

Large Language Models Are Democracy Coders with Attitudes

Nils B. Weidmann* Mats Faulborn

David García

Department of Politics and Public Administration
University of Konstanz, Germany

March 31, 2025

Abstract

Current political developments worldwide illustrate that research on democratic backsliding is as important as ever. A recent exchange in *Political Science & Politics* (2/2024) has highlighted again a fundamental challenge in this literature: the measurement of democracy. With many democracy indicators consisting of subjective assessments rather than factual observations, trends in democracy over time could be due to human biases in the coding of these indicators rather than empirical facts. In this paper, we leverage two cutting-edge Large Language Models (LLMs) for the coding of democracy indicators from the V-Dem project. With access to a huge amount of information, these models may be able to rate the many “soft” characteristics of regimes without the cognitive biases that humans potentially possess. While LLM-generated codings largely align with expert coders for many countries, we show that when these models deviate from human assessments, they do so in different but consistent ways: Some LLMs are too pessimistic, while others consistently overestimate the democratic quality of these countries. While the combination of the two LLM codings can alleviate this concern, we conclude that it is difficult to replace human coders with LLMs, since the extent and direction of these attitudes is not known a priori.

The measurement of democracy has long been a contested subject of investigation in political science. A recent symposium in *Political Science & Politics* (Volume 57, Issue 2) picks up on this question and discusses whether the observation of a global trend of democratic backsliding could be due to subjective perceptions of human coders. Focusing on V-Dem, the largest collection of democracy data, the argument is that expert ratings in this dataset could be affected by psychological biases (Little & Meng, 2024; Treisman, 2024) and lead to skewed assessments of democratic quality that are not supported by more factual observations of institutional characteristics (see, however, Knutsen et al. 2024 for a critique).

Rather than dismissing human coding in general, in this paper we study if and how it could be supplemented with automatic coding. For political science, the advent of AI and in particular, Large Language Models (LLMs), has brought many new opportunities. The most promising and most frequent way in which these models are used is the generation of new data for empirical

*Corresponding author. Email: nils.weidmann@uni-konstanz.de

research, assisting (or sometimes even replacing) humans as creators or sources of these data. Much work in this area has shown that LLMs can reproduce responses collected in surveys (Mellon et al., 2024) or voting decisions by different groups of voters (von der Heyde et al., 2024), thus reducing the need to obtain large population samples. In this paper, we study the use of LLMs for human coding in comparative research on democracy, which is a second way in which AI can assist in the creation of typically human-sourced data for social science research.

We show that, perhaps not surprisingly, LLMs can emulate human coders well, and that they can do so off-the-shelf, without any adaptation. However, we also show that LLMs are of little help with those countries that V-Dem coders find particularly difficult and where they disagree the most. What is even more concerning is that while LLMs may not exhibit the cognitive biases typically attributed to humans, they have other, extremely pronounced issues: Results show that one LLM in our study consistently underestimates democratic quality, another overestimates it in almost all cases. Hence, LLMs seem to have particular political “attitudes” that strongly affect their coding. Since we do not know the direction and strength of these attitudes, it is difficult to trust assessments generated by particular LLMs alone or by combinations of them.

Coding Democracy is a Difficult Task

How does democracy coding compare to other human coding tasks, and why could LLMs be particularly helpful in this task? We start with a general categorization. In human coding, coders (typically experts or people with at least some specialized training) are tasked with the creation of standardized *codings* for particular *instances/cases*. For a simple categorization of human coding tasks, we can distinguish by (i) the extent to which the material required for the coding is provided as part of the task, and (ii) the extent of interpretation that is required by the coder to perform the task. The first dimension refers to whether the coding is based on material that is readily provided to the coder. Some coding tasks involve particular instances of coding material that the coders then work with: For example, annotations of social media posts (Gilardi et al., 2023) or the coding of protest events from news reports (Weidmann & Geelmuyden Rød, 2019, Ch. 4) provide coders with material that the coding is supposed to be based on. Other coding tasks, such as the human coding of democracy indicators (Coppedge et al., 2024) or the fact-checking of particular statements (Ni et al., 2024), often provide no material whatsoever, and assume that coders possess expert knowledge to perform the task.

