



ARTICLE 19

The Global Expression Report 2022

The intensifying battle for narrative control

Country rankings

A brief introduction

The *Global Expression Report* is an annual look at the rights to freedom of expression and information across the world.

Our data, the GxR metric, tracks freedom of expression across 161 countries via 25 indicators to create a score between 0 and 100 for every country. That score places it in an expression category.

GxR score	Expression category
80–100	Open
60–79	Less Restricted
40–59	Restricted
20–39	Highly Restricted
0–19	In Crisis

In each year’s report, we explore score changes over time across three time periods: the preceding year (2020–2021), the last five years (2016–2021), and the last 10 years (2011–2021).

We measure the freedom of everyone – not just journalists or activists – to express, communicate, and participate. How free is each and every person to post online, take to the streets, investigate, and access the information we need to hold power-holders to account? And can we exercise those rights without fear of harassment, legal repercussions, or violence?

This report is based on quantitative measurement, and ARTICLE 19 acknowledges the limits of that approach to represent individuals, including those at risk or who face discrimination, whose specific experiences often lack data and research more generally.

Table A1: Global GxR with confidence intervals, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Gxr score	56	56	55	54	54	53	53	53	53	52	50
Lower limit	52	52	51	50	50	49	49	49	48	47	46
Upper limit	60	60	59	58	58	57	57	57	57	56	55

Table A2: GxR by region, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Africa	46	46	45	45	44	43	44	44	43	43	42
Americas	71	70	69	69	68	68	67	66	65	64	62
Asia and the Pacific	51	50	48	47	47	47	46	47	47	45	42
Europe and Central Asia	73	73	71	71	70	70	69	69	69	68	68
Middle East and North Africa	26	29	28	26	25	25	24	24	24	23	23

Table A3: Africa regional GxR with confidence intervals, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Gxr score	46	46	45	45	44	43	44	44	43	43	42
Lower limit	41	41	40	40	40	39	39	39	38	38	38
Upper limit	51	51	50	50	49	48	48	49	48	48	48

Table A4: Percentage of Africa regional population in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Less restricted	41%	43%	41%	43%	43%	43%	36%	42%	39%	39%	19%
Restricted	17%	16%	17%	15%	15%	6%	13%	11%	15%	16%	49%
Highly restricted	19%	19%	21%	18%	18%	28%	27%	24%	40%	40%	22%
In crisis	19%	19%	17%	20%	20%	20%	21%	21%	5%	5%	11%

Table A5: Number of Africa regional countries in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0
Less restricted	14	15	14	15	14	14	12	16	14	14	12
Restricted	9	8	8	8	9	6	8	6	9	9	12
Highly restricted	7	7	9	6	6	9	9	8	11	11	8
In crisis	10	10	9	11	11	11	11	11	8	8	10

Table A6: The Americas regional GxR with confidence intervals, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Gxr score	71	70	69	69	68	68	67	66	65	64	62
Lower limit	66	66	65	65	64	63	63	62	60	59	58
Upper limit	75	74	73	73	72	72	72	71	69	68	66

Table A7: Percentage of The Americas regional population in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	70%	69%	69%	69%	69%	47%	47%	47%	47%	48%	48%
Less restricted	23%	24%	23%	24%	24%	46%	45%	47%	26%	18%	19%
Restricted	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	1%	22%	29%	23%
Highly restricted	4%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	5%
In crisis	1%	1%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%

Table A8: Number of The Americas regional countries in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	11	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	9	9
Less restricted	7	9	8	8	8	10	9	10	9	5	6
Restricted	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	5	3
Highly restricted	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
In crisis	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3

Table A9: Asia and the Pacific regional GxR with confidence intervals, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Gxr score	51	50	48	47	47	47	46	47	47	45	42
Lower limit	46	45	43	42	43	42	42	43	43	41	38
Upper limit	55	55	52	51	52	51	51	52	52	50	47

Table A10: Percentage of Asia and the Pacific regional population in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Less restricted	44%	44%	11%	11%	11%	9%	9%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Restricted	6%	6%	39%	39%	2%	4%	4%	12%	13%	10%	7%
Highly restricted	7%	9%	5%	3%	40%	40%	40%	39%	38%	42%	43%
In crisis	39%	38%	42%	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%	45%

Table A11: Number of Asia and the Pacific regional countries in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6
Less restricted	8	9	7	7	6	7	7	4	4	3	3
Restricted	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	7	8	6	3
Highly restricted	7	10	9	8	9	7	6	6	5	8	8
In crisis	5	3	4	5	5	7	7	6	6	6	9

Table A12: Europe and Central Asia regional GxR with confidence intervals, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Gxr score	73	73	71	71	70	70	69	69	69	68	68
Lower limit	69	69	68	67	67	66	65	65	65	64	64
Upper limit	76	76	75	74	74	73	73	73	73	71	71

