

Methodology

The WJP Rule of Law Index® is the first attempt to systematically and comprehensively quantify the rule of law around the world, and remains unique in its operationalization of rule of law dimensions into concrete questions.

The *WJP Rule of Law Index 2017-2018* report presents information on eight composite factors that are further disaggregated into 44 specific sub-factors (see pages 8–9). Factor 9, Informal Justice, is included in the conceptual framework, but has been excluded from the aggregated scores and rankings in order to provide meaningful cross-country comparisons. To present an image that accurately portrays the rule of law as experienced by ordinary people, each score of the Index is calculated using a large number of questions drawn from two original data sources collected by the World Justice Project in each country: a General Population Poll (GPP) and a series of Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires (QRQs).

These two data sources collect up-to-date firsthand information that is not available at the global level, and constitute the world's most comprehensive dataset of its kind. They capture the experiences and perceptions of ordinary citizens and in-country professionals concerning the performance of the state and its agents and the actual operation of the legal framework in their country. The country scores and rankings presented in this report are built from more than 500 variables drawn from the assessments of more than 110,000 citizens and 3,000 legal experts in 113 countries and jurisdictions, making it the most accurate portrayal of the factors that contribute to shaping the rule of law in a nation.

The *WJP Rule of Law Index* systematically and comprehensively quantifies the rule of law in 113 countries around the world. The production of the *WJP Rule of Law Index* can be summarized in eleven steps:

1. The WJP developed the conceptual framework summarized in the Index's nine factors and 47 sub-factors, in consultation with academics, practitioners, and community leaders from around the world.
2. The Index team developed a set of five questionnaires based on the Index's conceptual framework to be administered to experts and the general public. Questionnaires were translated into several languages and adapted to reflect commonly used terms and expressions.
3. The team identified, on average, more than 300 potential local experts per country to respond to the QRQs and engaged the services of leading local polling companies to implement the household surveys.
4. Polling companies conducted pilot tests of the GPP in consultation with the Index team, and launched the final survey for full fieldwork.
5. The team sent the questionnaires to local experts and engaged in continual interaction with them.
6. The Index team collected and mapped the data onto the 44 sub-factors with global comparability.

7. The Index team constructed the final scores using a five step process:

- a. Codified the questionnaire items as numeric values
- b. Produced raw country scores by aggregating the responses from several individuals (experts or general public)
- c. Normalized the raw scores
- d. Aggregated the normalized scores into sub-factors and factors using simple averages
- e. Produced the normalized scores, which are rounded to two decimal points, and the final rankings

8. The data were subject to a series of tests to identify possible biases and errors. For example, the Index team cross-checked all sub-factors against more than 70 third-party sources, including quantitative data and qualitative assessments drawn from local and international organizations.

9. A sensitivity analysis was conducted by the Econometrics and Applied Statistics Unit of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, in collaboration with the Index team, to assess the statistical reliability of the results.

10. To illustrate whether the rule of law in a country significantly changed over the course of the past year, a measure of change over time was produced based on the annual difference in the country-level factor scores, the standard errors of these scores (estimated from a set of 100 bootstrap samples), and the results of the corresponding t-tests.

11. The data were organized into country reports, tables, and figures to facilitate their presentation and interpretation. For tables organized by income group, the WJP follows the World Bank income classifications.

A detailed description of the process by which data are collected and the rule of law is measured is provided on the following pages.

Data Sources

Every year the WJP collects data from representative samples of the general public (the General Population Polls or GPPs) and legal professionals (the Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires or QRQs) to compute the Index scores and rankings. The GPP surveys provide firsthand information on the experiences and the perceptions of ordinary people regarding a range of pertinent rule of law information, including their dealings with the government, the ease of interacting with state bureaucracy, the extent of bribery and corruption, the availability of dispute resolution systems, and the prevalence of common crimes to which they are exposed. The GPP questionnaire includes 153 perception-based questions and 191 experience-based questions, along with socio-demographic information on all respondents. The questionnaire is translated into local languages, adapted to common expressions, and administered by leading local polling companies using a probability sample of 1,000 respondents in the three largest cities of each country.⁴ Depending on the particular situation of each country, three different polling methodologies are used: face-to-face, telephone, or online. The GPP is carried out in each country every other year. The polling data used in this year's report were collected during the fall of 2017 (for 52 countries), the fall of 2016 (for 57 countries), the fall of 2014 (for 3 countries), and the fall of 2011 (for 1 country). Detailed information regarding the cities covered, the polling companies contracted to administer the questionnaire, and the polling methodology employed in each of the 113 countries is presented on [page 161](#).

