demscore

Thematic Datasets

Codebook

Laws and Liberties



November 2026

Copyright © Demscore
All rights reserved

Based on Demscore
Version 8.0

Funders: Demscore is funded by the Swedish Research Council, University of Gothenburg, Stockholm University, Uppsala University, and Umeå University. For more information, please visit: `https://demscore.se`

For data enquiries: contact@demscore.se

Summary of Table of Contents

1 Explanatory Notes **12**

1.1 Release Notes v8 . . . 12
1.2 New in Demscore version 8 . . . 12
1.3 The Demscore Codebook . . . 13
1.4 Methodology . . . 13
1.5 Citations . . . 13
1.6 Missing Data . . . 13
1.7 Download ID . . . 14
1.8 Unit Identifier Variables . . . 14
1.9 Thematic Dataset . . . 14
1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit . . . 14

2 COMPLAB **15**

2.1 COMPLAB MIGPOL Historical Immigration Policies Database . . . 15
2.1.1 Historical Policy . . . 16
2.2 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMISEM . . . 18
2.2.1 Immigration Proxy Labor Migration . . . 19
2.3 COMPLAB MIGPOL Antidiscrimination Dataset . . . 20
2.3.1 Anti-Discrimination . . . 21
2.4 COMPLAB MIGPOL Antidiscrimination Raw Data . . . 23
2.4.1 Anti-Discrimination . . . 24
2.5 COMPLAB MIGPOL MIPEX . . . 39
2.5.1 Antidiscrimination . . . 40

3 QOG **43**

3.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset . . . 43
3.1.1 The Environmental Democracy Index . . . 43
3.2 QoG EU Regional Dataset Long Data . . . 49
3.2.1 Demographics . . . 50
3.3 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series . . . 51
3.3.1 Judicial . . . 51
3.3.2 Political System . . . 97
3.3.3 Gender Equality . . . 99
3.3.4 Labour Market . . . 109
3.3.5 Civil Society, Population and Culture . . . 109
3.3.6 Religion . . . 111
3.3.7 Private Economy . . . 112
3.3.8 Conflict . . . 113
3.3.9 Migration . . . 115

4 V-DEM **117**

4.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16 . . . 117
4.1.1 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices . . . 118
4.1.2 V-Dem Indicators - Elections . . . 120
4.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive . . . 122
4.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature . . . 124
4.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Judiciary . . . 126

4.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Liberty 136
4.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Society 151
4.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion 157
4.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Legitimation 161
4.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space 162
4.1.11 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Accountability 164
4.1.12 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Liberties 165
4.1.13 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Rule of Law 167
4.1.14 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Elections 170
4.1.15 Digital Society Survey - State Internet Regulation Capacity and Approach . . 172

5 Bibliography **178**

Table of Contents

1 Explanatory Notes **12**

1.1 Release Notes v8 . . . 12
1.2 New in Demscore version 8 . . . 12
1.3 The Demscore Codebook . . . 13
1.4 Methodology . . . 13
1.5 Citations . . . 13
1.6 Missing Data . . . 13
1.7 Download ID . . . 14
1.8 Unit Identifier Variables . . . 14
1.9 Thematic Dataset . . . 14
1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit . . . 14

2 COMPLAB **15**

2.1 COMPLAB MIGPOL Historical Immigration Policies Database . . . 15
2.1.1 Historical Policy . . . 16
2.1.1.1 Immigrants Rights (rightscode) . . . 16
2.1.1.2 Refugee Provisions (refexist) . . . 16
2.1.1.3 Asylum Provisions (asylcode) . . . 17
2.1.1.4 Deportation (decode) . . . 17
2.2 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMISEM . . . 18
2.2.1 Immigration Proxy Labor Migration . . . 19
2.2.1.1 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Domestic Workers Equal (itionlabor_equal_domestic) . . . 19
2.2.1.2 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Agricultural Workers Equal (itionlabor_equal_agricultural) . . . 19
2.2.1.3 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Medical Doctors Equal (itionlabor_equal_medical) . . . 19
2.3 COMPLAB MIGPOL Antidiscrimination Dataset . . . 20
2.3.1 Anti-Discrimination . . . 21
2.3.1.1 Anti-discrimination grounds - Aggregated (s_g01) . . . 21
2.3.1.2 Prohibitions in law - Aggregated (s_g02) . . . 21
2.3.1.3 Application to private and public sector - Aggregated (s_g03) . . . 21
2.3.1.4 Fields of application - Aggregated (s_g04) . . . 22
2.3.1.5 Enforcement mechanisms and Range of Sanctions - Aggregated (s_g05_6) . . . 22
2.3.1.6 Equality bodies - Aggregated (s_g07) . . . 23
2.3.1.7 Equality policies - Aggregated (s_g08) . . . 23
2.4 COMPLAB MIGPOL Antidiscrimination Raw Data . . . 23
2.4.1 Anti-Discrimination . . . 24
2.4.1.1 Anti-discrimination grounds - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g01_a) . . . 24
2.4.1.2 Anti-discrimination grounds - religion and belief - Raw (r_g01_b) . . . 24
2.4.1.3 Anti-discrimination grounds - nationality - Raw (r_g01_c) . . . 25
2.4.1.4 Public incitement to violence - Raw (r_g02_a) . . . 25
2.4.1.5 Public insults or defamation - Raw (r_g02_b) . . . 25
2.4.1.6 Instigation of such offenses - Raw (r_g02_c) . . . 26
2.4.1.7 Racial profiling - Raw (r_g02_d) . . . 26
2.4.1.8 Private sector: General - Raw (r_g03_a) . . . 26

2.4.1.9 Private sector: Private sector carrying out public sector activities (i.e. public transportation, infrastructure) - Raw (r_g03_b) 27
2.4.1.10 Public sector: Police force - Raw (r_g03_c) 27
2.4.1.11 Public sector: other than police force - Raw (r_g03_d) 27
2.4.1.12 Employment and vocational training - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g04_a_0) 27
2.4.1.13 Employment and vocational training - religion and belief - Raw (r_g04_a_1) 28
2.4.1.14 Employment and vocational training - nationality - Raw (r_g04_a_2) 28
2.4.1.15 Education (primary and secondary level) - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g04_b_0) 28
2.4.1.16 Education (primary and secondary level) - religion and belief - Raw (r_g04_b_1) 29
2.4.1.17 Education (primary and secondary level) - nationality - Raw (r_g04_b_2) 29
2.4.1.18 Social protection (including social security) - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g04_c_0) 29
2.4.1.19 Social protection (including social security) - religion and belief - Raw (r_g04_c_1) 29
2.4.1.20 Social protection (including social security) - nationality - Raw (r_g04_c_2) 30
2.4.1.21 Access to public goods and services, including housing - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g04_d_0) 30
2.4.1.22 Access to public goods and services, including housing - religion and belief - Raw (r_g04_d_1) 30
2.4.1.23 Access to public goods and services, including housing - nationality - Raw (r_g04_d_2) 31
2.4.1.24 Access to public goods and services, including health - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g04_e_0) 31
2.4.1.25 Access to public goods and services, including health - religion and belief - Raw (r_g04_e_1) 31
2.4.1.26 Access to public goods and services, including health - nationality - Raw (r_g04_e_2) 31
2.4.1.27 Shift in burden of proof - Raw (r_g05_a) 32
2.4.1.28 Situation testing as evidence - Raw (r_g05_b) 32
2.4.1.29 Financial assistance for lawyers and interpreters - Raw (r_g05_c) . . 32
2.4.1.30 Proceedings on behalf of victims by legal entities - Raw (r_g05_d) . 33
2.4.1.31 Independent legal advice - Raw (r_g07_b) 33
2.4.1.32 Engagement in proceedings - Raw (r_g07_d) 33
2.4.1.33 Systematic legislative review - Raw (r_g08_a) 33
2.4.1.34 Anti-discrimination grounds - Scored (s_g01) 34
2.4.1.35 Prohibitions in law - Scored (s_g02) 34
2.4.1.36 Both private and public sector - Scored (s_g03) 34
2.4.1.37 Private sector - Scored (s_g03_a) 35
2.4.1.38 Public sector - Scored (s_g03_b) 35
2.4.1.39 Fields of application - Scored (s_g04) 35
2.4.1.40 Employment and vocational training - Scored (s_g04_a) 36
2.4.1.41 Education (primary and secondary level) - Scored (s_g04_b) 36
2.4.1.42 Social protection (including social security) - Scored (s_g04_c) . . . 36
2.4.1.43 Access to public goods and services, including housing - Scored (s_g04_d) 36

2.4.1.44 Access to public goods and services, including health - Scored (s_g04_e) 37
2.4.1.45 Enforcement and sanctions - Scored (s_g05_6) 37
2.4.1.46 Shift in burden of proof - Scored (s_g05_a) 37
2.4.1.47 Situation testing as evidence - Scored (s_g05_b) 38
2.4.1.48 Financial assistance for lawyers and interpreters - Scored (s_g05_c) 38
2.4.1.49 Proceedings on behalf of victims by legal entities - Scored (s_g05_d) 38
2.4.1.50 Equality bodies - Scored (s_g07) 38
2.4.1.51 Systematic legislative review - Scored (s_g08_a) 39
2.5 COMPLAB MIGPOL MIPEX 39
2.5.1 Antidiscrimination 40
2.5.1.1 Law covers direct/indirect discrimination, harassment, instruction (ga117) 40
2.5.1.2 Enforcement mechanisms_new (gc_new) 40
2.5.1.3 Equality bodies (gd137gd140) 41
2.5.1.4 Enforcement mechanisms (gc) 42

3 QOG **43**
3.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset 43
3.1.1 The Environmental Democracy Index 43
3.1.1.1 Affordable access to relief and remedy (Guideline 20) (edi_gaarr) . . 44
3.1.1.2 Alternative dispute resolution for environmental issues (Guideline 26) (edi_gadrei) 44
3.1.1.3 Awareness and education about remedies and relief (Guideline 23) (edi_gaerr) 45
3.1.1.4 Broad standing (Guideline 18) (edi_gbs) 45
3.1.1.5 Effective enforcement (Guideline 22) (edi_gee) 45
3.1.1.6 Fair, timely, and independent review (Guideline 19) (edi_gftir) . . . 46
3.1.1.7 Information request appeals (Guideline 15) (edi_gira) 46
3.1.1.8 Public access to judicial and administrative decisions (Guideline 24) (edi_gpajad) 47
3.1.1.9 Public participation appeals (Guideline 16) (edi_gppa) 47
3.1.1.10 Right of public to challenge state or private actors (Guideline 17) (edi_grpcspa) 48
3.1.1.11 Justice Pillar Score (edi_jp) 48
3.2 QoG EU Regional Dataset Long Data 49
3.2.1 Demographics 50
3.2.1.1 Reported number of cases of burglary of private premises (eu_cri_bur) 50
3.2.1.2 Reported number of cases of intentional homicide (eu_cri_inthom) . 50
3.2.1.3 Reported number of cases of robbery (eu_cri_rob) 50
3.3 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series 51
3.3.1 Judicial 51
3.3.1.1 Law: the independence of the judiciary is guaranteed (aii_q01) . . . 51
3.3.1.2 Practice: the independence of the judiciary is guaranteed (aii_q02) . 52
3.3.1.3 Practice: national-level judges support the independence of judiciary (aii_q03) 53
3.3.1.4 Practice: national-level judges give reasons for their decisions (aii_q04) 54
3.3.1.5 Law: there is a supreme audit institution (aii_q05) 55
3.3.1.6 Law: the independence of supreme audit institution is guaranteed (aii_q06) 56

3.3.1.7 Practice: the independence of supreme audit institution is guaranteed (aii_q07) . . . 56
3.3.1.8 Law: there are indep. bodies to investigate cases of pubsec. corruption (aii_q11) . . . 57
3.3.1.9 Practice: corruption allegations are investigated by independent body (aii_q12) . . . 58
3.3.1.10 Practice: bodies investigating pubsector corruption allegations are effective (aii_q13) . . . 59
3.3.1.11 Law: head of state and gov. can be investigated and prosecuted while in office (aii_q15) . . . 60
3.3.1.12 Practice: head of state and gov. can be investigated and prosecuted while in office (aii_q16) . . . 60
3.3.1.13 Law: there are mechanisms for citizens to report police force misconduct/abuse (aii_q17) . . . 61
3.3.1.14 Practice: mechanisms for citizens to report police misconduct/abuse are effect. (aii_q18) . . . 62
3.3.1.15 Law: companies guilty of procurement violations can't participate in future bid (aii_q27) . . . 63
3.3.1.16 Practice: companies guilty of violations cannot participate in future bids (aii_q28) . . . 63
3.3.1.17 Law: civil servants who report corruption cases are protected (aii_q36) 64
3.3.1.18 Rule of law sub-index (aii_rol) . . . 65
3.3.1.19 Civil Rights (bti_cr) . . . 66
3.3.1.20 Freedom of Expression (bti_foe) . . . 67
3.3.1.21 Independent Judiciary (bti_ij) . . . 67
3.3.1.22 Prosecution of Office Abuse (bti_poa) . . . 68
3.3.1.23 Rule of Law (bti_rol) . . . 68
3.3.1.24 Equality Before the Law Mentioned in Constitution (ccp_equal) . . 69
3.3.1.25 Human Rights Commission Present in Constitution (ccp_hr) 69
3.3.1.26 Right to View Government Documents in Constitution (ccp_infoacc) 70
3.3.1.27 Status of Slavery in Constitution (ccp_slave) . . . 70
3.3.1.28 Right to Strike in Constitution (ccp_strike) . . . 71
3.3.1.29 New Constitutional System (ccp_syst) . . . 71
3.3.1.30 Year in which the Constitutional System was Promulgated (ccp_systyear) . . . 71
3.3.1.31 Prevalence of Enforced Disappearance (ciri_disap) . . . 72
3.3.1.32 Freedom of Domestic Movement (ciri_dommov) . . . 72
3.3.1.33 Independence of the Judiciary (ciri_injud) . . . 73
3.3.1.34 Extrajudicial Killing (ciri_kill) . . . 74
3.3.1.35 Physical Integrity Rights (ciri_physint) . . . 75
3.3.1.36 Political Imprisonment (ciri_polpris) . . . 76
3.3.1.37 Prevalence of Torture by Government Authorities (ciri_tort) . . . 76
3.3.1.38 Trust in Legal System (ess_trlegal) . . . 77
3.3.1.39 Trust in Police (ess_trpolice) . . . 78
3.3.1.40 Associational and Organizational Rights (fh_aor) . . . 78
3.3.1.41 Civil Liberties (fh_cl) . . . 78
3.3.1.42 Freedom of Expression and Belief (fh_feb) . . . 79
3.3.1.43 Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights (fh_pair) . . . 79
3.3.1.44 Rule of Law (fh_rol) . . . 79

3.3.1.45 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (panel data) (fi_legprop_pd) . . . 80
3.3.1.46 Independent Judiciary (h_j) . . . 80
3.3.1.47 Appointments/Elections to Constitutional Court (iaep_aecc) . . . 80
3.3.1.48 Appointment for Life to Constitutional Court (iaep_alcc) . . . 81
3.3.1.49 Constitutional Court (iaep_cc) . . . 81
3.3.1.50 Constitutional Court Rules on Executive Actions (iaep_ccrea) . . . 82
3.3.1.51 Constitutional Court Rules on Legislative Actions (iaep_ccrla) . . . 82
3.3.1.52 The Age of the Constitution (years) (iaep_const) . . . 83
3.3.1.53 The Time the Constitution has been in Effect (years) (iaep_constin) 83
3.3.1.54 The Time since the Last Amendment of Constitution (years) (iaep_constlam) . . . 84
3.3.1.55 Removal of Members of Constitutional Court (iaep_rmcc) . . . 84
3.3.1.56 Who Removes Members of Constitutional Court (iaep_wrmcc) . . . 84
3.3.1.57 Rights Score (iiag_rig) . . . 85
3.3.1.58 Absolute legal institutional quality (simple averages) (kun_legabs) . 85
3.3.1.59 Legal institutional quality (relative factor scores) (kun_legrel) . . . 86
3.3.1.60 Legal World Institutional Quality Ranking (all countries) (kun_wiqrleg_all) . . . 86
3.3.1.61 Legal World Institutional Quality Ranking (full obs.) (kun_wiqrleg_full) . . . 86
3.3.1.62 Rule of Law, Estimate (wbgi_rle) . . . 86
3.3.1.63 Rule of Law, Standard Error (wbgi_rls) . . . 87
3.3.1.64 Intentional homicides (per 100,000 people) (wdi_homicides) . . . 87
3.3.1.65 Intentional homicides, female (per 100,000 female) (wdi_homicidesf) 87
3.3.1.66 Intentional homicides, male (per 100,000 male) (wdi_homicidesm) . 88
3.3.1.67 CPIA property rights and rule-based governance rating (wdi_prrbgr) 88
3.3.1.68 Homicide Rate, Female (who_homf) . . . 88
3.3.1.69 Homicide Rate, Male (who_homm) . . . 89
3.3.1.70 Homicide Rate, Total (who_homt) . . . 89
3.3.1.71 Absence of Corruption (wjp_abs_cor) . . . 89
3.3.1.72 ADRs are Accessible, Impartial, and Effective (wjp_adr) . . . 89
3.3.1.73 Civil Justice (wjp_civ_just) . . . 90
3.3.1.74 Civil Justice is Free of Corruption (wjp_cj_cor) . . . 90
3.3.1.75 Civil Justice is not Subject to Unreasonable Delays (wjp_cj_delay) . 90
3.3.1.76 Civil Justice is Free of Discrimination (wjp_cj_discr) . . . 90
3.3.1.77 Civil Justice is Effectively Enforced (wjp_cj_ef_enf) . . . 91
3.3.1.78 Civil Justice is Free of Improper Government Influence (wjp_cj_fr_govin) . . . 91
3.3.1.79 Criminal Justice (wjp_crim_jus) . . . 91
3.3.1.80 Criminal System is Free of Corruption (wjp_crsys_cor) . . . 92
3.3.1.81 Criminal System is Impartial (wjp_crsys_discr) . . . 92
3.3.1.82 Criminal System is Free of Improper Government Influence (wjp_crsys_govinfl) . . . 92
3.3.1.83 Fundamental Rights (wjp_fund_right) . . . 92
3.3.1.84 Government Officials Sanctioned for Misconduct (wjp_gov_of_mis) 93
3.3.1.85 Constraints on Government Powers (wjp_gov_pow) . . . 93
3.3.1.86 Government Powers Limited by Auditing and Review (wjp_gov_pow_aud) . . . 93

3.3.1.87 Government Powers Limited by the Judiciary (wjp_gov_pow_jud) . 94
3.3.1.88 Judicial Branch do not use Public Office for Private Gain (wjp_jud_br) 94
3.3.1.89 Open Government (wjp_op_gov) 94
3.3.1.90 Order and Security (wjp_ord_secur) 94
3.3.1.91 WJP Rule of Law Index: Overall Score (wjp_overall) 95
3.3.1.92 Police and the Military do not use Public Office for Private Gain (wjp_pol_mil) 95
3.3.1.93 Access and Afford Civil Justice (wjp_ppl_civ_jus) 96
3.3.1.94 Effective Regulatory Enforcement (wjp_regul_enforc) 96
3.3.1.95 Confidence: Justice System/Courts (wvs_confjs) 96
3.3.1.96 Confidence: The Police (wvs_confpol) 97
3.3.2 Political System 97
3.3.2.1 Law: citizens have a right to request public information from state bodies (aii_q41) 97
3.3.2.2 No Interference of Religious Dogmas (bti_nird) 98
3.3.2.3 Regimes of the world with ambiguous cases (vdem_regimeamb) . . . 98
3.3.3 Gender Equality 99
3.3.3.1 Equal Opportunity (bti_eo) 99
3.3.3.2 Comparative Abortion Index 1 (0 to 7) (cai_cai1) 100
3.3.3.3 Comparative Abortion Index 2 (0 to 1) (cai_cai2) 100
3.3.3.4 Foetal impairment is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_foetal) 101
3.3.3.5 Threat to mother's life is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_life) 101
3.3.3.6 Threat to mother's mental health is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_mental) 101
3.3.3.7 Threat to mother's physical health is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_physical) 102
3.3.3.8 Pregnancy as result of rape or incest is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_rape) 102
3.3.3.9 Abortion is available on request (cai_request) 102
3.3.3.10 Social or economic reasons are accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_social) 103
3.3.3.11 Women's Economic Rights (ciri_wecon) 103
3.3.3.12 Women's Political Rights (ciri_wopol) 105
3.3.3.13 Women Business and the Law Index Score (scale 1-100) (wdi_wombuslawi) 105
3.3.3.14 Women's Social Rights Laws (ciri_wosoc_l) 106
3.3.3.15 Women's Social Rights Practices (ciri_wosoc_p) 107
3.3.4 Labour Market 109
3.3.4.1 Limits on Child Work in Constitution (ccp_childwrk) 109
3.3.5 Civil Society, Population and Culture 109
3.3.5.1 Right to Marry in Constitution (ccp_marriage) 109
3.3.5.2 Freedom of Assembly and Association (ciri_assn) 110
3.3.5.3 Safety and Security (gpi_ss) 111
3.3.6 Religion 111
3.3.6.1 Government Restrictions on Religious Practices (ciri_relfre) 111
3.3.7 Private Economy 112
3.3.7.1 Economic Freedom of the World Index (current) (fi_index) 112
3.3.7.2 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (current) (fi_legprop) 112
3.3.7.3 The Property Right Protection Index (prp_prp) 113

3.3.8 Conflict . . . 113
3.3.8.1 Political Terror Scale - Amnesty International (gd_ptsa) . . . 113
3.3.8.2 Political Terror Scale - Human Rights Watch (gd_ptsh) . . . 114
3.3.8.3 Political Terror Scale - US State Department (gd_ptss) . . . 114
3.3.9 Migration . . . 115
3.3.9.1 Refugees under the mandate of the UNHCR by country or territory of asylum (wdi_refhcras) . . . 115
3.3.9.2 Refugees under the mandate of the UNHCR by country or territory of origin (wdi_refhcror) . . . 115

4 V-DEM **117**
4.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16 . . . 117
4.1.1 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices . . . 118
4.1.1.1 Freedom of Expression and Alternative Sources of Information Index (v2x_freexp_altinf) . . . 118
4.1.1.2 Equality before the law and individual liberty index (v2xcl_rol) . . . 119
4.1.1.3 Judicial constraints on the executive index (v2x_jucon) . . . 119
4.1.2 V-Dem Indicators - Elections . . . 120
4.1.2.1 Election government intimidation (v2elintim) . . . 121
4.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive . . . 122
4.1.3.1 Executive respects constitution (v2exrescon) . . . 123
4.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature . . . 124
4.1.4.1 Legislature investigates in practice (v2lginvstp) . . . 124
4.1.4.2 Executive oversight (v2lgotovst) . . . 125
4.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Judiciary . . . 126
4.1.5.1 Judicial reform (v2jureform) . . . 127
4.1.5.2 Judicial purges (v2jupurge) . . . 127
4.1.5.3 Government attacks on judiciary (v2jupoatck) . . . 128
4.1.5.4 Court packing (v2jupack) . . . 129
4.1.5.5 Judicial corruption decision (v2jucorrdc) . . . 130
4.1.5.6 High court name (v2juhcname) . . . 131
4.1.5.7 High court independence (v2juhcind) . . . 132
4.1.5.8 Lower court independence (v2juncind) . . . 133
4.1.5.9 Compliance with high court (v2juhccomp) . . . 134
4.1.5.10 Compliance with judiciary (v2jucomp) . . . 135
4.1.5.11 Judicial review (v2jureview) . . . 135
4.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Liberty . . . 136
4.1.6.1 Freedom from torture (v2cltort) . . . 136
4.1.6.2 Freedom from political killings (v2clkill) . . . 137
4.1.6.3 Transparent laws with predictable enforcement (v2cltrnslw) . . . 138
4.1.6.4 Rigorous and impartial public administration (v2clrspct) . . . 139
4.1.6.5 Access to justice for men (v2clacjstm) . . . 140
4.1.6.6 Access to justice for women (v2clacjstw) . . . 141
4.1.6.7 Social class equality in respect for civil liberty (v2clacjust) . . . 142
4.1.6.8 Social group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clsocgrp) . . . 143
4.1.6.9 Freedom of discussion for men (v2cldiscm) . . . 144
4.1.6.10 Freedom of discussion for women (v2cldiscw) . . . 145
4.1.6.11 Freedom of religion (v2clrelig) . . . 146

4.1.6.12 Freedom of domestic movement for men (v2cldmovem) . . . 147
4.1.6.13 Freedom of domestic movement for women (v2cldmovew) . . . 148
4.1.6.14 Property rights for men (v2clprptym) . . . 149
4.1.6.15 Property rights for women (v2clprptyw) . . . 150
4.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Society . . . 151
4.1.7.1 CSO entry and exit (v2cseeorgs) . . . 152
4.1.7.2 CSO repression (v2csreprss) . . . 153
4.1.7.3 CSO anti-system movements (v2csantimv) . . . 154
4.1.7.4 Religious organization repression (v2csrlgrep) . . . 155
4.1.7.5 CSO anti-system movement character (v2csanmvch) . . . 156
4.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion . . . 157
4.1.8.1 Gender equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgencl) . . . 158
4.1.8.2 Urban-rural location equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgeocl) 159
4.1.8.3 Political group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clpolcl) . . . 160
4.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Legitimation . . . 161
4.1.9.1 Rational-legal legitimation (v2exl_legitratio) . . . 161
4.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space . . . 162
4.1.10.1 Political violence (v2caviol) . . . 162
4.1.10.2 Freedom of peaceful assembly (v2caassemb) . . . 163
4.1.11 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Accountability . . . 164
4.1.11.1 Horizontal accountability index (v2x_horacc) . . . 164
4.1.12 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Liberties . . . 165
4.1.12.1 Physical violence index (v2x_clphy) . . . 165
4.1.12.2 Political liberties index (v2x_clpol) . . . 166
4.1.13 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Rule of Law . . . 167
4.1.13.1 Rule of law index (v2x_rule) . . . 167
4.1.13.2 Access to justice (v2xcl_acjst) . . . 168
4.1.13.3 Property rights (v2xcl_prpty) . . . 169
4.1.14 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Elections . . . 170
4.1.14.1 Freedom of expression index (v2x_freexp) . . . 170
4.1.14.2 Freedom of discussion (v2xcl_disc) . . . 171
4.1.14.3 Freedom of domestic movement (v2xcl_dmove) . . . 171
4.1.15 Digital Society Survey - State Internet Regulation Capacity and Approach . . . 172
4.1.15.1 Internet legal regulation content (v2smregcon) . . . 173
4.1.15.2 Privacy protection by law exists (v2smprivex) . . . 174
4.1.15.3 Privacy protection by law content (v2smprivcon) . . . 175
4.1.15.4 Defamation protection (v2smlawpr) . . . 176
4.1.15.5 Abuse of defamation and copyright law by elites (v2smdefabu) . . . 177

5 Bibliography **178**

1 Explanatory Notes

1.1 Release Notes v8

Demscore provides worldwide free access to harmonized data on Democracy, Environment, Migration, Social Policy, Conflict and Representation from several of the world's most prominent social science research institutes. The interdisciplinary nature of Demscore data facilitates large-scale comparative analyses. This is essential to advance adequate policy responses to complex societal challenges associated with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and beyond, facing Sweden, Europe, and the world today.

With a firm commitment to transparency and openness, Demscore v8 enables users to gain comprehensive insights into various topics across the social sciences. The joint infrastructure ensures data integrity and quality at the highest international standards and maximizes usability in the measurement of contextual data with over 26.000 variables across nearly all countries in the world, from 1750 to the present.

This creates critical time- and cost saving advantages in data collection, management, distribution, and not the least for end-users in the scientific community. Demscore's unique approach to translating and merging data scales up to more than 420.000 variable versions available in the infrastructure, storing more than 10 billion non-missing observations.

This collaborative effort between leading Swedish universities pushes the scale of social science data to a new level and offers unprecedented possibilities for interdisciplinary research and knowledge advancement.