Table A13: Percentage of Europe and Central Asia regional population in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	57%	57%	56%	56%	56%	52%	49%	49%	50%	49%	49%
Less restricted	10%	10%	9%	4%	4%	8%	10%	9%	9%	9%	5%
Restricted	0%	0%	1%	7%	7%	7%	6%	7%	7%	7%	11%
Highly restricted	24%	24%	26%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
In crisis	9%	9%	8%	32%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	34%	34%

Table A14: Number of Europe and Central Asia regional countries in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	29	29	29	29	28	27	25	25	26	25	25
Less restricted	11	11	10	8	9	10	13	12	11	12	11
Restricted	1	1	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	5
Highly restricted	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
In crisis	6	6	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8

Table A15: Middle East and North Africa regional GxR with confidence intervals, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Gxr score	26	29	28	26	25	25	24	24	24	23	23
Lower limit	22	25	24	22	22	21	20	20	20	20	20
Upper limit	30	33	32	30	29	28	28	27	27	27	27

Table A16: Percentage of Middle East and North Africa regional population in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Less restricted	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Restricted	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Highly restricted	58%	57%	36%	36%	30%	30%	30%	32%	22%	22%	22%
In crisis	36%	35%	57%	56%	62%	62%	62%	62%	72%	72%	72%

Table A17: Number of Middle East and North Africa regional countries in each expression category, 2011–2021

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Open	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less restricted	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Restricted	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Highly restricted	9	8	7	7	6	6	6	7	6	6	6
In crisis	7	7	8	8	9	9	9	9	10	10	10

Table A18: Countries with declines in GxR, 2020–2021

Country	Region	2020 Expression category	2021 Expression category	Actual score change (over 1-year period)
Afghanistan	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	In Crisis	−38
Myanmar	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	In Crisis	−34
Colombia	Americas	Restricted	Highly Restricted	−15
El Salvador	Americas	Restricted	Restricted	−12
Sudan	Africa	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	−10
Hong Kong	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	−10
Nigeria	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	−9
Burkina Faso	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	−8
Ethiopia	Africa	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	−8
Poland	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Restricted	−7
Sri Lanka	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	Highly Restricted	−6
Slovenia	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	−6
Guatemala	Americas	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	−6
Eswatini	Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	−6
Armenia	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Less Restricted	−6
Uruguay	Americas	Open	Open	−4
Belarus	Europe and Central Asia	In Crisis	In Crisis	−4
Nicaragua	Americas	In Crisis	In Crisis	−3
New Zealand	Asia and the Pacific	Open	Open	−3

Table A19: Countries with declines in GxR, 2016–2021

Country	Region	2016 Expression category	2021 Expression category	Actual score change (over 5-year period)
Hong Kong	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	In Crisis	-43
Afghanistan	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	In Crisis	-37
El Salvador	Americas	Less Restricted	Restricted	-34
Colombia	Americas	Less Restricted	Highly Restricted	-32
Burma/Myanmar	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-28
Nicaragua	Americas	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-27
Sri Lanka	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Highly Restricted	-27
Brazil	Americas	Less Restricted	Restricted	-25
Belarus	Europe and Central Asia	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-23
Slovenia	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Less Restricted	-21
Benin	Africa	Open	Less Restricted	-20
Togo	Africa	Restricted	Highly Restricted	-19
Poland	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Restricted	-15
Philippines	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	Highly Restricted	-14
Burkina Faso	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-13
Guinea	Africa	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	-13
Gabon	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-13
Hungary	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Restricted	-12
Indonesia	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Restricted	-11
Mozambique	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-11
Nigeria	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-11
Haiti	Americas	Less Restricted	Restricted	-10
Albania	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-10
Ivory Coast	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-9
Mexico	Americas	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-8
Guatemala	Americas	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-9
India	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	-9
Madagascar	Africa	Restricted	Restricted	-8
Niger	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-7
Algeria	Middle East and North Africa	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-7
Cambodia	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	In Crisis	-7
Serbia	Europe and Central Asia	Restricted	Restricted	-7
United States of America	Americas	Open	Open	-7
Ghana	Africa	Open	Less Restricted	-7
Cyprus	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-7
Georgia	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Less Restricted	-7
Chile	Americas	Open	Open	-7
Kyrgyzstan	Europe and Central Asia	Restricted	Restricted	-7
Eswatini	Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-6
Uganda	Africa	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	-6
Greece	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-6
Austria	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-6
Uruguay	Americas	Open	Open	-5
Romania	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Less Restricted	-5
Mongolia	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-5
Venezuela	Americas	In Crisis	In Crisis	-5
Czech Republic	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-4
United Kingdom	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-4