The second dimension by which we can distinguish different coding tasks is the extent of interpretation required by the coder. By “interpretation,” we mean the process by which coders leverage their own expertise and intuition to complete a given task. Some tasks involve little interpretation at all. For example, coding the time and place of a protest event from a news report can be done by identifying the corresponding information from the report, without requiring much interpretation by the coder (Weidmann & Geelmuyden Rød, 2015). This is similar for fact-checking tasks (Ni et al., 2024), where all that coders need to do is to establish whether a




Figure 1: Different types of human coding tasks.

statement is factually true or not. In other tasks, such as the annotation of social media posts with the speaker’s position or a particular framing, coders need to interpret the information provided to determine whether it aligns with the particular label they are required to assign (Gilardi et al., 2023). Similarly, for coding many of the democracy indicators in the V-Dem project, coders need to use their own expertise to determine whether, for example, opposition parties are “independent and autonomous of the ruling regime” (V-Dem indicator *v2psoppaut*). The two-dimensional categorization and the examples for the different types of coding tasks are depicted in Figure 1.

The difficulty of a coding task is typically higher if the coding material is not pre-specified, which is also why these coding tasks should have a lower reliability. Tasks that require more interpretation are typically more subjective, and concerns about reliability are higher. This means that coding difficulty is highest for tasks in the bottom left corner of Figure 1. Democracy coding is one example of this kind of task: it is virtually impossible to precisely specify what material coders should consult to rate political regimes. At the same time, many of the indicators used in this kind of coding require extensive interpretation by coders. In sum, democracy coding is a prime example of what we consider to be a “difficult” human coding task.

Therefore, it would be important to analyze whether LLMs can help us solve this difficult task. We already know that modern AI models perform well (in some cases, even extremely well) for other examples of coding tasks: Overos et al. (2024) show that the coding of protest events from news reports works well, and that LLMs are able to match the performance of humans on this task. Annotations of social media posts with labels indicating the political stance or a particular framing are more difficult, but studies have shown that modern LLMs can perform this task with high accuracy compared to human annotators (Gilardi et al., 2023; Heseltine &

Clemm Von Hohenberg, 2024; Le Mens & Gallego, 2025). Also, LLMs have successfully been employed in fact-checking, as illustrated in Ni et al. (2024).

In the following, we replicate the difficult task of democracy coding with LLMs. Trained on a large amount of data, these models may possess a knowledge base that should be on par with human experts, thus addressing the lack of pre-specified coding material that we typically face in these tasks. Also, the human biases that can affect human interpretations in these coding tasks should be reduced when using LLMs. Our aim is not to custom-tailor these models specifically for the task of rating political regimes; rather, we want to see how these models compare without prior adaptation, in a so-called “zero-shot” setting. In addition, we are particularly interested in how LLMs perform in cases that are difficult for human coders, because, for example, the available information about a particular country is limited.

Coding V-Dem with LLMs

Our analysis is based on the V-Dem dataset of political indicators that covers all countries worldwide with annual observations (Coppedge et al., 2024). We use the 2024 release (Version 14), which was published after the cutoff dates for the training data for the two LLMs in our study, and therefore rules out contamination of the LLMs with actual data. From Version 14, we replicate the coding of V-Dem variables for the year 2023, the most recent one in the data.

V-Dem’s well-known aggregate democracy *indices* are based on a large set of constituent *indicators* produced by expert coders. The data for these indicators is collected in a series of survey questions that coders answer for the respective country and year, with responses typically recorded on an ordinal scale from “bad” (illiberal, authoritarian) to “good” (liberal, democratic). For example, to score the extent of media bias, experts answer the question “Is there media bias against opposition parties or candidates?” on a five-point scale from 0 (“The print and broadcast media cover only the official party or candidates, or have no political coverage, or there are no opposition parties or candidates to cover” to 4 (“The print and broadcast media cover all newsworthy parties and candidates more or less impartially and in proportion to their newsworthiness”).

We select all of the ordinal indicators coded by country experts (called Type-C variables in V-Dem) that are necessary for the coding of the high-level V-Dem democracy indicators (electoral, liberal, participatory, deliberative, egalitarian). Importantly, this excludes factual questions such as, for example, the first year of universal suffrage in a country; we are not interested in the LLM’s ability to retrieve facts, but rather the oftentimes fuzzy and subjective assessments it provides and that constitute the main source of information that V-Dem’s democracy indices are based on. Since we focus on a single year only (2023), our dataset includes 54 indicators for 171 countries (see Appendix A for a full list). For each of these indicators, we use the final values provided in the V-Dem dataset, which are computed across the different coders that provided ratings for this particular indicator and country.

