holly Ann and Michael Pal, eds. 2022. *Cyber-Threats to Canadian Elections*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Garnett, Holly Ann and Margarita Zavadsкая Eds. 2017. *Electoral Integrity and Political Regimes: Actors, Strategies and Consequences*. New York: Routledge Press.
- James, Toby S. 2012. *Elite Statecraft and Election Administration*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- James, Toby S. 2022. *Comparative Electoral Management*. New York: Routledge.
- James, Toby S. and Holly Ann Garnett, eds. 2020. *Building Inclusive Elections*. New York: Routledge Press.
- LeDuc, Lawrence, Richard Niemi, and Pippa Norris, eds. 2014. *Comparing Democracies 4: Elections and Voting in a Changing World*. London: Sage Publications.
- Martínez i Coma, Ferran, Alessandro Nai and Pippa Norris. 2016. *Democratic Diffusion: How regional organizations strengthen electoral integrity*. Washington DC: Organization of American States.
- Nai, Alessandro, and Annemarie Walter, eds. 2015. *New Perspectives on Negative Campaigning: Why Attack Politics Matters*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Norris, Pippa and Alessandro Nai. Eds. 2017. *Election Watchdogs*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Norris, Pippa and Andrea Abel van Es, eds. 2016. *Checkbook Elections? Political Finance in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank, and Ferran Martínez i Coma, eds. 2014. *Advancing Electoral Integrity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank, and Ferran Martínez i Coma, eds. 2015. *Contentious Elections: From Ballots to the Barricades*. New York: Routledge.
- Norris, Pippa, Sarah Cameron, & Thomas Wynter, eds. 2018. *Electoral Integrity in America: Securing Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press. (In press, forthcoming fall)
- Norris, Pippa. 2014. *Why Electoral Integrity Matters*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 2015. *Why Elections Fail*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 2017. *Strengthening Electoral Integrity: The Pragmatic Case for Assistance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 2017. *Why American Elections are Flawed (And How to Fix Them)*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.





## JOURNAL ARTICLES

- Bjarnegård, Elin and Pär Zetterberg. 2016. 'Political parties and gender quota implementation: The role of bureaucratized candidate selection procedures.' *Comparative Politics* 48(3): 393-417.
- Bowler, Shaun, Thomas Brunell, Todd Donovan, and Paul Gronke. 2015. 'Election administration and perceptions of fair elections.' *Electoral Studies* 38: 1-9.
- Coffe, Hilde. 2017. 'Citizens' media use and the accuracy of their perceptions of electoral integrity.' *International Political Science Review*. doi: 10.1177/0192512116640984
- Donovan, Todd, and Jeffrey Karp. 2017. 'Electoral rules, corruption, inequality and evaluations of democracy.' *European Journal of Political Research*. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12188.
- Flesken, Anaïd and Jakob Hartl. 2017. 'Party Support, Values, and Perceptions of Electoral Integrity.' *Political Psychology*. doi:10.1111/pops.12431
- Frank, Richard W., and Ferran Martínez i Coma. 2017. 'How election dynamics shape perceptions of electoral integrity.' *Electoral Studies*. doi:10.1016/j.electstud.2017.05.007
- Garnett, Holly Ann. 2019. "On the front lines of democracy: perceptions of electoral officials and democratic elections." *Democratization*. 26 (8), 1399-1418.
- Garnett, Holly Ann. 2019. "Evaluating Electoral Management Body Capacity." *International Political Science Review* 40 (3), 335–353.
- Garnett, Holly Ann and Toby S. James. 2021. "Measuring Electoral Integrity: The Perceptions of Electoral Officials." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 31(3).
- Garnett, Holly Ann and Jean-Nicolas Bordeleau. 2022. "Deploying Democracy: Security Forces' Involvement in Elections." *Democracy and Security*.
- Garnett, Holly Ann. Forthcoming. "Who Runs Elections? A Cross-National Analysis of Electoral Management Throughout the Electoral Cycle." *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*.
- Gauja, Anika. Ed. 2015. Special issue of the *Election Law Journal* on Electoral integrity and the legal regulation of political parties. 15(1): doi: 10.1089/elj.2015.0354
- Grömping, Max and Ferran Martínez i Coma. 2015. 'Electoral Integrity in Africa.' Hans Seidel Foundation.
- Grömping, Max. 'Domestic Election Monitoring and Advocacy: An Emerging Research Agenda.' *Nordic Journal of Human Rights* 35, no. 4 (2017): 407-423.
- Grömping, Max. 2013. 'Cambodia's 2013 Elections: The Retreat of "Electoral Authoritarianism"?' *SocDem Asia Quarterly*, 1(2):13-15.
- Grömping, Max. 2018. 'The integrity of elections in Asia: Policy lessons from expert evaluations.' *Asian Politics & Policy*, 10(3):527-547.
- Karp, Jeffrey A, Alessandro Nai, and Pippa Norris. 2018. 'Dial 'F' for fraud: Explaining citizens suspicions about elections.' *Electoral Studies*, doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2018.01.010.
- Karp, Jeffrey A. and Caitlin Milazzo. 2015. 'Democratic scepticism and political participation in Europe.' *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*. 25(1): 97-110.
- Lago, Ignacio and Ferran Martínez i Coma. 2016. 'Challenge or consent? Understanding losers' reactions in mass elections.' *Government and Opposition*.
- Martínez i Coma, Ferran and Carolien Van Ham. 2015. 'Can experts judge elections? Testing the validity of expert judgments for measuring election integrity.' *European Journal of Political Research* 54(2) 305-325. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12084.
- Martínez i Coma, Ferran and Ignacio Lago. 2016. 'Gerrymandering in comparative perspective.' *Party Politics*. Pre-publication. doi:10.1177/1354068816642806
- Martínez i Coma, Ferran, and Minh Trinh. 2017. 'How electoral integrity affects voter turnout in democracies.' *Australian Journal of Political Science* 52.1 (2017): 53-74.
- Martínez i Coma, Ferran. 2017. 'Ethnic diversity decreases turnout. Comparative evidence from over 650 elections around the world.' *Electoral Studies* 49(1): 75-95.