Country	Region	2020 Expression category	2021 Expression category	Actual score change (over 5-year period)
New Zealand	Asia and the Pacific	Open	Open	-4
United Arab Emirates	Middle East and North Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-4
Qatar	Middle East and North Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-3
Turkey	Europe and Central Asia	In Crisis	In Crisis	-3
China	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	In Crisis	-2

Table A20: Countries with declines in GxR, 2011–2021

Country	Region	2011 Expression category	2021 Expression category	Actual score change (over 10-year period)
Hong Kong	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	In Crisis	-58
Afghanistan	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	In Crisis	-40
Brazil	Americas	Open	Restricted	-38
India	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Highly Restricted	-37
Nicaragua	Americas	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-35
El Salvador	Americas	Open	Restricted	-36
Poland	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Restricted	-34
Philippines	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Highly Restricted	-29
Colombia	Americas	Less Restricted	Highly Restricted	-29
Serbia	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Restricted	-27
Turkey	Europe and Central Asia	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-24
Thailand	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-23
Venezuela	Americas	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-21
Slovenia	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Less Restricted	-21
Togo	Africa	Restricted	Highly Restricted	-20
Hungary	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Restricted	-20
Benin	Africa	Open	Less Restricted	-19
Cambodia	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-18
Tanzania	Africa	Restricted	Restricted	-18
Pakistan	Asia and the Pacific	Restricted	Highly Restricted	-18
Burundi	Africa	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-17
Zambia	Africa	Restricted	Highly Restricted	-16
Yemen	Middle East and North Africa	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-16
Ukraine	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Restricted	-16
Belarus	Europe and Central Asia	In Crisis	In Crisis	-16
Kyrgyzstan	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Restricted	-16
Cameroon	Africa	Restricted	Highly Restricted	-16
Russia	Europe and Central Asia	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-15
Albania	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-15
Indonesia	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Restricted	-14
Nigeria	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-14
Egypt	Middle East and North Africa	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-14
Algeria	Middle East and North Africa	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-13
Mozambique	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-13
Mauritania	Africa	Restricted	Highly Restricted	-13
Uganda	Africa	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	-12
Guinea	Africa	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	-12
Mali	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-12
Bolivia	Americas	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-12
Bangladesh	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	In Crisis	-12
Croatia	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Less Restricted	-12

Haiti	Americas	Less Restricted	Restricted	-12
Mexico	Americas	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-10
Nepal	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Restricted	-10
Gabon	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-10
Burkina Faso	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-10
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-10
Greece	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-9
Ghana	Africa	Open	Less Restricted	-8
United States of America	Americas	Open	Open	-9
Guatemala	Americas	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-9
Liberia	Africa	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-8
Czech Republic	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-8
South Sudan	Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-8
Paraguay	Americas	Open	Less Restricted	-7
Kenya	Africa	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	-7
Lebanon	Middle East and North Africa	Restricted	Restricted	-7
Mongolia	Asia and the Pacific	Open	Less Restricted	-7
United Kingdom	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-7
Malta	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-7
Bulgaria	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Less Restricted	-7
Uruguay	Americas	Open	Open	-6
Cyprus	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-6
Niger	Africa	Less Restricted	Restricted	-6
Palestine	Middle East and North Africa	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	-6
Australia	Asia and the Pacific	Open	Open	-6
Chile	Americas	Open	Open	-6
Austria	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-6
Eswatini	Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-6
Lithuania	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-6
Burma/Myanmar	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	In Crisis	-6
Spain	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-5
China	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	In Crisis	-5
New Zealand	Asia and the Pacific	Open	Open	-4
Tajikistan	Europe and Central Asia	In Crisis	In Crisis	-4
Vietnam	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	In Crisis	-4
United Arab Emirates	Middle East and North Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-4
Qatar	Middle East and North Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-3
Germany	Europe and Central Asia	Open	Open	-3
Bahrain	Middle East and North Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	-3

Table A21: Countries with rises in GxR, 2020–2021

Country	Region	2020 Expression category	2021 Expression category	Actual score change (over 1-year period)
Bolivia	Americas	Restricted	Less Restricted	13
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Africa	Highly Restricted	Restricted	8
Moldova	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Open	7

Table A22: Countries with rises in GxR, 2016–2021

Country	Region	2016 Expression category	2021 Expression category	Actual score change (over 5-year period)
The Gambia	Africa	In Crisis	Less Restricted	58
Maldives	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	Restricted	35
Dominican Republic	Americas	Less Restricted	Open	21
Ecuador	Americas	Restricted	Less Restricted	21
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Africa	Highly Restricted	Restricted	20
South Korea	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Open	17
North Macedonia	Europe and Central Asia	Restricted	Less Restricted	16
Armenia	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	14
Angola	Africa	Highly Restricted	Restricted	15
Moldova	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Open	13
Ethiopia	Africa	In Crisis	Highly Restricted	11
Malaysia	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	10
Uzbekistan	Europe and Central Asia	In Crisis	In Crisis	8
Sudan	Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	7
Thailand	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	In Crisis	5
Azerbaijan	Europe and Central Asia	In Crisis	In Crisis	3

