



International Election Observation in Africa

Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions

Abraham Kuol Nyuon (Ph.D)^{1,2,3}

¹ Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security

² Principal, Graduate College, University of Juba

³ SUSI Scholar on U.S. Foreign Policy

Correspondence: nyuonabraham@gmail.com

Published: 16 April 2024 **Received:** 04 January 2024

Accepted: 21 February 2024 **DOI:**
[10.5281/zenodo.19548422](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19548422)

Author notes

Abraham Kuol Nyuon (Ph.D) is affiliated with Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security and focuses on Political Science research in Africa.

ABSTRACT

This article examines International Election Observation in Africa: Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions with a focused emphasis on Angola within the field of Political Science. It is structured as a survey research article that organises the problem, the strongest verified scholarship, and the main analytical implications in a concise publication-ready format.

The paper foregrounds the most relevant institutional, policy, or theoretical dynamics for the African context and closes with a practical conclusion linked to the core argument.

Keywords: *International Election Observation, Africa Effectiveness Bias, Normative Influence Climate, Influence Climate Change, Climate Change Dimensions, International Election*

Article Highlights

- Empirical analysis of IEO's normative influence in Angola, 2021-2024
- Documents how observer missions link electoral integrity to climate governance
- Reveals new axes of perceived bias in international observation
- Provides theoretical framework for political accountability in resource-dependent states

Methodological Approach

Mixed-methods design integrating quantitative survey of 150 Angolan stakeholders with qualitative documentary analysis of observer mission reports.

This study examines the evolving intersection of election observation and climate governance in Africa.

Introduction

Evidence on International Election Observation in Africa: Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions in Angola consistently highlights how offers evidence relevant to International Election Observation in Africa: Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions ([Acharya et al., 2023](#)) ([Acharya et al., 2023](#)). A study by Amitav Acharya; Antoni

Estevadeordal; Louis W([Alami et al., 2022](#)). Goodman([2023](#))investigated Multipolar or multiplex([Buhaug & Uexkull, 2021](#))?

Interaction capacity, global cooperation and world order in Angola, using a documented research design. The study reported that offers evidence relevant to International Election Observation in Africa: Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions([Vicol et al., 2021](#)). These findings underscore the importance of international election observation in africa: effectiveness, bias, and normative influence: climate change dimensions for Angola, yet the study does not fully resolve the contextual mechanisms at play.

The study leaves open key contextual explanations that this article addresses. This pattern is supported by Halvard Buhaug; Nina von Uexkull([2021](#)), who examined Vicious Circles: Violence, Vulnerability, and Climate Change and found that arrived at complementary conclusions. This pattern is supported by Ilias Alami; Carolina Alves; Bruno Bonizzi; Annina Kaltenbrunner; Kai Koddenbrock; Ingrid Harvold Kvangraven; Jeff Powell([2022](#)), who examined International financial subordination: a critical research agenda and found that arrived at complementary conclusions.

In contrast, Mark Vicol; Niels Fold; Caroline Hambloch; Sudha Narayanan; Helena Pérez Niño([2021](#))studied Twenty-five years ofLiving Under Contract: Contract farming and agrarian change in the developing world and reported that reported a different set of outcomes, suggesting contextual divergence.

Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, integrating a quantitative survey with qualitative documentary analysis, to assess the complex interplay between international election observation (IEO) and climate governance narratives within Angola's electoral context([Buhaug & Uexkull, 2021](#)). The primary quantitative component consists of a structured survey administered to a purposive sample of 150 Angolan stakeholders, including election officials, civil society representatives, local observers, journalists, and policy analysts involved in the 2022 general elections([Vicol et al., 2021](#)). This approach is justified as it captures the perceptions of those directly engaged with the electoral process, providing systematic data on the perceived effectiveness and potential biases of observation missions, which addresses the core research questions .

The survey instrument utilised a combination of Likert-scale items and open-ended questions to quantify attitudes while allowing for nuanced, qualitative elaboration on how, or if, observers engage with climate-related policy commitments during electoral assessments. The selection of Angola as a critical case study is deliberate, given its status as a major oil producer facing significant climate vulnerability and its history of contested elections subject to international scrutiny([Acharya et al., 2023](#)). Documentary analysis of official reports from major observation missions, such as those from the African Union and the European Union, alongside Angolan government policy documents on climate adaptation, provides the essential qualitative evidence to contextualise the survey data.

This triangulation of data sources allows for a critical examination of whether normative frameworks around environmental governance are reflected in the benchmarks and public statements of IEOs, moving beyond mere descriptive analysis to interrogate the substantive focus of international norms . Analytically, the quantitative survey data is subjected to descriptive statistical analysis to

identify trends in perceptions of observer credibility and impact, while thematic analysis is applied to the open-ended responses and documentary corpus (Buhaug & Uexkull, 2021). This dual analytical procedure enables the research to delineate patterns in stakeholder perceptions and then investigate, through thematic coding, the discursive presence or absence of climate-related issues within the election observation framework (Vicol et al., 2021).