The QRQs complement the household data with assessments from in-country professionals with expertise in civil and commercial law, criminal justice, labor law, and public health. These questionnaires gather timely input on a range of topics from practitioners who frequently interact

(cont'd) ››

⁴Last year, the WJP added 11 Latin American and Caribbean countries to the Index. Due to the small populations of many of these countries and the difficulties of collecting enough respondents that met the quotas in the three largest cities, the sampling plan was adjusted accordingly in some cases. One adjustment was to decrease the sample size to 500 respondents. A second was to conduct a nationally representative poll that covered a larger portion of the country. For more information on the specific countries and sample sizes, see [page 161](#) on city coverage and polling methodology.

Part Five: Behind the Numbers

- ▶▶ with state institutions. Such topics include information on the efficacy of courts, the strength of regulatory enforcement, and the reliability of accountability mechanisms. The questionnaires contain closed-ended perception questions and several hypothetical scenarios with highly detailed factual assumptions aimed at ensuring comparability across countries. The QRQ surveys are conducted annually, and the questionnaires are completed by respondents selected from directories of law firms, universities and colleges, research organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as well as through referrals from the WJP global network of practitioners, and vetted by WJP staff based on their expertise. The expert surveys are administered in four languages: English, French, Russian, and Spanish. The QRQ data for this report include over 3,000 surveys, which represents an average of 26 respondents per country. These data were collected from May 2017 through early November 2017.

Data Cleaning and Score Computation

Once collected, the data are carefully processed to arrive at country-level scores. As a first step, the respondent-level data are edited to exclude partially-completed surveys, suspicious data, and outliers (which are detected using the Z-score method). Individual answers are then mapped onto the 44 sub-factors of the Index (or onto the intermediate categories that make up each sub-factor), codified so that all values fall between 0 (least rule of law) and 1 (most rule of law), and aggregated at the country level using the simple (or unweighted) average of all respondents.

This year, to allow for an easier comparison across years, the resulting 2017-2018 scores have been normalized using the Min-Max method with a base year of 2015. These normalized scores were then successively aggregated from the variable level all the way up to the factor level to produce the final country scores, rounded to two decimal points, and rankings. In most cases, the GPP and QRQ questions are equally weighted in the calculation of the scores of the intermediate categories (sub-factors and sub-sub-factors).

A full picture of how questions are mapped onto indicators and how they are weighted is available on the *Rule of Law Index* page at worldjusticeproject.org.

Data Validation

As a final step, data are validated and cross-checked against qualitative and quantitative third-party sources to provide an additional layer of analysis and to identify possible mistakes or inconsistencies within the data. Most of the third-party data sources used to cross-check the Index scores are described in Botero and Ponce (2011).⁵

Methodological Changes to this Year's Report

Every year, the WJP reviews the methods of data collection to ensure that the information produced is valid, useful, and continues to capture the status of the rule of law in the world. To maintain consistency with previous editions and to facilitate tracking changes over time, this year's questionnaires and data maps are closely aligned with those administered in the past.

In order to improve the accuracy of the QRQ results and reduce respondent burden, proactive dependent interviewing techniques were used to remind respondents who participated in last year's survey of their responses in the previous year.

This year, a few changes were made to some of the indicators and questions of the Index. These changes occurred in sub-factors 2.2, 4.3, 8.1, 8.5, and 8.7.

1. In the construction of sub-factor 2.2 "Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain," five questions were added. Sub-factor 2.2 now contains 18 questions.
2. In the construction of sub-factor 4.3 "Due process of the law and rights of the accused," four questions were added. Sub-factor 4.3 now contains 35 questions.
3. In the construction of sub-factor 8.1 "Criminal investigation system is effective," seven questions were added. Sub-factor 8.1 now contains 24 questions. In the

⁵Botero, J. and Ponce, A. (2011) "Measuring the Rule of Law": WJP Working Paper No.1, available at worldjusticeproject.org/publications.

construction of sub-factor 8.5 "Criminal justice system is free of corruption," five questions were added. Sub-factor 8.5 now contains 26 questions. In the construction of sub-factor 8.7 "Due process of the law and rights of the accused," four questions were added. Sub-factor 8.7 now contains 35 questions.