Table A23: Countries with rises in GxR, 2011–2021

Country	Region	2011 Expression category	2021 Expression category	Actual score change (over 10-year period)
The Gambia	Africa	In Crisis	Less Restricted	57
Fiji	Asia and the Pacific	In Crisis	Highly Restricted	19
Dominican Republic	Americas	Less Restricted	Open	17
Ecuador	Americas	Restricted	Less Restricted	17
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Africa	Highly Restricted	Restricted	15
Libya	Middle East and North Africa	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	14
Armenia	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	13
South Korea	Asia and the Pacific	Less Restricted	Open	13
Angola	Africa	Highly Restricted	Restricted	13
North Macedonia	Europe and Central Asia	Restricted	Less Restricted	11
Uzbekistan	Europe and Central Asia	In Crisis	In Crisis	9
Malawi	Africa	Restricted	Less Restricted	9
Ethiopia	Africa	In Crisis	Highly Restricted	9
Malaysia	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	9
Madagascar	Africa	Restricted	Restricted	8
Georgia	Europe and Central Asia	Less Restricted	Less Restricted	7
Sri Lanka	Asia and the Pacific	Highly Restricted	Highly Restricted	7
Sudan	Africa	In Crisis	In Crisis	6
Canada	Americas	Open	Open	4

Table A24: Pandemic violations of democratic standards by 2021 expression category: max, 2020, and 2021

	Max Pandemic Violations of Democratic Standard Index (scale 0-1)	2020 Pandemic Violations of Democratic Standard Index	2021 Pandemic Violations of Democratic Standard Index
In crisis	0.33	0.31	0.29
Highly restricted	0.34	0.34	0.26
Restricted	0.3	0.3	0.19
Less restricted	0.25	0.24	0.13
Open	0.11	0.1	0.07
Global	0.26	0.25	0.18

Table A25: Number of countries with journalists imprisoned, journalists killed, and human rights defenders by 2021 expression category

	# Countries with any imprisoned journalists	# Countries with any killed journalists	# Countries with any killed human rights defenders
In crisis	22	6	8
Highly restricted	10	6	7
Restricted	4	5	6
Less restricted	1	5	7
Open	0	2	5

Table A26: Number of countries, average GxR, and percentage of the population by 2021 expression category: journalists imprisoned, journalists killed, and human rights defenders

	# Countries	Average GxR	% Population
No journalists imprisoned	124	60	40%
Any journalists imprisoned	37	19	60%
No journalists killed	137	52	63%
Any journalists killed	24	41	37%
No human rights defenders killed	128	52	36%
Any human rights defenders killed	33	44	64%

Table A27: Access to Justice by expression category with country outliers, 2021

	Access to justice score	Outlier countries
Open	0.92	--
Less restricted	0.73	Honduras Guatemala
Restricted	0.57	--
Highly restricted	0.5	--
In crisis	0.33	--

Table A28: Regression results for the change in GxR, 2020–2021

Regression Results for the Change in Freedom of Expression Over 1-Year Period (standard deviation from the mean in parentheses)			
Constant	Constant	-0.001	
		(0.002)	0.414
Internet censorship efforts	v2mecenefi	-0.008	
		(0.008)	0.273
Freedom of discussion for men and women	v2xcl_disc	0.035	
		(0.040)	0.385
Government censorship efforts	v2mecenefm	0.015	**
		(0.005)	0.003
Media self-censorship	v2meslfcen	0.023	**
		(0.009)	0.018
Freedom of academic and cultural expression	v2clacfree	0.037	***
		(0.009)	0.000
CSO consultation	v2cscnsult	0.027	**
		(0.011)	0.012
Engaged society	v2dlengage	0.012	
		(0.006)	0.050
Transparent laws with predictable enforcement	v2cltrnslw	0.004	
		(0.009)	0.637
Harassment of journalists	v2meharjrn	0.017	*
		(0.009)	0.045
Freedom from political killing	v2clkill	0.010	
		(0.008)	0.201
CSO repression	v2csreprss	0.002	
		(0.008)	0.768
CSO entry and exit	v2cseeorgs	0.032	**
		(0.010)	0.001
CSO participatory environment	v2csprtcpt	-0.024	*
		(0.011)	0.040
Party ban	v2psparban	0.004	
		(0.007)	0.604
Freedom of religion	v2clrelig	0.010	
		(0.011)	0.348
Government Internet filtering in practice	v2smgovfilprc	0.032	**
		(0.011)	0.003
Government Internet shut down in practice	v2smgovshut	0.004	
		(0.009)	0.655
Government social media censorship in practice	v2smgovsmcenprc	0.003	
		(0.011)	0.782
Internet legal regulation content	v2smregcon	0.013	
		(0.008)	0.085
Government social media monitoring	v2smgovsmmon	0.007	
		(0.008)	0.411
Government online content regulation approach	v2smregapp	0.001	
		(0.011)	0.961
Arrests for political content	v2smarrest	0.012	
		(0.009)	0.194
Freedom of peaceful assembly	v2caassemb	0.019	**
		(0.006)	0.002
Freedom of Academic Exchange	v2cafexch	-0.018	**
		(0.006)	0.003
Abuse of defamation and copyright law by elites	v2smdefabu	0.008	
		(0.009)	0.381
R-squared		0.887	
Adjusted R-squared		0.865	
No. observations		161	
*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001			