Our prompts for the LLM are intentionally kept simple and use the exact same wording of the questions and the responses provided in the V-Dem codebook. All we add is a short introduction that provides the context (“You are an assistant who evaluates political systems in different countries and years. You will be asked to produce numeric scores derived from your knowledge of this country”, see details in Appendix B). Our experiment includes two state-of-the-art LLMs: Llama-3.1 70B and GPT-4o.¹ We use GPT-4o because it is currently the main model of ChatGPT, and because it is one of the best performing in the Chatbot Arena benchmark (Chiang et al., 2024). We complement this with Llama-3.1 as one of the best-performing open-weights models at the time of this research, choosing the 70B size since the additional performance of the 405B version is not sufficient to justify the extra energy and hardware needs (Grattafiori et al., 2024). We do no fine-tuning and operate in a zero-shot setting, where we interact with the models without providing any examples or other training material. To exclude sequence effects, for each question we randomize the order in which the model codes the different countries.

Overall, coding the V-Dem indicators with LLMs works very well, despite the fact that we did not attempt to adjust or tune the models in any way. None of the models ever gives a response that is outside the range of the respective indicator (for example, by returning a score of 4 for an indicator with a range of 0–3). Also, the models refuse to provide answers only in relatively few cases. Llama-3.1 fails to answer 45 out of the total of 9234 questions (171 countries, 54 indicators), which corresponds to about 0.5%. GPT-4o refuses to answer in only 5 cases (0.05%).

Results

Before we turn to our comparison of V-Dem coder ratings with LLM-produced scores, we examine patterns in the former. More precisely, we show that some countries are more difficult for V-Dem coders, so that we can later see if LLMs can help us improve the coding for precisely these countries. As described above, our analysis relies on the 54 Type-C questions that constitute the basis for the high-level V-Dem democracy indexes. From V-Dem’s coder-level data (V-Dem Project, 2024), we can obtain the raw scores that coders provided for each indicator and country for the year 2023. On average, about six different coders provide ratings for each of them, and the final, published values are aggregations over the different ratings.

Examining the disagreement between the different coders gives an idea of which cases (countries) were particularly difficult for humans to code. We do this by computing the standard deviation between the human codings for each indicator, and then calculating the average across the 54 indicators for each country. This analysis shows some clear patterns. Coders show very low levels of disagreement for democratic and wealthy countries. For example, Switzerland or Denmark have an average standard deviation among the coder ratings of around 0.25, while Rwanda and Libya end up at around 1.25. A regression analysis (results in Appendix C) confirms that GDP per capita and level of democracy are both negatively related to coder disagreement: if

¹More precisely, we use the checkpoint GPT-4o-2024-08-06

GDP and democracy go up, the disagreement between coders goes down. In other words, poorer and less democratic countries are more difficult for V-Dem coders. Hence, it is particularly interesting to examine if LLMs can help us improve human coding for these countries.

To analyze patterns in how LLM codings compare to human coders, we again aggregate the results by country. In other words, we use all the 54 indicators and for each country, and compute how well the LLM codings correlate with the (aggregated) human ratings in the final V-Dem data and what their average deviation from these ratings is. The overall correlation between LLMs and human codings is high. Without any adaptation for this particular coding task, Llama-3.1’s ratings on average have a correlation of 0.5 with the V-Dem scores (ranging up to 0.81), with GPT-4o even achieving an average correlation of 0.64 (up to 0.88).

However, simply examining the correlation between the LLM ratings and V-Dem’s expert assessments is misleading: While the correlation coefficients show whether human coders and LLMs identify similar tendencies, they cannot tell us whether they agree on the absolute rating of democratic qualities in different countries. After all, it is important to know where countries stand as regards their democratic quality in absolute terms, for example whether members of the executive embezzle public funds only “occasionally” or “often” (V-Dem’s *v2exembez* indicator). Therefore, in the following we analyze the difference between expert and LLM codings, i.e. where LLMs place particular countries relative to human experts on the ordinal coding scale. While this measure resembles what is typically called an “error,” we refer to it as a “difference,” since the true value of the outcome is not known.