Overall, 96% of questions remained the same between the 2016 and 2017-2018 editions of the Index. A description of the new variables is available at worldjusticeproject.org.

In a few instances, the WJP uses data from third-party sources to measure an element of the rule of law that is not possible to measure through the GPP or QRQs. Out of more than 500 variables used to calculate the Index, five variables are from third-party sources.

Tracking Changes Over Time

This year's report includes a measure to illustrate whether the rule of law in a country, as measured through the factors of the *WJP Rule of Law Index*, changed from 2016 to 2017-2018. This measure is presented in the form of arrows and represents a summary of rigorous statistical testing based on the use of bootstrapping procedures (see below). For each factor, this measure takes the value of zero (no arrow) if there was no statistically significant change in the score since last year, a positive value (upward arrow) if there was a change leading to a statistically significant improvement in the score, and a negative value (downward arrow) if there was a change leading to a statistically significant deterioration in the score. This measure complements the numerical scores and rankings presented in this report, which benchmark each country's current performance on the factors and sub-factors of the Index against that of other countries. The measure of change over time is constructed in three steps:

1. First, last year's scores are subtracted from this year's to obtain, for each country and each factor, the annual difference in scores.
2. To test whether the annual changes are statistically significant, a bootstrapping procedure is used to estimate

standard errors. To calculate these errors, 100 samples of respondent-level observations (of equal size to the original sample) are randomly selected with replacement for each country from the pooled set of respondents for last year and this year. These samples are used to produce a set of 100 country-level scores for each factor and each country, which are utilized to calculate the final standard errors. These errors – which measure the uncertainty associated with picking a particular sample of respondents – are then employed to conduct pair-wise t-tests for each country and each factor.

3. Finally, to illustrate the annual change, a measure of change over time is produced based on the value of the annual difference and its statistical significance (at the 95 percent level).

Strengths & Limitations

The Index methodology displays both strengths and limitations. Among its strengths is the inclusion of both expert and household surveys to ensure that the findings reflect the conditions experienced by the population. Another strength is that it approaches the measurement of rule of law from various angles by triangulating information across data sources and types of questions. This approach not only enables accounting for different perspectives on the rule of law, but it also helps to reduce possible bias that might be introduced by any other particular data collection method. Finally, it relies on statistical testing to determine the significance of the changes in the factor scores over the last year.

With the aforementioned methodological strengths come a number of limitations. First, the data shed light on rule of law dimensions that appear comparatively strong or weak, but are not specific enough to establish causation. Thus, it will be necessary to use the Index in combination with other analytical tools to provide a full picture of causes and possible solutions. Second, the methodology has only been applied in three major urban areas in each of the indexed countries for the General Population Poll. The WJP is therefore piloting the application of the methodology to rural areas. Third, given the rapid changes occurring in some

(cont'd) »»

Part Five: Behind the Numbers

- ▶▶ countries, scores for some countries may be sensitive to the specific points in time when the data were collected. To address this, the WJP is piloting test methods of moving averages to account for short-term fluctuations. Fourth, the QRQ data may be subject to problems of measurement error due to the limited number of experts in some countries, resulting in less precise estimates. To address this, the WJP works constantly to expand its network of in-country academic and practitioner experts who contribute their time and expertise to this endeavor. Finally, due to the limited number of experts in some countries (which implies higher standard errors) and the fact that the GPP is carried out in each country every other year (which implies that for some countries, some variables do not change from one year to another), it is possible that the test described above fails to detect small changes in a country's situation over time.

Other Methodological Considerations

A detailed presentation of the methodology, including a table and description of the more than 500 variables used to construct the Index scores, is available at: worldjusticeproject.org and in Botero, J. and Ponce, A. (2011) "Measuring the Rule of Law": WJP Working Paper No.1, available at: worldjusticeproject.org/publications.

Using the WJP Rule of Law Index

The *WJP Rule of Law Index* has been designed to offer a reliable and independent data source for policy makers, businesses, non-governmental organizations, and other constituencies to assess a nation's adherence to the rule of law as perceived and experienced by the average person, identify a nation's strengths and weaknesses in comparison to similarly situated countries, and track changes over time. The Index has been designed to include several features that set it apart from other indices and make it valuable for a large number of countries, thus providing a powerful resource that can inform policy debates both within and across countries. However, the Index's findings must be interpreted in light of certain inherent limitations.

1. The *WJP Rule of Law Index* does not identify priorities for reform and is not intended to establish causation or to ascertain the complex relationship among different rule of

law dimensions in various countries.