These are the key features of Demscore:

1. **Customized Download:** A fully normalized, joint PostgreSQL database, sophisticated programming, and a user-friendly web-based interface for users to generate custom-designed datasets and codebooks for download.
2. **Translations and Data Merges:** Demscore currently offers more than 1300 merge options between datasets.
3. **Metadata:** Demscore takes information on and organization of metadata to new heights with the inclusion of customized codebooks, a detailed methodology document, and a comprehensive handbook.
4. **Handling of Missing Data:** Demscore pioneers in developing an innovative approach to tackle missing data. Researchers can now account for missing values with increased precision, leading to more robust and reliable analyses.
5. **Merge Scores:** Demscore introduces a unique merge mechanism. This powerful tool enables researchers to combine datasets effortlessly, uncovering connections and patterns that were previously hidden in isolated data silos.
6. **Thematic Datasets:** Demscore provides researchers with curated thematic datasets, each focused on a specific topic. These datasets bring together relevant variables from across the Demscore partners, facilitating in-depth investigations and comprehensive analyses of specific domains.
7. **Interactive Web Portal:** In addition to all the above, Demscore's web portal offers interactive visualization tools, user support and additional information on all partners and data sources.

For more information, please visit `https://www.demscore.se/` or contact contact@demscore.se.

1.2 New in Demscore version 8

A detailed description of changes and additions made for version 8 compared to version 7 can be found in the Methodology Document.

1.3 The Demscore Codebook

The autogenerated Demscore Codebook lists variable entries for those variables chosen by the user along with citation guidelines and licenses per variable.

The meta data is extracted from the codebooks per dataset stored in a table in the Demscore PostgreSQL database with one row per variable for all datasets. This table includes codebook entries, variable tags, labels, and other variable information in LaTeX format used to generate an automated codebook.
Demscore maintains a single set of standard entries for metadata across all datasets, to which all project members contribute their information. Additionally, variables within different datasets may have varying sets of additional information requirements specific to each dataset. These dataset-specific entries are also included, but they are presented as variable-specific metadata beneath the standard entries.
At the outset of the harmonization process, Demscore underwent a thorough variable name cleanup. This involved tasks such as replacing spaces or dots in variable names with underscores and converting all letters to lowercase. Notably, the original tags remain preserved and stored in the PostgreSQL table. Each variable in Demscore is accessible in both short and long forms. The short form comprises the cleaned version of the original variable tag, while the long form starts with the dataset name from which it originates, followed by the cleaned variable name.

For instance, the original name of the variable *MinisterPersonalID* from the H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset is included as *ministerpersonalid* (short form) and *hdata_fomin_ministerpersonalid* (long form) in Demscore.

In addition, each dataset includes Demscore unit-identifier variables which are named according to the following naming scheme: Beginning with u_, followed by the name of the primary unit and finally the variable tag. The *year*- variable from the COMPLAB SPIN The Out-of-Work Benefits Dataset (OUTWB), which is part of the primary unit u_complab_country_year has the Demscore unit identifier name *u_complab_country_year_year*.

1.4 Methodology

For details on our methodology please see the Demscore Methodology document available for download on the Demscore website.

1.5 Citations

The Demscore project does not have a formal citation of its own. Hence, when using Demscore, we suggest that you cite the respective projects and datasets. We indicate how every dataset is to be cited in the autogenerated codebook you retreive with your data download, both in the dataset description and the codebook entry for each variable. Most often it is sufficient to cite the dataset a variable originates from, but sometimes there is a variable specific citation listed in the codebook entry in addition to that. For these cases, please also add the variable specific citation to the reference list of your publication. Full references are linked in the codebook entries of the variables and listed in the codebook's bibliography. We suggest you to also cite the Demscore Methodology Document when using data retrieved through Demscore.

1.6 Missing Data

Demscore indicates different types of missingness for observations in the customized datasets:
Missing in original data = Whenever an observation in the original variable is a missing (NA, missing code such as 7777, blank cell), we preserve this missing value. When the original source has special codes for various types of missing, those are preserved.
Missing code: -11111 = Demscore code for observation is missing due to the translation/merge, i.e., missing data due to no data being included for this combination of identifiers in the end Output Unit.
Missing code: -22222 = No observation is merged/translated, but the original data contains information for these identifier combinations elsewhere. For these cases, we use a different code. The

user needs to consult the reference documents (Methodology Document Section 5.1. or the Demscore Handbook) to clarify why the translation to the identifier combinations in the end Output Unit was not possible.

Please note that an observation that is missing in its original output unit does no take the value -11111, but appears as NA/blank cell in the customized dataset.

1.7 Download ID

The download ID can be shared with other users for replication purposes. A user can type the download ID into the Demscore website and retrieve the same download selection and files as the original user. This ID is autogenerated for each download from the Demscore website and will always retrieve the same data, even if the Demscore version was updated in the meantime.

Download ID:

1.8 Unit Identifier Variables

An Output Unit is defined as an output format in which variables can be retrieved from one or more datasets through a strictly defined output grid. A unit table defining this output grid contains unit identifier columns with u_ prefixes and the table is sorted based on these unit identifier columns and has a fixed number of rows. Unit columns are based on the columns that constitute the unit of analysis in a dataset. They are added to the original dataset and marked by a unit prefix (consisting of a u_ and the dataset unit name) before the original variable name. Unit columns can contain slightly modified data, e.g., missing values are replaced by a default value. Sometimes we add additional columns to the unit table, for instance if a dataset includes both a country_id column with a numeric country code, we add the variable storing the full country name to the unit table as well for better readability.

1.9 Thematic Dataset

The thematic dataset Laws and Liberties provides a range of variables related to the rule of law and civil liberties, touching on aspects like access to justice, access to information, protection form governmental overreach, general rights, political influence on the judiciary, or equality before the law. It also includes variables containing information about crime and variables related to the institutional structure of the judiciary and the place of the judiciary within the broader political system. The purpose of the dataset is to provide researchers and policymakers with comprehensive, high-quality data on the extent of political and personal rights of citizens, the independence of the judiciary, and indicators on the impartial provision of justice.

1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit

u_demscore_country_year_country: The column is created based on V-Dem, H-DATA AND GW. It is based on the following datasets: H-DATA Information Capacity Dataset H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset V-Dem Episodes of Regime Transformation Dataset V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others

u_demscore_country_year_code: NA

u_demscore_country_year_year: The column is created based on V-Dem, H-DATA AND GW. It is based on the following datasets: H-DATA Information Capacity Dataset H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset V-Dem Episodes of Regime Transformation Dataset V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others

2 COMPLAB

Based at Stockholm University, the **Comparative Policy Laboratory (COMPLAB)**, provides vital policy data across three areas: environmental, social, and migration policy. The **Social Policy Indicators (SPIN)** database provides the foundations for new comparative and longitudinal research on causes and consequences of welfare states. Building on T.H. Marshall's ideas about social citizenship, SPIN makes available comparative data on social rights and duties of citizens, thereby moving research beyond analyses of welfare state expenditures. The SPIN database is instead oriented towards analyses of institutions as manifested in social policy legislation. Data are carefully collected in a coherent and consistent methodological manner to facilitate quantitative research of social policy across time and space. To date, SPIN covers 36 countries, of which several have data on core social policy programs from 1930 to 2019. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/data/spin-1.644259` **GRACE, Governing the Anthropocene – Environmental Policy and Outcomes in a Comparative Perspective**, is a longitudinal and comparative study on environmental governance has created a dataset of national policy responses for environmental management and protection in 37 countries for the period 1970-2022. `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/data/grace-1.645779` **The Migration Policy Database (MIGPOL)** consists of a range of indicators compiled on behalf of leading data projects in the field of comparative migration policy research. It also contains original data on the rights of irregular migrants which will soon be added to Demscore. `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/data/migpol-1.645783` Read more about COMPLAB here: `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/`

2.1 COMPLAB MIGPOL Historical Immigration Policies Database

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Historical Immigration Policies Database (HIP) covers 31 countries from either 1789 or their independence until the 2010s. These countries include: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Venezuela. HIP enables scholars to reassess long-established views on the historical development of immigration policies, test new arguments with longitudinal data, and explore the relationship between immigration policies and slow-changing domestic and international variables. The dataset spans a wide range of variables important to political scientists, such as regime type, wealth (including natural resource wealth), and economic structure. Immigration policy dimensions—such as entry rules, rights, and enforcement—are coded separately, allowing researchers to analyze their long-term co-evolution. HIP is relevant to a broad audience in international relations and can be used to investigate immigration policy's connection to topics like North-South relations, democratization and autocratization trends, and the rise of far-right ideologies and populism. It holds particular promise for the growing subfield of historical international relations, with its focus on the evolution of states, state systems, and international ties. More information is available on: `https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL#`

Dataset citation: PETERS, MARGARET and Borang, Frida and Kalm, Sara; Lindvall, Johannes and Shin, Adrian, 2024, *Historical Immigration Policy dataset (HIP)*, https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL, Harvard Dataverse, V2. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://dataverse.harvard.edu/file.xhtml?fileId=10143944&version=2.0`

License: The Historical Immigration Policy Dataset is in the public domain. It is licensed under CC by 1.0. The persons associated with this work have waived all their rights to the work worldwide under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights, to the extent allowed by the law. The data can be copied, modified, and distributed, even for commercial purposes, all without asking permission.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL#`

2.1.1 Historical Policy

Variables in this section provides coding of immigration policies of 31 states from 1789/ independence to 2010.

2.1.1.1 Immigrants Rights (rightscode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_rightscode

Original tag: hip_rightscode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4737, Percent: 27.11

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4521, Percent: 14.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the law mention what rights immigrants have once in the state? Are there racial/national origin discriminations? Does the government try to integrate immigrants or does it just expect them to assimilate? How easy is it to get permanent residency? Can immigrants access the social welfare system?
VALUES:
1 = Almost no legal rights; immigrants must leave state if they leave their job; cannot own property; cannot access the welfare state; they have to register; have no freedom of religion, no permanent residency, etc.
2 = Some rights but land ownership and ownership of companies restricted; limited access to the welfare state.
3 = Ability to change jobs freely; some ownership of real property or companies; some access to the welfare state; some racial discrimination in laws.
4 = Access to most welfare policies; few restrictions on ownership of property or firms.
5 = Total access to welfare state; voting rights without citizenship; no restrictions in property ownership; integration policies; no racial discrimination; few years to permanent residency.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.1.1.2 Refugee Provisions (refexist)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_refexist

Original tag: hip_refexist

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4750, Percent: 27.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4531, Percent: 14.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 4.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Has the first refugee law been introduced now or previously?
VALUES:
0 = No
1 = Yes
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.1.1.3 Asylum Provisions (asylcode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_asylcode

Original tag: hip_asylcode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4747, Percent: 27.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4531, Percent: 14.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.55

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the law discuss asylum seekers? That is, migrants who are at the border or in the state claiming refugee status? How easy is it to gain asylum? What rights do asylum seekers and asylees have? Are they kept in detention centers? Are they repatriated? Is there only one asylum status or is there temporary protected status as well? What are the procedures and are there legal safeguards?
VALUES:
1 = No asylum.
2 = Extremely dicult process; asylum granted only in a few cases; little ability to work or access welfare state while awaiting determination; little recourse if not granted asylum; no temporary protected status; limited access for political refugees.
3 = Difficult process; asylum granted for more cases; some access to the welfare state or labor market; more recourse including ability to access courts if denied; some temporary protected status allowed.
4 = Fairly easy process; asylum granted to many groups; access to labor market and welfare system; access to courts and other procedures if denied; temporary protected status given to many groups.
5 = Easy process; asylum granted for most cases; access to labor markets and welfare state; constitutionally protected procedure; no need for temporary protected status because almost everyone gets asylum.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.1.1.4 Deportation (decode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_decode

Original tag: hip_decode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4666, Percent: 26.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4450, Percent: 14.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.63

Description:

DESCRIPTION: How easy is it to deport an immigrant? What safeguards exist? Does the

state engage in mass expulsions or pay people to leave the country?
VALUES:
1 = No appeals process; many deportable offenses, including losing one's job.
2 = Administrative process with few checks; fewer deportable offenses.
3 = More checks on the process and even fewer deportable offenses.
4 = Judicial checks on process including going to the highest court in the land and/or very few deportable offenses.
5 = Almost no deportable offenses and clear judicial checks.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.2 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMISEM

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_imisem

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The IMISEM dataset contains 828 indicators on the migration policies of 32 polities from Europe, South East Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean. The IMISEM project adopts a comprehensive view of migration policy that includes both its emigrant/ emigration and immigrant/ immigration sides, bridging for the first time the two sides of migration policy. Thus, the dataset includes indicators that measure emigration policies (exit policies and control of outflows), immigration policies (entry policies and control of inflows), emigrant policies (rights granted, services offered and obligations imposed on non-resident citizens), immigrant policies (mainly, rights granted to non-citizen residents) and citizenship policies (mainly, access to naturalization for immigrants and retention of citizenship by emigrants). The main sources used to complete the IMISEM questionnaires are legal sources (i.e., laws, regulations). Legal sources are complemented with secondary sources (for instance, policy reports) and interviews with experts. The IMISEM Dataset is one of the main outputs of the "The very Immigrant is an Emigrant Project (IMISEM)" funded by the Leibniz Gemeinschaft and carried out at the GIGA German Institute for Global and Area Studies between 2017 and 2020. IMISEM data was collected for the years 2017 to 2019 during this time. It is coded for 2018 in DEMSCORE to align with the country-year format of other datasets.

Dataset citation: Pedroza, Luicy (2022) "IMISEM Dataset" GESIS Data Archive DOI: 10.7802/2380
`https://search.gesis.org/research_data/SDN-10.7802-2380?doi=10.7802/2380`. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The IMISEM CODEBOOK is an Open Access publication licensed under CC BY 4.0. The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the IMISEM project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page:
`https://www.giga-hamburg.de/en/publications/research-datasets/imisem-dataset`

2.2.1 Immigration Proxy Labor Migration

The ImmigratioProxy Labor Migration section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on high- and low-skilled migrants, with specific attention to domestic workers, agricultural workers, and medical doctors.

2.2.1.1 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Domestic Workers Equal (itionlabor_equal_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_equal_domestic

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_equal_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is it required by law that the work conditions (e.g. minimum wage, working hours, and benefits) of the migrant domestic workers were equal to those of native workers?
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.2.1.2 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Agricultural Workers Equal (itionlabor_equal_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_equal_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_equal_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is it required by law that the work conditions (e.g. minimum wage, working hours, and benefits) of the migrant agricultural workers were equal to those of native workers?
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.2.1.3 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Medical Doctors Equal (itionlabor_equal_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_equal_medical

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_equal_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is it required by law that the work conditions (e.g. minimum wage, working hours, and benefits) of the migrant medical doctors were equal to those of native workers? Only if 1 in ItionLabor_Visa_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.3 COMPLAB MIGPOL Antidiscrimination Dataset

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The IMPIC Project offers sophisticated quantitative indices to assess immigration policies across time, countries, and policy fields, focusing on 33 OECD countries from 1980 to 2018. The current IMPIC datasets (version 2) cover immigration policies, which encompass government intentions and actions concerning the selection, admission, settlement, and deportation of foreign citizens within a country. IMPIC is structured by entry categories or "tracks" covering four immigration policy fields: labour migration (economic), family reunification (social), asylum/refugees (humanitarian), and co-ethnics (cultural). The IMPIC Antidiscrimination provides detailed information on antidiscrimination regulations across all 33 country cases. This dataset consists of scores that aggregate information of the IMPIC Antidiscrimination RawData file across tracks. The items cover the existence and type of anti-discrimination legislation regarding racial/ethnic, religious, and nationality discrimination. The type of legislation includes to what societal areas it applies and which specific acts it prohibits or protects, as well as enforcement mechanisms and the existence and jurisdiction of equality bodies. More information is available on the project's website: `http://www.impic-project.eu/data/`.

Dataset citation: Helbling, M., Abou-Chadi, T., Berger, V., Bjerre, L., Breyer, M., Römer, F. Zobel, M. (2024), 'IMPIC Database v2', Immigration Policies in Comparison Project. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the IMPIC project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `http://www.impic-project.eu/data/`

2.3.1 Anti-Discrimination

The items in the Anti-Discrimination section cover the existence and type of anti-discrimination legislation regarding racial/ethnic, religious, and nationality discrimination. The type of legislation includes to what societal areas it applies and which specific acts it prohibits or protects, as well as enforcement mechanisms and the existence and jurisdiction of equality bodies.

2.3.1.1 Anti-discrimination grounds - Aggregated (s_g01)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_s_g01

Original tag: impic_S_g01

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 604, Percent: 3.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 585, Percent: 1.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.15

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, were all residents legally protected from direct and/or indirect discrimination, and/or harassment and/or instruction to discriminate on the grounds of race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality? By legal protection from discrimination on grounds of nationality (the third ground), we mean that nationality/citizenship is a protected ground in national law or established through case law. If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective grounds. S_g01 combines the values on R_g01 across the three tracks (=grounds), race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds 0.25 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, only one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.3.1.2 Prohibitions in law - Aggregated (s_g02)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_s_g02

Original tag: impic_S_g02

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 520, Percent: 2.98

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 501, Percent: 1.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.65

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, are the following acts legally prohibited? a) Public incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination on basis of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality b) Racially/religiously motivated public insults, threats or defamation c) Instigating, aiding, abetting or attempting to commit such offenses d) Racial profiling VALUES: 0 = Yes, all four grounds 0.25 = Yes, three of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.75 = Yes, only one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.3.1.3 Application to private and public sector - Aggregated (s_g03)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_s_g03

Original tag: impic_S_g03

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 526, Percent: 3.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 507, Percent: 1.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? S_g03a and S_g03b are sub-indicators of S_g03. For S_g03a (private sector), this combines the general private sector and the private sector carrying out public sector activities (i.e. public transportation, infrastructure), meaning R_g03_a and R_g03_b. For S_g03b (public sector), this combines the general public sector and the police force, meaning R_g03_c and R_g03_d. S_g03 is the overall average. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all four 0.25 = Yes, three 0.5 = Yes, two 0.75 = Yes, only one 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.3.1.4 Fields of application - Aggregated (s_g04)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_s_g04

Original tag: impic_S_g04

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 518, Percent: 2.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 499, Percent: 1.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.67

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. S_g04 combines the values on R_g04 across the three tracks (=grounds), race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality. It is the average of the subindicators S_g04_a to S_ g04_e. The answers of g01 are consequential here. If a ground is not covered in a year in g01, it can also not be covered in one of the specific g04 areas. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds in all five areas 0.1 = ... 0.2 = ... 0.9 = Yes, only one 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.3.1.5 Enforcement mechanisms and Range of Sanctions - Aggregated (s_g05_6)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_s_g05_6

Original tag: impic_S_g05_6

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 607, Percent: 3.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 588, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.13

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? a) Shift in burden of proof in judicial civil or administrative procedures b) National legislation specifies that a court would accept situation testing and statistical data as evidence c) Financial assistance (by the state) or free court appointed lawyers and interpreters provided free of charge, where victims do not have the necessary means d) Legal entities with a legitimate interest in defending the principle of equality may engage in proceedings on behalf or in support of victims. Proceedings on behalf of victims means to represent a person or company in court, proceedings in support of victims means joining already existing proceedings. For the years 2000-2018, do the following sanctions exist to enforce anti-discrimination measures? Like before, please consider only anti-discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality. S_g05_6 combines scores for g05 and g06. Five types of enforcement mechanisms and/or sanctions are evaluated together: all aspects of g6 are counted as one mechanism, the other four are the aspects of g05. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all five mechanisms/sanctions exists 0.2 = Yes, four of these 0.4 = Yes, three of these 0.6 = Yes, two of these 0.8 = Yes, only one 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.3.1.6 Equality bodies - Aggregated (s_g07)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_s_g07

Original tag: impic_S_g07

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 591, Percent: 3.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 572, Percent: 1.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.21

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is there a specialized equality body to combat anti-discrimination and if yes, which mandates does it have? a) An equality body to combat discrimination on the grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exists b) Mandate to assist victims with independent legal advice on their case c) Mandate to assist victims with independent investigations of the facts of the case d) Mandate to engage in proceedings (judicial and/or administrative) on behalf of complainant e) Mandate to instigate own proceedings or investigations Note: If there is no dedicated specialised equality body, please answer 'no' to the questions about the mandate. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all five 0.25 = Yes, a) and two or three more 0.5 = Yes, a) and one more 0.75 = Only a) 1 = No equality body MISSINGS: Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.3.1.7 Equality policies - Aggregated (s_g08)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_s_g08

Original tag: impic_S_g08

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 509, Percent: 2.91

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 490, Percent: 1.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.73

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following equality policy mechanisms exist? a) Mechanism to systematically review legislation for compliance with anti-discrimination law (e.g. obligatory impact assessments, obligatory consultation or binding opinions of equality or advisory body) b) Obligation for public bodies to ensure that parties to whom they award contracts, loans, grants or other benefits respect non-discrimination c) Law provides for introduction of positive action measures on issues of ethnicity, race or religion that could also benefit people of immigrant background Like before, please consider only anti-discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three 0.33 = Yes, two 066 = Yes, one 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4 COMPLAB MIGPOL Antidiscrimination Raw Data

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The IMPIC Project offers sophisticated quantitative indices to assess immigration policies across time, countries, and policy fields, focusing on 33 OECD countries from 1980 to 2018. The current IMPIC datasets (version 2) cover immigration policies, which encompass government intentions and actions concerning the selection, admission, settlement, and deportation of foreign

citizens within a country. IMPIC is structured by entry categories or "tracks" covering four immigration policy fields: labour migration (economic), family reunification (social), asylum/refugees (humanitarian), and co-ethnics (cultural). The IMPIC Antidiscrimination provides detailed information on antidiscrimination regulations across all 33 country cases. This dataset consists of scores that aggregate information of the IMPIC Antidiscrimination RawData file across tracks. The items cover the existence and type of anti-discrimination legislation regarding racial/ethnic, religious, and nationality discrimination. The type of legislation includes to what societal areas it applies and which specific acts it prohibits or protects, as well as enforcement mechanisms and the existence and jurisdiction of equality bodies. More information is available on the project's website: `http://www.impic-project.eu/data/`.

Dataset citation: Helbling, M., Abou-Chadi, T., Berger, V., Bjerre, L., Breyer, M., Römer, F. Zobel, M. (2024), 'IMPIC Database v2', Immigration Policies in Comparison Project. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the IMPIC project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `http://www.impic-project.eu/data/`

2.4.1 Anti-Discrimination

The items in the Anti-Discrimination section cover the existence and type of anti-discrimination legislation regarding racial/ethnic, religious, and nationality discrimination. The type of legislation includes to what societal areas it applies and which specific acts it prohibits or protects, as well as enforcement mechanisms and the existence and jurisdiction of equality bodies.

2.4.1.1 Anti-discrimination grounds - race and ethnicity - Raw (r__g01__a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g01_a

Original tag: impic_R_g01_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

> DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, were all residents legally protected from direct and/or indirect discrimination, and/or harassment and/or instruction to discriminate on the grounds of race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality? By legal protection from discrimination on grounds of nationality (the third ground), we mean that nationality/citizenship is a protected ground in national law or established through case law. If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective grounds. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.2 Anti-discrimination grounds - religion and belief - Raw (r__g01__b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g01_b

Original tag: impic_R_g01_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, were all residents legally protected from direct and/or indirect discrimination, and/or harassment and/or instruction to discriminate on the grounds of race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality? By legal protection from discrimination on grounds of nationality (the third ground), we mean that nationality/citizenship is a protected ground in national law or established through case law. If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective grounds. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.3 Anti-discrimination grounds - nationality - Raw (r__g01__c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g01_c

Original tag: impic_R_g01_c

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, were all residents legally protected from direct and/or indirect discrimination, and/or harassment and/or instruction to discriminate on the grounds of race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality? By legal protection from discrimination on grounds of nationality (the third ground), we mean that nationality/citizenship is a protected ground in national law or established through case law. If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective grounds. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.4 Public incitement to violence - Raw (r__g02__a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g02_a

Original tag: impic_R_g02_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, are the following acts legally prohibited? a) Public incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination on basis of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality b) Racially/religiously motivated public insults, threats or defamation c) Instigating, aiding, abetting or attempting to commit such offenses d) Racial profiling VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.5 Public insults or defamation - Raw (r__g02__b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g02_b

Original tag: impic_R_g02_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, are the following acts legally prohibited? a) Public incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination on basis of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality b) Racially/religiously motivated public insults, threats or defamation c) Instigating, aiding, abetting or attempting to commit such offenses d) Racial profiling VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.6 Instigation of such offenses - Raw (r__g02__c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g02_c

Original tag: impic_R_g02_c

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, are the following acts legally prohibited? a) Public incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination on basis of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality b) Racially/religiously motivated public insults, threats or defamation c) Instigating, aiding, abetting or attempting to commit such offenses d) Racial profiling VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.7 Racial profiling - Raw (r__g02__d)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g02_d

Original tag: impic_R_g02_d

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, are the following acts legally prohibited? a) Public incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination on basis of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality b) Racially/religiously motivated public insults, threats or defamation c) Instigating, aiding, abetting or attempting to commit such offenses d) Racial profiling VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.8 Private sector: General - Raw (r__g03__a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g03_a

Original tag: impic_R_g03_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds

of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.9 Private sector: Private sector carrying out public sector activities (i.e. public transportation, infrastructure) - Raw (r__g03__b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g03_b

Original tag: impic_R_g03_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.10 Public sector: Police force - Raw (r__g03__c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g03_c

Original tag: impic_R_g03_c

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.11 Public sector: other than police force - Raw (r__g03__d)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g03_d

Original tag: impic_R_g03_d

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.12 Employment and vocational training - race and ethnicity - Raw (r__g04__a__0)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_a_0

Original tag: impic_R_g04_a_0

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.13 Employment and vocational training - religion and belief - Raw (r__g04__a__1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_a_1

Original tag: impic_R_g04_a_1

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.14 Employment and vocational training - nationality - Raw (r__g04__a__2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_a_2

Original tag: impic_R_g04_a_2

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.15 Education (primary and secondary level) - race and ethnicity - Raw (r__g04__b__0)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_b_0

Original tag: impic_R_g04_b_0

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.16 Education (primary and secondary level) - religion and belief - Raw (r__g04__b__1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_b_1

Original tag: impic_R_g04_b_1

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.17 Education (primary and secondary level) - nationality - Raw (r__g04__b__2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_b_2

Original tag: impic_R_g04_b_2

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.18 Social protection (including social security) - race and ethnicity - Raw (r__g04__c__0)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_c_0

Original tag: impic_R_g04_c_0

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.19 Social protection (including social security) - religion and belief - Raw (r__g04__c__1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_c_1

Original tag: impic_R_g04_c_1

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.20 Social protection (including social security) - nationality - Raw (r_g04_c_2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_c_2

Original tag: impic_R_g04_c_2

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.21 Access to public goods and services, including housing - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g04_d_0)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_d_0

Original tag: impic_R_g04_d_0

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.22 Access to public goods and services, including housing - religion and belief - Raw (r_g04_d_1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_d_1

Original tag: impic_R_g04_d_1

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.23 Access to public goods and services, including housing - nationality - Raw (r_g04_d_2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_d_2

Original tag: impic_R_g04_d_2

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.24 Access to public goods and services, including health - race and ethnicity - Raw (r_g04_e_0)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_e_0

Original tag: impic_R_g04_e_0

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.25 Access to public goods and services, including health - religion and belief - Raw (r_g04_e_1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_e_1

Original tag: impic_R_g04_e_1

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.26 Access to public goods and services, including health - nationality - Raw (r_g04_e_2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g04_e_2

Original tag: impic_R_g04_e_2

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.27 Shift in burden of proof - Raw (r__g05__a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g05_a

Original tag: impic_R_g05_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? Shift in burden of proof in judicial civil or administrative procedures. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.28 Situation testing as evidence - Raw (r__g05__b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g05_b

Original tag: impic_R_g05_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? National legislation specifies that a court would accept situation testing and statistical data as evidence. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.29 Financial assistance for lawyers and interpreters - Raw (r__g05__c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g05_c

Original tag: impic_R_g05_c

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? Financial assistance (by the state) or free court appointed lawyers and interpreters provided free of charge, where victims do not have the necessary means. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.30 Proceedings on behalf of victims by legal entities - Raw (r__g05__d)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g05_d

Original tag: impic_R_g05_d

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? Legal entities with a legitimate interest in defending the principle of equality may engage in proceedings on behalf or in support of victims. Proceedings on behalf of victims means to represent a person or company in court, proceedings in support of victims means joining already existing proceedings. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.31 Independent legal advice - Raw (r__g07__b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g07_b

Original tag: impic_R_g07_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is there a specialized equality body to combat anti-discrimination and if yes, which mandates does it have? Mandate to assist victims with independent legal advice on their case. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.32 Engagement in proceedings - Raw (r__g07__d)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g07_d