- Norris, Pippa, Ferran Martínez i Coma, and Richard W. Frank. 2013. 'Assessing the quality of elections.' *Journal of Democracy*. 24(4): 124-135.
- Norris, Pippa, Holly Ann Garnett and Max Grömping. 2020. "The Paranoid Style of American Elections: Explaining perceptions of electoral integrity in an age of populism." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*. 30 (1), 105-125
- Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank and Ferran Martínez i Coma. 2014. 'Measuring electoral integrity: A new dataset.' *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47(4): 789-798.
- Norris, Pippa; Nai, Alessandro; Karp, Jeffrey, 2016, "Electoral Learning and Capacity Building (ELECT) data", doi:10.7910/DVN/MQCI3U. Latest: 14 Dec 2016
- Norris, Pippa; Nai, Alessandro; Karp, Jeffrey, 2016, "The Australian Voter Experience (AVE) dataset", doi:10.7910/DVN/FEBKDE
- Norris, Pippa. 2013. 'Does the world agree about standards of electoral integrity? Evidence for the diffusion of global norms.' Special issue of *Electoral Studies* 32(4):576-588.
- Norris, Pippa. 2013. 'The new research agenda studying electoral integrity'. Special issue of *Electoral Studies* 32(4): 563-575.
- Norris, Pippa. 2016. 'Electoral integrity in East Asia.' In *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*. 12(1): 1-18.
- Norris, Pippa. 2017. 'Electoral integrity and electoral systems.' *Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems* eds. Erik S. Herron, Robert J. Pekkanen, and Matthew S. Shugart. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 2017. 'Electoral integrity and voting behavior' *Routledge Handbook on Voting Behavior and Public Opinion*. Eds. Justin Fisher, Edward Fieldhouse, Mark N. Franklin, Rachel Gibson, Marta Cantijoch and Christopher Wlezian. NY: Routledge.
- Norris, Pippa. 2017. 'Electoral integrity in East Asia.' *Routledge Handbook on Democratization in East Asia*. Co-ed Tun-jen Cheng and Yun-han Chu. Routledge: New York.
- Norris, Pippa. 2017. 'Is Western democracy backsliding? Diagnosing the risks.' *Journal of Democracy*. 28(2). April.
- Norris, Pippa. 2018. 'Why procedural fairness matters for electoral legitimacy.' *International Political Science Review*.
- Otaola, Miguel Angel Lara. 2017. "To include or not to include? Party representation in electoral institutions and confidence in elections: A comparative study of Latin America." *Party Politics*.
- van Ham, Carolien and Holly Ann Garnett. 2019. "Building Impartial Electoral Management? Institutional design, Independence and Electoral Integrity." *International Political Science Review*. 40 (3), 313–334.
- Zavadskaya, Margarita, Grömping, Max, & Martínez i Coma, Ferran. 2017. 'Electoral sources of authoritarian resilience in Russia: Varieties of electoral malpractice, 2007-2016.' *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization*, 25(4) : 455-480.

## SPECIAL ISSUES

- Garnett, Holly Ann and Toby S. James. 2020. "Cyber-Elections." *Election Law Journal*. 19(2).
- James, Toby S. and Holly Ann Garnett. 2020. "Inclusive Voting Practices." *Policy Studies*. 40 (2-3).
- James, Toby S., Holly Ann Garnett, Leontine Loeber and Carolien van Ham. 2019. "Building Better Elections." *International Political Science Review*. 40 (3).
- Norris, Pippa. 2013. "The new research agenda on electoral integrity." *Electoral Studies*. 32(4).



