

# ECHRdb European Court of Human Rights Database

## JUDGMENT CENTERED DATASET

### Version 1.0 Release 2017 CODEBOOK

To cite the European Court of Human Rights Database please use the following citation: Cichowski, Rachel A. and Elizabeth Chrun (2017). European Court of Human Rights Database, Version 1.0 Release 2017.  
URL: <http://depts.washington.edu/echrdb/>

## JUDGMENT CENTERED Dataset Codebook Version 1.0 Release 2017

The European Court of Human Rights Database (ECHRdb) provides comprehensive data on ECHR litigation to promote justice, accountability and transparency through the legal process. The database identifies comprehensive judgment descriptors and interest and advocacy organization participation in all judgments from the ECHR 1960-2014, total of 15,147 judgments. The database provides easy filtering functions and complements the ECHR's full text judgment repository located at HUDOC: <http://www.echr.coe.int/>

It is the first publicly accessible database to systematically detail international court judgment data, alongside interest and advocacy organization participation, and the effects on domestic and international law. The data base is cross-temporal, across legal domains, broadly cross-national and will enable researchers to map and analyze the human rights litigation in innovative ways. The data are accessible to students, researchers, practitioners and the general public.

### TEAM AND FUNDING

ECHRdb was developed by Principal Investigator Rachel Cichowski, Associate Professor of Political Science and Law, Societies & Justice at the University of Washington. Elizabeth Chrun, Postdoctoral Fellow at the Department of Political Science at McGill University serves as Lead Project Researcher and Web Developer. Christian Schmidt of Schema Design LLC serves as the Design Specialist. The project received funding from the University of Washington (Royalty Research Fund) and the National Science Foundation (SES 1322161, SES 1649863).

### SUGGESTED CITATION

To cite the European Court of Human Rights Database please use the following citation:  
Cichowski, Rachel A. and Elizabeth Chrun (2017). European Court of Human Rights Database, Version 1.0 Release 2017.  
URL: <http://depts.washington.edu/echrdb/>

### DATA SOURCE

The data was collected and coded from the following source for the period 1960-2014.

- HUDOC, the online full text database of the ECHR including all judgments from 1959 to the present. It can be accessed here:  
<http://www.echr.coe.int/>  
Case numbers in HUDOC take the following form: aaa/bb, where aaa is a three- to five-digit application number as assigned by the ECHR and where bb is the year the application was lodged. Application numbers are not necessarily unique: a single application can lead to more than one judgment, and the ECHR sometimes assigns the same case number to different cases. Thus, in order to link observations to unique HUDOC entries, one has to take into consideration 4 different variables in conjunction: 1) the application number assigned to the case by the ECHR (app variable); 2) the defendant country (variable country); 3) the year the case was lodged (variable dtelgd); and 4) the year of the judgment (variable dtejmt).
- Interest and advocacy participation was retrieved by looking up each judgment from 1960-2014 in HUDOC. The Procedures section of the judgment was analyzed to retrieve information about whether organizations were the applicant in the case, whether they served as legal counsel and whether there was a third party intervention invited in the case. The text of the judgment provided information (through summaries, and inclusion of organizational arguments) to identify third party intervention support and engagement variables.

### DATA TIME PERIOD

- 1960-2014

## UNIT OF ANALYSIS

The unit of analysis is an individual application that led to a judgment on merits. The dataset excludes just satisfaction judgments (i.e. Article 41 judgments), and applications that were deemed inadmissible by the Court. Each observation includes general descriptive information along with general information on advocacy and interest organization participation. For more detailed information on the latter, please refer to our comprehensive dataset.

## VARIABLES

**app** The application number assigned to the case by the ECHR

**dtejmt** Year of the judgment

**dtelgd** Year case was lodged with the Commission/Court.

**country** Defendant country (respondent state) at the time the application was lodged.

1 = Austria	25 = Azerbaijan
2 = Belgium	26 = Bulgaria
3 = Switzerland	27 = Croatia
4 = Cyprus	28 = Czech Republic
5 = Germany	29 = Estonia
6 = Denmark	30 = Georgia
7 = Spain	31 = Hungary
8 = France	32 = Latvia
9 = Greece	33 = Liechtenstein
10 = Italy	34 = Lithuania
11 = Ireland	35 = Moldova
12 = Iceland	36 = Poland
13 = Luxembourg	37 = Romania
14 = Malta	38 = Russia
15 = Norway	39 = San Marino
16 = Netherlands	40 = Slovakia
17 = Portugal	41 = Slovenia
18 = Sweden	42 = Macedonia
19 = Finland	43 = Ukraine
20 = Turkey	44 = Bosnia Herzegovina
21 = United Kingdom	45 = Serbia and Montenegro
22 = Albania	46 = Monaco
23 = Andorra	47 = Montenegro
24 = Armenia	48 = Serbia

**country2** The second defendant country, when it applies.

**impt** The Bureau of the ECHR categorizes the decisions into level of importance.

1 = This includes cases that are published in the Case Reports (also called "key cases"), which are of highest importance and also those categorized as High Importance by the Bureau. This category

is defined as: all judgments, decisions and advisory opinions which make a significant contribution to the development, clarification or modification of its case-law, either generally or in relation to a particular State.

2 = This includes cases categorized as medium importance: Other judgments, decisions and advisory opinions which, while not making a significant contribution to the case-law, nevertheless go beyond merely applying existing case-law.

3 = This includes cases categorized as low importance: Judgments, decisions and advisory opinions of little legal interest, namely judgments and decisions that simply apply existing case-law, friendly settlements and strike outs (unless raising a particular point of interest). The importance levels are mentioned in the notice accompanying each document.

**decision** This is the global decision. If there are one or more violations of a Convention provision found in the decision it is coded as a violation.

1 = no violation

2 = violation

**art1 (art2, etc.)** This details which articles of the Convention were in question in the decision and whether the ECHR found a violation or not.

0 = article not in question

1 = no violation

2 = violation

**p1a1 (p1a2, etc.)** This details the articles of particular protocols of the Convention that were in question in the decision and whether the ECHR found a violation or not. For example, **p1a1** is Protocol 1 Article 1.

0 = article not in question

1 = no violation

2 = violation

**orgapp** Total number of advocacy and interest organizations participating as an applicant in the case.

**orgrep** Total number of advocacy and interest organizations participating as the legal representative for the applicant in the case.

**totaltpi** Total number of third party interventions in the case.

**apptpi** Total number of third party interventions supporting the applicant.

**statetpi** Total number of third party interventions supporting the respondent state.

**othertpi** Total number of third party interventions that could not be coded as supporting either party (e.g. some cases provide general information or another perspective for the judges, other cases could not be coded due to what was included in the decision. Clearly, there are briefs in this category that may have supported the applicant or respondent state but could not be coded as such without further information).

**totsumm** Total number of third party interventions summarized in the decision.

**totengcrt** Total number of third party interventions engaged with (or mentioned by) the court.

<b>totengapp</b>	Total number of third party interventions engaged with (or mentioned by) the applicant.
<b>totengstate</b>	Total number of third party interventions engaged with (or mentioned by) the respondent state.
<b>totengdiss</b>	Total number of third party interventions engaged with (or mentioned) in the dissenting opinion.
<b>totengcon</b>	Total number of third party interventions engaged with (or mentioned) in the concurring decision.