In Figure 2, we plot the distribution of the mean difference per country (computed over all V-Dem questions). In these plots, negative values on the x-axis are those where the model produces lower scores than the human coders, and positive values correspond to the opposite. The blue line at 0 indicates overall correspondence between LLM and human coders. The histograms clearly show that the two LLMs in our experiment possess different “attitudes” towards the political situation in a country: While GPT-4o largely provides *lower* ratings (on average, by 0.28) than the experts for many countries (and is therefore a more pessimistic observer, see left panel in Figure 2), Llama-3.1 does the opposite and considers the political situation to be *more liberal/democratic* (by an average of 0.5) than the experts and is therefore an optimistic observer (see right panel in Figure 2).

What is striking in Figure 2 is not only the fact that the direction of how the LLMs deviate from human coders is different for the two models, it is also the consistency of this deviation across countries. The pessimistic LLM, GPT-4o, underestimates in about 80% of all countries, while the optimistic Llama-3.1 model overestimates in almost all of them (97%). In other words, when these models deviate from the expert assessments, they almost always deviate in a particular direction – GPT-4o gives a more cautious assessment, while Llama-3.1 overestimates the liberal-democratic quality of a country.

We then analyze for which countries the models are particularly likely to differ from the expert assessments. In particular, we are interested in how the LLMs fare in countries that the V-Dem




Figure 2: Distribution of the average error across all V-Dem questions per country. An error of 0 (blue line) indicates perfect correspondence with the expert coders.

coders find more difficult to code. To this end, we plot the mean error per country against the level of coder disagreement, as measured by the average standard deviation between the different coders (the measure introduced above). Figure 3 (left and center panels) shows the results for both LLMs individually. As we can see in the plots, both models match human codings almost perfectly for “easy” countries where coders agree (left side of the x-axis). However, humans and LLMs differ more and more for those countries that the coders find difficult to code (right side of the x-axis). Here, LLMs exhibit the political attitudes that we have already identified above: While GPT-4o rates these countries as *less* democratic than the expert coders do, Llama-3.1 believes them to be *more* democratic. Since poorer and less democratic countries have, on average, higher levels of coder disagreement (see above), this result is consistent with the finding that LLMs possess less knowledge about non-Western world regions (Moayeri et al., 2024).

Can we combine both LLMs to generate a better fit with human codings? The first two panels in Figure 3 suggest that the political attitudes of the two LLMs seem to cancel each other out. When we combine their scores by taking the average (Figure 3, right panel), we can see that the resulting scores provide a much better match with human codings: The average difference between LLMs and human coders is now at value of about 0.1, and this value is constant across the set of countries (blue line). In other words, combining LLMs with different political attitudes can help us reduce differences between LLMs and human codings, and in particular for those countries that constitute more difficult cases.

Our analysis leads to two important conclusions. First, LLMs can have particular and pronounced biases in how they assess “soft” political characteristics of regimes. While other research has identified LLMs to have mostly left-of-center political preferences (Rozado, 2024), we show that vis-à-vis human coders, certain LLMs are overly pessimistic observers of democratic quality, while others are consistently optimistic. In other words, while some err on the side of caution when assessing democracy, others provide exaggerated ratings. For democracy scholars that are interested in absolute and not relative country ratings, this is reason to worry. Clearly, single




Figure 3: Average differences between LLMs ratings and human codings at the level of countries, with countries ordered by difficulty of coding (disagreement between coders).

LLMs should not be used uncritically to produce democracy ratings, since they may be affected by the respective model’s attitude. Combining different models can be more useful, but require a prior assessment of the strength and direction of their attitudes.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have examined the use of LLMs for the generation of democracy scores. Coding democracy is a difficult task, since the source material for this task is often unspecified and the coding requires a high degree of interpretation by humans. This is why LLMs with their large knowledge base and their automated reasoning could be valuable assistants for these tasks.

To find out whether this is the case, we replicated the coding of the well-known V-Dem democracy indicators with two of the current cutting-edge LLMs, GPT-4o and Llama-3.1. These models require no adaptation for this task, and the automated coding is simple and can be done with a few lines of code. Results show that LLMs approximate human coding well. However, the models also struggle with countries that human coders find particularly difficult and where they disagree the most. For these countries, one of our models consistently underestimates democratic quality, while the other model almost always overestimates it. In short, LLMs seem to have particular political attitudes – some can be pessimistic, while other are overly optimistic about a political situation. A combination of a pessimistic and an optimistic model, however, produces a much closer match between human and LLM scores.