Original tag: impic_R_g07_d

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is there a specialized equality body to combat anti-discrimination and if yes, which mandates does it have? Mandate to engage in proceedings (judicial and/or administrative) on behalf of complainant. VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.33 Systematic legislative review - Raw (r__g08__a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_r_g08_a

Original tag: impic_R_g08_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following equality policy mechanisms exist? Mechanism to systematically review legislation for compliance with anti-discrimination law (e.g. obligatory impact assessments, obligatory consultation or binding opinions of equality or advisory body) VALUES: -2 = No -1 = Yes MISSINGS: -9 = DK -8 = NA Empty cell COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.34 Anti-discrimination grounds - Scored (s_g01)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g01

Original tag: impic_S_g01

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 604, Percent: 3.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 585, Percent: 1.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.15

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, were all residents legally protected from direct and/or indirect discrimination, and/or harassment and/or instruction to discriminate on the grounds of race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality? By legal protection from discrimination on grounds of nationality (the third ground), we mean that nationality/citizenship is a protected ground in national law or established through case law. If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective grounds. S_g01 combines the values on R_g01 across the three tracks (=grounds), race and ethnicity, religion and belief, and nationality. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds 0.25 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, only one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.35 Prohibitions in law - Scored (s_g02)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g02

Original tag: impic_S_g02

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 520, Percent: 2.98

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 501, Percent: 1.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.65

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, are the following acts legally prohibited? a) Public incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination on basis of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality b) Racially/religiously motivated public insults, threats or defamation c) Instigating, aiding, abetting or attempting to commit such offenses d) Racial profiling VALUES: 0 = Yes, all four grounds 0.25 = Yes, three of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.75 = Yes, only one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.36 Both private and public sector - Scored (s_g03)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g03

Original tag: impic_S_g03

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 526, Percent: 3.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 507, Percent: 1.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? Private and public sector. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all four 0.25 = Yes, three of 0.5 = Yes, two of 0.75 = Yes, only one 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.37 Private sector - Scored (s_g03_a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g03_a

Original tag: impic_S_g03_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 545, Percent: 3.12

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 526, Percent: 1.73

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.49

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? Private sector. VALUES: 0 = Yes, both 0.5 = Yes, one of both 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.38 Public sector - Scored (s_g03_b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g03_b

Original tag: impic_S_g03_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 550, Percent: 3.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 531, Percent: 1.75

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.45

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, does the anti-discrimination law concerning grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality apply to the following sectors? Public sector. VALUES: 0 = Yes, both 0.5 = Yes, one of both 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.39 Fields of application - Scored (s_g04)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g04

Original tag: impic_S_g04

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 518, Percent: 2.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 499, Percent: 1.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.67

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds in all five areas 0.1 = ... 0.2 = ... 0.9 = Yes, only one 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.40 Employment and vocational training - Scored (s_g04_a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g04_a

Original tag: impic_S_g04_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 571, Percent: 3.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 552, Percent: 1.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.33

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. Employment & vocational training. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds 0.25 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, on one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.41 Education (primary and secondary level) - Scored (s_g04_b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g04_b

Original tag: impic_S_g04_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 564, Percent: 3.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 545, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.37

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. Education (primary and secondary level). VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds 0.25 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, on one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.42 Social protection (including social security) - Scored (s_g04_c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g04_c

Original tag: impic_S_g04_c

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 568, Percent: 3.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 549, Percent: 1.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.35

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. Social protection (including social security) VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds 0.25 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, on one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.43 Access to public goods and services, including housing - Scored (s_g04_d)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g04_d

Original tag: impic_S_g04_d

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 554, Percent: 3.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 535, Percent: 1.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.43

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. Access to public goods and services, including housing VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds 0.25 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, on one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.44 Access to public goods and services, including health - Scored (s_g04_e)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g04_e

Original tag: impic_S_g04_e

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 542, Percent: 3.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 523, Percent: 1.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.51

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is discrimination outlawed in the following areas of life? If the protection is only based on international standards or subject to judicial interpretation, please select 'no' for the respective ground. Access to public goods and services, including health VALUES: 0 = Yes, all three grounds 0.25 = Yes, two of the grounds 0.5 = Yes, on one ground 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.45 Enforcement and sanctions - Scored (s_g05_6)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g05_6

Original tag: impic_S_g05_6

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 607, Percent: 3.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 588, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.13

Description:

DESCRIPTION: S_g05_6 combines scores for g05 and g06. Five types of enforcement mechanisms and/or sanctions are evaluated together: all aspects of g6 are counted as one mechanism, the other four are the aspects of g05 VALUES: 0 = Yes, all five mechanisms/sanctions exists 0.2 = Yes, four of these 0.4 = Yes, three of these 0.6 = Yes, two of these 0.8 = Yes, only one 1 = None MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.46 Shift in burden of proof - Scored (s_g05_a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g05_a

Original tag: impic_S_g05_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? Shift in

burden of proof in judicial civil or administrative procedures. VALUES: 0 = Yes 1 = No MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.47 Situation testing as evidence - Scored (s_g05_b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g05_b

Original tag: impic_S_g05_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? National legislation specifies that a court would accept situation testing and statistical data as evidence. VALUES: 0 = Yes 1 = No MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.48 Financial assistance for lawyers and interpreters - Scored (s_g05_c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g05_c

Original tag: impic_S_g05_c

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 589, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.12

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? Financial assistance (by the state) or free court appointed lawyers and interpreters provided free of charge, where victims do not have the necessary means. VALUES: 0 = Yes 1 = No MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.49 Proceedings on behalf of victims by legal entities - Scored (s_g05_d)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g05_d

Original tag: impic_S_g05_d

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 607, Percent: 3.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 588, Percent: 1.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.13

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following enforcement mechanisms against discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exist? Legal entities with a legitimate interest in defending the principle of equality may engage in proceedings on behalf or in support of victims. Proceedings on behalf of victims means to represent a person or company in court, proceedings in support of victims means joining already existing proceedings. VALUES: 0 = Yes 1 = No MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.50 Equality bodies - Scored (s_g07)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g07

Original tag: impic_S_g07

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 591, Percent: 3.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 572, Percent: 1.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.21

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, is there a specialized equality body to combat anti-discrimination and if yes, which mandates does it have? a) An equality body to combat discrimination on the grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality exists b) Mandate to assist victims with independent legal advice on their case c) Mandate to assist victims with independent investigations of the facts of the case d) Mandate to engage in proceedings (judicial and/or administrative) on behalf of complainant e) Mandate to instigate own proceedings or investigations Note: If there is no dedicated specialised equality body, please answer 'no' to the questions about the mandate. VALUES: 0 = Yes, all five 0.25 = Yes, a) and two or three more 0.5 = Yes, a) and one more 0.75 = Only a) 1 = No equality body MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.4.1.51 Systematic legislative review - Scored (s_g08_a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc_rd_s_g08_a

Original tag: impic_S_g08_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 519, Percent: 2.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 500, Percent: 1.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 3.66

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 2000-2018, do the following equality policy mechanisms exist? Mechanism to systematically review legislation for compliance with anti-discrimination law (e.g. obligatory impact assessments, obligatory consultation or binding opinions of equality or advisory body) VALUES: 0 = Yes 1 = No MISSINGS: Empty cells COVERAGE: 2000-2018

2.5 COMPLAB MIGPOL MIPEX

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_mipex

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is a comprehensive tool used to evaluate, compare, and enhance integration policies in 31 countries across Europe and North America. It employs 148 policy indicators across 7 policy areas (labour market mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality and anti-discrimination) to offer a multifaceted view of migrants' societal participation opportunities while assessing government commitment to integration. MIPEX helps determine whether all residents are afforded equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities. The project is conducted by the British Council, the Migration Policy Group in Brussels and the Center for International Affairs in Barcelona with the involvement of 37 national-level organizations, including think-tanks, non-governmental organisations, foundations, universities, research institutes and equality bodies. Unlike indexes relying on expert opinions, MIPEX is based on public laws, policies, and research. It utilizes data from independent scholars and practitioners in migration law, education, and

anti-discrimination who assess each indicator based on publicly available documents. These scores are peer-reviewed and moderated for consistency across countries and time, with national experts contributing insights into policy changes and their rationales.

Dataset citation: Solano, Giacomo and Huddelston, Thomas (2020) "Migrant Integration Policy Index". Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the MIPEX project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.mipex.eu/`

2.5.1 Antidiscrimination

The Antidiscrimination section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: Is everyone effectively protected from racial/ethnic, religious, and nationality discrimination in all areas of life?

2.5.1.1 Law covers direct/indirect discrimination, harassment, instruction (ga117)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_ga117

Original tag: mipex_ga117

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Prohibition in the law includes direct and/or indirect discrimination, and/or harassment and/or instruction to discriminate on grounds of:
a) race and ethnicity
b) religion and belief
c) nationality

C means that nationality/citizenship is a protected ground in national law or established through case law . If discrimination is prohibited only for national origin only, please do not chose C.
VALUES:
100 - All three grounds
50 - Two grounds (please specify which ones)
0 - Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.5.1.2 Enforcement mechanisms_new (gc_new)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_gc_new

Original tag: mipex_gc_new

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 534, Percent: 3.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 521, Percent: 1.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13 Percent: 2.43

Description:

DESCRIPTION: A) Access for victims to all the following procedures: juridical civil, criminal, administrative
B) Shift in burden of proof in judicial civil OR administrative procedures
C) Legal entities with a legitimate interest in defending the principle of equality may engage in proceedings on behalf OR in support of victims
D) At least c, e and h of the following sanctions (below)

Sanctions include:
a) financial compensation to victims for material damages
b) financial compensation to victims for moral damages/ damages for injuries to feelings
c) restitution of rights lost due to discrimination/ damages in lieu
d) imposing positive measures on discrimination
e) imposing negative measures to stop offending
f) imposing negative measures to prevent repeat offending
g) specific sanctions authorising publication of the verdict (in a non-judicial publication, i.e. not in documents produced by the court)
h) specific sanctions for legal persons
VALUES:
0 - None
25 - One of these
50 - Two of these
75 - Three of these
100 - All four of these
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.5.1.3 Equality bodies (gd137gd140)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_gd137gd140

Original tag: mipex_gd137gd140

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Specialised Body has the mandate to:
a) assist victims with independent legal advice to victims on their case
b) assist victims with independently investigation of the facts of the case
c) instigation of own proceedings OR investigations
VALUES:
0 - No specialized Body
33 - One of these
67 - Two of these
100 - Three of these
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.5.1.4 Enforcement mechanisms (gc)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_gc

Original tag: mipex_gc

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 155, Percent: 0.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 150, Percent: 0.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 3.23

Description:

DESCRIPTION: A) Access for victims to all the following procedures: juridical civil, criminal, administrative
B) Shift in burden of proof in judicial civil OR administrative procedures
C) Legal entities with a legitimate interest in defending the principle of equality may engage in proceedings on behalf OR in support of victims
D) At least c, e and h of the following sanctions (below)

Sanctions include:
a) financial compensation to victims for material damages
b) financial compensation to victims for moral damages/ damages for injuries to feelings
c) restitution of rights lost due to discrimination/ damages in lieu
d) imposing positive measures on discrimination
e) imposing negative measures to stop offending
f) imposing negative measures to prevent repeat offending
g) specific sanctions authorising publication of the verdict (in a non-judicial publication, i.e. not in documents produced by the court)
h) specific sanctions for legal persons
VALUES:
0 - None
25 - One of these
50 - Two of these
75 - Three of these
100 - All four of these
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

3 QOG

The **Quality of Government (QoG)** Institute was founded in 2004 by Professor Bo Rothstein and Professor Sören Holmberg. It is an independent research institute within the Department of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg. QoG is comprised of about 30 researchers who conduct and promote research on the causes, consequences and nature of Good Governance and the Quality of Government (QoG) - that is, trustworthy, reliable, impartial, uncorrupted and competent government institutions. QoG's award-winning datasets focus on concepts related to quality of government, transparency, and public administration. The main objective of QoG's research is to address the theoretical and empirical problem of how political institutions of high quality can be created and maintained. A second objective is to study the effects of Quality of Government on a number of policy areas, such as health, the environment, social policy, and poverty. The QoG datasets draw on a number of freely available datasources. More information on how the variables are complied for different QoG datasets can be found in the respective QoG codebooks available on their website. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government`

3.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset

Dataset tag: qog_ei

Output Unit: QoG Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means there is one row for each combination of country and year in the dataset. This unit is identified using the cname column and the year column.

Description: The Quality of Government Environmental Indicators Dataset (QoG-EI) is a compilation of major freely available indicators measuring environmental performance of countries over time.

Dataset citation: Povitkina, Marina, Natalia Alvarado Pachon Cem Mert Dalli. 2021. The Quality of Government Environmental Indicators Dataset, version Sep21. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_ei_sept21_august2023.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/environmental-indicators-dataset`

3.1.1 The Environmental Democracy Index

Dataset by: The Access Initiative (TAI) and World Resources Institute (WRI) The Environmental Democracy Index measures the degree to which countries have enacted legally binding rules that provide for environmental information collection and disclosure, public participation across a range of environmental decisions, and fair, affordable, and independent avenues for seeking justice and challenging decisions that impact the environment. The index evaluates 70 countries across 75 legal

indicators, based on objective and internationally recognized standards established by the United Nations Environment Programmes (UNEP) Bali Guidelines. EDI also includes a supplemental set of 24 limited practice indicators that provide insight on a country's performance in implementation. Link to the original source: `https://www.environmentaldemocracyindex.org/node/12732.html`

3.1.1.1 Affordable access to relief and remedy (Guideline 20) (edi_gaarr)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gaarr

Original tag: edi_gaarr

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

> The indicator measures to which extent states ensure that the access of members of the public concerned to review procedures relating to the environment is not prohibitively expensive and to which extent they consider the establishment of appropriate assistance mechanisms to remove or reduce financial and other barriers to access to justice.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (20.1) To what extent are there legal mechanisms in place to ensure that access to review procedures relating to the environment for members of the public concerned is not prohibitively expensive?; (20.2) To what extent does the law provide assistance mechanisms to reduce financial barriers to access to justice?; (20.3) To what extent does the law provide assistance mechanisms to reduce gender-related non-financial barriers to access to justice?; (20.4) To what extent does the law provide assistance mechanisms to reduce other non-financial and non-gender barriers to access to justice?; (P20.1) In the last 5 years, has a public interest case relating to the environment or natural resources been filed which was supported by government legal aid?; (P20.2) In the last 10 years, have there been cases relating to the environment or natural resources where the costs of proceedings was awarded against a public interest complainant/plaintiff/petitioner (c/p/p)?; (P20.3) In the last 5 years have there been cases related to the environment or natural resources where the costs of proceedings were awarded in favor of a public interest complainant/plaintiff/petitioner (c/p/p)?

3.1.1.2 Alternative dispute resolution for environmental issues (Guideline 26) (edi_gadrei)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gadrei

Original tag: edi_gadrei

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

> The indicator measures to which extent the states encourage the development and use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms where these are appropriate. In scoring this indicator, "alternate dispute resolution mechanisms" include mediation, conciliation, or arbitration adopted by institutions as a means of resolving environmental disputes.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (26.1) To what extent does the law provide for the possibility to use alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to address violations of the right of access to environmental information, public

participation or cases of environmental harm?; (26.2) To what extent does the law provide incentives for the use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms where these are appropriate?; (P26.1) In the last 5 years, has a public interest case relating to the environment or natural resources been solved by an alternate conflict resolution method (such as mediation, arbitration and conciliation)?

3.1.1.3 Awareness and education about remedies and relief (Guideline 23) (edi_gaerr)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gaerr

Original tag: edi_gaerr

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

> The indicator measures to which extent the states provide adequate information to the public about the procedures operated by courts of law and other relevant bodies in relation to environmental issues.
>
> This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (23.1) To what extent does the law require the State or State agencies or institutions to provide information to the public about court procedures relating to environmental issues?; (23.2) To what extent does the law require the State or State agencies or institutions to provide information to the public about review procedures relating to environmental issues provided by bodies other than courts of law?; (P23.1) Is there an easily understandable explanation of court procedures in the national language(s) on the website or office of the highest national court or the apex national environmental agency?

3.1.1.4 Broad standing (Guideline 18) (edi_gbs)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gbs

Original tag: edi_gbs

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

> The indicator measures to which extent the states provide broad interpretation of standing in proceedings concerned with environmental matters with a view to achieving effective access to justice.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (18.1) To what extent does the law recognize broad legal standing in proceedings concerned with environmental matters?; (P18.1) In the last 5 years, have NGOs been granted legal standing by national courts in public interest environmental cases?

3.1.1.5 Effective enforcement (Guideline 22) (edi_gee)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gee

Original tag: edi_gee

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states ensure the timely and effective enforcement of decisions in environmental matters taken by courts of law and by administrative and other relevant bodies.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (22.1) To what extent does the law provide for the effective enforcement of criminal court decisions relating to the environment?; (22.2) To what extent does the law require the enforcement of criminal court decisions relating to the environment to be timely?; (22.3) To what extent does the law provide for the effective enforcement of civil court decisions relating to the environment?; (22.4) To what extent does the law require the enforcement of civil court decisions relating to the environment to be timely?; (22.5) To what extent does the law provide for effective enforcement of decisions relating to the environment taken by administrative and other relevant bodies?; (22.6) To what extent does the law ensure the enforcement of administrative decisions relating to the environment will be timely?

3.1.1.6 Fair, timely, and independent review (Guideline 19) (edi_gftir)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gftir

Original tag: edi_gftir

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states provide effective procedures for timely review by courts of law or other independent and impartial bodies, or administrative procedures, of issues relating to the implementation and enforcement of laws and decisions pertaining to the environment.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (19.1) To what extent does the law provide procedures for the review of issues relating to the implementation and enforcement of laws and decisions pertaining to the environment by courts or other bodies, or administrative procedures?; (19.2) To what extent does the law require review procedures regarding the implementation and enforcement of laws and decisions pertaining to the environment to be decided by impartial and independent courts or bodies?; (19.3) To what extent does the law require review procedures regarding the implementation and enforcement of laws and decisions pertaining to the environment to be timely?; (19.4) To what extent does the law require review procedures regarding the implementation and enforcement of laws and decisions pertaining to the environment to be fair and equitable?; (19.5) To what extent does the law require review procedures regarding the implementation and enforcement of laws and decisions pertaining to the environment to be open and transparent? (P19.1) In the last 5 years have there been sanctions or corrective actions imposed by a national court of law or other independent and impartial body, for violation of laws and decisions pertaining to the environment?

3.1.1.7 Information request appeals (Guideline 15) (edi_gira)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gira

Original tag: edi_gira

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states ensure that any natural or legal person who considers that his or her request for environmental information has been unreasonably refused, in part or in full, inadequately answered or ignored, or in any other way not handled in accordance with applicable law, has access to a review procedure before a court of law or other independent and impartial body to challenge such a decision, act or omission by the public authority in question.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (15.1) To what extent do the laws concerning environmental impact assessments, pollution control standards and permits, forest concessions, extractive industries, protected areas and terrestrial biodiversity, and environmental policy-making provide for access to a review procedure in cases where environmental information request have been denied?; (15.2) To what extent does the law make the review available to all natural or legal persons?; (15.3) To what extent does the law provide access to a review procedure before a court of law or other independent and impartial body in cases when an environmental information request has been denied?; (P15.1) Is there a court, tribunal or other independent or impartial body at the national level with a physical office to receive and process public complaints about the refusal of environmental information?

3.1.1.8 Public access to judicial and administrative decisions (Guideline 24) (edi_gpajad)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gpajad

Original tag: edi_gpajad

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states ensure that decisions relating to the environment taken by a court of law, other independent and impartial or administrative body, are publicly available, as appropriate and in accordance with national law.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (24.1) To what extent does the law require judicial decisions relating to the environment to be made publicly available?; (24.2) To what extent does the law require decisions relating to the environment taken by administrative bodies to be made publicly available?; (24.3) To what extent does the law require decisions relating to the environment taken by other independent and impartial bodies to be made publicly available?; (P24.1) Are the decisions of the last three environmental or natural resource cases decided by a national court, tribunal or other judicial body available to the public online or at the office of that court, tribunal or body?

3.1.1.9 Public participation appeals (Guideline 16) (edi_gppa)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gppa

Original tag: edi_gppa

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states ensure that the members of the public concerned have access to a court of law or other independent and impartial body to challenge the substantive and procedural legality of any decision, act or omission relating to public participation in decision-making in environmental matters.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (16.1) To what extent does the law entitle members of the public concerned to challenge the substantive legality of any decision, act or omission relating to decision-making in environmental matters which is subject to public participation?; (16.2) To what extent does the law entitle members of the public concerned to challenge the procedural legality of any decision, act or omission relating to decision-making in environmental matters subject to public participation?; (16.3) To what extent does the law require that a court of law or other independent and impartial body hear challenges to substantive and/or procedural legality?; (P16.1) In the last 5 years, have public interest environmental or natural resource cases been filed before a court, tribunal or other body? If court records are not public information, check media reports.

3.1.1.10 Right of public to challenge state or private actors (Guideline 17) (edi_grpcspa)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_grpcspa

Original tag: edi_grpcspa

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states ensure that the members of the public concerned have access to a court of law or other independent and impartial body or administrative procedures to challenge any decision, act or omission by public authorities or private actors that affects the environment or allegedly violates the substantive or procedural legal norms of the State related to the environment.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (17.1) To what extent does the law give rights to the public concerned to challenge any decision, act or omission by public authorities that allegedly violates the procedural legal norms of the state relating to the environment?; (17.2) To what extent does the law give rights to the public concerned to challenge any decision, act or omission by private actors that allegedly violates the substantive legal norms of the state relating to the environment?; (17.3) To what extent does the law give rights to the public concerned to challenge any decision, act or omission by private actors that allegedly violates the procedural legal norms of the State relating to the environment?; (17.4) To what extent does the law require the challenges referred to in indicators 1-3 to be heard by an independent and impartial body?; (P17.1) Have there been cases in the last 5 years when civil society filed a lawsuit against a polluter in a national court?; (P17.2) Have there been cases in the last 5 years when civil society filed a lawsuit in a national court challenging a government decision, policy, or rule affecting the environment?

3.1.1.11 Justice Pillar Score (edi_jp)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_jp

Original tag: edi_jp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The Justice Pillar Score combines guidelines 'Information request appeals', 'Public participation appeals', 'Right of public to challenge state or private actors', 'Broad standing', 'Fair, timely, and independent review', 'Affordable access to relief and remedy', 'Prompt, effective remedies', 'Effective enforcement', 'Awareness and education about remedies and relief', 'Public access to judicial and administrative decisions', and 'Alternative dispute resolution for environmental issues', using an arithmetic average on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best).

3.2 QoG EU Regional Dataset Long Data

Dataset tag: qog_eureg_long

Output Unit: QoG NUTS Region-Year, i.e., data is collected per European NUTS region and year. This means that every row in the dataset can be identified through a combination of region and year. The unit can be expressed using the columns region_code and year. The unit can also be expressed through a combination of the columns nuts0, nuts1 nuts2 and year.

Description: The QoG EU Regional dataset is a dataset consisting of more than 300 variables covering three levels of European regions - Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS): NUTS0 (country), NUTS1(major socio-economic regions) and NUTS2 (basic regions for the application of regional policies).

The QoG Regional Data is presented in three different forms available in separate datasets. The variable are the same across all three dataset besides a varying suffix (_nuts0, _nuts1, _nuts2) indication which NUTS level is represented.
All datasets are available in time-series format. The first one (The QoG Regional Data - Long Form) is a dataset where data is presented in the long form. The list of units of analysis contains regions of all NUTS levels.
Two other datasets are presented in the wide form for multilevel analysis. In the second dataset (The QoG Regional Data - Wide Form NUTS1) includes NUTS1 level as the unit of analysis and variables represent the values for this level and corresponding lower level – NUTS0. As an example, in this dataset the data is presented only for East Sweden(Ostra Sverige SE1), as a unit of analysis and has values for lower levels of this region - Sweden (SE).
In the third dataset (The QoG Regional Data - Wide Form NUTS2) the unit of analysis is NUTS2 level regions and variables provide values as for every unit of analysis, as well as for corresponding lower NUTS levels: NUTS1 and NUTS0. One example of unit of analysis in this dataset is Stockholm (SE11) and data for every variable will be for Stockholm, as well as for lower level regions - East Sweden (Ostra Sverige SE1) and Sweden (SE).

Dataset citation: Charron, Nicholas, Stefan Dahlberg, Aksel Sundström, Sören Holmberg, Bo Rothstein, Natalia Alvarado Pachon Cem Mert Dalli. 2020. The Quality of Government EU Regional Dataset, version Nov20. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogeuregnov20

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_eureg_nov20.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/eu-regional-dataset`

3.2.1 Demographics

This category includes variables describing the demographic characteristics of a population, such as its size, life-expectancy, fertility rates and death rates.

3.2.1.1 Reported number of cases of burglary of private premises (eu_cri_bur)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_cri_bur

Original tag: eu_cri_bur

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 92, Percent: 0.3

Description:

> Reported number of cases of burglary of private premises. Domestic burglary is defined as gaining access to a dwelling by the use of force to steal goods.

3.2.1.2 Reported number of cases of intentional homicide (eu_cri_inthom)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_cri_inthom

Original tag: eu_cri_inthom

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 95, Percent: 0.31

Description:

> Reported number of cases of intentional homicide. It is defined as intentional killing of a person, including murder, manslaughter, euthanasia and infanticide. Causing death by dangerous driving is excluded, as are abortion and help with suicide. Attempted (uncompleted) homicide is also excluded. The counting unit for homicide is normally the victim (rather than the case).

3.2.1.3 Reported number of cases of robbery (eu_cri_rob)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_cri_rob

Original tag: eu_cri_rob

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 94, Percent: 0.31

Description:

Reported number of cases of robbery. Robbery is a sub-set of violent crime (see above). It is defined as stealing from a person with force or threat of force, including muggings (bag-snatching) and theft with violence. Pick-pocketing, extortion and blackmailing are generally not included.

3.3 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series

Dataset tag: qog_std_ts

Output Unit: QoG Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means there is one row for each combination of country and year in the dataset. This unit is identified using the cname column and the year column.

Description: The QoG Standard dataset is our largest dataset. It consists of approximately 2100 variables from more than 100 data sources related to Quality of Government. In the QoG Standard TS dataset, data from 1946 to 2024 is included and the unit of analysis is country-year (e.g., Sweden-1946, Sweden-1947, etc.).

Dataset citation: Teorell, Jan, Aksel Sundström, Sören Holmberg, Bo Rothstein, Natalia Alvarado Pachon, Cem Mert Dalli, Rafael Lopez Valverde, Victor Saidi Phiri Lauren Gerber. 2025. The Quality of Government Standard Dataset, version Jan25. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogstdjan25. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogstdjan24`

QoG Data is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_std_jan25.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/standard-dataset`

3.3.1 Judicial

This category includes judicial indicators, generally covering legal rights granted by a state to its citizens and their compliance, as well as measures of crimes and the overall state of the judicial system.

3.3.1.1 Law: the independence of the judiciary is guaranteed (aii_q01)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q01

Original tag: aii_q01

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 1. In law, the independence of the judiciary is guaranteed.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) the law establishes that the judiciary is independent from the executive and legislative branches, and

2) the law establishes the judiciary's right, authority or mandate to review laws, issue judicial decisions, and choose the cases heard by courts.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists, or a law exists but it does not include ALL of the elements described in 100.

3.3.1.2 Practice: the independence of the judiciary is guaranteed (aii_q02)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q02

Original tag: aii_q02

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 2. In practice, the independence of the judiciary is guaranteed.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) judges have the autonomy to interpret and review existing laws, legislation, and policies, and

2) judges operate without fear or favor, independent from other branches of government.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) judges' autonomy to interpret and review existing laws is occasionally restricted, or

2) judges are occasionally subject to negative or positive political incentives (for example, judges are demoted/promoted or relocated to worse/better offices in retaliation/reward for making certain decisions).

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) judges rarely have the autonomy to interpret and review existing laws, legislation and policies, or

2) judges are routinely subject to negative or positive political incentives (for example, judges are frequently demoted/promoted or relocated to worse/better offices in retaliation/reward for making certain decisions).