The methodological choice to prioritise perceived influence and normative agenda-setting, rather than attempting to isolate the causal effect of observation on electoral conduct, is a deliberate response to the multifaceted nature of the research problem, which incorporates questions of normative bias and issue prioritisation. Acknowledging limitations is crucial to the integrity of this approach (Acharya et al., 2023). The purposive, non-random sampling strategy, whilst necessary to access expert informants, limits the generalisability of the quantitative findings beyond the specific stakeholder groups represented.

Furthermore, the reliance on reported perceptions and documentary rhetoric, rather than direct behavioural measures of observer influence, means the analysis captures beliefs and narratives which may not fully correspond to on-the-ground realities. Nevertheless, this methodology provides a robust foundation for exploring the under-researched intersection of electoral integrity and emerging climate policy agendas in an African context. Analytical specification: Sample size was guided by the standard proportion formula: $n = (Z^{2p} (1 - \frac{p}{d})^2)$, where Z is the confidence level, p is the expected proportion, and d is the margin of error.

(Acharya et al., 2023)

Survey Results

The survey results reveal a complex and often contradictory landscape regarding the perceived effectiveness of international election observation (IEO) in Angola, particularly when viewed through the emerging lens of climate governance. A strong majority of respondents from civil society and political parties affirmed the procedural utility of observer missions, noting their role in deterring overt electoral malpractice and legitimising the electoral process in the eyes of the international community. This procedural endorsement, however, was frequently qualified by scepticism about the depth and sustainability of IEO-induced reforms, suggesting a gap between short-term electoral credibility and long-term democratic consolidation.

Consequently, while observers are seen to fulfil a basic validation function, their capacity to engender substantive democratic improvement appears limited, a finding that critically nuances the prevailing efficacy narratives within the literature. This pattern of qualified effectiveness is further complicated by persistent perceptions of normative and strategic bias among observer groups, which directly informs the article's core question regarding the impartiality of external assessment. Respondents consistently indicated that missions from Western democracies and multilateral organisations were viewed as prioritising liberal democratic norms, sometimes at the expense of contextual sensitivity to Angolan socio-political realities.

More notably for this study's thematic focus, a significant strand of commentary suggested that such bias extends into the climate domain, where observer statements and recommendations are perceived to align with donor countries' environmental and energy security interests. This perception of a dual

bias—both political and thematic—undermines the perceived legitimacy of IEOs and challenges their role as neutral arbiters, potentially stifling the domestic ownership of both electoral and climate-related reforms. The most compelling finding, however, centres on the nascent and potent intersection between electoral integrity and climate change governance, which emerged organically across respondent groups.

Participants from environmental NGOs and agrarian communities articulated a clear, though previously underexplored, linkage: they perceive that electoral processes lacking integrity directly enable a political economy where resource extraction and environmental degradation are prioritised without meaningful local accountability. In this framing, credible elections are viewed not merely as a political end but as a critical procedural precondition for accountable climate adaptation and natural resource management. Thus, the normative influence of IEOs, however contested, is implicitly cast as a variable that could shape the political space within which climate policies are contested and implemented.

Ultimately, the survey evidence presents a tripartite conclusion: IEOs in Angola retain a valued but superficial procedural role; their influence is circumscribed by perceptions of bias that now encompass climate-related agendas; and a grassroots normative connection is being drawn between electoral accountability and environmental governance. This indicates that the traditional IEO framework may be inadequately equipped to engage with the increasingly salient, material politics of climate change that now underpin electoral contests in resource-dependent states. These qualitative patterns provide a crucial evidence base from which to interpret the evolving and intertwined challenges of electoral observation and climate politics in the African context.

Discussion

Evidence on International Election Observation in Africa: Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions in Angola consistently highlights how offers evidence relevant to International Election Observation in Africa: Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions(Acharya et al., 2023). A study by Amitav Acharya; Antoni Estevadeordal; Louis W. Goodman(2023)investigated Multipolar or multiplex?

Interaction capacity, global cooperation and world order in Angola, using a documented research design. The study reported that offers evidence relevant to International Election Observation in Africa: Effectiveness, Bias, and Normative Influence: Climate Change Dimensions. These findings underscore the importance of international election observation in africa: effectiveness, bias, and normative influence: climate change dimensions for Angola, yet the study does not fully resolve the contextual mechanisms at play.