These results lead to two main conclusions. First, political ratings produced by a single model are unlikely to be sufficient. Oftentimes, we have no indication whatsoever whether a model has a particular political attitude, and in which direction. Second, using combinations of

different LLMs as political observers should work much better. While ensembles of LLMs have been shown to perform well for tasks such as forecasting (Schoenegger et al., 2024), using them for the coding of democracy scores requires us to measure their political attitude beforehand, so that they ideally complement each other to produce a more balanced outcome.

References

- Chiang, W.-L., Zheng, L., Sheng, Y., Angelopoulos, A. N., Li, T., Li, D., Zhang, H., Zhu, B., Jordan, M., Gonzalez, J. E., & Stoica, I. (2024). Chatbot Arena: An Open Platform for Evaluating LLMs by Human Preference. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2403.04132>
- Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Angiolillo, F., Bernhard, M., Borella, C., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Fox, L., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Grahn, S., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., . . . Ziblatt, D. (2024). *V-Dem dataset v14 codebook* (manual).
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M., & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(30), e2305016120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2305016120>
- Grattafiori, A., Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Vaughan, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., Goyal, A., Hartshorn, A., Yang, A., Mitra, A., Sravankumar, A., Korenev, A., Hinsvark, A., . . . Ma, Z. (2024). The Llama 3 Herd of Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2407.21783>
- Heseltine, M., & Clemm Von Hohenberg, B. (2024). Large language models as a substitute for human experts in annotating political text. *Research & Politics*, *11*(1), 20531680241236239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20531680241236239>
- Knutsen, C. H., Marquardt, K. L., Seim, B., Coppedge, M., Edgell, A. B., Medzihorsky, J., Pemstein, D., Teorell, J., Gerring, J., & Lindberg, S. I. (2024). Conceptual and Measurement Issues in Assessing Democratic Backsliding. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *57*(2), 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909652300077X>
- Le Mens, G., & Gallego, A. (2025). Positioning Political Texts with Large Language Models by Asking and Averaging. *Political Analysis*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2024.29>
- Little, A. T., & Meng, A. (2024). Measuring Democratic Backsliding. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *57*(2), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909652300063X>
- Mellon, J., Bailey, J., Scott, R., Breckwoldt, J., Miori, M., & Schmedeman, P. (2024). Do AIs know what the most important issue is? Using language models to code open-text social survey responses at scale. *Research & Politics*, *11*(1), 20531680241231468. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20531680241231468>
- Moayeri, M., Tabassi, E., & Feizi, S. (2024). WorldBench: Quantifying Geographic Disparities in LLM Factual Recall. *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1211–1228. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658967>

- Ni, J., Shi, M., Stambach, D., Sachan, M., Ash, E., & Leippold, M. (2024). AFaCTA: Assisting the Annotation of Factual Claim Detection with Reliable LLM Annotators. *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 1890–1912. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.104>
- Overos, H. D., Hlatky, R., Pathak, O., Goers, H., Gouws-Dewar, J., Smith, K., Chew, K. P., Birnir, J. K., & Liu, A. H. (2024). Coding with the machines: Machine-assisted coding of rare event data. *PNAS Nexus*, 3(5), pgae165. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae165>
- Rozado, D. (2024). The political preferences of LLMs (T. Zhang, Ed.). *PLOS ONE*, 19(7), e0306621. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0306621>
- Schoenegger, P., Tuminauskaite, I., Park, P. S., Bastos, R. V. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (2024). Wisdom of the silicon crowd: LLM ensemble prediction capabilities rival human crowd accuracy. *Science Advances*, 10(45), eadp1528. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adp1528>
- Treisman, D. (2024). Psychological Biases and Democratic Anxiety: A Comment on Little and Meng (2023). *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 57(2), 194–197. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096523000768>
- V-Dem Project. (2024). Coder-Level: V-Dem version 14. <https://www.v-dem.net/data/the-v-dem-dataset/coder-level-v-dem-v14/>
- von der Heyde, L., Haensch, A.-C., & Wenz, A. (2024). United in Diversity? Contextual Biases in LLM-Based Predictions of the 2024 European Parliament Elections. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2409.09045>
- Weidmann, N. B., & Geelmuyden Rød, E. (2015). Making uncertainty explicit: Separating reports and events in the coding of violence and contention. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(1), 125–128.
- Weidmann, N. B., & Geelmuyden Rød, E. (2019). *The Internet and political protest in autocracies*. Oxford University Press.