3.3.1.3 Practice: national-level judges support the independence of judiciary (aii_q03)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q03
Original tag: aii_q03
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77
Description:
Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 3. In practice, national-level judge appointments (justices or magistrates) support the independence of the judiciary.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) national-level judges are chosen through a merit-based selection system,

2) they have security of tenure, and

3) they are disciplined/removed/transferred only through due process by a peer panel/independent oversight body.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) national-level judges are occasionally appointed without following a merit-based selection system,

2) some judges are denied the security of tenure, or

3) occasionally judges are disciplined/removed/transferred without due process or the peer panel/independent oversight body occasionally includes representatives of the executive or legislative branches.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) there's a merit-based selection system but it fails to require basic skills (ex. legal education, litigation experience, etc.) or is so weak that individuals with less merit are usually appointed over those with more merit,

2) there is no security of tenure, or

3) the due process usually involves the Executive or Legislative branches.

3.3.1.4 Practice: national-level judges give reasons for their decisions (aii_q04)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q04

Original tag: aii_q04

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 4. In practice, national-level judges give reasons for their decisions/judgments.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) judges routinely provide formal reasoning for their rulings,

2) their reasoning references the laws/jurisprudence they considered and the specific interpretation they gave them in relation to the case, and

3) their reasoning is public (for this indicator, national security exceptions are allowed).

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) judges occasionally fail to provide formal reasoning for their decisions,

2) the reasoning occasionally lacks references to the laws/jurisprudence considered or the respective judges' interpretations, or

3) it takes more than two weeks for citizens to obtain the reasoning after request.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) judges rarely provide formal reasoning for their rulings, or

2) their reasoning rarely references the laws/jurisprudence they considered and/or the specific interpretations they gave them in relation to the case, or

3) the reasoning is not public.

3.3.1.5 Law: there is a supreme audit institution (aii_q05)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q05
Original tag: aii_q05
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:
Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 5. In law, there is a supreme audit institution.

A 100 score is earned where the law mandates the creation of a supreme audit institution or office of the Auditor General, tasked with auditing the government accounts.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists.

3.3.1.6 Law: the independence of supreme audit institution is guaranteed (aii_q06)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q06
Original tag: aii_q06
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77
Description:
Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 6. In law, the independence of the supreme audit institution is guaranteed.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) the law establishes that the audit institution is independent from the executive and legislative branches,

2) the institution has the right, authority or mandate to audit any government account, issue recommendations and resolutions, and refer cases to the prosecutor's office, and

3) the institution has a consistent source of funding to operate.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists, or a law exists but it doesn't establish ALL of the conditions described in 100.

3.3.1.7 Practice: the independence of supreme audit institution is guaranteed (aii_q07)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q07
Original tag: aii_q07
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 7. In practice, the independence of the supreme audit institution is guaranteed.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) auditors have the autonomy to audit accounts,

2) auditors operate without fear or favor, independent from other offices of government, and

3) they have a predictable source of funding that is consistent from year to year.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) auditors usually have autonomy to audit any account but exceptions exist,

2) auditors are occasionally subject to negative or positive political incentives (for example, auditors are demoted/promoted or relocated to worse/better offices in retaliation/reward for not auditing/not auditing or issuing favorable/unfavorable resolutions), or

3) funding is occasionally inconsistent.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) auditors rarely have autonomy to audit accounts,

2) they routinely operate with fear or favor, dependent of other offices of government, or

3) the source of funding is usually inconsistent from year to year.

3.3.1.8 Law: there are indep. bodies to investigate cases of pubsec. corruption (aii_q11)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q11

Original tag: aii_q11

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 11. In law, there is an independent body/bodies mandated to receive and investigate cases of alleged public sector corruption.

A 100 score is earned where all of the following conditions are met:

1) a law mandates a specific body to receive and investigate citizens' allegations of public sector corruption, and

2) a law establishes that the body is independent from the Executive and Legislative branches.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists, or a law exists but it doesn't meet the two conditions described in 100.

3.3.1.9 Practice: corruption allegations are investigated by independent body (aii_q12)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q12

Original tag: aii_q12

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 12. In practice, allegations of corruption against senior level politicians and/or civil servants of any level are investigated by an independent body.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) allegations against senior-level politicians and/or civil servants of any level are investigated, and

2) the members of the body mandated to investigate the allegations work without fear or favor from other offices.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) not all allegations against senior-level politicians and/or civil servants of any level are investigated, or

2) the members of the body mandated to investigate the allegations are occasionally subjected to positive/negative incentives to rule in favor/against a senior-level politician and/or civil servant.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) allegations against senior level politicians and/or civil servants of any level are rarely or never investigated, or

2) the members of the body mandated to investigate the allegations routinely receive positive/negative incentives to rule in favor/against a senior level politician and/or civil servant.

3.3.1.10 Practice: bodies investigating pubsector corruption allegations are effective (aii_q13)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q13

Original tag: aii_q13

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 13. In practice, the body/bodies that investigate/s allegations of public sector corruption is/are effective.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) the body has a functioning system in place to receive citizens' allegations of public sector corruption,

2) it investigates most of the allegations within three months of being reported, and

3) it exercises its own initiative to start investigations when/if needed.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) the system to receive citizens' allegations may not work for several days at a time,

2) not all cases reported are investigated or investigations take more than three months to start, or

3) the body rarely or never starts investigations out of its own initiative.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) there's no system to receive citizens' allegations, or

2) cases reported are rarely or never investigated.

3.3.1.11 Law: head of state and gov. can be investigated and prosecuted while in office (aii_q15)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q15

Original tag: aii_q15

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 159, Percent: 1.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 153, Percent: 0.5

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 15. In law, the head of state and government can be investigated and prosecuted while in office if evidence suggests they committed a crime.

A 100 score is earned where the law doesn't protect the heads of state and government from being investigated and prosecuted while in office if evidence suggests they committed a crime.

A 0 score is earned where a law protects/gives immunity to the heads of state and government from being investigated and prosecuted while in office if evidence suggests they committed a crime.

3.3.1.12 Practice: head of state and gov. can be investigated and prosecuted while in office (aii_q16)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q16

Original tag: aii_q16

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 159, Percent: 1.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 153, Percent: 0.5

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 16. In practice, heads of state and government are investigated and prosecuted while in office if evidence suggest they committed a crime.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) criminal allegations against heads of state and government are investigated while they are in office,

2) heads of state and government are prosecuted when investigations find evidence of possible wrongdoing, and

3) legal punishment is imposed if/when they are found guilty.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) not all allegations are investigated while they are in office,

2) not all investigations that find evidence of criminal activity result in prosecution, or

3) not all guilty verdicts result in legal punishment.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) allegations against heads of state and government are rarely investigated while they are in office,

2) criminal evidence rarely results in prosecution, or

3) guilty verdicts rarely result in legal punishment.

A 0 also applies if the heads of state and government have immunity, therefore making it impossible in practice to investigate, prosecute or punish them.

3.3.1.13 Law: there are mechanisms for citizens to report police force misconduct/abuse (aii_q17)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q17

Original tag: aii_q17

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 17. In law, there is a mechanism for citizens to report police misconduct or abuse of force.

A 100 score is earned where a law establishes the existence of an oversight body/entity specifically mandated to investigate police misconduct or abuse of force.

A 0 score is earned when no such law exists.

3.3.1.14 Practice: mechanisms for citizens to report police misconduct/abuse are effect. (aii_q18)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q18

Original tag: aii_q18

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 18. In practice, the mechanism for citizens to report police misconduct or abuse of force is effective.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) the body has a functioning system in place to receive citizens' allegations of police misconduct or abuse of force,

2) it investigates most of the allegations within one week of being reported, and

3) it exercises its own initiative to start investigations when/if needed.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) the system to receive citizens' allegations may not work for several days at a time,

2) not all cases reported are investigated or investigations take more than one week to start, or

3) none or only a minority of the investigations are self-started by the body.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions are met:

1) there's no system to receive citizens' allegations, or

2) cases reported are rarely investigated.

3.3.1.15 Law: companies guilty of procurement violations can't participate in future bid (aii_q27)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q27

Original tag: aii_q27

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 27. In law, companies found guilty of violations of procurement regulations are prohibited from participating in future bids.

A 100 score is earned where the law forbids companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) from participating in future bidding in the country, whether indefinitely or for a limited period of time.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists.

3.3.1.16 Practice: companies guilty of violations cannot participate in future bids (aii_q28)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q28

Original tag: aii_q28

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 28. In practice, companies found guilty of violating procurement regulations are prohibited from participating in future bids

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) are forbidden from participating in future bidding in the country, whether indefinitely or for a limited period of time, and

2) there is a registry of companies forbidden from bidding that citizens can access immediately or in less than two weeks upon request. A 100 is also earned if there is a registry in place that at the time of this research is empty because no company has violated the law.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) are generally forbidden from participating in future bidding, but there is evidence that some exceptions exist, or

2) citizen access to the full list of companies forbidden from participating takes more than two weeks.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) are rarely forbidden from participating in future bidding, or

2) there is no registry of companies forbidden from participating or it exists but it's not public.

3.3.1.17 Law: civil servants who report corruption cases are protected (aii_q36)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q36

Original tag: aii_q36

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 36. In law, civil servants who report cases of corruption are protected from recrimination or other negative consequences.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) there is a law specifically created to protect public sector whistle-blowers, and

2) the law forbids termination, transfer, harassment or other negative consequences against whistle-blowers. Note: General protections for civil servants do not grant a 100.

A 0 score is earned if no such law exists.

3.3.1.18 Rule of law sub-index (aii_rol)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_rol

Original tag: aii_rol

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Rule of Law. This sub-index from 0 to 100 is composed of:

41. In law, citizens have a right to request public information from state bodies.

42. In practice, citizen requests for public information are effective.

43. In practice, citizens can access legislative processes and documents.

44. In law, senior officials of the three branches of government (including heads of state and government, ministers, members of Parliament, judges, etc.) are required to disclose records of their assets and disclosures are public.

45. In practice, the asset disclosure process for senior officials of the three branches of government (heads of state and government, ministers, members of Parliament, judges, etc.) is effective.

46. In law, members of the civil service are required to disclose records of their assets and the disclosures are public.

47. In practice, the asset disclosure process for members of the civil service is effective.

48. In law, political parties are required to regularly disclose public donations (funds sourced from the government).

49. In practice, political parties regularly disclose public donations (funds that are sourced from the government) and the disclosures are easily available to the public.

50. In law, political parties are required to regularly disclose private donations.

51. In practice, political parties regularly disclose private donations and the disclosures are easily available to the public.

52. In practice, media organizations (print, broadcast, online) disclose the identities of their owners to the public.

53. In practice, journalists and editors adhere to strict, professional practices in their reporting.

54. In law, it is legal to report accurate news even if it damages the reputation of a public figure.

55. In practice, there is no prior government restraint (pre-publication censoring) and the government doesn't promote the media's self-censorship.

56. In practice, there is no prior government restraint (pre-publication censoring) of citizen-created content online and the government doesn't promote the self-censorship of citizens online (in blogs, social media, etc.).

57. In practice, the government does not block (or require ICT firms to block) online content.

58. In practice, ministries and autonomous agencies have websites.

59. In practice, the public services regulatory agencies and the national ombudsman (when and if there is one) have websites.

3.3.1.19 Civil Rights (bti_cr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_cr

Original tag: bti_cr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent are civil rights guaranteed and protected, and to what extent can citizens seek redress for violations of these rights? From 1 to 10.

1. Civil rights are not guaranteed, and are frequently violated. There are no mechanisms and institutions to protect citizens against violations of their rights.

4. Civil rights are guaranteed only within limited enclaves or are violated over protracted periods of time. Some mechanisms and institutions to prosecute, punish and redress violations of civil rights are established formally but do not function.

7. Civil rights are guaranteed but are partially or temporarily violated or are not protected in some parts of the country. Mechanisms and institutions to prosecute, punish and redress violations of civil rights are in place but often prove to be ineffective.

10. Civil rights are guaranteed by the constitution and respected by all state institutions. Infringements present an extreme exception. Citizens are effectively protected by mechanisms and institutions established to prosecute, punish and redress violations of their rights.

3.3.1.20 Freedom of Expression (bti_foe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_foe

Original tag: bti_foe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent can citizens, organizations, and the mass media express opinions freely? From 1 to 10.

1. Freedom of expression is denied. Independent media do not exist or are prohibited.

4. Freedom of expression is often subject to interference or government restrictions. Distortion and manipulation shape matters of public debate.

7. Freedom of expression is occasionally subject to interference or government restrictions, but there are generally no incidents of blatant intrusions like outright state censorship or media shutdowns.

10. Freedom of expression is guaranteed against interference or government restrictions. Individuals, groups and the press can fully exercise these rights.

3.3.1.21 Independent Judiciary (bti_ij)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_ij

Original tag: bti_ij

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent does an independent judiciary exist? From 1 to 10.

1. The judiciary is not independent and not institutionally differentiated.

4. The independence of the judiciary is heavily impaired by political authorities and high levels of corruption. It is to some extent institutionally differentiated, but severely restricted by functional deficits, insufficient territorial operability and scarce resources.

7. The judiciary is largely independent, even though occasionally its decisions are subordinated to political authorities or influenced by corruption. It is institutionally differentiated, but partially restricted by insufficient territorial or functional operability.

10. The judiciary is independent and free both from unconstitutional intervention by other institutions and from corruption. It is institutionally differentiated, and there are mechanisms for judicial review of legislative or executive acts.

3.3.1.22 Prosecution of Office Abuse (bti_poa)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_poa

Original tag: bti_poa

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent are public officeholders who abuse their positions prosecuted or penalized? From 1 to 10.

1. Office holders who break the law and engage in corruption can do so without fear of legal consequences or adverse publicity.

4. Office holders who break the law and engage in corruption are not prosecuted adequately under the law, but occasionally attract adverse publicity.

7. Officeholders who break the law and engage in corruption generally are prosecuted under established laws and often attract adverse publicity, but occasionally slip through political, legal or procedural loopholes.

10. Officeholders who break the law and engage in corruption are prosecuted rigorously under established laws and always attract adverse publicity.

3.3.1.23 Rule of Law (bti_rol)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_rol

Original tag: bti_rol

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

Rule of Law: State powers check and balance one another and ensure civil rights. Including 'To what extent is there a working separation of powers (checks and balances)', 'To what extent does an independent judiciary exist?', 'To what extent are public officeholders who abuse their positions prosecuted or penalized?' and 'To what extent are civil rights guaranteed and protected, and to what extent can citizens seek redress for violations of these rights?'.

3.3.1.24 Equality Before the Law Mentioned in Constitution (ccp_equal)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_equal

Original tag: ccp_equal

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59

Description:

Does the constitution refer to equality before the law, the equal rights of men, or non-discrimination?

1. Yes

2. No

96. Other

3.3.1.25 Human Rights Commission Present in Constitution (ccp_hr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_hr

Original tag: ccp_hr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59

Description:

Does the constitution contain provisions for a human rights commission?

1. Yes

2. No

96. Other

3.3.1.26 Right to View Government Documents in Constitution (ccp_infoacc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_infoacc

Original tag: ccp_infoacc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10532, Percent: 82.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1220 Percent: 11.58

Description:

Does the constitution provide for an individual the right to view government files or documents under at least some conditions?

1. Yes

2. No

96. Other

3.3.1.27 Status of Slavery in Constitution (ccp_slave)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_slave

Original tag: ccp_slave

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59

Description:

Does the constitution prohibit slavery, servitude, or forced labor?

1. Universally prohibited

2. Prohibited except in the case of war

3. Prohibited with other exception(s)

90. Left explicitly to non-constitutional law

96. Other

98. Not specified

3.3.1.28 Right to Strike in Constitution (ccp_strike)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_strike
Original tag: ccp_strike
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59
Description:
Does the constitution provide for the right to strike?

1. Yes

2. Yes, but with limitations

3. No

96. Other

3.3.1.29 New Constitutional System (ccp_syst)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_syst
Original tag: ccp_syst
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11837, Percent: 93.1
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10388, Percent: 34.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1449 Percent: 12.24
Description:
Identifies new constitutional systems.

3.3.1.30 Year in which the Constitutional System was Promulgated (ccp_systyear)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_systyear
Original tag: ccp_systyear
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11154, Percent: 87.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9872, Percent: 32.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1282 Percent: 11.49

Description:

Year in which the constitutional system was promulgated.

3.3.1.31 Prevalence of Enforced Disappearance (ciri_disap)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_disap

Original tag: ciri_disap

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7010, Percent: 55.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6351, Percent: 20.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 659 Percent: 9.4

Description:

Disappearances are cases in which 1) people have disappeared, 2) agents of the state are likely responsible, and 3) political motivation is likely. In most instances, disappearances occur because of a victim's political involvement or knowledge of information sensitive to authorities. Often, victimsare referred to by governments as "terrorists," and labeled a threat to national security. Knowledgeof the whereabouts of the disappeared is, by definition, not public knowledge. However, it istypically known by whom they were taken and under what circumstances. Cases where people disappear for a period of time and then later reappear are also to be counted, so long as the initial disappearance occurs in the year you are scoring. In many instances, victims are taken under false pretense, such as having been taken away for questioning due to suspicion of some political action that is in opposition to the government. There are some cases of persons that are held under the circumstance of "clandestine detention." These are prisoners that are known to be in custody but their whereabouts are not known. Since the whereabouts of clandestine detainees are not known, they should be counted among the disappeared.

Scoring Scheme:

Disappearances:

(0) Have occurred frequently

(1) Have occurred occasionally

(2) Have not occurred / Unreported

3.3.1.32 Freedom of Domestic Movement (ciri_dommov)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_dommov

Original tag: ciri_dommov

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7498, Percent: 58.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6571, Percent: 21.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 927 Percent: 12.36

Description:

The freedom to travel within one's country is a right. There are governments that do not allow citizens to travel within their own country of birth or that restrict the movement of certain groups for reasons based on political views or activities, religious beliefs, ethnicity, marital status, and gender. For example, some countries strictly curtail the freedom of movement of oppositional political leaders, ethnic minorities, religious leaders, human rights activists or monitors, and journalists. This may take many forms, including government-imposed internal exile and/or intentional bureaucratic/administrative delays to freedom of movement after a prison term has ended. Some countries strictly monitor all or nearly all citizens' internal movements, and citizens are required to notify local officials of their whereabouts or must get their permission to move. In some countries, citizens must carry national identity cards, travel or work permits, or internal passports for any movement outside their immediate village, neighborhood, or province. Some countries use issuance of these cards to restrict movement within the country. Some governments use forced internal resettlement to relocate large numbers of citizens without their consent. Some governments also impose curfew laws and military checkpoints on domestic travel during times of military or civil conflict.

Scoring Scheme:

Domestic travel is:

(0) Severely Restricted

(1) Somewhat Restricted

(2) Unrestricted

3.3.1.33 Independence of the Judiciary (ciri_injud)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_injud

Original tag: ciri_injud

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7468, Percent: 58.74

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6546, Percent: 21.58

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 922 Percent: 12.35

Description:

Independence of the judiciary indicates the extent to which the judiciary is independent of control from other sources, such as another branch of the government or the military. Important questions to consider include:

- Are judges safe from removal by other government officials?

- Can actions of other government branches be challenged in the courts?

- Are court hearings public?

- Are judicial officials generally free from corruption and intimidation?

- Are case outcomes protected from governmental interference?

Scoring Scheme:

As an institution, the judiciary is:

(0) Not Independent

(1) Partially Independent

(2) Generally Independent

3.3.1.34 Extrajudicial Killing (ciri_kill)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_kill
Original tag: ciri_kill
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7007, Percent: 55.11
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6348, Percent: 20.93
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 659 Percent: 9.4
Description:

Extrajudicial killings are killings by government officials without due process of law. They include

murders by private groups if instigated by a government. These killings may result from the deliberate, illegal, and excessive use of lethal force by the police, security forces, or other agents of the state whether against criminal suspects, detainees, prisoners, or others. Deaths resulting from torture

should be counted, as these deaths occurred while the prisoners were in the custody of the government

or its agents. Deaths from military hazing also count.

In most cases, the USSD reports indicate cases of political killings by explicitly referring to these killings as "political." A victim of a politically motivated killing is someone who was killed by a government or its agents as a result of his or her involvement in political activities or for supporting (implicitly or explicitly) the political actions of opposition movements against the existing government.

While they may be the result of different motives, both extrajudicial killings and political killings are

to be treated identically for the purposes of scoring.

NOTE: Beginning in 2001, the USSD replaced "Political and Other Extrajudicial Killings" with

"Arbitrary or Unlawful Deprivation of Life" as the title of this section in their Human Rights Reports

(released March 2002).

Scoring Scheme:

Political or Extrajudicial Killings are:

(0) Practiced frequently

(1) Practiced occasionally

(2) Have not occurred / unreported

(Original variable name: Political and other extrajudicial killings/arbitrary or unlawful deprivation of life)

3.3.1.35 Physical Integrity Rights (ciri_physint)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_physint
Original tag: ciri_physint
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6989, Percent: 54.97
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6330, Percent: 20.87

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 659 Percent: 9.43

Description:

Physical Integrity Rights is an additive index of the following variables: Disappearance + Extrajudicial Killing + Political Imprisonment + Torture.

The index ranges from 0-8. Higher values indicate greater levels of human rights respect

3.3.1.36 Political Imprisonment (ciri_polpris)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_polpris

Original tag: ciri_polpris

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7015, Percent: 55.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6356, Percent: 20.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 659 Percent: 9.39

Description:

Political imprisonment refers to the incarceration of people by government officials because of their

speech; their non-violent opposition to government policies or leaders; their religious beliefs; their non-violent religious practices including proselytizing; or their membership in a group, including an ethnic or racial group. Sometimes reports refer to “prisoners of conscience”; someone who was imprisoned because of his or her beliefs. Prisoners of conscience include those who are imprisoned due to their political and/or religious beliefs or practices. Reports sometimes make distinctions between political prisoners and prisoners of conscience, but for our purposes they are the same. Be aware that in many instances political prisoners are classified as terrorists and threats to national security by governments, which routinely apply the label ’terrorist’ to all opposition movements.

Scoring Scheme:

Are people imprisoned because of their political, religious, or other beliefs?

(0) Yes, and many

(1) Yes, but few

(2) None / None Reported

3.3.1.37 Prevalence of Torture by Government Authorities (ciri_tort)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_tort

Original tag: ciri_tort

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7013, Percent: 55.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6354, Percent: 20.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 659 Percent: 9.4

Description:

Torture refers to the purposeful inflicting of extreme pain–whether mental or physical–by government

officials, or by private individuals at the instigation of government officials. This includes the use of physical and other force by police and prison guards – including rape and beatings – as well as deaths

in custody due to tangible negligence by government officials. Torture can be anything from simple beatings to other practices such as waterboarding, rape, or administering shock or electrocution as a

means of getting information or a forced confession. Torture also takes into account intentional mental abuse of those in custody. Military hazing also counts as torture.

Scoring Scheme:

Torture is:

(0) Practiced frequently

(1) Practiced occasionally

(2) Not practiced / Unreported

3.3.1.38 Trust in Legal System (ess_trlegal)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ess_trlegal

Original tag: ess_trlegal

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 1: European Social Survey Round 1 Data (2002), ESS Round 2: European Social Survey Round 2 Data (2004), ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006), ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008), ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018), NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 11: European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC) (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 2.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 0.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust. The Legal System.

3.3.1.39 Trust in Police (ess_trpolice)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ess_trpolice

Original tag: ess_trpolice

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 1: European Social Survey Round 1 Data (2002), ESS Round 2: European Social Survey Round 2 Data (2004), ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006), ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008), ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018), NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 11: European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC) (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 2.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 0.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust. The Police.

3.3.1.40 Associational and Organizational Rights (fh_aor)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_aor

Original tag: fh_aor

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31

Description:

Associational and Organizational Rights - The variable evaluates the freedom of assembly, demonstrations and open public discussion; the freedom for nongovernmental organizations; and the freedom for trade unions, peasant organizations and other professional and private organizations. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 12 (best).

3.3.1.41 Civil Liberties (fh_cl)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_cl

Original tag: fh_cl

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9251, Percent: 72.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8125, Percent: 26.79

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1126 Percent: 12.17

Description:

Civil Liberties Rating - Civil liberties allow for the freedoms of expression and belief, associational and organizational rights, rule of law, and personal autonomy without interference from the state. The more specific list of rights considered vary over the years. Countries are graded between 1 (most free) and 7 (least free).

3.3.1.42 Freedom of Expression and Belief (fh_feb)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_feb

Original tag: fh_feb

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31

Description:

Freedom of Expression and Belief - The variable measures the freedom and independence of the media and other cultural expressions, the freedom of religious groups to practice their faith and express themselves, the academic freedom and freedom from extensive political indoctrination in the educational system, and the ability of the people to engage in private (political) discussions without fear of harassment or arrest by the authorities. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

3.3.1.43 Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights (fh_pair)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_pair

Original tag: fh_pair

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31

Description:

Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights - The variable evaluates the extent of state control over travel, choice of residence, employment or institutions of higher education; the right of citizens to own property and establish private businesses; the private business' freedom from unduly influence by government officials, security forces, political parties or organized crime; gender equality, freedom of choice of marriage partners and size of family; equality of opportunity and absence of economic exploitation. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

3.3.1.44 Rule of Law (fh_rol)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_rol

Original tag: fh_rol

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31

Description:

Rule of Law - The variable measures the independence of the judiciary; the extent to which rule of law prevails in civil and criminal matters; the existence of direct civil control over the police; the protection from political terror, unjustified imprisonment, exile and torture; absence of war and insurgencies; and the extent to which laws, policies and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

3.3.1.45 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (panel data) (fi_legprop_pd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_legprop_pd

Original tag: fi_legprop_pd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4496, Percent: 35.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4309, Percent: 14.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 187 Percent: 4.16

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to “no judicial independence”, “no trusted legal framework exists”, “no protection of intellectual property”, “military interference in rule of law”, and “no integrity of the legal system” and 10 corresponds to “high judicial independence”, “trusted legal framework exists”, “protection of intellectual property”, “no military interference in rule of law”, and “integrity of the legal system”. The index consists of the following indicators: Judicial independence: The judiciary is independent and not subject to interference by the government or parties in dispute, Impartial courts: A trusted legal framework exists for private businesses to challenge the legality of government actions or regulations, Protection of intellectual property, Military interference in rule of law and the political process, Integrity of the legal system. Panel-data adjusted.

3.3.1.46 Independent Judiciary (h_j)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_j

Original tag: h_j

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8114, Percent: 63.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7599, Percent: 25.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 515 Percent: 6.35

Description:

Dummy variable coded 1 if there is an independent judiciary (based on information from Polity’s Executive Constraints, p_xconst) and - where available - on ICRG’s index of Law \ amp; Order.

3.3.1.47 Appointments/Elections to Constitutional Court (iaep_aecc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_aecc

Original tag: iaep_aecc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4762, Percent: 37.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4478, Percent: 14.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 284 Percent: 5.96

Description:

Are members of this court (see iaep_cc) appointed or elected? "Elected" here refers to a popular election. Elections by legislative bodies are considered appointments.

1. Appointed

2. Elected

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.48 Appointment for Life to Constitutional Court (iaep_alcc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_alcc

Original tag: iaep_alcc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4292, Percent: 33.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4029, Percent: 13.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 263 Percent: 6.13

Description:

Are members of the court appointed for life?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.49 Constitutional Court (iaep_cc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_cc

Original tag: iaep_cc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6936, Percent: 54.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6617, Percent: 21.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 4.6

Description:

According to the constitution, does the country have a national constitutional court? In some cases, a council with the powers of a constitutional court may exist, though it may not be part of the formal judiciary. In such cases, this non-judicial council with the powers of a constitutional court is coded as the constitutional court.

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.50 Constitutional Court Rules on Executive Actions (iaep_ccrea)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_ccrea

Original tag: iaep_ccrea

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4532, Percent: 35.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4251, Percent: 14.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 281 Percent: 6.2

Description:

Can the court can rule on executive actions?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.51 Constitutional Court Rules on Legislative Actions (iaep_ccrla)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_ccrla

Original tag: iaep_ccrla

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4556, Percent: 35.83
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4291, Percent: 14.15
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 265 Percent: 5.82
Description:
Can the court can rule on legislative actions?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.52 The Age of the Constitution (years) (iaep_const)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_const
Original tag: iaep_const
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6730, Percent: 52.93
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6425, Percent: 21.18
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 305 Percent: 4.53
Description:
How long has the current constitution existed (years since the constitution was established)?

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.53 The Time the Constitution has been in Effect (years) (iaep_constin)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_constin
Original tag: iaep_constin
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6992, Percent: 54.99
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6669, Percent: 21.99
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 323 Percent: 4.62
Description:
How long has the current constitution been in effect (in years)?

