**3.8.3 Private and Political Liberties  
3.8.3.1 Freedom of discussion for men (C) (v2cldiscm)**

*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*: 1-12.

*Cross-coder aggregation*: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology* ).

*Citation*: Pemstein *et al.* (2022, *V-Dem Working Paper Series* 2022:21); *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

*Years*: 1789-2021  
**3.8.3.2 Freedom of discussion for women (C) (v2cldiscw)**
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*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*: 1-12.

*Cross-coder aggregation*: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology* ).

*Citation*: Pemstein *et al.* (2022, *V-Dem Working Paper Series* 2022:21); *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

*Years*: 1789-2021  
**3.8.3.3 Freedom of academic and cultural expression (C) (v2clacfree)**

*Project Manager(s)*: Svend-Erik Skaaning  
*Additional versions*: \*\_osp, \*\_ord, \*\_codelow, \*\_codehigh, \*\_sd, \*\_mean, \*\_nr  
*Question*: Is there academic freedom and freedom of cultural expression related to political issues?

*Responses*:  
0: Not respected by public authorities. Censorship and intimidation are frequent. Academic activities and cultural expressions are severely restricted or controlled by the government.  
1: Weakly respected by public authorities. Academic freedom and freedom of cultural expression are practiced occasionally, but direct criticism of the government is mostly met with repression.  
2: Somewhat respected by public authorities. Academic freedom and freedom of cultural expression are practiced routinely, but strong criticism of the government is sometimes met with repression.  
3: Mostly respected by public authorities. There are few limitations on academic freedom and freedom of cultural expression, and resulting sanctions tend to be infrequent and soft.  
4: Fully respected by public authorities. There are no restrictions on academic freedom or cultural expression.

*Scale*: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

*Data release*: 1-12.

*Cross-coder aggregation*: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology* ).

*Citation*: Pemstein *et al.* (2022, *V-Dem Working Paper Series* 2022:21); *V-Dem Codebook* (see TOC 184
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suggested citation at the top of this document). *Years*: 1789-2021

**3.8.3.4 Freedom of religion (C) (v2clrelig)**

*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*: 1-12.

*Cross-coder aggregation*: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology* ).

*Citation*: Pemstein *et al.* (2022, *V-Dem Working Paper Series* 2022:21); *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

*Years*: 1789-2021  
**3.8.3.5 Freedom of foreign movement (C) (v2clfmove)**

*Project Manager(s)*: Svend-Erik Skaaning

*Additional versions*: \*\_osp, \*\_ord, \*\_codelow, \*\_codehigh, \*\_sd, \*\_mean, \*\_nr

*Question*: Is there freedom of foreign travel and emigration?

*Clarification*: This indicator specifies the extent to which citizens are able to travel freely to and from the country and to emigrate without being subject to restrictions by public authorities.

*Responses*:  
0: Not respected by public authorities. Citizens are rarely allowed to emigrate or travel out of the country. Transgressors (or their families) are severely punished. People discredited by the public authorities are routinely exiled or prohibited from traveling.  
1: Weakly respected by public authorities. The public authorities systematically restrict the right to travel, especially for political opponents or particular social groups. This can take the
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form of general restrictions on the duration of stays abroad or delays/refusals of visas.  
2: Somewhat respected by the public authorities. The right to travel for leading political opponents or particular social groups is occasionally restricted but ordinary citizens only met minor restrictions.  
3: Mostly respected by public authorities. Limitations on freedom of movement and residence are not directed at political opponents but minor restrictions exist. For example, exit visas may be required and citizens may be prohibited from traveling outside the country when accompanied by other members of their family.  
4: Fully respected by the government. The freedom of citizens to travel from and to the country, and to emigrate and repatriate, is not restricted by public authorities.

*Scale*: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

*Data release*: 1-12.

*Cross-coder aggregation*: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology* ).

*Citation*: Pemstein *et al.* (2022, *V-Dem Working Paper Series* 2022:21); *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

*Years*: 1789-2021  
**3.8.3.6 Freedom of domestic movement for men (C) (v2cldmovem)**

*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*: 1-12.

*Cross-coder aggregation*: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology* ).

*Citation*: Pemstein *et al.* (2022, *V-Dem Working Paper Series* 2022:21); *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

*Years*: 1789-2021  
**3.8.3.7 Freedom of domestic movement for women (C) (v2cldmovew)**

*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
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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*: 1-12.

*Cross-coder aggregation*: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology* ).

*Citation*: Pemstein *et al.* (2022, *V-Dem Working Paper Series* 2022:21); *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

*Years*: 1789-2021