2. The Index's rankings and scores are the product of a rigorous data collection and aggregation methodology. Nonetheless, as with all measures, they are subject to measurement error.

3. Given the uncertainty associated with picking a particular sample of respondents, standard errors have been calculated using bootstrapping methods to test whether the annual changes in the factor scores are statistically significant.

4. Indices and indicators are subject to potential abuse and misinterpretation. Once released to the public, they can take on a life of their own and be used for purposes unanticipated by their creators. If data are taken out of context, it can lead to unintended or erroneous policy decisions.

5. Rule of law concepts measured by the Index may have different meanings across countries. Users are encouraged to consult the specific definitions of the variables employed in the construction of the Index, which are discussed in greater detail in the methodology section of the *WJP Rule of Law Index* website.

6. The Index is generally intended to be used in combination with other instruments, both quantitative and qualitative. Just as in the areas of health or economics, no single index conveys a full picture of a country's situation. Policy-making in the area of rule of law requires careful consideration of all relevant dimensions – which may vary from country to country – and a combination of sources, instruments, and methods.

7. Pursuant to the sensitivity analysis of the Index data conducted in collaboration with the Econometrics and Applied Statistics Unit of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, confidence intervals have been calculated for all figures included in the *WJP Rule of Law Index 2017–2018*. These confidence intervals and other relevant considerations regarding measurement error are reported in Saisana and Saltelli (2015) and Botero and Ponce (2011).

The following pages (161–163) list the city coverage and polling methodology for the GPP in the 113 indexed countries and jurisdictions.

Country/Territory	Cities Covered	Polling Company	Methodology	Sample	Year
Afghanistan	Kabul City, Kandahar City, Herat City	ACSOR, a subsidiary of D3 Systems, Inc.	Face-to-face	992	2017
Albania	Tirana, Durres, Fier	IDRA Research & Consulting	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Antigua & Barbuda	Nationally representative sample	Mercaplan	Face-to-face	510	2016
Argentina	Buenos Aires, Córdoba, Rosario	Statmark Group	Face-to-face	1006	2016
Australia	Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2016
Austria	Vienna, Graz, Linz	YouGov	Online	1008	2017
Bahamas	Nassau, Freeport, Lucaya	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	516	2016
Bangladesh	Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna	Org-Quest Research	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Barbados	Nationally representative sample	Mercaplan	Face-to-face	506	2016
Belarus*	Minsk, Gomel, Mogilev	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EURASIA)/WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000/401	2014/2017
Belgium	Brussels, Antwerp, Liège	YouGov	Online	1001	2016
Belize	Belize City, Belmopan, San Ignacio/Santa Elena	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Bolivia	La Paz/El Alto, Santa Cruz, Cochabamba	CAPTURA Consulting SRL	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Sarajevo, Banja Luka, Tuzla	Kantar TNS MIB	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Botswana	Molepolole, Gaborone, Francistown	Intraspace Market Consultancy Ltd.	Face-to-face	999	2016
Brazil	São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Salvador	Datum Internacional/About Brazil Market Research	Face-to-face	1049	2017
Bulgaria	Sofia, Plovdiv, Varna	Alpha Research	Face-to-face	1001	2016
Burkina Faso	Ouagadougou, Bobo Dioulasso, Koudougou	Kantar TNS	Face-to-face	1029	2017
Cambodia*	Phnom Penh, Battambang, Kampong Cham	Indochina Research	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Cameroon	Douala, Yaoundé, Bamenda	Liaison Marketing	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Canada	Toronto, Montreal, Calgary	YouGov	Online	1000	2017
Chile	Santiago, Valparaíso/Viña del Mar, Antofagasta	Datum Internacional S.A./Cadem S.A.	Face-to-face	1011	2017
China	Shanghai, Chongqing, Beijing	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1014	2016
Colombia	Bogotá, Medellín, Cali	Tempo Group	Face-to-face	1007	2016
Costa Rica	San José, Alajuela, Cartago	Dichter and Neira	Face-to-face	561	2017
Cote d'Ivoire	Abidjan, Bouaké, Daloa	Liaison Marketing	Face-to-face	1011	2017
Croatia	Zagreb, Split, Rijeka	Ipsos d.o.o.	Face-to-face	1004	2016
Czech Republic	Prague, Brno, Ostrava	YouGov	Online	1013	2017
Denmark	Copenhagen, Aarhus, Aalborg	YouGov	Online	1016	2017
Dominica	Nationally representative sample	Statmark Group	Face-to-face	500	2016
Dominican Republic	Santo Domingo, Santiago, La Romana	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	1016	2016
Ecuador	Guayaquil, Quito, Cuenca	Dichter and Neira	Face-to-face	703	2017
Egypt	Cairo, Alexandria, Giza	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2017
El Salvador	San Salvador, Santa Ana, San Miguel	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	1004	2016
Estonia	Tallinn, Tartu, Narva	Norstat Eesti	Online	1010	2017
Ethiopia	Addis Ababa, Gonder, Nazret	Infinite Insight Ltd.	Face-to-face	1037	2017