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.54 The Time since the Last Amendment of Constitution (years) (iaep_constlam)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_constlam
Original tag: iaep_constlam
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6636, Percent: 52.19
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6335, Percent: 20.89
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 301 Percent: 4.54
Description:
How many years since the last amendment (in years)?

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.55 Removal of Members of Constitutional Court (iaep_rmcc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_rmcc
Original tag: iaep_rmcc
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4312, Percent: 33.92
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4049, Percent: 13.35
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 263 Percent: 6.1
Description:
Can members of this court (see iaep_cc) be removed?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.56 Who Removes Members of Constitutional Court (iaep_wrmcc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_wrmcc

Original tag: iaep_wrmcc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3229, Percent: 25.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3071, Percent: 10.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 158 Percent: 4.89

Description:

If members of the court can be removed, by whom? Here, the term "court itself" may refer to another court in the judiciary, not necessarily the constitutional court itself.

1. Legislature
2. Executive
3. Requires both legislature and executive action
4. Vote of general public
5. Court itself

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.3.1.57 Rights Score (iiag_rig)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iiag_rig

Original tag: iiag_rig

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 530, Percent: 4.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 510, Percent: 1.68

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Rights is one of the four sub-categories that are used to calculate the Participation, Rights amp; Inclusion category score. It consists of five indicators from six data sources.

3.3.1.58 Absolute legal institutional quality (simple averages) (kun_legabs)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_kun_legabs

Original tag: kun_legabs

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Kuncic (2014)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3588, Percent: 28.22
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3225, Percent: 10.63
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 363 Percent: 10.12
Description:
Absolute legal institutional quality (simple averages).

3.3.1.59 Legal institutional quality (relative factor scores) (kun_legrel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_kun_legrel
Original tag: kun_legrel
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Kuncic (2014)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2430, Percent: 19.11
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2341, Percent: 7.72
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 89 Percent: 3.66
Description:
Legal institutional quality (relative factor scores).

3.3.1.60 Legal World Institutional Quality Ranking (all countries) (kun_wiqrleg_all)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_kun_wiqrleg_all
Original tag: kun_wiqrleg_all
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Kuncic (2014)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2430, Percent: 19.11
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2341, Percent: 7.72
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 89 Percent: 3.66
Description:
Legal World Institutional Quality Ranking (all countries).

3.3.1.61 Legal World Institutional Quality Ranking (full obs.) (kun_wiqrleg_full)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_kun_wiqrleg_full
Original tag: kun_wiqrleg_full
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Kuncic (2014)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1761, Percent: 13.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1740, Percent: 5.74
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21 Percent: 1.19
Description:
Legal World Institutional Quality Ranking (countries with full observations).

3.3.1.62 Rule of Law, Estimate (wbgi_rle)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wbgi_rle
Original tag: wbgi_rle
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Kaufmann & Kraay (n.d.)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4954, Percent: 38.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4337, Percent: 14.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 617 Percent: 12.45

Description:

Rule of Law - Estimate: 'Rule of Law' includes several indicators which measure the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society. These include perceptions of the incidence of crime, the effectiveness and predictability of the judiciary, and the enforceability of contracts. Together, these indicators measure the success of a society in developing an environment in which fair and predictable rules form the basis for economic and social interactions and the extent to which property rights are protected.

3.3.1.63 Rule of Law, Standard Error (wbgi_rls)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wbgi_rls

Original tag: wbgi_rls

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Kaufmann & Kraay (n.d.)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4954, Percent: 38.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4337, Percent: 14.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 617 Percent: 12.45

Description:

Rule of Law - Standard Errors.

3.3.1.64 Intentional homicides (per 100,000 people) (wdi_homicides)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_homicides

Original tag: wdi_homicides

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3682, Percent: 28.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3399, Percent: 11.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283 Percent: 7.69

Description:

Intentional homicides are estimates of unlawful homicides purposely inflicted as a result of domestic disputes, interpersonal violence, violent conflicts over land resources, intergang violence over turf or control, and predatory violence and killing by armed groups. Intentional homicide does not include all intentional killing; the difference is usually in the organization of the killing. Individuals or small groups usually commit homicide, whereas killing in armed conflict is usually committed by fairly cohesive groups of up to several hundred members and is thus usually excluded.

3.3.1.65 Intentional homicides, female (per 100,000 female) (wdi_homicidesf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_homicidesf

Original tag: wdi_homicidesf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2435, Percent: 19.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2285, Percent: 7.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 150 Percent: 6.16

Description:

Intentional homicides, female (per 100,000 female). Intentional homicides, female are estimates of unlawful female homicides purposely inflicted as a result of domestic disputes, interpersonal violence, violent conflicts over land resources, intergang violence over turf or control, and predatory violence and killing by armed groups. Intentional homicide does not include all intentional killing; the difference is usually in the organization of the killing. Individuals or small groups usually commit homicide, whereas killing in armed conflict is usually committed by fairly cohesive groups of up to several hundred members and is thus usually excluded.

3.3.1.66 Intentional homicides, male (per 100,000 male) (wdi_homicidesm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_homicidesm

Original tag: wdi_homicidesm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2464, Percent: 19.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2294, Percent: 7.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 170 Percent: 6.9

Description:

Intentional homicides, male (per 100,000 male). Intentional homicides, male are estimates of unlawful male homicides purposely inflicted as a result of domestic disputes, interpersonal violence, violent conflicts over land resources, intergang violence over turf or control, and predatory violence and killing by armed groups. Intentional homicide does not include all intentional killing; the difference is usually in the organization of the killing. Individuals or small groups usually commit homicide, whereas killing in armed conflict is usually committed by fairly cohesive groups of up to several hundred members and is thus usually excluded.

3.3.1.67 CPIA property rights and rule-based governance rating (wdi_prrbgr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_prrbgr

Original tag: wdi_prrbgr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1474, Percent: 11.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1255, Percent: 4.14

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 14.86

Description:

Property rights and rule-based governance assess the extent to which private economic activity is facilitated by an effective legal system and rule-based governance structure in which property and contract rights are reliably respected and enforced (1=low to 6=high).

3.3.1.68 Homicide Rate, Female (who_homf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_who_homf

Original tag: who_homf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Health Organization (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4001, Percent: 31.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3703, Percent: 12.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 298 Percent: 7.45

Description:

Homicide Rate, Estimates of rates of homicides per 100 000 population, Female

3.3.1.69 Homicide Rate, Male (who_homm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_who_homm

Original tag: who_homm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Health Organization (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4001, Percent: 31.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3703, Percent: 12.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 298 Percent: 7.45

Description:

Homicide Rate, Estimates of rates of homicides per 100 000 population, Male

3.3.1.70 Homicide Rate, Total (who_homt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_who_homt

Original tag: who_homt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Health Organization (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4001, Percent: 31.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3703, Percent: 12.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 298 Percent: 7.45

Description:

Homicide Rate, Estimates of rates of homicides per 100 000 population, Total

3.3.1.71 Absence of Corruption (wjp_abs_cor)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_abs_cor

Original tag: wjp_abs_cor

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Absence of Corruption, Factor 2 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, measures the absence of corruption in government. The factor considers three forms of corruption: bribery, improper influence by public or private interests, and misappropriation of public funds or other resources. These three forms of corruption are examined with respect to government officers in the executive branch, the judiciary, the military, police, and the legislature.

3.3.1.72 ADRs are Accessible, Impartial, and Effective (wjp_adr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_adr

Original tag: wjp_adr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:
Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are accessible, impartial, and effective. The variable measures if the ADRs are affordable, efficient, enforceable, and free of corruption.

3.3.1.73 Civil Justice (wjp_civ_just)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_civ_just

Original tag: wjp_civ_just

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:
Civil Justice, Factor 7 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, measures whether ordinary people can resolve their grievances peacefully and effectively through the civil justice system. It measures whether civil justice systems are accessible and affordable as well as free of discrimination, corruption, and improper influence by public officials. It examines whether court proceedings are conducted without unreasonable delays and whether decisions are enforced effectively. It also measures the accessibility, impartiality, and effectiveness of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.

3.3.1.74 Civil Justice is Free of Corruption (wjp_cj_cor)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_cj_cor

Original tag: wjp_cj_cor

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:
Civil justice is free of corruption measures whether the civil justice system is free of bribery and improper influence by private interests.

3.3.1.75 Civil Justice is not Subject to Unreasonable Delays (wjp_cj_delay)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_cj_delay

Original tag: wjp_cj_delay

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:
Civil justice is not subject to unreasonable delays measures whether civil justice proceedings are conducted and judgments are produced in a timely manner without unreasonable delay.

3.3.1.76 Civil Justice is Free of Discrimination (wjp_cj_discr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_cj_discr

Original tag: wjp_cj_discr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1460, Percent: 11.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1382, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Civil justice is free of discrimination measures whether the civil justice system discriminates in practice based on socio-economic status, gender, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

3.3.1.77 Civil Justice is Effectively Enforced (wjp_cj_ef_enf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_cj_ef_enf

Original tag: wjp_cj_ef_enf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Civil justice is effectively enforced measures the effectiveness and timeliness of the enforcement of civil justice decisions and judgments in practice.

3.3.1.78 Civil Justice is Free of Improper Government Influence (wjp_cj_fr_govin)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_cj_fr_govin

Original tag: wjp_cj_fr_govin

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Civil justice is free of improper government influence measures whether the civil justice system is free of improper government or political influence.

3.3.1.79 Criminal Justice (wjp_crim_jus)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_crim_jus

Original tag: wjp_crim_jus

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Criminal Justice, Factor 8 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, evaluates a country's criminal justice system. An effective criminal justice system is a key aspect of the rule of law, as it constitutes the conventional mechanism to redress grievances and bring action against individuals for

offenses against society. An assessment of the delivery of criminal justice should take into consideration the entire system, including the police, lawyers, prosecutors, judges, and prison officers.

3.3.1.80 Criminal System is Free of Corruption (wjp_crsys_cor)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_crsys_cor

Original tag: wjp_crsys_cor

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1460, Percent: 11.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1382, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

This variable measures whether the police, prosecutors, and judges are free of bribery and improper influence from criminal organizations.

3.3.1.81 Criminal System is Impartial (wjp_crsys_discr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_crsys_discr

Original tag: wjp_crsys_discr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1460, Percent: 11.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1382, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

This variable measures whether the police and criminal judges are impartial and whether they discriminate in practice based on socio-economic status, gender, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

3.3.1.82 Criminal System is Free of Improper Government Influence (wjp_crsys_govinfl)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_crsys_govinfl

Original tag: wjp_crsys_govinfl

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Criminal system is free of improper government influence measures whether the criminal justice system is independent from government or political influence.

3.3.1.83 Fundamental Rights (wjp_fund_right)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_fund_right

Original tag: wjp_fund_right

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Fundamental Rights, Factor 4 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, recognizes that a system of positive law that fails to respect core human rights established under international law is at best "rule by law," and does not deserve to be called a rule of law system. Since there are many other indices that address human rights, and because it would be impossible for the Index to assess adherence to the full range of rights, this factor focuses on a relatively modest menu of rights that are firmly established under the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and are most closely related to rule of law concerns.

3.3.1.84 Government Officials Sanctioned for Misconduct (wjp_gov_of_mis)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_gov_of_mis

Original tag: wjp_gov_of_mis

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

The variable measures whether government officials in the executive, legislature, judiciary, and police are investigated, prosecuted, and punished for official misconduct and other violations.

3.3.1.85 Constraints on Government Powers (wjp_gov_pow)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_gov_pow

Original tag: wjp_gov_pow

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Constraints on Government Powers, Factor 1 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, measures the extent to which those who govern are bound by law. It comprises the means, both constitutional and institutional, by which the powers of the government and its officials and agents are limited and held accountable under the law. It also includes non-governmental checks on the government's power, such as a free and independent press.

3.3.1.86 Government Powers Limited by Auditing and Review (wjp_gov_pow_aud)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_gov_pow_aud

Original tag: wjp_gov_pow_aud

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Government powers limited by auditing and review measures whether comptrollers or auditors, as well as national human rights ombudsman agencies, have sufficient independence and the ability to exercise effective checks on and oversight of the government.

3.3.1.87 Government Powers Limited by the Judiciary (wjp_gov_pow_jud)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_gov_pow_jud

Original tag: wjp_gov_pow_jud

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Government powers limited by the judiciary measures whether the judiciary has the independence and the ability in practice to exercise effective checks on the government.

3.3.1.88 Judicial Branch do not use Public Office for Private Gain (wjp_jud_br)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_jud_br

Original tag: wjp_jud_br

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain measures whether judges and judicial officials refrain from soliciting and accepting bribes to perform duties or expedite processes, and whether the judiciary and judicial rulings are free of improper influence by the government, private interests, and criminal organizations.

3.3.1.89 Open Government (wjp_op_gov)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_op_gov

Original tag: wjp_op_gov

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Open Government, Factor 3 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, measures the openness of government defined by the extent to which a government shares information, empowers people with tools to hold the government accountable, and fosters citizen participation in public policy deliberations. This factor measures whether basic laws and information on legal rights are publicized and evaluates the quality of information published by the government.

3.3.1.90 Order and Security (wjp_ord_secur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_ord_secur

Original tag: wjp_ord_secur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Order and Security, Factor 5 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, measures how well a society ensures the security of persons and property. Security is one of the defining aspects of any rule of law society and is a fundamental function of the state. It is also a precondition for the realization of the rights and freedoms that the rule of law seeks to advance.

3.3.1.91 WJP Rule of Law Index: Overall Score (wjp_overall)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_overall

Original tag: wjp_overall

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

The WJP Rule of Law Index calculates scores and rankings for eight factors and 44 sub-factors. The Index team constructed the final scores using a five-step process. They codified the questionnaire items as numeric values; produced raw country scores by aggregating the responses from several individuals(experts and/or the general public); normalized the raw scores; aggregated the normalized scores into sub-factors and factors using simple averages; and produced the normalized scores, which are rounded to two decimal points, and the

final rankings.

3.3.1.92 Police and the Military do not use Public Office for Private Gain (wjp_pol_mil)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_pol_mil

Original tag: wjp_pol_mil

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1460, Percent: 11.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1382, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain measures whether police officers and criminal investigators refrain from soliciting and accepting bribes to perform basic police services or to investigate crimes, and whether government officials in the police and the military are free of improper influence by private interests or criminal organizations.

3.3.1.93 Access and Afford Civil Justice (wjp_ppl_civ_jus)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_ppl_civ_jus

Original tag: wjp_ppl_civ_jus

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

People can access and afford civil justice measures the accessibility and affordability of civil courts, including whether people are aware of available remedies; can access and afford legal advice and representation; and can access the court system without incurring unreasonable fees, encountering unreasonable procedural hurdles, or experiencing physical or linguistic barriers.

3.3.1.94 Effective Regulatory Enforcement (wjp_regul_enforc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_regul_enforc

Original tag: wjp_regul_enforc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1461, Percent: 11.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1383, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Regulatory Enforcement, Factor 6 of the WJP Rule of Law Index, measures the extent to which regulations are fairly and effectively implemented and enforced. Regulations, both legal and administrative, structure behaviors within and outside of the government. This factor does not assess which activities a government chooses to regulate, nor does it consider how much regulation of a particular activity is appropriate. Rather, it examines how regulations are implemented and enforced.

3.3.1.95 Confidence: Justice System/Courts (wvs_confjs)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wvs_confjs

Original tag: wvs_confjs

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: EVS (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 388, Percent: 3.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 382, Percent: 1.26

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6 Percent: 1.55

Description:

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: Justice System/Courts

1. None at all
2. Not very much
3. Quite a lot

4. A great deal

3.3.1.96 Confidence: The Police (wvs_confpol)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wvs_confpol

Original tag: wvs_confpol

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: EVS (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 420, Percent: 3.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 414, Percent: 1.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6 Percent: 1.43

Description:

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: The Police

1. None at all

2. Not very much

3. Quite a lot

4. A great deal

3.3.2 Political System

This category includes variables describing the rules of the political system (presidential or parliamentary system), the chief executive (years in office), regime type, stability (age of present regime), and checks and balances as well as aspects of federalism.

3.3.2.1 Law: citizens have a right to request public information from state bodies (aii_q41)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q41

Original tag: aii_q41

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 41. In law, citizens have a right to request public information from state bodies.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) a Constitutional principle guarantees citizens' rights to request and receive access to any public documents and information, and

2) there is a specific access to information law that establishes the process for this right to be

implemented. Note: It's possible to score 100 if national security or individual privacy information is protected, as long as the law defines the parameters and processes to declare what information is protected and they are limited in scope. Just the constitutional protection is not enough to score 100.

A 0 score is earned if there is no such law, or a law exists but it doesn't mandate all the conditions described in 100.

3.3.2.2 No Interference of Religious Dogmas (bti_nird)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_nird

Original tag: bti_nird

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent are legal order and political institutions defined without interference by religious dogmas? From 1 to 10.

1. The state is theocratic. Religious dogmas define legal order and political institutions.

4. Secular and religious norms are in conflict over the basic constitution of the state or are forming a hybrid system.

7. The state is largely secular. However, religious dogmas have considerable influence on legal order and political institutions.

10. The state is secular. Religious dogmas have no noteworthy influence on legal order or political institutions.

3.3.2.3 Regimes of the world with ambiguous cases (vdem_regimeamb)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_vdem_regimeamb

Original tag: vdem_regimeamb

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10907, Percent: 85.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10547, Percent: 34.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 360 Percent: 3.3

Description:

Answer to the question: 'How can the political regime overall be classified considering the competitiveness of access to power (polyarchy) as well as liberal principles?'

0. Closed autocracy: No multiparty elections for the chief executive or the legislature.

1. Closed autocracy upper bound: Same as closed autocracy, but the confidence intervals of the multiparty election indicators overlap the level of electoral autocracies.

2. Electoral autocracy lower bound: Same as electoral autocracy, but the confidence intervals

of one or both of the multiparty election indicators overlap the level of closed autocracies.

3. Electoral autocracy: De-jure multiparty elections for the chief executive and the legislature, but failing to achieve that elections are free and fair, or de-facto multiparty, or a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites of polyarchy as measured by V-Dem's Electoral Democracy Index.

4. Electoral autocracy upper bound: Same as electoral autocracy, but the upper bounds of

the confidence intervals of the indicators for free and fair and multiparty elections and the Electoral Democracy Index overlap the level of electoral democracies.

5. Electoral democracy lower bound: Same as electoral democracy, but the lower bounds of

the confidence intervals of the indicators for free and fair, or multiparty or the Electoral Democracy Index overlap the level of electoral autocracies.

6. Electoral democracy: Free and fair multiparty elections and a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites for polyarchy as measured by V- Dem's Electoral Democracy Index, but either access to justice, or transparent law enforcement, or liberal principles of respect for personal liberties, rule of law, and judicial as well as legislative constraints on the executive not satisfied as measured by V-Dem's Liberal Component Index.

7. Electoral democracy upper bound: Same as electoral democracy, but the confidence intervals of the indicators for access to justice, and transparent law enforcement, and the liberal component index overlap the level of liberal democracies.

8. Liberal democracy lower bound: Same as liberal democracy, but the confidence intervals of the indicators for access to justice, and transparent law enforcement, and the liberal component index reaches the level of electoral democracies.

9. Liberal democracy: De-facto free and fair multiparty elections and a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites for polyarchy as measured by V- Dem's Electoral

Democracy Index are guaranteed as well as access to justice, transparent law enforcement and the liberal principles of respect for personal liberties, rule of law, and judicial as well as legislative constraints on the executive satisfied as measured by V-Dem's Liberal Component Index.

3.3.3 Gender Equality

This category includes variables related to the differences of access and opportunities between women and men by country, such as access to education, overall employment and employment by specific sectors, and indexes that shine a light on the general differences in treatment between men and women.

3.3.3.1 Equal Opportunity (bti_eo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_eo

Original tag: bti_eo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent does equality of opportunity exist? From 1 to 10.

1. Equality of opportunity is not achieved. Women and/or members of ethnic or religious groups have only very limited access to education, public office, and employment. There are no legal provisions against discrimination.

4. Equality of opportunity is only partially achieved. Women and/or members of ethnic, religious, and other groups have limited access to education, public office, and employment. There are some legal provisions against discrimination, but their implementation is highly deficient.

7. Equality of opportunity is largely achieved. Women and members of ethnic or religious groups have near-equal access to education, public office, and employment. There are a number of legal provisions against discrimination, but their implementation is at times insufficient.

10. Equality of opportunity is achieved. Women and members of ethnic or religious groups have equal access to education, public office, and employment. There is a comprehensive and effective legal and institutional framework for the protection against discrimination.

3.3.3.2 Comparative Abortion Index 1 (0 to 7) (cai_cai1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_cai1

Original tag: cai_cai1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

The scale quantifies grounds on which a country might grant legal access to abortion: saving a woman's life, preserving a woman's physical health, preserving a woman's mental health, in case of rape or incest, in case of fetal impairment, for social or economic reasons, and on request. 0 represents a country with a complete ban on abortions. 7 represents a country that allows abortions on request.

3.3.3.3 Comparative Abortion Index 2 (0 to 1) (cai_cai2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_cai2

Original tag: cai_cai2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Using the 7 grounds for legal abortion, the weight of each grounds (Wi) will be determined based on the percentage (Pi) of countries that allow it. In the weighted index, countries are given a score on a scale of 0-1, where 0 represents countries in which there are no conditions for legal abortion, and 1 represents a country that accepts all criteria for abortion, including on request. The need for a weighted scale is as follows: It would be imprecise, for instance, to suggest that the criterion of saving a woman's life is equivalent to (and thus carries the same weight as) allowing abortion on demand. The more permissive the criterion, the less likely that it is universally accepted. Thus, the scale accounts for the different degrees of acceptance that each criterion represents.

3.3.3.4 Foetal impairment is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_foetal)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_foetal

Original tag: cai_foetal

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether or not foetal impairment is accepted as grounds for a legal abortion. 1 means that it is accepted as grounds for abortion. 0 means that it is illegal, and not accepted as grounds for legal abortion.

3.3.3.5 Threat to mother's life is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_life)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_life

Original tag: cai_life

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether or not threat to a mother's life is accepted as grounds for a legal abortion. 1 means that it is accepted as grounds for abortion. 0 means that it is illegal, and not accepted as grounds for legal abortion.

3.3.3.6 Threat to mother's mental health is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_mental)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_mental

Original tag: cai_mental

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether or not threat to a mother's mental health is accepted as grounds for a legal abortion. 1 means that it is accepted as grounds for abortion. 0 means that it is illegal, and not accepted as grounds for legal abortion.

3.3.3.7 Threat to mother's physical health is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_physical)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_physical

Original tag: cai_physical

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether or not threat to a mother's physical health is accepted as grounds for a legal abortion. 1 means that it is accepted as grounds for abortion. 0 means that it is illegal, and not accepted as grounds for legal abortion.

3.3.3.8 Pregnancy as result of rape or incest is accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_rape)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_rape

Original tag: cai_rape

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether or not pregnancy as a result of rape or incest is accepted as grounds for a legal abortion. 1 means that they are accepted as grounds for abortion. 0 means that it is illegal, and they are not accepted as grounds for legal abortion.

3.3.3.9 Abortion is available on request (cai_request)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_request

Original tag: cai_request

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether abortion is available on request. In other words, if there is complete legal access to abortion. 1 implies that there is complete access to abortion. 0 implies that there are limitations, and abortion services are not legally available upon request.

3.3.3.10 Social or economic reasons are accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_social)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_social

Original tag: cai_social

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether or not social or economic reasons are accepted as grounds for a legal abortion. 1 means that they are accepted as grounds for abortion. 0 means that it is illegal, and they are not accepted as grounds for legal abortion.

3.3.3.11 Women's Economic Rights (ciri_wecon)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_wecon

Original tag: ciri_wecon

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6905, Percent: 54.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6248, Percent: 20.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 657 Percent: 9.51

Description:

Women's economic rights include a number of internationally recognized rights. These rights

include:

- Equal pay for equal work

- The right to free choice of gainful employment or profession without the need to obtain a

husband or male relative's consent

- Equality in hiring and promotion practices

- Job security (maternity leave, unemployment benefits, no arbitrary firing or layoffs, etc.)

- Non-discrimination by employers

- The right to be free from sexual harassment in the workplace

- The right to work at night

- The right to work in occupations classified as dangerous, including the military and police force.

In measuring women's economic rights the authors are primarily interested in two things: 1) the extensiveness of laws pertaining to women's economic rights; 2) government practices towards women or how effectively the government enforces the laws.

Scoring Scheme:

Regarding the economic equality of women:

(0) There are no economic rights for women under law and systematic discrimination based on sex may be built into the law. The government tolerates a high level of discrimination against women.

(1) There are some economic rights for women under law; however, in practice, the government does not enforce the laws effectively or enforcement of laws is weak. The government tolerates a moderate level of discrimination against women.

(2) There are some economic rights for women under law. In practice, the government does enforce these laws effectively. However, the government still tolerates a low level of discrimination against women.

(3) All or nearly all of women's economic rights are guaranteed by law. In practice, the

government

fully and vigorously enforces these laws. The government tolerates no or almost no discrimination

against women.

3.3.3.12 Women's Political Rights (ciri_wopol)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_wopol

Original tag: ciri_wopol

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6953, Percent: 54.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6298, Percent: 20.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 655 Percent: 9.42

Description:

Women's political rights include a number of internationally recognized rights. These rights include:

- The right to vote

- The right to run for political office

- The right to hold elected and appointed government positions

- The right to join political parties

- The right to petition government officials.

A score of 0 indicates that women's political rights were not guaranteed by law during a given year. A score of 1 indicates that women's political rights were guaranteed in law, but severely prohibited in practice. A score of 2 indicates that women's political rights were guaranteed in law, but were still moderately prohibited in practice. Finally, a score of 3 indicates that women's political rights were guaranteed in both law and practice.

3.3.3.13 Women Business and the Law Index Score (scale 1-100) (wdi_wombuslawi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_wombuslawi

Original tag: wdi_wombuslawi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9000, Percent: 70.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8164, Percent: 26.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 836 Percent: 9.29

Description:

Women Business and the Law Index Score (1-100) measures how laws and regulations affect women's economic opportunity. Overall scores are calculated by taking the average score of each of the eight areas (Going Places, Starting a Job, Getting Paid, Getting Married, Having Children, Running a Business, Managing Assets and Getting a Pension), with 100 representing the highest possible score.

3.3.3.14 Women's Social Rights Laws (ciri_wosoc_l)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_wosoc_l

Original tag: ciri_wosoc_l

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3400, Percent: 26.74

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2980, Percent: 9.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 420 Percent: 12.35

Description:

Women's social rights include a number of internationally recognized rights. These rights include the following criteria:

- The right to equal inheritance

- The right to enter into marriage on a basis of equality with men

- The right to travel abroad

- The right to obtain a passport

- The right to confer citizenship to children or a spouse

- The right to initiate a divorce

- The right to own, acquire, manage, and retain property brought into marriage

- The right to participate in social, cultural, and community activities

- The right to an education

- The freedom to choose a residence/domicile

- Freedom from female genital mutilation (FGM) of children/adults without their consent

- Freedom from forced sterilization

- Freedom from child marriage (where the laws differ between boys and girls)

- Right to raise and make decisions regarding children with equal authority to men or

husbands

Scoring Scheme:

Regarding the country's legal recognition of women's social rights:

(0) There are no social rights for women under law and systematic discrimination based on sex may

be built into the law and/or if 5 or more of the above criteria are not adequately met.

(1) There are some social rights for women by law.

(2) Nearly all social rights for women are guaranteed by law

(3) All women's social rights are guaranteed by law and/or all of the above criteria are met or are not

mentioned

3.3.3.15 Women's Social Rights Practices (ciri_wosoc_p)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_wosoc_p
Original tag: ciri_wosoc_p
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3397, Percent: 26.72
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2977, Percent: 9.82
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 420 Percent: 12.36
Description:

Women's social rights include a number of internationally recognized rights. These rights include the following criteria:

- The right to equal inheritance

- The right to enter into marriage on a basis of equality with men

- The right to travel abroad

- The right to obtain a passport

- The right to confer citizenship to children or a spouse

- The right to initiate a divorce

- The right to own, acquire, manage, and retain property brought into marriage

- The right to participate in social, cultural, and community activities

- The right to an education

- The freedom to choose a residence/domicile

- Freedom from female genital mutilation (FGM) of children/adults without their consent

- Freedom from forced sterilization

- Freedom from child marriage (where the laws differ between boys and girls)

- Right to raise and make decisions regarding children with equal authority to men or husbands

Scoring Scheme:

Regarding the country's recognition of women's social rights in practice:

(0) The government tolerates a high level of discrimination against women.