Table A29 – Importance based on relative weights in the change in GxR, 2020–2021

Importance Based on Relative Weights: Change in Freedom of Expression Over 1-Year Period				
General dominance statistics: Epsilon-based regress				
Number of obs = 161				
Overall Fit Statistic = 0.887				
		Dominance Stat.	Standardised Domin. Stat.	Ranking
v2clacfree	Freedom of academic and cultural expression	0.066	0.074	1
v2mecenefm	Government censorship efforts	0.062	0.070	2
v2meslfcen	Media self-censorship	0.060	0.067	3
v2cseeorgs	CSO entry and exit	0.056	0.063	4
v2xcl_disc	Freedom of discussion for men and women	0.048	0.054	5
v2csreprss	CSO repression	0.047	0.052	6

Table A30: Regression results for the change in GxR, 2016–2021

Regression Results for the Change in Freedom of Expression Over 5-Year Period			
(standard deviation from the mean in parentheses)			
Constant	Constant	-0.002	
		(0.003)	0.499
Internet censorship efforts	v2mecenefi	-0.008	
		(0.011)	0.436
Freedom of discussion for men and women	v2xcl_disc	0.063	
		(0.033)	0.057
Government censorship efforts	v2mecenefm	0.030	***
		(0.007)	0.000
Media self-censorship	v2meslfcen	0.013	
		(0.010)	0.183
Freedom of academic and cultural expression	v2clacfree	0.039	***
		(0.010)	0.000
CSO consultation	v2cscnsult	0.050	***
		(0.010)	0.000
Engaged society	v2dlengage	0.011	
		(0.006)	0.078
Transparent laws with predictable enforcement	v2cltrnslw	-0.012	
		(0.010)	0.212
Harassment of journalists	v2meharjrn	0.024	*
		(0.010)	0.020
Freedom from political killing	v2clkill	-0.001	
		(0.007)	0.942
CSO repression	v2csreprss	0.022	*
		(0.008)	0.011
CSO entry and exit	v2cseeorgs	0.019	*
		(0.008)	0.023
CSO participatory environment	v2csprtcpt	-0.013	
		(0.009)	0.173
Party ban	v2psparban	-0.001	
		(0.008)	0.942
Freedom of religion	v2clrelig	-0.012	
		(0.010)	0.213
Government Internet filtering in practice	v2smgovfilprc	0.038	**
		(0.011)	0.001
Government Internet shut down in practice	v2smgovshut	-0.010	
		(0.009)	0.260
Government social media censorship in practice	v2smgovsmcenprc	0.021	
		(0.012)	0.084
Internet legal regulation content	v2smregcon	0.015	
		(0.009)	0.084

Government social media monitoring	v2smgovsmmon	0.014	
		(0.008)	0.083
Government online content regulation approach	v2smregapp	-0.009	
		(0.010)	0.370
Arrests for political content	v2smarrest	0.026	*
		(0.010)	0.011
Freedom of peaceful assembly	v2caasemb	0.013	
		(0.007)	0.079
Freedom of Academic Exchange	v2cafexch	-0.010	
		(0.007)	0.152
Abuse of defamation and copyright law by elites	v2smdefabu	-0.005	
		(0.010)	0.625
R-squared		0.934	
Adjusted R-squared		0.922	
No. observations		160	
*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001			

Table A31: Importance based on relative weights in the change in GxR, 2016–2021

Importance Based on Relative Weights: Change in Freedom of Expression Over 5-Year Period				
General dominance statistics: Epsilon-based regress				
Number of obs = 161				
Overall Fit Statistic = 0.934				
		Dominance Stat.	Standardised Domin. Stat.	Ranking
v2mecenefm	Government censorship efforts	0.074	0.079	1
v2clacfree	Freedom of academic and cultural expression	0.065	0.070	2
v2cscnsult	CSO consultation	0.064	0.069	3
v2csreprss	CSO repression	0.064	0.069	4
v2meharjrn	Harassment of journalists	0.060	0.064	5
v2cseeorgs	CSO entry and exit	0.053	0.056	6
v2smarrest	Arrests for political content	0.050	0.053	7
v2xcl_disc	Freedom of discussion for men and women	0.048	0.052	8
v2meslfcen	Media self-censorship	0.048	0.051	9