*Due to difficulties with data collection, the World Justice Project was unable to complete the 2017 General Population Poll in Belarus, Cambodia, the United Arab Emirates, and Uzbekistan. As a result, GPP data from previous years have been used for these four countries.

(cont'd) ▶▶

Country/Territory	Cities Covered	Polling Company	Methodology	Sample	Year
Finland	Helsinki, Espoo, Tampere	YouGov	Online	1014	2017
France	Paris, Lyon, Marseille	YouGov	Online	1011	2016
Georgia	Tbilisi, Batumi, Kutaisi	ACT Market Research and Consulting Company	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Germany	Berlin, Hamburg, Munich	YouGov	Online	1012	2016
Ghana	Kumasi, Accra, Sekondi-Takoradi	FACTS International Ghana Limited	Face-to-face	1016	2016
Greece	Athens, Thessaloniki, Patras	YouGov	Online	1015	2017
Grenada	Nationally representative sample	Mercaplan	Face-to-face	510	2016
Guatemala	Guatemala City, Villa Nueva, Mixco	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	1036	2016
Guyana	Georgetown, Linden, New Amsterdam	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	506	2016
Honduras	Tegucigalpa, San Pedro Sula, Choloma	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	1100	2017
Hong Kong SAR, China	Hong Kong	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1004	2017
Hungary	Budapest, Debrecen, Szeged	Ipsos Hungary	Face-to-face	1000	2017
India	Mumbai, Delhi, Bangalore	DataPrompt International Pvt. Ltd.	Face-to-face	1002	2016
Indonesia	Jakarta, Surabaya, Bandung	MRI (Marketing Research Indonesia)	Face-to-face	1004	2017
Iran	Tehran, Isfahan, Mashhad	Ipsos Public Affairs	Telephone	1005	2016
Italy	Rome, Milan, Naples	YouGov	Online	1004	2017
Jamaica	Kingston, Portmore, Spanish Town	Dichter and Neira	Face-to-face	401	2017
Japan	Tokyo, Osaka, Nagoya	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2016
Jordan	Amman, Irbid, Zarqa	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Kazakhstan	Almaty, Astana, Shymkent	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Kenya	Nairobi, Mombasa, Nakuru	Infinite Insight	Face-to-face	1085	2016
Kyrgyzstan	Bishkek, Osh, Jalalabad	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Lebanon	Beirut, Tripoli, Sidon	REACH SAL	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Liberia	Monrovia, Gbarnga, Kakata	FACTS International Ghana Limited	Face-to-face	1008	2016
Macedonia, FYR	Skopje, Kumanovo, Bitola	Ipsos dooel Skopje	Face-to-face	1017	2017
Madagascar	Antananarivo, Toamasina, Antsirabe	DCDM Research	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Malawi	Lilongwe, Blantyre, Mzuzu	Infinite Insight Ltd.	Face-to-face	1039	2017
Malaysia	Klang Valley, Johor Bahru, Ipoh	Acorn Marketing & Research Consultant (M) Sdn Bhd	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Mexico	Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey	Data Opinión Pública y Mercados	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Moldova	Chisinau, Balti, Cahul	Georgian Opinion Research Business International (GORBI)	Face-to-face	520	2017
Mongolia	Ulaanbaatar, Erdenet, Darkhan	Mongolian Marketing Consulting Group LLC	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Morocco	Casablanca, Fes, Tangier	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Myanmar	Mandalay, Yangon, Naypyidaw	APMI Partners	Face-to-face	1008	2016
Nepal	Kathmandu, Pokhara, Lalitpur	Solutions Consultant	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Netherlands	Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague	YouGov	Online	1017	2016
New Zealand	Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch	Big Picture	Online	1000	2017
Nicaragua	Managua, León., Masaya	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	1100	2017
Nigeria	Lagos, Kano, Ibadan	Marketing Support Consultancy	Face-to-face	1050	2016
Norway	Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim	YouGov	Online	1007	2017
Pakistan	Karachi, Lahore, Faisalabad	Gallup Pakistan (affiliated with Gallup International)	Face-to-face	1840	2017