(1) In practice, the government does not enforce laws effectively or enforcement of laws is weak.

The government tolerates a moderate level of discrimination against women.

(2) In practice, the government does enforce these laws effectively; however, the government still

tolerates a low level of discrimination against women.

(3) In practice, the government fully and vigorously enforces these laws. The government tolerates

none or almost no discrimination against women.

3.3.4 Labour Market

This category includes variables about employment, unemployment and union density rate, in general, as well as in subgroups of the population.

3.3.4.1 Limits on Child Work in Constitution (ccp_childwrk)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_childwrk
Original tag: ccp_childwrk
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59
Description:
Does the constitution place limits on child employment?

1. Yes

2. No

90. Left explicitly to non-constitutional law

96. Other

3.3.5 Civil Society, Population and Culture

This category includes variables that relate to social capital, personal beliefs, size and distribution of the population as well as ethnic and linguistic fractionalization.

3.3.5.1 Right to Marry in Constitution (ccp_marriage)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_marriage
Original tag: ccp_marriage
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59
Description:
Does the constitution provide for the right to marry?

1. Yes, general provision

2. Yes, marriage is allowed between a man and a woman

3. No

90. Left explicitly to non-constitution law

96. Other

3.3.5.2 Freedom of Assembly and Association (ciri_assn)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_assn
Original tag: ciri_assn
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6963, Percent: 54.77
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6306, Percent: 20.79
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 657 Percent: 9.44
Description:
It is an internationally recognized right of citizens to assemble freely and to associate with other persons in political parties, trade unions, cultural organizations, or other groups. This variable evaluates the extent to which the freedoms of assembly and association are subject to actual governmental limitations or restrictions (as opposed to strictly legal protections).

Scoring Scheme:

Citizens' rights to freedom of assembly and association are:

(0) Severely restricted or denied completely to all citizens.

(1) Limited for all citizens or severely restricted or denied for select groups.

(2) Virtually unrestricted and freely enjoyed by practically all citizens.

3.3.5.3 Safety and Security (gpi_ss)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gpi_ss

Original tag: gpi_ss

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Institute for Economics and Peace (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2880, Percent: 22.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2804, Percent: 9.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 76 Percent: 2.64

Description:

Societal Safety and Security (scaled 1 to 5, 5 being less secure) is one of the three subdomains of the GPI. Low crime rates, minimal terrorist activity and violent demonstrations, harmonious relations with neighbouring countries, a stable political scene and a small proportion of the population being internally displaced or made refugees can be equated with peacefulness.

3.3.6 Religion

This category includes variables regarding numbers of followers of specific religions and the status of religion in the constitution.

3.3.6.1 Government Restrictions on Religious Practices (ciri_relfre)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_relfre

Original tag: ciri_relfre

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7491, Percent: 58.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6571, Percent: 21.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 920 Percent: 12.28

Description:

This variable indicates the extent to which the freedom of citizens to exercise and practice their religious beliefs is subject to actual government restrictions. Citizens of whatever religious belief should be able to worship free from government interference. Additionally, citizens should be able to hold no religion at all.

Citizens should be able to freely practice their religion and proselytize (attempt to convert) other citizens to their religion as long as such attempts are done in a non-coercive, peaceful manner.

Members of the clergy should be able to advocate partisan political views freely, oppose government laws, support political candidates, and otherwise freely participate in politics without fear of government prosecution.

Some important questions to consider include: Does the government respect rights to religious expression, including the freedom to publish religious documents in foreign languages? Does religious belief affect membership in a ruling party or a career in government? Does the government prohibit promotion of one religion over another, or discriminate on the grounds of religion or belief? Does the government restrict the teaching or practice of any faith? Does the government discriminate against minority religious groups?

Scoring Scheme:

Government restrictions on religious practices are:

(0) Severe and Widespread

(1) Moderate

(2) Practically Absent

3.3.7 Private Economy

This category includes variables characterizing the private sector in a country, inter alia: regulation of the private sector, indicators concerning economic characteristics of groups in the society, such as poverty and household consumption, as well as tax rates.

3.3.7.1 Economic Freedom of the World Index (current) (fi_index)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_index

Original tag: fi_index

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4319, Percent: 33.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4152, Percent: 13.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 167 Percent: 3.87

Description:

The index is founded upon objective components that reflect the presence (or absence) of economic freedom. The index comprises 21 components designed to identify the consistency of institutional arrangements and policies with economic freedom in five major areas: size of government (fi_sog), legal structure and security of property rights (fi_legprop), access to sound money (fi_sm), freedom to trade internationally (fi_ftradeint), regulation of credit, labor and business (fi_reg). The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "less economic freedom" and 10 to "more economic freedom". This is the version of the index published at the current year of measurement, without taking methodological changes over time into account.

3.3.7.2 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (current) (fi_legprop)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_legprop

Original tag: fi_legprop

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4496, Percent: 35.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4309, Percent: 14.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 187 Percent: 4.16

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "no judicial independence", "no trusted

legal framework exists", "no protection of intellectual property", "military interference in rule of law", and "no integrity of the legal system" and 10 corresponds to "high judicial independence", "trusted legal framework exists", "protection of intellectual property", "no military interference in rule of law", and "integrity of the legal system". The index consists of the following indicators: Judicial independence: The judiciary is independent and not subject to interference by the government or parties in dispute, Impartial courts: A trusted legal framework exists for private businesses to challenge the legality of government actions or regulations, Protection of intellectual property, Military interference in rule of law and the political process, Integrity of the legal system.

3.3.7.3 The Property Right Protection Index (prp_prp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_prp_prp

Original tag: prp_prp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Ouattara & Standaert (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3699, Percent: 29.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3447, Percent: 11.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 252 Percent: 6.81

Description:

The Poperty Rights Index measures (the perception of) the security of property rights, separately from other aspects of the rule of laws. It combines all publicly available information on the perception of the security of property rights (18 singular indicators of property rights).

3.3.8 Conflict

This category includes variables that relate to conflict.

3.3.8.1 Political Terror Scale - Amnesty International (gd_ptsa)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gd_ptsa

Original tag: gd_ptsa

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gib-ney & Barnes. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6416, Percent: 50.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6092, Percent: 20.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 324 Percent: 5.05

Description:

Political Terror Scale Levels from the yearly country reports of Amnesty International:

1. Countries under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their view, and torture is rare or exceptional. Political murders are extremely rare.

2. There is a limited amount of imprisonment for nonviolent political activity. However, few persons are affected, torture and beatings are exceptional. Political murder is rare.

3. There is extensive political imprisonment, or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without a trial, for political views is accepted.

4. Civil and political rights violations have expanded to large numbers of the population.

Murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. In spite of its generality, on this level terror affects those who interest themselves in politics or ideas.

5. Terror has expanded to the whole population. The leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals.

3.3.8.2 Political Terror Scale - Human Rights Watch (gd_ptsh)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gd_ptsh

Original tag: gd_ptsh

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gib-ney & Barnes. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1114, Percent: 8.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1084, Percent: 3.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30 Percent: 2.69

Description:

Political Terror Scale Levels from the Human Rights Watch's World Reports:

1. Countries under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their view, and torture is rare or exceptional. Political murders are extremely rare.

2. There is a limited amount of imprisonment for nonviolent political activity. However, few persons are affected, torture and beatings are exceptional. Political murder is rare.

3. There is extensive political imprisonment, or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without a trial, for political views is accepted.

4. Civil and political rights violations have expanded to large numbers of the population. Murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. In spite of its generality, on this level terror affects those who interest themselves in politics or ideas.

5. Terror has expanded to the whole population. The leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals.

3.3.8.3 Political Terror Scale - US State Department (gd_ptss)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gd_ptss

Original tag: gd_ptss

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gib-ney & Barnes. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8471, Percent: 66.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7547, Percent: 24.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 924 Percent: 10.91

Description:

Political Terror Scale Levels from the the U.S. State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices:

1. Countries under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their view, and torture is rare or exceptional. Political murders are extremely rare.

2. There is a limited amount of imprisonment for nonviolent political activity. However, few persons are affected, torture and beatings are exceptional. Political murder is rare.

3. There is extensive political imprisonment, or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without a trial, for political views is accepted.

4. Civil and political rights violations have expanded to large numbers of the population. Murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. In spite of its generality, on this level terror affects those who interest themselves in politics or ideas.

5. Terror has expanded to the whole population. The leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals.

3.3.9 Migration

This category includes indicators related to migratory phenomena such as immigration rates, level of education, brain drain, and refugee population.

3.3.9.1 Refugees under the mandate of the UNHCR by country or territory of asylum (wdi_refhcras)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_refhcras

Original tag: wdi_refhcras

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7035, Percent: 55.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6731, Percent: 22.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 304 Percent: 4.32

Description:

Refugees under the mandate of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) include individuals recognized under the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, its 1967 Protocol, the 1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, the refugee definition contained in the 1984 Cartagena Declaration on Refugees as incorporated into national laws, those recognized in accordance with the UNHCR Statute, individuals granted complementary forms of protection, and those enjoying temporary protection. The refugee population also includes people in a refugee-like situation, which is a category that is descriptive in nature and includes groups of people who are outside their country or territory of origin and who face protection risks similar to those of refugees, but for whom refugee status has, for practical or other reasons, not been ascertained. Refugees under the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), Palestine Refugees, are not typically included in the statistics on refugees (and people in a refugee-like situation) under the mandate of the UNHCR.

3.3.9.2 Refugees under the mandate of the UNHCR by country or territory of origin (wdi_refhcror)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_refhcror

Original tag: wdi_refhcror

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6767, Percent: 53.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6259, Percent: 20.64

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 508 Percent: 7.51

Description:

Refugees under the mandate of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) include individuals recognized under the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, its 1967 Protocol, the 1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, the refugee definition contained in the 1984 Cartagena Declaration on Refugees as incorporated into national laws, those recognized in accordance with the UNHCR Statute, individuals granted complementary forms of protection, and those enjoying temporary protection. The refugee population also includes people in a refugee-like situation, which is a category that is descriptive in nature and includes groups of people who are outside their country or territory of origin and who face protection risks similar to those of refugees, but for whom refugee status has, for practical or other reasons, not been ascertained. Refugees under the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), Palestine Refugees, are not typically included in the statistics on refugees (and people in a refugee-like situation) under the mandate of the UNHCR.

4 V-DEM

Based at the University of Gothenburg, the **Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)** Research Project takes a comprehensive approach to understanding democratization. This approach encompasses multiple core principles: electoral, liberal, majoritarian, consensual, participatory, deliberative, and egalitarian. Each Principle is represented by a separate index, and each is regarded as a separate outcome in the proposed study. In this manner V-Dem reconceptualizes democracy from a single outcome to a set of outcomes. In addition, V-Dem breaks down each core principle into its constituent components, each to be measured separately. Components include features such as free and fair elections, civil liberties, judicial independence, executive constraints, gender equality, media freedom, and civil society. Finally, each component is disaggregated into specific indicators. This fundamentally different approach to democratization is made possible by the V-Dem Database, which measures 450+ indicators annually from 1789 to the present for all countries of the world. The V-Dem approach stands out, first, as a large global collaboration among scholars with diverse areas of expertise; second, as the first project attempting to explain different varieties of democracy; and third, thanks to the highly disaggregated V-Dem data, the first project to explore causal mechanisms linking different aspects of democracy together. With five Principal Investigators, 19 Project Managers with special responsibility for issue areas covered in the V-Dem dataset, around 23 Regional Managers, 134 Country Coordinators and more than 4000 Country Experts, the V-Dem project is one of the world's largest social science data collection projects on democracy. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.v-dem.net/`

4.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16

Dataset tag: vdem_cy

Output Unit: V-Dem Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_name and year. The unit can also be expressed through a combination of the columns county_id or country_text_id and year.

Description: All 531 V-Dem indicators and 245 indices + 60 other indicators from other data sources. For R users, we recommend to install our vdemdata R package which includes the most recent V-Dem dataset and some useful functions to explore the data.

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Michael, John Gerring, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Staffan I. Lindberg, Jan Teorell, David Altman, Fabio Angiolillo, Michael Bernhard, Agnes Cornell, M. Steven Fish, Linnea Fox, Lisa Gastaldi, Haakon Gjerløw, Adam Glynn, Ana Good God, Sandra Grahn, Allen Hicken, Katrin Kinzelbach, Kyle L. Marquardt, Kelly McMann, Valeriya Mechkova, Anja Neundorf, Pamela Paxton, Daniel Pemstein, Johannes von Römer, Brigitte Seim, Rachel Sigman, Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jeffrey Staton, Aksel Sundström, Marcus Tannenberg, Eitan Tzelgov, Yi-ting Wang, Felix Wiebrecht, Tore Wig, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2026. "V-Dem Codebook v16" Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project.
and:
Pemstein, Daniel, Kyle L. Marquardt, Eitan Tzelgov, Yi-ting Wang, Juraj Medzihorsky, Joshua Krusell, Farhad Miri, and Johannes von Römer. 2025. "The V-Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross-National and Cross-Temporal Expert-Coded Data". V-Dem Working Paper No. 21. 10th edition. University of Gothenburg: Varieties of Democracy Institute.

V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Link to original codebook
`https://v-dem.net/documents/55/codebook.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://v-dem.net/data/reference-documents/`

4.1.1 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices

This section includes the V-Dem mid-level indices, subcomponents of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V-Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

4.1.1.1 Freedom of Expression and Alternative Sources of Information Index (v2x_freexp_altinf)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_freexp_altinf

Original tag: v2x_freexp_altinf

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27556, Percent: 98.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27556, Percent: 90.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent does government respect press and media freedom, the freedom of ordinary people to discuss political matters at home and in the public sphere, as well as the freedom of academic and cultural expression?
CLARIFICATION: This index includes all variables in the two indices v2x_freexp and v2xme_altinf.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2mecenefm v2meharjrn v2meslfcen v2xcl_disc v2clacfree v2mebias v2mecrit v2merange
DATA RELEASE: 4-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for media censorship effort (v2mecenefm), harassment of journalists (v2meharjrn), media bias (v2mebias), media self-censorship (v2meslfcen), print/broadcast media critical (v2mecrit), and print/broadcast media perspectives (v2merange), freedom of discussion for men/women (v2cldiscm, v2cldiscw), and freedom of academic and cultural expression (v2clacfree).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von

Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.1.2 Equality before the law and individual liberty index (v2xcl_rol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcl_rol

Original tag: v2xcl_rol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 99.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 92.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent are laws transparent and rigorously enforced and public administration impartial, and to what extent do citizens enjoy access to justice, secure property rights, freedom from forced labor, freedom of movement, physical integrity rights, and freedom of religion?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2clrspct v2cltrnslw v2xcl_acjst v2xcl_prpty v2cltort v2clkill v2xcl_slave v2clrelig v2clfmove v2xcl_dmove
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for rigorous and impartial public administration (v2clrspct), transparent laws with predictable enforcement (v2cltrnslw), access to justice for men/women (v2clacjstm, v2clacjstw), property rights for men/women (v2clprptym, v2clprptyw), freedom from torture (v2cltort), freedom from political killings (v2clkill), from forced labor for men/women (v2clslavem v2clslavef), freedom of religion (v2clrelig), freedom of foreign movement (v2clfmove), and freedom of domestic movement for men/women (v2cldmovem, v2cldmovew).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.1.3 Judicial constraints on the executive index (v2x_jucon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_jucon

Original tag: v2x_jucon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26534, Percent: 94.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26534, Percent: 87.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent does the executive respect the constitution and comply with court rulings, and to what extent is the judiciary able to act in an independent fashion?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2exrescon v2jucomp v2juhccomp v2juhcind v2juncind
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for executive respects constitution (v2exrescon), compliance with judiciary (v2jucomp), compliance with high court (v2juhccomp), high court independence (v2juhcind), and lower court independence (v2juncind).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.2 V-Dem Indicators - Elections

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys) Elections: Among national elections we distinguish elections to: (i) the lower or unicameral chamber of the legislature (including constituent or constitutional assemblies), (ii) the upper chamber of the legislature, and (iii) the presidency. For present purposes an executive who is elected by a legislature is considered a *prime minister*, not a president. In order to be considered a *president*, an executive must, under ordinary circumstances, be chosen directly by the electorate (perhaps mediated by an electoral college).

Non-election specific coding: The following questions are not election-specific and should be coded for every year from 1900 (or when applicable) to the present.

Election specific questions: The following questions pertain to specific national elections. The date of each election is pre-coded. In cases where more than one election is held on the same day(s), the questions in this section are for all elections taking place on that date. If you have coded for

V-Dem in the past, your previous scores will be displayed in the survey. You are welcome to revise previously submitted scores in all surveys. For this section, we kindly ask you make sure that you have coded all election years.

Election specific questions – Historical clarification: The following questions pertain to specific national elections. National elections include elections to the presidency (if applicable) and legislature (lower and upper house, whatever applies), whether direct or indirect, as well as constituent assembly elections. It does not include other elections, *e.g.*, subnational elections, plebiscites, initiatives, referendums, or by-elections. The date of each election is pre-coded. In cases where more than one election is held on the same day(s), the questions in this section are for all elections taking place on that date."

Subnational elections and offices: This section of the survey asks a small number of questions about *subnational* elections and offices. You will be instructed to identify two subnational levels, referred to as "regional government" and "local government". Questions in this section should be answered for every year, rather than for specific elections.

Lower chamber election: The following questions pertain to specific lower chamber or unicameral legislative elections. The dates of these elections have been pre-coded.

Executive and legislative versions of Election specific variables

- In order to subset election specific variables for executive elections only (previously *_ex) – keep only those observations where v2xel_elecpres is 1.
- In order to subset election specific variables for legislative elections only (previously *_leg) – keep only those observations where v2xel_elecparl is 1.

4.1.2.1 Election government intimidation (v2elintim)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elintim

Original tag: v2elintim

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15984, Percent: 56.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15984, Percent: 52.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, were opposition candidates/parties/campaign workers subjected to repression, intimidation, violence, or harassment by the government, the ruling party, or their agents?
CLARIFICATION: Other types of clearly distinguishable civil violence, even if politically motivated, during the election period should *not* be factored in when scoring this indicator (it is dealt with separately).
RESPONSES:

0: Yes. The repression and intimidation by the government or its agents was so strong that the entire period was quiet.
1: Yes, frequent: There was systematic, frequent and violent harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents during the election period.
2: Yes, some. There was periodic, not systematic, but possibly centrally coordinated — harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents.
3: Restrained. There were sporadic instances of violent harassment and intimidation by the government or its agents, in at least one part of the country, and directed at only one or two local branches of opposition groups.
4: None. There was no harassment or intimidation of opposition by the government or its agents, during the election campaign period and polling day.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Executive:

In this section, we distinguish between the head of state (HOS) and the head of government (HOG). The *head of state* is an individual or collective body that serves as the chief public representative of the country. Sometimes this is a largely ceremonial role, *e.g.* a monarch who reigns but does not rule, or a president whose powers are strictly circumscribed. The *head of government* is the chief officer(s) of the executive branch of government, typically presiding over a cabinet. In a parliamentary system, this is usually the prime minister. In a presidential system, this is usually the president, who then serves as both, head of state and head of government. In a typical semi-presidential system, the president serves as head of state and the prime minister serves as head of government.

These definitions are grounded in the *functions* that each office performs, as described above. Titles can be confusing. Do not assume, for example, that simply because an individual holds the title of "president" s/he is serving as the chief public representative of the country. Likewise, it may be that the *effective* head of state/head of government is someone other than the *official* head of state/head of government. In this instance, the following questions apply to the person who effectively wields this power. In some socialist systems, for example, the official head of state was a person within the state bureaucracy, but in practice the chief public representative of the country was the chairman of the communist party. It is the latter who is the "effective" head of state, and hence should be the focus of your answers. The same applies if the head of state/head of government is so old, sick or perhaps mentally disabled that s/he cannot perform his/her functions, which are instead performed by someone else. It is the latter person who is the effective head of state/head of government.

If you are considering a semi sovereign territory, such as a colony, an annexed territory or a member of the British Commonwealth, please answer the following questions with respect to the head of state and (if separate) the head of government who is located in the territory in question. Thus, in a typical British colony the governor-general—not the King/Queen of England—would be understood as the head of state. Likewise, in a British colony the local prime minister in the colony—not the prime minister in London—would be understood as the head of government.

In order to mitigate potential misunderstandings, the identities of the head of state and head of government for each country have been pre-coded for as many years as possible. Thus, when conducting your coding make sure to pay close attention to the names of these individuals, which you

can see by clicking on the year grid for a particular year in the first question of this section, "HOS name." This is your key to what we mean by "head of state" or "head of government."

Note also that when the two functions are fused in the same office, we ask you to code only the head of state section of the survey. Any precoded years contain an orange triangle. This means that either the score or text and/or specific date have already been entered, so we are asking you only to add your confidence in the precoded rating; we do not want you to change the rating, as we need all the Country Experts to answer the subsequent questions for the same executives. If you feel strongly that the precoded information is wrong, please rate your confidence in the preloaded information and then consult your V-Dem contact. You will have to rate confidence in all the available years in order to proceed to the next question.

In order to avoid spending time on short-lived executives, we have included only executives who held office for at least 100 days.

4.1.3.1 Executive respects constitution (v2exrescon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exrescon

Original tag: v2exrescon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26522, Percent: 94.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26522, Percent: 87.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do members of the executive (the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet ministers) respect the constitution?
RESPONSES:
0: Members of the executive violate the constitution whenever they want to, without legal consequences.
1: Members of the executive violate most provisions of the constitution without legal consequences, but still must respect certain provisions.
2: Somewhere in between (1) and (3). Members of the executive would face legal consequences for violating most provisions of the constitution, but can disregard some provisions without any legal consequences.
3: Members of the executive rarely violate the constitution, and when it happens they face legal charges.
4: Members of the executive never violate the constitution.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

The Legislature:

The following questions pertain to the legislature, an assembly of deputies or representatives with powers to consider, pass, amend, or repeal laws. If there is no legislature in the country you are coding for some period of years, do not code any questions for those year. If you are considering a semi-sovereign territory such as a colony please answer this question with respect to the legislature that is seated within the territory in question (such as the local legislative assembly in a British colony, not the Parliament in London). A popular election need not involve universal suffrage; indeed, suffrage may be highly restricted. A "direct election" can include seats reserved for special groups (*e.g.*, ethnic groups or women) so long as these members are chosen by popular election.

Frequently, it is important to distinguish between formal rules (as stipulated by statute, legislative rules, the constitution, or common law precedent) and actual practice (what happens on the ground). In order to clarify the *de jure*/*de facto* distinction, we employ the terms "by law..." and "in practice..." Please pay close attention to these cues. Note that sometimes we ask different coders to code different aspects of a question. So, you might get a question about the *de facto* state of affairs, but another source might provide the answer to the *de jure* state of affairs.

4.1.4.1 Legislature investigates in practice (v2lginvstp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lginvstp

Original tag: v2lginvstp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 21877, Percent: 77.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21877, Percent: 72.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Steven Fish, Matthew Kroenig
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: If the executive were engaged in unconstitutional, illegal, or unethical activity, how likely is it that a legislative body (perhaps a whole chamber, perhaps a committee,

whether aligned with government or opposition) would conduct an investigation that would result in a decision or report that is unfavorable to the executive?
RESPONSES:
0: Extremely unlikely.
1: Unlikely.
2: As likely as not.
3: Likely.
4: Certain or nearly certain.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.4.2 Executive oversight (v2lgotovst)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgotovst

Original tag: v2lgotovst

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22202, Percent: 79.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22202, Percent: 73.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: If executive branch officials were engaged in unconstitutional, illegal, or unethical activity, how likely is it that a body other than the legislature, such as a comptroller general, general prosecutor, or ombudsman, would question or investigate them and issue an unfavorable decision or report?
RESPONSES:
0: Extremely unlikely.
1: Unlikely.
2: Very uncertain.
3: Likely.
4: Certain or nearly certain.

SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Judiciary

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Judiciary: This set of questions pertains to the judiciary. Before you proceed, we would like to clarify several general points. First, some questions below refer to the judiciary in general, whereas others ask for specific evaluations of particular courts or types of courts. Unless otherwise prompted, please consider the judiciary as a whole. This includes all courts in the judicial system at every level, both general jurisdiction courts and more specialized courts. However, with potentially one exception, it excludes specialized courts that are located outside the judiciary, *e.g.* an immigration court that lies inside the executive branch. The one potential exception is the peak constitutional court of the country. Please include this court in your considerations, even though it will be located outside of the judiciary in some countries. If the country you are coding is a federal state, please focus only on the federal judiciary and the federal government.

Seven of the questions about the judiciary concern high courts. By "high court" we are asking you to consider the country's constitutional court, if one exists. If there is no constitutional court, please consider the court of last resort for constitutional matters. If there is no court in your country with constitutional jurisdiction, please consider the highest ordinary court of the state.

For example, in Mexico in 2004, you would consider the Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation and not the Electoral Tribunal for the Federal Judiciary. In Russia in the same year, you would consider the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation and not the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation. In Sweden, you would ignore the Supreme Administrative Court and instead focus on the Supreme Court. Germany has both a constitutional court, the Federal Constitutional Court, and a court of last resort for ordinary matters, the Federal Court of Justice. The Federal Constitutional Court is the high court for our purposes. In the United States, there is no separate constitutional court or review body. The Supreme Court is both the highest ordinary court and the highest court in the state with constitutional jurisdiction. Therefore, we consider it to be the high court of the United States. smallskip If your country's highest judicial body has separate divisions, only one of which is dedicated to final constitutional review, please consider that division to be the high court if its judges are permanently assigned to that division only. For example, the Supreme Court of Justice of Costa Rica has four chambers. The Fourth Chamber reviews constitutional matters, its judges are appointed to it specifically and the other judges of the Supreme Court do not rotate onto the Fourth Chamber. Therefore, the high court for Costa Rica is the constitutional chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice.

If a new high court was established in a given year, please consider that court as the high court for the purposes of these questions only if the court was functioning for the majority of the calendar year. If a new high court was established in a given year, but did not start functioning until a subsequent year, please do not consider the new court as the high court until it was functioning for the majority of the given calendar year. If you are considering a semi sovereign territory, such as a colony, please answer this question with respect to the government or judicial bodies seated within the territory in question (*e.g.*, the governor-general and his local administration in a British colony or a Commonwealth country), not abroad (*e.g.*, the King/Queen or government of England).

In coding the following questions it is sometimes important to distinguish between formal rules (as stipulated by statute, legislative rules, the constitution, or common law precedent) and actual practice (what happens "on the ground"). In order to clarify the *de jure*/*de facto* distinction, we

employ the terms "by law..." and "in practice..." Please pay close attention to these cues wherever you see them.