## RELATED DATASETS

- James, Toby S., Holly Ann Garnett, Leontine Loeber; Carolien van Ham. 2020. "Comparative Structural Survey Election Management Bodies EMS (Version 1, European and International Data, February 2019)", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/1X5FVB>, Harvard Dataverse, V1
- Norris, Pippa, Max Grömping, and Holly Ann Garnett. 2019. "Perceptions of Electoral Integrity - US 2018 (PEI\_US\_2018)", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/METZ3U>, Harvard Dataverse, V1.
- Norris, Pippa; Nai, Alessandro; Grömping, Max, 2016, "Perceptions of Electoral Integrity - US 2016 (PEI\_US\_1.0)", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/YXUV3W>, Harvard Dataverse, V1, UNF:6:1cMrtJfvUs9uBoNewfUKqA== [fileUNF]
- Norris, Pippa; Martinez i Coma, Ferran; Nai, Alessandro; Grömping, Max, 2016, "Perceptions of Electoral Integrity-Mexico, (PEI-Mexico 2.0)", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/YJW0AQ>, Harvard Dataverse, V1, UNF:6:+ILE/ZN47/GcqJ11a/ReTQ== [fileUNF]
- Norris, Pippa; Martinez i Coma, Ferran; Nai, Alessandro; Grömping, Max, 2015, "Perceptions of Electoral Integrity-Russia, (PEI-Russia 1.0)", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/8LYUAY>, Harvard Dataverse, V1, UNF:6:vYH36AJ97SouQLbww76u7g== [fileUNF]
- Norris, Pippa; Martinez i Coma, Ferran; Nai, Alessandro; Grömping, Max, 2015, "Perceptions of Electoral Integrity-Mexico, (PEI-Mexico 1.0)", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/O6UCIM>, Harvard Dataverse, V5, UNF:6:kEgO8gFqfSq73HhYhW7RxQ== [fileUNF]
- Norris, Pippa; Martinez i Coma, Ferran; Nai, Alessandro; Grömping, Max, 2015, "Perceptions of Electoral Integrity-UK, (PEI-UK 1.0)", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/U6OYK9>, Harvard Dataverse, V2, UNF:6:8OeOiDDuDfPV+bm+ja93MA== [fileUNF]



## VII: Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.state.gov/summit-for-democracy/>

<sup>2</sup> See exceptions (missing elections) in codebook associated with this dataset on the PEI dataverse: <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/PEI>

<sup>3</sup> See Codebook for more details regarding the process for the 2019-2021 elections.

<sup>4</sup> See Norris, Pippa, Holly Ann Garnett and Max Gromping. 2019. *Electoral Integrity in the 2018 American Elections*. Sydney: University of Sydney. <https://www.electoralintegrityproject.com/peius2018>

<sup>5</sup> Norris, Pippa. 2014. *Why Elections Fail*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>6</sup> Norris, Pippa, Richard W. Frank, and Ferran Martínez i Coma. "Measuring Electoral Integrity around the World: A New Dataset." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47, no. 4 (2014): 789–98. doi:10.1017/S1049096514001061.

<sup>7</sup> It is important to note that response rates are low for each of these countries in recent elections and further data is required to ascertain the true nature of any shifts in overall electoral integrity.

<sup>8</sup> 2018. "Controversial vote on presidential powers passes in Comoros." Al Jazeera.

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/7/31/controversial-vote-on-presidential-powers-passes-in-comoros>; 2020. "Comoros president's party wins poll boycotted by opposition." Al Jazeera.

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/1/21/comoros-presidents-party-wins-poll-boycotted-by-opposition>.

<sup>9</sup> Moala, Kalafi. 2021. "Independents the winners in Tongan election." <https://pacificsecurity.net/independents-the-winners-in-tongan-election/>; Moala, Kalafi. 2021. "Challenges for Tonga as election looms."

<https://www.policyforum.net/challenges-for-tonga-as-election-looms/>; 2021. "Tongan cabinet minister convicted of major fraud." Radio New Zealand. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/international/pacific-news/444113/tongan-cabinet-minister-convicted-of-major-fraud>.

<sup>10</sup> Norris, Pippa. 2013: 'The new research agenda studying electoral integrity.' *Electoral Studies* 32(4): 563-575.

<sup>11</sup> Cases in the list are not yet included in the dataset either because the number of responses fell below the minimum cut off point or because elections have been delayed during the period of data collection.

<sup>12</sup> See the PEI Codebook for further information on the PEI 8.0 dataverse:

<https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/PEI>