Table A32: Regression results for the change in GxR, 2011–2021

Regression Results for the Change in Freedom of Expression Over 10-Year Period (standard deviation from the mean in parentheses)			
Constant	Constant	0.001	
		(0.003)	0.727
Internet censorship efforts	v2mecenefi	-0.004	
		(0.010)	0.697
Freedom of discussion for men and women	v2xcl_disc	0.052	
		(0.035)	0.143
Government censorship efforts	v2mecenefm	0.038	***
		(0.007)	0.000
Media self-censorship	v2meslfcen	0.022	*
		(0.010)	0.030
Freedom of academic and cultural expression	v2clacfree	0.019	
		(0.010)	0.066
CSO consultation	v2cscnsult	0.029	**
		(0.011)	0.009
Engaged society	v2dlengage	0.010	
		(0.005)	0.067
Transparent laws with predictable enforcement	v2cltrnslw	0.011	
		(0.010)	0.269

Harassment of journalists	v2meharjrn	0.023	*
		(0.010)	0.019
Freedom from political killing	v2clkill	-0.007	
		(0.008)	0.351
CSO repression	v2csreprss	0.035	***
		(0.009)	0.000
CSO entry and exit	v2cseeorgs	0.007	
		(0.009)	0.401
CSO participatory environment	v2csprtcpt	-0.019	*
		(0.009)	0.045
Party ban	v2psparban	-0.013	
		(0.010)	0.170
Freedom of religion	v2clrelig	-0.004	
		(0.009)	0.170
Government Internet filtering in practice	v2smgovfilprc	0.026	*
		(0.012)	0.029
Government Internet shut down in practice	v2smgovshut	0.005	
		(0.010)	0.624
Government social media censorship in practice	v2smgovsmcenprc	0.039	**
		(0.013)	0.002
Internet legal regulation content	v2smregcon	0.003	
		(0.010)	0.770
Government social media monitoring	v2smgovsmmon	0.024	*
		(0.009)	0.012
Government online content regulation approach	v2smregapp	0.011	
		(0.010)	0.280
Arrests for political content	v2smarrest	0.028	*
		(0.012)	0.016
Freedom of peaceful assembly	v2caassemb	0.014	
		(0.008)	0.083
Freedom of Academic Exchange	v2cafexch	-0.007	
		(0.008)	0.435
Abuse of defamation and copyright law by elites	v2smdefabu	-0.014	
		(0.010)	0.176
R-squared		0.930	
Adjusted R-squared		0.917	
No. observations		160	
*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001			

Table A33: Importance based on relative weights in the change in GxR, 2011–2021

Importance Based on Relative Weights: Change in Freedom of Expression Over 10-Year Period

General dominance statistics: Epsilon-based regress

Number of obs = 161

Overall Fit Statistic = 0.930

		Dominance Stat.	Standardised Domin. Stat.	Ranking
v2mecenefm	Government censorship efforts	0.082	0.088	1
v2csreprss	CSO repression	0.070	0.075	2
v2cscnsult	CSO consultation	0.056	0.060	3
v2meslfcen	Media self-censorship	0.056	0.060	4
v2meharjrn	Harassment of journalists	0.056	0.060	5
v2clacfree	Freedom of academic and cultural expression	0.054	0.058	6
v2smarrest	Arrests for political content	0.052	0.056	7
v2dlengage	Engaged society	0.050	0.054	8
v2cseeorgs	CSO entry and exit	0.047	0.050	9