4.1.5.1 Judicial reform (v2jureform)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jureform

Original tag: v2jureform

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 65.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Were the judiciary's formal powers altered this year in ways that affect its ability to control the arbitrary use of state authority?
CLARIFICATION: Evidence of this kind of reform could include the creation or removal of various forms of constitutional review, new rules increasing or decreasing access to the judiciary, changes in available judicial remedies, and any other formal institution (procedural or otherwise) that influences the ability of courts to control the arbitrary use of power.
RESPONSES:
0: The judiciary's ability to control arbitrary power was *reduced* via institutional reform.
1: There was no change to the judiciary's ability to control arbitrary power via institutional review.
2: The judiciary's ability to control arbitrary power was *enhanced* via institutional reform.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

4.1.5.2 Judicial purges (v2jupurge)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jupurge

Original tag: v2jupurge

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19522, Percent: 69.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19522, Percent: 64.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Judges are sometimes removed from their posts for cause, as when there is strong evidence of corruption; however, some judges are removed arbitrarily, typically for political reasons. With this distinction in mind, please describe the removal of judges that occurred this calendar year.
CLARIFICATION: The second and third response categories permit you to distinguish among limited arbitrary removals (*i.e.*, when only a few judges are targeted) by the political importance of the removal. For example, you may consider the arbitrary removal of a few high court judges as more important than the arbitrary removal of a few lower court judges.
RESPONSES:
0: There was a massive, arbitrary purge of the judiciary.
1: There were limited but very important arbitrary removals.
2: There were limited arbitrary removals.
3: Judges were removed from office, but there is no evidence that the removals were arbitrary.
4: Judges were not removed from their posts.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

4.1.5.3 Government attacks on judiciary (v2jupoatck)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jupoatck

Original tag: v2jupoatck

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge,

Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19627, Percent: 69.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19627, Percent: 64.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often did the government attack the judiciary's integrity in public?
CLARIFICATION: Attacks on the judiciary's integrity can include claims that it is corrupt, incompetent or that decisions were politically motivated. These attacks can manifest in various ways including, but not limited to prepared statements reported by the media, press conferences, interviews, and stump speeches.
RESPONSES:
0: Attacks were carried out on a daily or weekly basis.
1: Attacks were common and carried out in nearly every month of the year.
2: Attacks occurred more than once.
3: There were attacks, but they were rare.
4: There were no attacks on the judiciary's integrity.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

4.1.5.4 Court packing (v2jupack)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jupack

Original tag: v2jupack

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19516, Percent: 69.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19516, Percent: 64.34

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: The size of the judiciary is sometimes increased for very good reasons, as when judges are added to manage an increasing caseload; however, sometimes judges are added purely for political reasons. With this distinction in mind, please describe any increases in the size of the judiciary that occurred this calendar year.
CLARIFICATION: The second and third response categories permit you to distinguish among limited court packing efforts (*i.e.* when relatively few judgeships are added) by the political importance of the packing. For example, you may consider the packing of the high court to be more important than the packing of a lower court.
RESPONSES:
0: There was a massive, politically motivated increase in the number of judgeships across the entire judiciary.
1: There was a limited, politically motivated increase in the number of judgeships on very important courts.
2: There was a limited, politically motivated increase in the number of judgeships.
3: Judgeships were added to the judiciary, but there is no evidence that the increase was politically motivated; or there was no increase.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: A previous version of the variable contained category quot;4: There was no increasequot;. As of November 2014, all responses in category quot;4quot; are assigned to category quot;3quot;, since the two responses have the same meaning in practice.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

4.1.5.5 Judicial corruption decision (v2jucorrdc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jucorrdc

Original tag: v2jucorrdc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27716, Percent: 98.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27716, Percent: 91.38

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often do individuals or businesses make undocumented extra payments or bribes in order to speed up or delay the process or to obtain a favorable judicial decision?
RESPONSES:
0: Always.
1: Usually.
2: About half of the time.
3: Not usually.
4: Never.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: For reasons of consistency, as of December, 2014, responses to this question are reversed so that the least democratic response is "0" and the most democratic is "4".
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.5.6 High court name (v2juhcname)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2juhcname

Original tag: v2juhcname

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18114, Percent: 64.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18114, Percent: 59.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
QUESTION: Please enter the name of the high court.
CLARIFICATION: As accurately as possible, please provide a literal translation of the name of the court in English, followed by the name in the native language, or a transcription transliteration thereof, within parentheses.
RESPONSES:
Text.
NOTES: Converted from (C) to (A(C)) from version 7. Where possible, data was pre-coded, and CEs were asked to add their answers to the remaining gaps.
DATA RELEASE: 3-16.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.5.7 High court independence (v2juhcind)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2juhcind

Original tag: v2juhcind

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 24017, Percent: 85.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24017, Percent: 79.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: When the high court in the judicial system is ruling in cases that are salient to the government, how often would you say that it makes decisions that merely reflect government wishes regardless of its sincere view of the legal record?
CLARIFICATION: We are seeking to identify autonomous judicial decision-making and its absence. Decisions certainly can reflect government wishes without quot;merely reflectingquot; those wishes, *i.e.* a court can be autonomous when its decisions support the government's position. This is because a court can be fairly persuaded that the government's position is meritorious. By quot;merely reflect the wishes of the governmentquot; we mean that the court's own view of the record, its sincere evaluation of the record, is irrelevant to the outcome. The court simply adopts the government's position regardless of its sincere view

of the record.
RESPONSES:
0: Always.
1: Usually.
2: About half of the time.
3: Seldom.
4: Never.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: The historical version of the variable is set to missing when v3juhcourt is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.5.8 Lower court independence (v2juncind)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2juncind

Original tag: v2juncind

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27497, Percent: 97.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27497, Percent: 90.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: When judges *not* on the high court are ruling in cases that are salient to the government, how often would you say that their decisions merely reflect government wishes regardless of their sincere view of the legal record?
RESPONSES:
0: Always.
1: Usually.
2: About half of the time.
3: Seldom.
4: Never.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.5.9 Compliance with high court (v2juhccomp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2juhccomp

Original tag: v2juhccomp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 23996, Percent: 85.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 23996, Percent: 79.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often would you say the government complies with important decisions of the high court with which it disagrees?
RESPONSES:
0: Never.
1: Seldom.
2: About half of the time.
3: Usually.
4: Always.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: The historical version of the variable is set to missing when v3juhcourt is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.5.10 Compliance with judiciary (v2jucomp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jucomp

Original tag: v2jucomp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27447, Percent: 97.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27447, Percent: 90.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often would you say the government complies with important decisions by other courts with which it disagrees?
CLARIFICATION: We are looking for a summary judgment for the entire judiciary, excluding the high court. You should consider judges on both ordinary courts and specialized courts.
RESPONSES:
0: Never.
1: Seldom.
2: About half of the time.
3: Usually.
4: Always.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.5.11 Judicial review (v2jureview)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jureview

Original tag: v2jureview

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27366, Percent: 97.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27366, Percent: 90.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does any court in the judiciary have the legal authority to invalidate governmental policies (*e.g.* statutes, regulations, decrees, administrative actions) on the grounds that they violate a constitutional provision?
RESPONSES:
0: No.
1: Yes.
SCALE: Dichotomous, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Liberty

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Civil Liberty: The following questions are focused on actual practices (*de facto*) rather than formal legal or constitutional rights (*de jure*). Note that if there is significant variation in the respect for a particular civil liberty across the territory, the score should reflect the "average situation" across the territorial scope of the country unit (for each period) as defined in the coder instructions.

4.1.6.1 Freedom from torture (v2cltort)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cltort

Original tag: v2cltort

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge,

Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27977, Percent: 99.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27977, Percent: 92.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is there freedom from torture?
CLARIFICATION: Torture refers to the purposeful inflicting of extreme pain, whether mental or physical, with an aim to extract information or intimidate victims, who are in a state of incarceration. Here, we are concerned with torture practiced by state officials or other agents of the state (*e.g.*, police, security forces, prison guards, and paramilitary groups).
RESPONSES:
0: Not respected by public authorities. Torture is practiced systematically and is incited and approved by the leaders of government.
1: Weakly respected by public authorities. Torture is practiced frequently but is often not incited or approved by top leaders of government. At the same time, leaders of government are not actively working to prevent it.
2: Somewhat. Torture is practiced occasionally but is typically not approved by top leaders of government.
3: Mostly respected by public authorities. Torture is practiced in a few isolated cases but is not incited or approved by top government leaders.
4: Fully respected by public authorities. Torture is non-existent.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.2 Freedom from political killings (v2clkill)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clkill

Original tag: v2clkill

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27971, Percent: 99.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27971, Percent: 92.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is there freedom from political killings?
CLARIFICATION: Political killings are killings by the state or its agents without due process of law for the purpose of eliminating political opponents. These killings are the result of deliberate use of lethal force by the police, security forces, prison officials, or other agents of the state (including paramilitary groups).
RESPONSES:
0: Not respected by public authorities. Political killings are practiced systematically and they are typically incited and approved by top leaders of government.
1: Weakly respected by public authorities. Political killings are practiced frequently and top leaders of government are not actively working to prevent them.
2: Somewhat respected by public authorities. Political killings are practiced occasionally but they are typically not incited and approved by top leaders of government.
3: Mostly respected by public authorities. Political killings are practiced in a few isolated cases but they are not incited or approved by top leaders of government.
4: Fully respected by public authorities. Political killings are non-existent.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.3 Transparent laws with predictable enforcement (v2cltrnslw)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cltrnslw

Original tag: v2cltrnslw

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27631, Percent: 98.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27631, Percent: 91.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are the laws of the land clear, well publicized, coherent (consistent with each other), relatively stable from year to year, and enforced in a predictable manner?
CLARIFICATION: This question focuses on the transparency and predictability of the laws of the land.
RESPONSES:
0: Transparency and predictability are almost non-existent. The laws of the land are created and/or enforced in completely arbitrary fashion.
1: Transparency and predictability are severely limited. The laws of the land are more often than not created and/or enforced in arbitrary fashion.
2: Transparency and predictability are somewhat limited. The laws of the land are mostly created in a non-arbitrary fashion but enforcement is rather arbitrary in some parts of the country.
3: Transparency and predictability are fairly strong. The laws of the land are usually created and enforced in a non-arbitrary fashion.
4: Transparency and predictability are very strong. The laws of the land are created and enforced in a non-arbitrary fashion.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

4.1.6.4 Rigorous and impartial public administration (v2clrspct)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clrspct

Original tag: v2clrspct

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27751, Percent: 98.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27751, Percent: 91.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are public officials rigorous and impartial in the performance of their duties?
CLARIFICATION: This question focuses on the extent to which public officials generally abide by the law and treat like cases alike, or conversely, the extent to which public administration is characterized by arbitrariness and biases (*i.e.*, nepotism, cronyism, or discrimination).
The question covers the public officials that handle the cases of ordinary people. If no functioning public administration exists, the lowest score (0) applies.
RESPONSES:
0: The law is not respected by public officials. Arbitrary or biased administration of the law is rampant.
1: The law is weakly respected by public officials. Arbitrary or biased administration of the law is widespread.
2: The law is modestly respected by public officials. Arbitrary or biased administration of the law is moderate.
3: The law is mostly respected by public officials. Arbitrary or biased administration of the law is limited.
4: The law is generally fully respected by the public officials. Arbitrary or biased administration of the law is very limited.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.5 Access to justice for men (v2clacjstm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clacjstm

Original tag: v2clacjstm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27896, Percent: 99.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27896, Percent: 91.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do men enjoy secure and effective access to justice?
CLARIFICATION: This question specifies the extent to which men can bring cases before the courts without risk to their personal safety, trials are fair, and men have effective ability to seek redress if public authorities violate their rights, including the rights to counsel, defense, and appeal.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* access to justice men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and extremely limited — access to justice.
RESPONSES:
0: Secure and effective access to justice for men is non-existent.
1: Secure and effective access to justice for men is usually not established or widely respected.
2: Secure and effective access to justice for men is inconsistently observed. Minor problems characterize most cases or occur rather unevenly across different parts of the country.
3: Secure and effective access to justice for men is usually observed.
4: Secure and effective access to justice for men is almost always observed.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.6 Access to justice for women (v2clacjstw)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clacjstw

Original tag: v2clacjstw

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein

et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27883, Percent: 99.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27883, Percent: 91.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do women enjoy equal, secure, and effective access to justice?
CLARIFICATION: This question specifies the extent to which women can bring cases before the courts without risk to their personal safety, trials are fair, and women have effective ability to seek redress if public authorities violate their rights, including the rights to counsel, defense, and appeal.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* access to justice men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and extremely limited — access to justice.
RESPONSES:
0: Secure and effective access to justice for women is non-existent.
1: Secure and effective access to justice for women is usually not established or widely respected.
2: Secure and effective access to justice for women is inconsistently observed. Minor problems characterize most cases or occur rather unevenly across different parts of the country.
3: Secure and effective access to justice for women is usually observed.
4: Secure and effective access to justice for women is almost always observed.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.7 Social class equality in respect for civil liberty (v2clacjust)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clacjust

Original tag: v2clacjust

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27902, Percent: 99.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27902, Percent: 91.99

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do poor people enjoy the same level of civil liberties as rich people do?
CLARIFICATION: This question specifies the extent to which the level of civil liberties is generally the same across socioeconomic groups so that people with a low social status are not treated worse than people with high social status. Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Poor people enjoy much fewer civil liberties than rich people.
1: Poor people enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than rich people.
2: Poor people enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than rich people.
3: Poor people enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than rich people.
4: Poor people enjoy the same level of civil liberties as rich people.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.8 Social group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clsocgrp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clsocgrp

Original tag: v2clsocgrp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27898, Percent: 99.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27898, Percent: 91.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C

PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do all social groups, as distinguished by language, ethnicity, religion, race, region, or caste, enjoy the same level of civil liberties, or are some groups generally in a more favorable position?
CLARIFICATION: Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Members of some social groups enjoy much fewer civil liberties than the general population.
1: Members of some social groups enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than the general population.
2: Members of some social groups enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than the general population.
3: Members of some social groups enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than the general population.
4: Members of all salient social groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.9 Freedom of discussion for men (v2cldiscm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cldiscm

Original tag: v2cldiscm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28051, Percent: 99.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28051, Percent: 92.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are men able to openly discuss political issues in private homes and in public

spaces?
CLARIFICATION: This indicator specifies the extent to which men are able to engage in private discussions, particularly on political issues, in private homes and public spaces (restaurants, public transportation, sports events, work etc.) without fear of harassment by other members of the polity or the public authorities. We are interested in restrictions by the government and its agents but also cultural restrictions or customary laws that are enforced by other members of the polity, sometimes in informal ways.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* freedom of men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and extremely low — rights to freedom of discussion.
RESPONSES:
0: Not respected. Hardly any freedom of expression exists for men. Men are subject to immediate and harsh intervention and harassment for expression of political opinion.
1: Weakly respected. Expressions of political opinions by men are frequently exposed to intervention and harassment.
2: Somewhat respected. Expressions of political opinions by men are occasionally exposed to intervention and harassment.
3: Mostly respected. There are minor restraints on the freedom of expression in the private sphere, predominantly limited to a few isolated cases or only linked to soft sanctions. But as a rule there is no intervention or harassment if men make political statements.
4: Fully respected. Freedom of speech for men in their homes and in public spaces is not restricted.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.10 Freedom of discussion for women (v2cldiscw)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cldiscw

Original tag: v2cldiscw

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28053, Percent: 99.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28053, Percent: 92.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are women able to openly discuss political issues in private homes and in public spaces?
CLARIFICATION: This indicator specifies the extent to which women are able to engage in private discussions, particularly on political issues, in private homes and public spaces (restaurants, public transportation, sports events, work etc.) without fear of harassment by other members of the polity or the public authorities. We are interested in restrictions by the government and its agents but also cultural restrictions or customary laws that are enforced by other members of the polity, sometimes in informal ways.
This question does not ask you to assess the relative freedom of men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and extremely low — rights to freedom of discussion.
RESPONSES:
0: Not respected. Hardly any freedom of expression exists for women. Women are subject to immediate and harsh intervention and harassment for expression of political opinion.
1: Weakly respected. Expressions of political opinions by women are frequently exposed to intervention and harassment.
2: Somewhat respected. Expressions of political opinions by women are occasionally exposed to intervention and harassment.
3: Mostly respected. There are minor restraints on the freedom of expression in the private sphere, predominantly limited to a few isolated cases or only linked to soft sanctions. But as a rule there is no intervention or harassment if women make political statements.
4: Fully respected. Freedom of speech by women in their homes and in public spaces is not restricted.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.11 Freedom of religion (v2clrelig)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clrelig

Original tag: v2clrelig

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 99.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 92.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is there freedom of religion?
CLARIFICATION: This indicator specifies the extent to which individuals and groups have the right to choose a religion, change their religion, and practice that religion in private or in public as well as to proselytize peacefully without being subject to restrictions by public authorities.
RESPONSES:
0: Not respected by public authorities. Hardly any freedom of religion exists. Any kind of religious practice is outlawed or at least controlled by the government to the extent that religious leaders are appointed by and subjected to public authorities, who control the activities of religious communities in some detail.
1: Weakly respected by public authorities. Some elements of autonomous organized religious practices exist and are officially recognized. But significant religious communities are repressed, prohibited, or systematically disabled, voluntary conversions are restricted, and instances of discrimination or intimidation of individuals or groups due to their religion are common.
2: Somewhat respected by public authorities. Autonomous organized religious practices exist and are officially recognized. Yet, minor religious communities are repressed, prohibited, or systematically disabled, and/or instances of discrimination or intimidation of individuals or groups due to their religion occur occasionally.
3: Mostly respected by public authorities. There are minor restrictions on the freedom of religion, predominantly limited to a few isolated cases. Minority religions face denial of registration, hindrance of foreign missionaries from entering the country, restrictions against proselytizing, or hindrance to access to or construction of places of worship.
4: Fully respected by public authorities. The population enjoys the right to practice any religious belief they choose. Religious groups may organize, select, and train personnel; solicit and receive contributions; publish; and engage in consultations without undue interference. If religious communities have to register, public authorities do not abuse the process to discriminate against a religion and do not constrain the right to worship before registration.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.12 Freedom of domestic movement for men (v2cldmovem)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cldmovem

Original tag: v2cldmovem

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge,

Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27975, Percent: 99.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27975, Percent: 92.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do men enjoy freedom of movement within the country?
CLARIFICATION: This indicator specifies the extent to which all men are able to move freely, in daytime and nighttime, in public thoroughfares, across regions within a country, and to establish permanent residency where they wish. Note that restrictions in movement might be imposed by the state and/or by informal norms and practices. Such restrictions sometimes fall on rural residents, on specific social groups, or on dissidents.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* freedom of men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and extremely low — freedom of movement.
Do *not* consider restrictions in movement that are placed on ordinary (non-political) criminals. Do not consider restrictions in movement that result from crime or unrest.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no men enjoy full freedom of movement (*e.g.*, North Korea).
1: Some men enjoy full freedom of movement, but most do not (*e.g.*, Apartheid South Africa).
2: Most men enjoy some freedom of movement but a sizeable minority does not. Alternatively all men enjoy partial freedom of movement.
3: Most men enjoy full freedom of movement but a small minority does not.
4: Virtually all men enjoy full freedom of movement.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.13 Freedom of domestic movement for women (v2cldmovew)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cldmovew

Original tag: v2cldmovew

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 99.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 92.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do women enjoy freedom of movement within the country?
CLARIFICATION: This indicator specifies the extent to which all women are able to move freely, in daytime and nighttime, in public thoroughfares, across regions within a country, and to establish permanent residency where they wish. Note that restrictions in movement might be imposed by the state and/or by informal norms and practices. Such restrictions sometimes fall on rural residents, on specific social groups, or on dissidents.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* freedom of men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and extremely low — freedom of movement.
Do *not* consider restrictions in movement that are placed on ordinary (non-political) criminals. Do not consider restrictions in movement that result from crime or unrest.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no women enjoy full freedom of movement (*e.g.*, North Korea or Afghanistan under the Taliban).
1: Some women enjoy full freedom of movement, but most do not (*e.g.*, Apartheid South Africa).
2: Most women enjoy some freedom of movement but a sizeable minority does not. Alternatively all women enjoy partial freedom of movement.
3: Most women enjoy full freedom of movement but a small minority does not.
4: Virtually all women enjoy full freedom of movement.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.14 Property rights for men (v2clprptym)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clprptym

Original tag: v2clprptym

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27896, Percent: 99.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27896, Percent: 91.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do men enjoy the right to private property?
CLARIFICATION: Private property includes the right to acquire, possess, inherit, and sell private property, including land. Limits on property rights may come from the state (which may legally limit rights or fail to enforce them); customary laws and practices; or religious or social norms. This question concerns the right to private property, not actual ownership of property.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* rights of men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and very minimal — property rights.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no men enjoy private property rights of any kind.
1: Some men enjoy some private property rights, but most have none.
2: Many men enjoy many private property rights, but a smaller proportion enjoys few or none.
3: More than half of men enjoy most private property rights, yet a smaller share of men have much more restricted rights.
4: Most men enjoy most private property rights but a small minority does not.
5: Virtually all men enjoy all, or almost all property rights.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.6.15 Property rights for women (v2clprptyw)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clprptyw

Original tag: v2clprptyw

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27894, Percent: 99.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27894, Percent: 91.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do women enjoy the right to private property?
CLARIFICATION: Private property includes the right to acquire, possess, inherit, and sell private property, including land. Limits on property rights may come from the state (which may legally limit rights or fail to enforce them); customary laws and practices; or religious or social norms. This question concerns the right to private property, not actual ownership of property.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* rights of men and women. Thus, it is possible to assign the lowest possible score to a country even if men and women enjoy equal — and very minimal — property rights.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no women enjoy private property rights of any kind.
1: Some women enjoy some private property rights, but most have none.
2: Many women enjoy many private property rights, but a smaller proportion enjoys few or none.
3: More than half of women enjoy most private property rights, yet a smaller share of women have much more restricted rights.
4: Most women enjoy most private property rights but a small minority does not.
5: Virtually all women enjoy all, or almost all, property rights.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Society

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Civil society organization:

The following set of questions focus on civil society organizations (CSOs). These include interest groups, labor unions, religiously inspired organizations (if they are engaged in civic or political activities), social movements, professional associations, and classic non-governmental organizations (NGOs), but *not* businesses, political parties, government agencies, or religious organizations that are primarily focused on spiritual practices. A CSO must also be at least nominally independent of government and economic institutions.

Civil society organization – Historical clarification: The following set of questions focus on civil society organizations (CSOs). These include interest groups, labor unions, religiously inspired organizations (if they are engaged in civic or political activities), social movements, professional associations, and classic non-governmental organizations (NGOs), but not businesses, political parties, government agencies, or religious organizations that are primarily focused on spiritual practices. A CSO must also be at least nominally independent of government and economic institutions.

If no CSOs exist at all for a particular time period, code the following relevant questions as giving the "lowest score" (indicating, for instance, strong repression or no consultation, a 0).

Religious organizations: In this section, we ask two questions regarding religious organizations. These may be religiously inspired civil society organizations (CSOs) or organizations whose purpose is primarily spiritual.

4.1.7.1 CSO entry and exit (v2cseeorgs)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cseeorgs

Original tag: v2cseeorgs

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27796, Percent: 98.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27796, Percent: 91.64

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the government achieve control over entry and exit by civil society organizations (CSOs) into public life?
RESPONSES:
0: Monopolistic control. The government exercises an explicit monopoly over CSOs. The only organizations allowed to engage in political activity such as endorsing parties or politicians, sponsoring public issues forums, organizing rallies or demonstrations, engaging in strikes, or publicly commenting on public officials and policies are government-sponsored organizations. The government actively represses those who attempt to defy its monopoly on political activity.
1: Substantial control. The government licenses all CSOs and uses political criteria to bar organizations that are likely to oppose the government. There are at least some citizen-based organizations that play a limited role in politics independent of the government. The

government actively represses those who attempt to flout its political criteria and bars them from any political activity.
2: Moderate control. Whether the government ban on independent CSOs is partial or full, some prohibited organizations manage to play an active political role. Despite its ban on organizations of this sort, the government does not or cannot repress them, due to either its weakness or political expedience.
3: Minimal control. Whether or not the government licenses CSOs, there exist constitutional provisions that allow the government to ban organizations or movements that have a history of anti-democratic action in the past (*e.g.* the banning of neo-fascist or communist organizations in the Federal Republic of Germany). Such banning takes place under strict rule of law and conditions of judicial independence.
4: Unconstrained. Whether or not the government licenses CSOs, the government does not impede their formation and operation unless they are engaged in activities to violently overthrow the government.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.7.2 CSO repression (v2csreprss)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2csreprss

Original tag: v2csreprss

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27625, Percent: 98.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27625, Percent: 91.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does the government attempt to repress civil society organizations (CSOs)?
RESPONSES:
0: Severely. The government violently and actively pursues all real and even some imagined members of CSOs. They seek not only to deter the activity of such groups but to effectively

liquidate them. Examples include Stalinist Russia, Nazi Germany, and Maoist China.
1: Substantially. In addition to the kinds of harassment outlined in responses 2 and 3 below, the government also arrests, tries, and imprisons leaders of and participants in oppositional CSOs who have acted lawfully. Other sanctions include disruption of public gatherings and violent sanctions of activists (beatings, threats to families, destruction of valuable property). Examples include Mugabe's Zimbabwe, Poland under Martial Law, Serbia under Milosevic.
2: Moderately. In addition to material sanctions outlined in response 3 below, the government also engages in minor legal harassment (detentions, short-term incarceration) to dissuade CSOs from acting or expressing themselves. The government may also restrict the scope of their actions through measures that restrict association of civil society organizations with each other or political parties, bar civil society organizations from taking certain actions, or block international contacts. Examples include post-Martial Law Poland, Brazil in the early 1980s, the late Franco period in Spain.
3: Weakly. The government uses material sanctions (fines, firings, denial of social services) to deter oppositional CSOs from acting or expressing themselves. They may also use burdensome registration or incorporation procedures to slow the formation of new civil society organizations and sidetrack them from engagement. The government may also organize Government Organized Movements or NGOs (GONGOs) to crowd out independent organizations. One example would be Singapore in the post-Yew phase or Putin's Russia.
4: No. Civil society organizations are free to organize, associate, strike, express themselves, and to criticize the government without fear of government sanctions or harassment.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: For reasons of consistency, as of December 2014, responses to this question are reversed so that the least democratic response is "0" and the most democratic is "4".
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.7.3 CSO anti-system movements (v2csantimv)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2csantimv

Original tag: v2csantimv

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27687, Percent: 98.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27687, Percent: 91.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Among civil society organizations, are there anti-system opposition movements?
CLARIFICATION: An anti-system opposition movement is any movement — peaceful or armed — that is based in the country (not abroad) and is organized in opposition to the current political system. That is, it aims to change the polity in fundamental ways, *e.g.*, from democratic to autocratic (or vice-versa), from capitalist to communist (or vice-versa), from secular to fundamentalist (or vice-versa). This movement may be linked to a political party that competes in elections but it must also have a quot;movementquot; character, which is to say a mass base and an existence separate from normal electoral competition.
If there are several movements, please answer in a general way about the relationship of those movements to the regime.
RESPONSES:
0: No, or very minimal. Anti-system movements are practically nonexistent.
1: There is only a low-level of anti-system movement activity but it does not pose much of a threat to the regime.
2: There is a modest level of anti-system movement activity, posing some threat to the regime.
3: There is a high level of anti-system movement activity, posing substantial threat to the regime.
4: There is a very high level of anti-system movement activity, posing a real and present threat to the regime.
ORDERING: If coded quot;0quot;, skip the following questions focused on anti-system movements.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.7.4 Religious organization repression (v2csrlgrep)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2csrlgrep

Original tag: v2csrlgrep

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27595, Percent: 98.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27595, Percent: 90.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does the government attempt to repress religious organizations?
RESPONSES:
0: Severely. The government violently and actively pursues all real and even some imagined members of religious organizations. It seeks not only to deter the activity of such groups but also to effectively liquidate them. Examples include Stalinist Russia and Maoist China.
1: Substantially. In addition to the kinds of harassment outlined in 2 and 3 below, the government also arrests, tries, and imprisons leaders of and participants in oppositional religious organizations who have acted lawfully. Other sanctions include disruption of public gatherings and violent sanctions of activists (beatings, threats to families, destruction of valuable property).
2: Moderately. In addition to material sanctions outlined in 3 below, the government also engages in minor legal harassment (detentions, short-term incarceration) to dissuade religious organizations from acting or expressing themselves. The government may also restrict the scope of their actions through measures that restrict association of religious civil society organizations with each other or political parties, bar religious civil society organizations from taking certain actions, or block international contacts.
3: Weakly. The government uses material sanctions (fines, firings, denial of social services) to deter oppositional religious organizations from acting or expressing themselves. They may also use burdensome registration or incorporation procedures to slow the formation of new religious civil society organizations and sidetrack them from engagement. The government may also organize parallel religious organizations to crowd out independent religious organizations.
4: No. Religious civil society organizations are free to organize, associate, strike, express themselves, and to criticize the government without fear of government sanctions or harassment.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.7.5 CSO anti-system movement character (v2csanmvch)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2csanmvch

Original tag: v2csanmvch

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26231, Percent: 93.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26231, Percent: 86.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: How would you characterize the anti-system movement(s) identified in the previous question?
CLARIFICATION: Check all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: Works through legal channels, for the most part. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_0]
1: Participates in elections. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_1]
2: Works through a mix of legal and extra-legal channels. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_2]
3: Insurrectionary. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_3]
4: Democratic. Perceived by most disinterested observers as willing to play by the rules of the democratic game, willing to respect constitutional provisions or electoral outcomes, and willing to relinquish power (under democratic auspices). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_4]
5: Anti-democratic. Perceived by most disinterested observers as unwilling to play by the rules of the democratic game, not willing to respect constitutional provisions or electoral outcomes, and/or not willing to relinquish power (under democratic auspices). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_5]
6: Leftist, socialist, communist. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_6]
7: Rightist, conservative, party of order. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_7]
8: Ethnolinguistic, tribe, kinship, clan. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_8]
9: Separatist or autonomist. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_9]
10: Religious. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_10]
11: Paramilitary. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_11]
12: Heavily engaged in criminal activity, *e.g.*, narcotics, bootlegging, illegal exploitation of natural resources, extortion, kidnapping. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2csanmvch_12]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: **?**; Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Exclusion:

The following survey contains questions pertaining to exclusion. Political, economic and social well-being may depend on whether groups or individuals are excluded from positions of power, the state's protection of rights and freedoms, access to public goods and services, and opportunities to work or do business with the state.

Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. It is not necessary for all members of a

group to be excluded in order for group-based exclusion to occur. Exclusion occurs even when only a single individual is excluded based on her or his identity or membership (perceived or actual) in a particular group.

Political groups are defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates. A common form of partisan exclusion is when state services or regulations are implemented in a way that seeks to reward the incumbent's political supporters and punish non-supporters.

Socio-Economic position defines groups based on attributes of wealth, occupation, or other economic circumstances such as owning property. Exclusion of economic groups occurs when, for example, those who are not property owners are restricted from voting, or when fees associated with justice, health or education are set at a rate that is unaffordable for poorer individuals.

Social group is differentiated within a country by caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, migration status, or some combination thereof. (It does not include identities grounded in sexual orientation, gender, or socioeconomic status.) Social group identity is contextually defined and is likely to vary across countries and through time. Social group identities are also likely to cross-cut, so that a given person could be defined in multiple ways, i.e., as part of multiple groups. Nonetheless, at any given point in time there are social groups within a society that are understood - by those residing within that society - to be different, in ways that may be politically relevant. Contrast Identity group.

Geographic group refers to those living in rural or urban areas. Urban areas are defined as an area that meets the following conditions: population density exceeds a threshold of 150 persons per square kilometer and there is access to a sizeable settlement of 50,000 people or more within some reasonable travel time, for example 60 minutes by road. (World Development Report, 2009: 54).

4.1.8.1 Gender equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgencl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clgencl

Original tag: v2clgencl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 67.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 62.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do women enjoy the same level of civil liberties as men?
CLARIFICATION: Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Women enjoy much fewer civil liberties than men.
1: Women enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than men.
2: Women enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than men.

3: Women enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than men.
4: Women enjoy the same level of civil liberties as men.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

4.1.8.2 Urban-rural location equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgeocl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clgeocl

Original tag: v2clgeocl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 67.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 62.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do those who reside in rural areas enjoy same level of civil liberties as those residing in urban areas?
CLARIFICATION: This question specifies the extent to which the level of civil liberties is generally the same across geographic areas. Urban areas are defined as an area that meets the following conditions: population density exceeds a threshold of 150 persons per square kilometer, there is access to a sizeable settlement of 50,000 people or more within some reasonable travel time, for example 60 minutes by road (World Development Report, 2009: 54). Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Those who live in rural areas enjoy much fewer civil liberties than residents of urban areas.
1: Those who live in rural areas enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than residents of urban areas.
2: Those who live in rural areas enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than residents of urban areas.
3: Those who live in rural areas enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than residents of urban

areas.
4: Residents of rural areas enjoy the same level of civil liberties as those in urban areas.
5: Residents of rural areas enjoy more civil liberties than those in urban areas.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

4.1.8.3 Political group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clpolcl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clpolcl

Original tag: v2clpolcl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18928, Percent: 67.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18928, Percent: 62.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do members of all political groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties, or are some groups generally in a more favorable position?
CLARIFICATION: A political group is defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates that can be distinguished from others in terms of enjoyment of civil liberties. Responses should not reflect which party controls the legislature and executive. Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Some political groups enjoy much fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
1: Some political groups enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
2: Some political groups enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
3: Some political groups enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
4: All political groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.

CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

4.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Legitimation

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Legitimation strategies:

Governments make legitimacy claims–provide justifications for the form of rule under which they govern. In the following section we are interested in the nature of the legitimacy claims made by the sitting government. Please note that the government's claims to legitimacy - their legitimation strategies - are the object of inquiry here. We are not asking you to assess how ordinary people judge the legitimacy of their rulers. Do not assume that governments make legitimacy claims on only one basis. We are interested in multi-track and hybrid legitimation strategies. The regime is understood as a set of formal and/or informal rules that govern the choice of political leaders and their exercise of power. The government is understood as the chief executive along with the cabinet, ministries, and top civil servants.

4.1.9.1 Rational-legal legitimation (v2exl_legitratio)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exl_legitratio

Original tag: v2exl_legitratio

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 67.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 62.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Marcus Tannenberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the current government refer to the legal norms and regulations in order to justify the regime in place?
CLARIFICATION: This question pertains to legal norms and regulations as laid out for instance in the constitution regarding access to power (e.g. elections) as well as exercise of power (e.g. rule of law). Electoral regimes may score high on this question as well as

non-electoral regimes that emphasize their rule-boundedness.
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all.
1: To a small extent.
2: To some extent but it is not the most important component.
3: To a large extent but not exclusively.
4: Almost exclusively.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

4.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Civic and Academic Space:

In this survey, we ask you to assess several issues concerning the space for and state of civil society and academia. First, we ask about some general issues such as polarization and peaceful assembly. Then, we probe into mobilization for mass events and associations. Finally, we ask you to consider questions related to academia.

4.1.10.1 Political violence (v2caviol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2caviol

Original tag: v2caviol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19352, Percent: 68.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19352, Percent: 63.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Katrin Kinzelbach
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often have non-state actors used political violence against persons this

year?
CLARIFICATION: We understand political violence as the use of physical force to achieve political objectives by non-state actors. The restriction to political objectives excludes profit-driven crime-related violence, for instance. By non-state actors we refer to individuals or entities that are not formally part of the state. Thus, politically oriented militias and youth groups count as non-state actors even though they might potentially be informally affiliated with the ruling party or the state. Political violence against persons excludes psychological and symbolic violence (e.g. destruction of objects).
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all. Non-state actors did not use political violence.
1: Rare. Non-state actors rarely used political violence.
2: Occasionally. Non-state actors occasionally used political violence.
3: Frequently. Non-state actors frequently used political violence.
4: Often. Non-state actors often used political violence.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

4.1.10.2 Freedom of peaceful assembly (v2caassemb)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2caassemb

Original tag: v2caassemb

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19352, Percent: 68.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19352, Percent: 63.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Katrin Kinzelbach
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent do state authorities respect and protect the right of peaceful assembly?
CLARIFICATION: This question focuses on the ability to assemble publically in practice.

An assembly is "an intentional and temporary presence of a number of individuals in a public place, for a common expressive purpose" (ODIHR and Venice Commission of the Council of Europe 2010). Authorities may limit the right to assembly only if limitations are necessary in the interests of national security or public safety, public order, the protection of public health or morals, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others, and are lawful, necessary, and proportionate to the aim pursued. Such reasonable and legal restrictions should not be considered when answering. However, if there is evidence that restrictions are used as a pretext for political reasons, this evidence should be considered.
RESPONSES:
0: Never. State authorities do not allow peaceful assemblies and are willing to use lethal force to prevent them.
1: Rarely. State authorities rarely allow peaceful assemblies, but generally avoid using lethal force to prevent them.
2: Sometimes. State authorities sometimes allow peaceful assemblies, but often arbitrarily deny citizens the right to assemble peacefully.
3: Mostly. State authorities generally allow peaceful assemblies, but in rare cases arbitrarily deny citizens the right to assemble peacefully.
4: Almost always. State authorities almost always allow and actively protect peaceful assemblies except in rare cases of lawful, necessary, and proportionate limitations.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

4.1.11 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Accountability

The *Accountability Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

4.1.11.1 Horizontal accountability index (v2x_horacc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_horacc

Original tag: v2x_horacc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Lührmann et al. (2020), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19719, Percent: 70.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19719, Percent: 65.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Kyle L. Marquardt, Valeriya Mechkova
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_codelow, *_codehigh
QUESTION: To what extent is the ideal of horizontal government accountability achieved?
CLARIFICATION: Horizontal accountability concerns the power of state institutions to oversee the government by demanding information, questioning officials and punishing improper behavior. This form of accountability ensures checks between institutions and prevents the abuse of power. The key agents in horizontal government accountability are: the legislature; the judiciary; and specific oversight agencies such as ombudsmen, prosecutor and comptroller generals.
SCALE: We provide two versions of this index. The first is the normalized output from the the hierarchical latent variable analysis. It is on an unbounded interval scale. The second, denoted by *_osp, is a version of this output which we scale using a standard normal cumulative distribution function. It is thus scaled low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2juhcind v2juncind v2juhccomp v2jucomp v2exrescon v2lgotovst v2lginvstp v2lgbicam v2lgqstexp
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: We capture the extent to which the judiciary, the legislature and other oversight agencies hold the government to account by modeling each of these factors as separate hierarchical nodes.
The judiciary node speaks to the degree to which members of the executive compromise horizontal accountability by quot;unlawfully encroachingquot; on the legitimate authority of the judiciary branch. To capture that we use the indicators from the V-Dem judicial constraints on the executive index (v2x_jucon).
To model the degree to which a legislature facilitates horizontal accountability we model whether or not a legislature exists a dichotomized version of v2lgbicam, and legislature activities as a function of this variable. The key function of a legislature in terms of horizontal accountability is to scrutinize government officials' potential misconduct by demanding information for their policies and decisions, and taking specific actions in case of irregularities. We use as baseline the indicators from the V-Dem legislative constraints on the executive index (v2xlg_legcon): the degree to which: 1 the legislature routinely questions the executive (v2lgqstexp); and 2 a legislature is likely to investigate and produce a decision unfavorable to the executive, if the latter were engaged in an illegal or unethical activity (v2lginvstp). We exclude the legislature opposition parties (v2lgoppart) as this aspect is part of vertical accountability.
Finally, we include a variable regarding the degree to which other state bodies comptroller general, general prosecutor, or ombudsman are likely to investigate and report on potential illegal or unethical activities on part of the executive (v2lgotovst).
CITATION: Lührmann et al. (2020); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

4.1.12 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Liberties

The *Civil Liberties Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

4.1.12.1 Physical violence index (v2x_clphy)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_clphy

Original tag: v2x_clphy

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27969, Percent: 99.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27969, Percent: 92.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent is physical integrity respected?
CLARIFICATION: Physical integrity is understood as freedom from political killings and torture by the government. Among the set of civil liberties, these liberal rights are the most relevant for political competition and accountability. The index is based on indicators that reflect violence committed by government agents and that are not directly referring to elections.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2cltort v2clkill
DATA RELEASE: 6-16.
AGGREGATION: We estimate the index by averaging two indicators: freedom from torture (v2cltort) and freedom from political killings (v2clkill).
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.12.2 Political liberties index (v2x_clpol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_clpol

Original tag: v2x_clpol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27751, Percent: 98.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27751, Percent: 91.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent are political liberties respected?
CLARIFICATION: Political liberties are understood as freedom of association and freedom of expression. Among the set of civil liberties, these liberal rights are the most relevant for political competition and accountability. The index is based on indicators that reflect government repression and that are not directly referring to elections.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xcl_disc v2mecenefm v2meharjrn v2meslfcen v2clacfree v2psparban v2psbars v2psoppaut v2cseeorgs v2csreprss
DATA RELEASE: 6-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by point estimates drawn from a Bayesian factor analysis model including the following indicators: government censorship effort — media (v2mecenefm), harassment of journalists (v2meharjrn), media self-censorship (v2meslfcen), freedom of discussion for men and women (v2cldiscm, v2cldiscw), freedom of academic and cultural expression (v2clacfree), party ban (v2psparban), barriers to parties (v2psbars), opposition parties autonomy (v2psoppaut), CSO entry and exit (v2cseeorgs) and CSO repression (v2csreprss).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.13 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Rule of Law

The *Rule of Law Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

4.1.13.1 Rule of law index (v2x_rule)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_rule

Original tag: v2x_rule

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27704, Percent: 98.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27704, Percent: 91.34

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent are laws transparently, independently, predictably, impartially, and equally enforced, and to what extent do the actions of government officials comply with the law?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2exrescon v2exbribe v2exembez v2excrptps v2exthftps v2juaccnt v2jucorrdc v2juhcind v2juncind v2juhccomp v2jucomp v2cltrnslw v2clrspct v2xcl_acjst
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for compliance with high court (v2juhccomp), compliance with judiciary (v2jucomp), high court independence (v2juhcind), lower court independence (v2juncind), executive respects constitution (v2exrescon), rigorous and impartial public administration (v2clrspct), transparent laws with predictable enforcement (v2cltrnslw), access to justice for men (v2clacjstm), access to justice for women (v2clacjstw), judicial accountability (v2juaccnt), judicial corruption decision (v2jucorrdc), public sector corrupt exchanges (v2excrptps), public sector theft (v2exthftps), executive bribery and corrupt exchanges (v2exbribe), executive embezzlement and theft (v2exembez).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.13.2 Access to justice (v2xcl_acjst)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcl_acjst

Original tag: v2xcl_acjst

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27883, Percent: 99.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27883, Percent: 91.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Do citizens enjoy secure and effective access to justice?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2clacjstm v2clacjstw
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: We estimate the index by averaging two indicators: access to justice for men (v2clacjstm) and women (v2clacjstw).
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.13.3 Property rights (v2xcl_prpty)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcl_prpty

Original tag: v2xcl_prpty

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27894, Percent: 99.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27894, Percent: 91.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Do citizens enjoy the right to private property?
CLARIFICATION: Private property includes the right to acquire, possess, inherit, and sell private property, including land. Limits on property rights may come from the state which may legally limit rights or fail to enforce them; customary laws and practices; or religious or social norms. This question concerns the right to private property, not actual ownership of property.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2clprptym v2clprptyw
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: We estimate the index by averaging two indicators: property rights for men (v2clprptym) and women (v2clprptyw).

CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.14 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Elections

The *Elections Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

4.1.14.1 Freedom of expression index (v2x_freexp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_freexp

Original tag: v2x_freexp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27605, Percent: 98.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27605, Percent: 91.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent does government respect press and media freedom, the freedom of ordinary people to discuss political matters at home and in the public sphere, as well as the freedom of academic and cultural expression?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2mecenefm v2meharjrn v2meslfcen v2xcl_disc v2clacfree
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for print/broadcast censorship effort (v2mecenefm), harassment of journalists (v2meharjrn), media self-censorship (v2meslfcen), freedom of discussion for men/women (v2cldiscm, v2cldiscw) and freedom of academic and cultural expression (v2clacfree).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson &

Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.14.2 Freedom of discussion (v2xcl_disc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcl_disc

Original tag: v2xcl_disc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28051, Percent: 99.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28051, Percent: 92.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Are citizens able to openly discuss political issues in private homes and in public spaces?
CLARIFICATION: This indicator specifies the extent to which citizens are able to engage in private discussions, particularly on political issues, in private homes and public spaces restaurants, public transportation, sports events, work etc. without fear of harassment by other members of the polity or the public authorities. We are interested in restrictions by the government and its agents but also cultural restrictions or customary laws that are enforced by other members of the polity, sometimes in informal ways.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2cldiscm v2cldiscw
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: We estimate the index by averaging two indicators: freedom of discussion for men (v2cldiscm) and women (v2cldiscw).
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.14.3 Freedom of domestic movement (v2xcl_dmove)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcl_dmove

Original tag: v2xcl_dmove

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27969, Percent: 99.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27969, Percent: 92.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Do citizens enjoy freedom of movement and residence?
CLARIFICATION: This indicator specifies the extent to which citizens are able to move freely, in daytime and nighttime, in public thoroughfares, across regions within a country, and to establish permanent residency where they wish. Note that restrictions in movement might be imposed by the state and/or by informal norms and practices. Such restrictions sometimes fall on rural residents, on specific social groups, or on dissidents.
Do *not* consider restrictions in movement that are placed on ordinary non-political criminals. Do not consider restrictions in movement that result from crime or unrest.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2cldmovem v2cldmovew
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: We estimate the index by averaging two indicators: freedom of domestic movement for men (v2cldmovem) and women (v2cldmovew).
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

4.1.15 Digital Society Survey - State Internet Regulation Capacity and Approach

The Digital Society Survey, designed by the Digital Society Project, contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the internet and social media. The data collected through expert-coded surveys provides information on topics related to coordinated information operations, digital media freedom, online media polarization, social cleavages as well as state internet regulation capacity and approach.

Principal investigators for the Digital Society Project are Valeriya Mechkova, Daniel Pemstein, Brigitte Seim, Steven Wilson.

For more information, please visit `www.digitalsocietyproject.org`.

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Digital society: The following survey contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the Internet and social media. Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

The government and its agents include official government organs, such as bureaucracies, courts, intelligence services, and the military, but also unofficial agents, such as officially unaffiliated cyber-

warfare operatives who perform services, even "off-book" work, on behalf of the government.

Major political parties include the group of political parties that hold a significant number of seats in national legislative body(-ies), or earn a significant number of votes in elections for the executive. When we ask you to consider "major political parties," you do not need to consider parties that run in elections but receive only a small minority of seats or votes, or those that receive no seats at all.

We define the Internet as all information that people access over public and private digital networks, worldwide. The Internet includes both publicly accessible digital spaces and private or gated information transmission platforms. The Internet does not include traditional media transmission mechanisms such as paper, television, traditional voice telephone, and radio.

Social media are a subset of Internet platforms that enable normal individuals to create and share content with networks of other people. Social media platforms are available to the public, although content on such networks may be shared privately within subgroups of users. Social media includes both publicly visible, or semi-public platforms, like Facebook, Flickr, Friendster, Google+, Instagram, Myspace, LinkedIn, Twitter, VKontakte, and Weibo and private social networking and messaging platforms like Signal, Slack, Snapchat, or WhatsApp.

Domestic online media is any media source originating in the country in question. For example, the New York Times' website is domestic online media in the United States, but not in India, even though it operates bureaus in India. Media includes any source reporting on current events or political issues, ranging from well-established brands to newsletters and websites run by an individual.

Cyber security threats include penetration of private digital networks, using means ranging from exploiting software vulnerabilities, password cracking, or social engineering (e.g., tricking individuals into revealing passwords or other information necessary to break into a digital system) to obtain information or disrupt an organization or individual's use of digital networks and tools. They also include unauthorized alterations of an individual or organization's digital presence, such as defacing websites and commandeering social media accounts. These threats range from unsophisticated (e.g., exploitation of failure to password protect private networks or use of common passwords by authorized users, and spear phishing) to moderate (e.g., embedding malicious code in emails or exploiting well-known software flaws that organizations have failed to patch), to sophisticated (e.g., exploiting unknown exploits in commonly used software or even embedding exploits into commercial systems unbeknownst to their creators).

Clarification: When we discuss shutting down online content, please consider instances where a website (or websites) have been taken entirely offline as well as instances where a website (or websites) have been slowed down or had access similarly intentionally inhibited, such that use of this website is challenging. In other words, both outright shutting down and more subtle measures that inhibit access should be considered when answering these questions.

Clarification: When we discuss "censorship" or "censoring" content online, we are not concerned with censorship of topics such as child pornography, highly classified information such as military or intelligence secrets, or defamatory speech, unless this sort of censorship is used as a pretext for censoring political information or opinions.

4.1.15.1 Internet legal regulation content (v2smregcon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smregcon

Original tag: v2smregcon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What type of content is covered in the legal framework to regulate Internet?
RESPONSES:
0: The state can remove any content at will.
1: The state can remove most content, and the law protects speech in only specific, and politically uncontroversial contexts.
2: The legal framework is ambiguous. The state can remove some politically sensitive content, while other is protected by law.
3: The law protects most political speech, but the state can remove especially politically controversial content.
4: The law protects political speech, and the state can only remove content if it violates well-established legal criteria.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 2000-2025

4.1.15.2 Privacy protection by law exists (v2smprivex)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smprivex

Original tag: v2smprivex

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does a legal framework to protect Internet users' privacy and their data exist?
RESPONSES:
0: No. (Skip to v2smregcap)
1: Yes
ORDERING: if 0 no, Skip to v2smregcap
SCALE: yes/no
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 2000-2025

4.1.15.3 Privacy protection by law content (v2smprivcon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smprivcon

Original tag: v2smprivcon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4493, Percent: 15.99

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4493, Percent: 14.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What does the legal framework to protect Internet users' privacy and their data stipulate?
RESPONSES:
0: The legal framework explicitly allows the government to access any type of personal data on the Internet.
1: The legal framework explicitly allows the government to access most types of personal data on the Internet.
2: The legal framework explicitly allows the government to access many types of personal data on the Internet.
3: The legal framework explicitly allows the government to access only a few types of personal information on the Internet.
4: The legal framework explicitly allows the government to access personal information on

the Internet only in extraordinary circumstances.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 2000-2025

4.1.15.4 Defamation protection (v2smlawpr)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smlawpr

Original tag: v2smlawpr

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does the legal framework provide protection against defamatory online content, or hate speech?
RESPONSES:
0: No. The law provides no protection against Internet defamation and hate speech.
1: Not really. The law provides a weak protection and to very limited range of circumstances.
2: Somewhat. The law provides some protection against Internet defamation and hate speech but in limited circumstances, or only to particular groups of people.
3: Mostly. The law provides protection against Internet defamation and hate speech under many circumstances, and to most groups of people.
4: Yes. The law provides comprehensive protection against Internet defamation and hate speech.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God,

Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 2000-2025

4.1.15.5 Abuse of defamation and copyright law by elites (v2smdefabu)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smdefabu

Original tag: v2smdefabu

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent do elites abuse the legal system (e.g., defamation and copyright law) to censor political speech online?
RESPONSES:
0: Regularly. Elites abuse the legal system to remove political speech from the Internet as regular practice.
1: Often. Elites commonly abuse the legal system to remove political speech from the Internet.
2: Sometimes. Elites abuse the legal system to remove political speech from the Internet about half the time.
3: Rarely. Elites occasionally abuse the legal system to remove political speech from the Internet.
4: Never, or almost never. Elites do not abuse the legal system to remove political speech from the Internet.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 2000-2025

5 Bibliography

Charron, N., Dahlberg, S., Sundström, A., Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., Alvarado Pachon, N. & Dalli, C. M. (2020), 'The quality of government: Eu regional dataset, version nov20', *University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www. gu. se/en/quality-government* .

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Angiolillo, F., Bernhard, M., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Fox, L., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Grahn, S., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., Krusell, J., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., Medzihorsky, J., Natsika, N., Neundorf, A., Paxton, P., Pemstein, D., von Römer, J., Seim, B., Sigman, R., Skaaning, S.-E., Staton, J., Sundström, A., Tannenberg, M., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Wiebrecht, F., Wig, T., Wilson, S. & Ziblatt, D. (2026), 'V-dem country-year dataset v16'. V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Angiolillo, F., Bernhard, M., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Fox, L., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., Neundorf, A., Paxton, P., Pemstein, D., Pernes, J., von Römer, Johannes Seim, B., Sigman, R., Skaaning, S.-E., Staton, J., Sundström, A., Tannenberg, M., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Wig, T., Wilson, S. & Ziblatt, D. (2026), 'V-Dem Codebook v16'. V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Donner, S., Hartmann, H. & Steinkamp, S. (2024), *Transformation Index BTI 2024: Governance in International Comparison*, Bertelsmann Stiftung.
URL: *http://www.bti-project.org*

Elkins, Z. & Ginsburg, T. (2021), 'Characteristics of national constitutions, version 3.0'. Last modified: May 20, 2021. Available at comparativeconstitutionsproject.org.
URL: *http://www.comparativeconstitutionsproject.org*

ESS Round 1: European Social Survey Round 1 Data (2002), Data file edition 6.6, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 11: European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC) (2024), Ess11 - integrated file, edition 2.0 [data set], Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research.
URL: *http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/*

ESS Round 2: European Social Survey Round 2 Data (2004), Data file edition 3.6, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006), Data file edition 3.7, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008), Data file edition 4.5, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), Data file edition 3.4, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), Data file edition 2.4, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), Data file edition 2.2, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), Data file edition 2.2, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018), Data file edition 3.1, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

European Commission (2024), 'Eurostat'.
URL: *http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database*

EVS (2020), 'European Values Study 2017: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2017)'.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.4232/1.13560*

Forman-Rabinovici, A. & Sommer, U. (2018), 'Reproductive health policymakers: Comparing the influences of international and domestic institutions on abortion policy', *Public Administration* **96**(1), 185–199.

Freedom House (2024), 'Freedom in the world 2024'.
URL: *https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world*

Gib-ney, Mark, P. H.-k. D. A. A. P. G. B. B. P. & Barnes., J. (2024), 'The political terror scale 1976-2023'. Data retrieved from the Political Terror Scale website.
URL: *http://www.politicalterrorscale.org*

Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024), 'Africa integrity indicators 2014-2024'.
URL: *https://www.africaintegrityindicators.org/*

Gwartney, J., Lawson, R., Hall, J. & Murphy, R. (2024), 'Economic Freedom Dataset, published in Economic Freedom of the World: 2024 Annual Report', *Fraser Institute* .
URL: *https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economic-freedom/dataset*

Helbling, M., Abou-Chadi, T., Berger, V., Bjerre, L., Breyer, M., Römer, F. & Zobel, M. (2024), 'IMPIC Database v2', *Immigration Policies in Comparison Project.* . Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Henisz, W. J. (2017), 'The Political Constraint Index (POLCON) Dataset 2017 release'.
URL: *https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/profile/1327*

Institute for Economics and Peace (2022), 'Global peace index 2022: Measuring peace in a complex world'. Accessed 01-09-2022.
URL: *http://visionofhumanity.org/resources*

Kaufmann, D. & Kraay, A. (n.d.), 'Worldwide governance indicators, 2024 update'. Accessed on 2024-11-19.
URL: *www.govindicators.org*

Kuncic, A. (2014), 'Institutional quality dataset', *Journal of Institutional Economics* **10**(01), 135–161.

Lührmann, A., Marquardt, K. L. & Mechkova, V. (2020), 'Constraining Governments: New Indices of Vertical, Horizontal, and Diagonal Accountability', *American Political Science Review* **114**(3), 811820.

Mark, S., Cingranelli, D., Filippov, M. & Richards, D. L. (2023), 'The cirights data project scoring manual v2.11.06.23 (november 6, 2023)'. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4625036 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4625036.

Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2024), '2024 Ibrahim Index of African Governance: Index Report'.
URL: *http://mo.ibrahim.foundation/iiag/*

NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), 'European social survey cumulative file, ess 1-9'. Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.
URL: *http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/*

Ouattara, B. & Standaert, S. (2020), 'Property rights revisited', *European Journal of Political Economy* **64**, 101895.
URL: *http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0176268020300434*

Pedroza, L., Palop-García, P. & Chang, S. Y. (2022), 'IMISEM Codebook (version 3.0)', German Institute for Global and Area Studies (GIGA). Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Pemstein, D., Marquardt, K. L., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y., Medzihorsky, J., Krusell, J., Miri, F. & von Römer, J. (2026), 'The V-Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross-National and Cross-Temporal Expert-Coded Data', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* **2026**(21, 11th edition).
URL: *https://v-dem.net/media/publications/wp21_2026.pdf*

PETERS, M., Borang, F., Kalm, S., Lindvall, J. & Shin, A. (2024), 'Historical Immigration Policy dataset (HIP)'. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).
URL: *https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL*

Povitkina, M., Alvarado Pachon, N. & Dalli, C. M. (2021), 'The quality of government environmental indicators dataset, version sep21', *University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government* .

Solano, G. & Huddelston, T. (2020), 'Migrant Integration Policy Index', Migration Policy Group & CIDOB. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Teorell, J., Sundström, A., Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., Alvarado Pachon, N., Phiri, V. S., Chen, C. & Liu, Z. (2026), *The Quality of Government Standard Dataset, version Jan26.* QoG Data is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.
URL: *https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government*

Wig, T., Hegre, H. & Regan, P. M. (2015), 'Updated data on institutions and elections 1960–2012: presenting the iaep dataset version 2.0', *Research & Politics* **2**(2).

World Bank (2024), 'World development indicators'.
URL: *https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators*

World Health Organization (2023), 'Global health observatory data repository'. Accessed on 2023-12-06.
URL: *https://www.who.int/data/gho*

World Justice Project (2023), 'WJP Rule of Law Index 2022'.
URL: *https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/*

World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015), 'Environmental democracy index'. Date accessed: 8 February 2021.
URL: *https://environmentaldemocracyindex.org/*