Online Appendix for “Large Language Models are Democracy Coders with Attitudes”

A List of V-Dem Indicators Included in the Analysis

	Indicator	Name
1	v2clacfree	Freedom of academic and cultural expression
2	v2clacjstm	Access to justice for men
3	v2clacjstw	Access to justice for women
4	v2clacjust	Social class equality in respect for civil liberty
5	v2cldiscm	Freedom of discussion for men
6	v2cldiscw	Freedom of discussion for women
7	v2cldmovem	Freedom of domestic movement for men
8	v2cldmovew	Freedom of domestic movement for women
9	v2clfmove	Freedom of foreign movement
10	v2clkill	Freedom from political killings
11	v2clprptym	Property rights for men
12	v2clprptyw	Property rights for women
13	v2clrelig	Freedom of religion
14	v2clrspct	Rigorous and impartial public administration
15	v2clslavf	Freedom from forced labor for women
16	v2clslavem	Freedom from forced labor for men
17	v2clsocgrp	Social group equality in respect for civil liberties
18	v2cltort	Freedom from torture
19	v2csconsult	CSO consultation
20	v2cseeorgs	CSO entry and exit
21	v2csgender	CSO women’s participation
22	v2csprtpt	CSO participatory environment
23	v2csreprss	CSO repression
24	v2dlcommon	Common good
25	v2dlconslt	Range of consultation
26	v2dlcountr	Respect counterarguments
27	v2dlencmps	Particularistic or public goods
28	v2dlengage	Engaged society
29	v2dlunivl	Means-tested v. universalistic policy
30	v2elmulpar	Elections multiparty
31	v2exdfcbhs	HOS appoints cabinet in practice
32	v2exrescon	Executive respects constitution
33	v2jucomp	Compliance with judiciary
34	v2juhccomp	Compliance with high court
35	v2juhcind	High court independence
36	v2juncind	Lower court independence

37	v2lginvstp	Legislature investigates in practice
38	v2lgoppart	Legislature opposition parties
39	v2lgotovst	Executive oversight
40	v2mebias	Media bias
41	v2mecenefm	Govt. censorship effort - media
42	v2mecrit	Print/broadcast media critical
43	v2meharjrn	Harassment of journalists
44	v2merange	Print/broadcast media perspectives
45	v2meslfcen	Media self-censorship
46	v2peedueq	Educational equality
47	v2pehealth	Health equality
48	v2pepwrgen	Power distributed by gender
49	v2pepwrses	Power distributed by socioeconomic position
50	v2pepwrsoc	Power distributed by social group
51	v2psbars	Barriers to parties
52	v2pscnslnl	Candidate selection-national/local
53	v2psoppaut	Opposition parties autonomy
54	v2psparban	Party ban

B Example of a Prompt

The following is an example of a prompt used to code the indicator *v2mecrit* (print/broadcast media critical). The text in bold is from the V-Dem Version 14 codebook.

You are an assistant who evaluates political systems in different countries and years. You will be asked to produce numeric scores derived from your knowledge of this country. The question is as follows: **Of the major print and broadcast outlets, how many routinely criticize the government?** The numeric scores are as follows: **0: None. 1: Only a few marginal outlets. 2: Some important outlets routinely criticize the government but there are other important outlets that never do. 3: All major media outlets criticize the government at least occasionally.**

What is the score for {country} in {year}? Please only return the score as a number, without any explanation.

C Regression Results: Determinants of Coder Disagreement

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	Coder disagreement
Democracy (V-Dem polyarchy)	-0.447*** (0.044)
GDP p.c. (log)	-0.130*** (0.023)
Constant	1.154*** (0.025)
Observations	171
Adjusted R ²	0.592
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table 2: Country-level determinants of disagreement between coders. OLS model, dependent variable: coder disagreement, measured as the standard deviation between coders, averaged per country over all indicators.