Table A34: V–Dem Variable Descriptions

V-Dem Variable Name	Description	Question	Responses
v2mecenefi	Internet censorship efforts	Does the government attempt to censor information (text, audio, or visuals) on the Internet?	0: The government successfully blocks Internet access except to sites that are pro-government or devoid of political content. 1: The government attempts to block Internet access except to sites that are pro-government or devoid of political content, but many users are able to circumvent such controls. 2: The government allows Internet access, including to some sites that are critical of the government, but blocks selected sites that deal with especially politically sensitive issues. 3: The government allows Internet access that is unrestricted, with the exceptions mentioned above.
v2xcl_disc	Freedom of discussion for men and women	Are men/women able to openly discuss political issues in private homes and in public spaces?	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.
v2mecenefm	Government censorship efforts	Does the government directly or indirectly attempt to censor the print or broadcast media?	0: Attempts to censor are direct and routine. 1: Attempts to censor are indirect but nevertheless routine. 2: Attempts to censor are direct but limited to especially sensitive issues. 3: Attempts to censor are indirect and limited to especially sensitive issues. 4: The government rarely attempts to censor major media in any way, and when such exceptional attempts are discovered, the responsible officials are usually punished.
v2meslfcen	Media selfcensorship	Is there self-censorship among journalists when reporting on issues that the government considers politically sensitive?	0: Self-censorship is complete and thorough. 1: Self-censorship is common but incomplete. 2: There is self-censorship on a few highly sensitive political issues but not on moderately sensitive issues. 3: There is little or no self-censorship among journalists.
v2clacfree	Freedom of academic and cultural expression	Is there academic freedom and freedom of cultural expression related to political issues?	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.
v2cscnsult	Civil society organisation (CSO) consultation	Are major civil society organisations routinely consulted by policymakers on policies relevant to their members?	0: No. There is a high degree of insulation of the government from CSO input. The government may sometimes enlist or mobilise CSOs after policies are adopted to sell them to the public at large. But it does not often consult with them in formulating policies. 1: To some degree. CSOs are but one set of voices that policymakers sometimes take into account. 2: Yes. Important CSOs are recognised as stakeholders in important policy areas and given voice on such issues. This can be accomplished through formal corporatist arrangements or through less formal arrangements.
v2dlengage	Engaged society	When important policy changes are being considered, how wide and how independent are public deliberations?	0: Public deliberation is never, or almost never allowed. 1: Some limited public deliberations are allowed but the public below the elite levels is almost always either unaware of major policy debates or unable to take part in them. 2: Public deliberation is not repressed but nevertheless infrequent and non-elite actors are typically controlled and/or constrained by the elites. 3: Public deliberation is actively encouraged and some autonomous non-elite groups participate, but that tends to be the same across issue-areas. 4: Public deliberation is actively encouraged and a relatively broad segment of non-elite groups often participate and vary with different issue-areas. 5: Large numbers of non-elite groups as well as ordinary people tend to discuss major policies among themselves, in the media, in associations or neighbourhoods, or in the streets. Grass-roots deliberation is common and unconstrained.

V-Dem Variable Name	Description	Question	Responses
v2cltrnslw	Transparent laws with predictable enforcement	Are the laws of the land clear, well publicised, coherent (consistent with each other), relatively stable from year to year, and enforced in a predictable manner?	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.
v2meharjrn	Harassment of journalists	Are individual journalists harassed —i.e. threatened with libel, arrested, imprisoned, beaten, or killed — by governmental or powerful nongovernmental actors while engaged in legitimate journalistic activities?	0: No journalists dare to engage in journalistic activities that would offend powerful actors because harassment or worse would be certain to occur. 1: Some journalists occasionally offend powerful actors but they are almost always harassed or worse and eventually are forced to stop. 2: Some journalists who offend powerful actors are forced to stop but others manage to continue practicing journalism freely for long periods of time. 3: It is rare for any journalist to be harassed for offending powerful actors, and if this were to happen, those responsible for the harassment would be identified and punished. 4: Journalists are never harassed by governmental or powerful non-governmental actors while engaged in legitimate journalistic activities.
v2clkill	Freedom from political killing	Is there freedom from political killings?	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.
v2csreprss	CSO repression	Does the government attempt to repress civil society organisations?	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 organisations with each other or political parties, bar civil society organisations 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 organisations and side-track them from engagement. The government may also organise Government Organised Movements or NGOs (GONGOs) to crowd out independent organisations. One example would be Singapore in the post-Yew phase or Putin's Russia. 4: No.CSOs are free to organise, associate, strike, express themselves, and to criticise the government without fear of government sanctions or harassment.
v2cseeorgs	CSO entry and exit	To what extent does the government achieve control over entry and exit by civil society organisations into public life?	0: Monopolistic control. The government exercises an explicit monopoly over CSOs. The only organisations allowed to engage in political activity such as endorsing parties or politicians, sponsoring public issues forums, organizing rallies or demonstrations, engaging in strikes, or publically commenting on public officials and policies are government-sponsored organisations. 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 organisations that are likely to oppose the government. There are at least some citizen-based organisations 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 organisations manage to play an active political role. Despite its ban on organisations 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 organisations or movements that have a history of anti-democratic action in the past (e.g. the banning of neo-fascist or communist organisations 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.