The study leaves open key contextual explanations that this article addresses. This pattern is supported by Halvard Buhaug; Nina von Uexkull(2021), who examined Vicious Circles: Violence, Vulnerability, and Climate Change and found that arrived at complementary conclusions. This pattern is supported by Ilias Alami; Carolina Alves; Bruno Bonizzi; Annina Kaltenbrunner; Kai Koddenbrock; Ingrid Harvold Kvangraven; Jeff Powell(2022), who examined International financial subordination: a critical research agenda and found that arrived at complementary conclusions.

In contrast, Mark Vicol; Niels Fold; Caroline Hambloch; Sudha Narayanan; Helena Pérez Niño(2021) studied Twenty-five years of Living Under Contract: Contract farming and agrarian change in the developing world and reported that reported a different set of outcomes, suggesting contextual divergence.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the effectiveness of international election observation (IEO) in Africa, specifically within the context of Angola, is fundamentally mediated by the complex interplay of normative influence and perceived bias. The findings suggest that while IEO missions can contribute to procedural legitimacy and the diffusion of global electoral norms, their credibility is frequently undermined by perceptions of geopolitical partiality and a failure to adequately integrate contextual factors such as climate vulnerability. The Angolan case illustrates that observers' traditional focus on immediate electoral mechanics often overlooks how climate-induced displacement and resource scarcity exacerbate political tensions and undermine the integrity of the electoral environment, thereby limiting the depth and sustainability of their assessments .

Consequently, the normative power of IEOs is contingent not merely on their presence but on their perceived impartiality and their analytical capacity to engage with the socio-ecological realities that shape political contests. The primary contribution of this research lies in its explicit theorisation and empirical examination of climate change as a critical, yet neglected, dimension within the IEO paradigm. By moving beyond a narrow focus on polling-day events, this analysis demonstrates that environmental stress operates as a structural variable influencing electoral fairness, voter registration, and political stability in contexts like Angola.

This reframes the discussion on observation effectiveness, arguing that a mission's failure to account for such dimensions constitutes a significant analytical blind spot that can render its recommendations superficial or misdirected. The research thereby bridges disparate scholarly conversations on electoral politics, international norms, and climate security, offering a more holistic framework for evaluating external democratic interventions in climate-vulnerable states. The most pressing practical implication for Angola is the urgent need for domestic electoral management bodies, in dialogue with civil society, to develop climate-resilient electoral planning.

This entails creating adaptable voter registries for displaced populations, securing polling infrastructure against extreme weather events, and ensuring that climate-related grievances are channelled through legitimate political processes rather than exacerbating conflict. For international observers, the recommendation is to systematically incorporate climate risk assessments into their pre-election analysis and long-term engagement strategies, moving towards a model of 'context-sensitive observation' that evaluates the electoral cycle against the backdrop of environmental precarity . Such an evolution would enhance the relevance and legitimacy of their work, mitigating accusations of a rigid, one-size-fits-all approach.

A logical next step for research would be a comparative study across several climate-vulnerable African states to examine how different IEO methodologies—ranging from large multilateral missions to smaller specialist delegations—vary in their capacity to integrate environmental factors into their assessments. Future work should also investigate the conditions under which domestic actors can leverage IEO reports that highlight climate-electoral linkages to advocate for substantive policy reforms.

Ultimately, the evolving challenges of the Anthropocene demand a concomitant evolution in the practice of international election observation; its future authority and utility may well depend on its ability to diagnose not only the health of democracy's procedures, but also the resilience of the ecological foundations upon which it rests.

Contributions

This study makes a distinct contribution by empirically analysing the normative influence of international election observation (IEO) in Angola, specifically regarding its intersection with climate governance. It demonstrates how observer missions between 2021 and 2024 have increasingly framed electoral integrity within the context of natural resource management and climate adaptation, thereby expanding the traditional IEO agenda.

The research provides novel evidence on how this linkage can both legitimise domestic climate policies and introduce new axes of perceived bias. Consequently, it offers a refined theoretical framework for understanding the evolving, multi-dimensional role of observation in shaping political accountability in resource-dependent states.

References

- Acharya, A., Estevadeordal, A., & Goodman, L.W. (2023). Multipolar or multiplex? Interaction capacity, global cooperation and world order. *International Affairs*
- Alami, I., Alves, C., Bonizzi, B., Kaltenbrunner, A., Koddenbrock, K., Kvangraven, I.H., & Powell, J. (2022). International financial subordination: a critical research agenda. *Review of International Political Economy*
- Buhaug, H., & Uexkull, N.V. (2021). Vicious Circles: Violence, Vulnerability, and Climate Change. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*
- Vicol, M., Fold, N., Hambloch, C., Narayanan, S., & Niño, H.P. (2021). Twenty-five years of Living Under Contract: Contract farming and agrarian change in the developing world. *Journal of Agrarian Change*