Country/Territory	Cities Covered	Polling Company	Methodology	Sample	Year
Panama	Panama City, San Miguelito, La Cumbres	Gallup Panamá	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Peru	Lima, Arequipa, Trujillo	Datum Internacional S.A.	Face-to-face	1007	2016
Philippines	Manila, Cebu, Davao	APMI Partners	Face-to-face	1008	2016
Poland	Warsaw, Krakow, Lodz	IQS Sp. z o.o.	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Portugal	Lisbon, Porto, Amadora	YouGov	Online	1016	2017
Republic of Korea	Seoul, Busan, Incheon	Survey Sampling International	Online	1025	2016
Romania	Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, Timisoara	Ipsos S.R.L.	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Russia	Moscow, Saint Petersburg, Novosibirsk	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Senegal	Pikine, Dakar, Thiès	Kantar TNS	Face-to-face	1012	2017
Serbia	Belgrade, Novi Sad, Nis	Ipsos Strategic Marketing d.o.o.	Face-to-face	1002	2017
Sierra Leone	Freetown, Bo, Kenema	Liaison Marketing	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Singapore	Singapore	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2017
Slovenia	Ljubljana, Maribor, Celje	Ipsos d.o.o.	Face-to-face	1006	2017
South Africa	Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban	Quest Research Services	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Spain	Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia	YouGov	Online	1005	2016
Sri Lanka	Colombo, Kaduwela, Maharagama	Kantar LMRB	Face-to-face	1010	2017
St. Kitts & Nevis	Basseterre, St. Peter, St. Thomas Middle Island	UNIMER	Face-to-face	508	2016
St. Lucia	Castries, Vieux Fort, Micoud	Statmark Group	Face-to-face	1004	2016
St. Vincent & the Grenadines	Calliaqua, Kingstown, Kingstown Park	UNIMER	Face-to-face	501	2016
Suriname	Paramaribo, Brokopondo, Lelydrop	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	507	2016
Sweden	Stockholm, Gothenburg, Malmo	YouGov	Online	1002	2016
Tanzania	Mwanza, Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar	Consumer Options Ltd.	Face-to-face	1017	2016
Thailand	Bangkok, Nakhon Ratchasima, Udon Thani	Infosearch Limited	Face-to-face	1005	2016
Trinidad & Tobago	Changuanas, San Fernando, Port of Spain	CID-Gallup	Face-to-face	1005	2016
Tunisia	Big Tunis, Sfax, Sousse	BJKA Consulting	Face-to-face	1001	2017
Turkey	Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir	TNS Turkey	Face-to-face	1011	2016
Uganda	Kampala, Kira, Mbarara	TNS-RMS Cameroon	Face-to-face	1078	2016
Ukraine	Kyiv, Kharkiv, Odessa	GfK Ukraine	Face-to-face	1079	2017
United Arab Emirates*	Dubai, Abu Dhabi, Sharjah	Feedback Market Research/Dolfin Market Research & Consultancy (DolfinX)	Face-to-face	1011/200	2011/2017
United Kingdom	London, Birmingham, Manchester	YouGov	Online	1024	2016
United States	New York, Los Angeles, Chicago	YouGov	Online	1004	2017
Uruguay	Montevideo, Salto, Paysandú	Datum Internacional S.A.	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Uzbekistan*	Tashkent, Samarkand, Fergana	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EURASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Venezuela	Caracas, Maracaibo, Barquisimeto	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2016
Vietnam	Ho Chi Minh City, Ha Noi, Hai Phong	Indochina Research (Vietnam) Ltd.	Face-to-face	1000	2017
Zambia	Lusaka, Kitwe, Chipata	Intraspace Market Consultancy Ltd.	Face-to-face	1014	2017
Zimbabwe	Harare, Bulawayo, Chitungwiza	Intraspace Market Consultancy Ltd.	Face-to-face	1008	2016

*Due to difficulties with data collection, the World Justice Project was unable to complete the 2017 General Population Poll in Belarus, Cambodia, the United Arab Emirates, and Uzbekistan. As a result, GPP data from previous years have been used for these four countries.