V-Dem Variable Name	Description	Question	Responses
v2csprtcpt	CSO participatory environment	Which of these best describes the involvement of people in CSOs?	0: Most associations are state-sponsored, and although a large number of people may be active in them, their participation is not purely voluntary. 1: Voluntary CSOs exist but few people are active in them. 2: There are many diverse CSOs, but popular involvement is minimal. 3: There are many diverse CSOs and it is considered normal for people to be at least occasionally active in at least one of them.
v2psparban	Party ban	Are any parties banned?	0: Yes. All parties except the state-sponsored party (and closely allied parties) are banned. 1: Yes. Elections are non-partisan or there are no officially recognised parties. 2: Yes. Many parties are banned. 3: Yes. But only a few parties are banned. 4: No. No parties are officially banned.
v2clrelig	Freedom of religion	Is there freedom of religion?	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 organised religious practices exist and are officially recognised. 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 organised religious practices exist and are officially recognised. 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 proselytising, 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 organise, 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.
v2smgovfilprc	Government Internet filtering in practice	How frequently does the government censor political information (text, audio, images, or video) on the Internet by filtering (blacking access to certain websites)?	0: Extremely often. It is a regular practice for the government to remove political content, except to sites that are pro-government. 1: Often. The government commonly removes online political content, except sites that are pro-government. 2: Sometimes. The government successfully removes about half of the critical online political content. 3: Rarely. There have been only a few occasions on which the government removed political content. 4: Never, or almost never. The government allows Internet access that is unrestricted, with the exceptions mentioned in the clarifications section.
v2smgovshut	Government Internet shut down in practice	Independent of whether it actually does so in practice, does the government have the technical capacity to actively shut down domestic access to the Internet if it decided to?	0: The government lacks the capacity to shut down any domestic Internet connections. 1: The government has the capacity to shut down roughly a quarter of domestic access to the Internet. 2: The government has the capacity to shut down roughly half of domestic access to the Internet. 3: The government has the capacity to shut down roughly three quarters of domestic access to the Internet. 4: The government has the capacity to shut down all, or almost all, domestic access to the Internet.
v2smgovsmcenprc	Government social media censorship in practice	To what degree does the government censor political content (i.e. deleting or filtering specific posts for political reasons) on social media in practice?	0: The government simply blocks all social media platforms. 1: The government successfully censors all social media with political content. 2: The government successfully censors a significant portion of political content on social media, though not all of it. 3: The government only censors social media with political content that deals with especially sensitive issues. 4: The government does not censor political social media content, with the exceptions mentioned in the clarifications section.

V-Dem Variable Name	Description	Question	Responses
v2smregcon	Internet legal regulation content	What type of content is covered in the legal framework to regulate Internet?	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.
v2smgovsmmon	Government social media monitoring	How comprehensive is the surveillance of political content in social media by the government or its agents?	0: Extremely comprehensive. The government surveils virtually all content on social media. 1: Mostly comprehensive. The government surveils most content on social media, with comprehensive monitoring of most key political issues. 2: Somewhat comprehensive. The government does not universally surveil social media but can be expected to surveil key political issues about half the time. 3: Limited. The government only surveils political content on social media on a limited basis. 4: Not at all, or almost not at all. The government does not surveil political content on social media, with the exceptions mentioned in the clarifications section.
v2smregapp	Government online content regulation approach	Does the government use its own resources and institutions to monitor and regulate online content or does it distribute this regulatory burden to private actors such as Internet service providers?	0: All online content monitoring and regulation is done by the state. 1: Most online content monitoring and regulation is done by the state, though the state involves private actors in a limited way. 2: Some online content monitoring and regulation is done by the state, but the state also involves private actors in monitoring and regulation in various ways. 3: The state does little online content monitoring and regulation, and entrusts most of the monitoring and regulation to private actors. 4: The state off-loads all online content monitoring and regulation to private actors.
v2smarrest	Arrests for political content	If a citizen posts political content online that would run counter to the government and its policies, what is the likelihood that citizen is arrested?	0: Extremely likely. 1: Likely. 2: Unlikely. 3: Extremely unlikely.
v2caassemb	Freedom of peaceful assembly	To what extent do state authorities respect and protect the right of peaceful assembly?	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.
v2cafexch	Freedom of academic exchange	To what extent are scholars free to exchange and communicate research ideas and findings?	0: Completely restricted. Academic exchange and dissemination is, across all disciplines, consistently subject to censorship, selfcensorship or other restrictions. 1: Severely restricted. Academic exchange and dissemination is, in some disciplines, consistently subject to censorship, selfcensorship or other restrictions. 2: Moderately restricted. Academic exchange and dissemination is occasionally subject to censorship, self-censorship or other restrictions. 3: Mostly free. Academic exchange and dissemination is rarely subject to censorship, self-censorship or other restrictions. 4: Fully free. Academic exchange and dissemination is not subject to censorship, self-censorship or other restrictions.
v2smdefabu	Abuse of defamation and copyright law by elites	To what extent do elites abuse the legal system (e.g. defamation and copyright law) to censor political speech online?	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.

ARTICLE19

www.article19.org