


Support for the political system

API-414



Structure

1. The concept of political support
2. Evidence of global patterns & trends
 - o Klingemann, Dalton
3. Explanations?
4. Conclusions & implications:
 - o A crisis of legitimacy?
 - o Consequences for older and newer democracies?

Reading

- o Russ Dalton Chapter 12.
- o Additional resources:
 - *Klingemann Ch 2 in Critical citizens* Ed Norris OUP 1999
 - Russ Dalton *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices* Oxford 2004.
 - Pippa Norris. *Critical citizens* Ch 1

1. Concept

- o Support important for democratic legitimacy
- o David Easton (1965)
- o Evaluative and affective types
- o Diffuse and specific support
- o Three levels or 'objects'
 - Support for community eg nation
 - Support for the regime eg legislature
 - Support for authorities eg leaders

Expanded dimensions

- o Support for the community
- o Support for the regime
 - Regime – ideals
 - eg democratic principles
 - Regime – norms, procedures, performance
 - Eg government
 - Regime – institutions
 - Eg courts, legislature, police, civil service
- o Support for authorities/leaders

2. Evidence: Klingemann

	Political Community	Democracy as a form of Government	Performance of Democracy
Fight for Country	.81	-.06	.03
National Pride	.71	.12	.15
Democracy Good Way of Governing	-.02	.83	-.10
Democracy Best Form of Governing	.03	.84	.04
Performance of System	.01	.14	.69
Performance of People in National Office	.07	.10	.67
Performance of Parliament	.09	.01	.77
Performance of Government	.12	-.04	.82
Eigenvalue	1.20	1.46	2.24
% Total Variance	15	18	28

Klingemann's conclusions

- o High support for political community
- o High support for democratic ideals
- o Mixed support for regime performance

Measure: support for community

Political Community. Two indicators:

- "How proud are you to be a [citizen of this country]? (4) Very proud, (3) quite proud, (2) not very proud, (1) not at all proud"
- "Of course we all hope that there will be not another war, but if it were to come to that, would you be willing to fight for your country? (1) yes, (0) no."

Table 2.3
System Age, Level of Democracy, and Support for Political Community
(World Values Survey, 1994/97)

Systems Over 40 Years, High Democracy (1996) | Systems Under 20 Years, High Democracy (1996) | Systems Over 20 Years, Low Democracy (1996)

Country	% High Support for Political Community	Country	% High Support for Political Community	Country	% High Support for Political Community
Sweden	85	Slovenia	84	Azerbaijan	93
Norway	81	Croatia	71	Turkey	92
Finland	78	South Africa	69	Ferri	86
USA	76	Chile	67	Philippines	83
Australia	73	Brazil	64	Dominican Republic	75
Switzerland	60	Argentina	63	Belarus	72
West Germany	36	Estonia	58	Yugoslavia	70
Japan	38	Spain	58	Taiwan	70
		Uruguay	56	Armenia	70
		Lithuania	54	Georgia	70
		Latvia	52	Moldova	63
		East Germany	38	Ukraine	62
				Russia	62
				Nigeria	61
Mean	63		61		73
Mean 1996 per Cap GDP (1990 US\$)	25,537		5,476		2,004

China, Mexico, Russia, Spain, Yugoslavia do not fit any of the 3

Table 2.4
Change in National Pride in the 1990s

Country	Very proud or quite proud (mid 90s %)	Pattern of change as compared to the early 90s (%)		
		Increase	No change	Decline
USA	98		-0.1	
Australia	97		-1*	
South Africa	97	+5		
Mexico	94	+5		
Turkey	94		+2	
Spain	92	+5		
Slovenia	92		+1	
Finland	89	+7		
Norway	89	+6		
Sweden	89	+5		
Argentina	89	+3		
China	88	+6		
Chile	87		+1	
Nigeria	85		-1	
India	84			-3
Belarus	79			-3
Switzerland	78			-3
Russia	71	+6		
Lithuania	69			-18
Latvia	67			-24
Estonia	67			-17
East Germany	62			-12
Japan	62			-4
West Germany	57			-11

Table 2.5
Change in Willingness to Fight for Country in the 1990s

Country	Would fight for my country (mid 90s %)	Pattern of change as compared to the early 90s (%)		
		Increase	No change	Decline
Turkey	96.3	+4.3		
China	93.4			-3.6
Sweden	92.1	+3.6		
Slovenia	89.8	+7.5		
Norway	88.6	+3.4		
Belarus	87.8			-2.8
Finland	84.2			-3.3
Russia	82.2		-1.3	
USA	77.4		-0.4	
Australia	74.6		-0.4*	
Estonia	74.6			-17.6
Chile	74.0			-8.9
Mexico	73.0	+3.3		
Brazil	71.8	+8.6		
South Africa	70.4			-6.7
Switzerland	70.3	+4.4		
Nigeria	69.5			-10.4
Lithuania	68.1			-16.6
Latvia	67.6			-29.8
Armenia	67.0	+20.1		
Spain	58.8		-0.1	
East Germany	49.9			-3.0
West Germany	49.2	+7.5		
Japan	24.2	+3.9		

Measure support for democratic principles

1. I am going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each would you say it is (4) a very good, (3) a fairly good, (2) a fairly bad or (1) a very bad way of governing this country? Having a democratic system.
2. I am going to read off some things that people sometimes say about a democratic system. Could you please tell me if you (4) agree strongly, (3) agree, (2) disagree, or (1) disagree strongly, after I read each of them? Democracy may have many problems but it's better than any other form of government'.

Table 2.6: Mapping Support for Democracy as a Form of Government

	Western Europe	Eastern Europe	Asia	Africa	N.Amer	Southern America	Australia/Oceania
Azerbaijan		87					
Spain		95					
Uruguay						98	
West Germany	93						
Norway	93						
Sweden	93						
Switzerland	93						
East Germany	91						
Argentina						90	
DominicanRep							90
Turkey		89					
Japan			88				
Yugoslavia		88					
USA					88		
Nigeria				87			
Puerto Rico					87		
Lithuania		86					86
Peru							86
South Africa				85			
Estonia		85					
Georgia		85					
Venezuela						85	
South Korea			84				
Taiwan			83				
Australia							83
Slovenia		82					
Latvia		79					79
Chile						78	
Brazil		75					
Belarus							
Finland	75						
Armenia		75					
Ukraine		75					
Philippines			72				
Moldova		71			71		
Russia		61					
Adress	60	81	82	86	84	86	83

Table 2.7: System Age, Level of Democracy, and Support for Democracy as a Form of Government (World Values Survey, 1994/97)

Systems Over 40 Years ^{**} , High Democracy ^{***} (1996)		Systems Under 20 Years, High Democracy (1996)		Systems Over 20 Years, Low Democracy (1996)	
Country	% High Support for Democracy	Country	% High Support for Democracy	Country	% High Support for Democracy
West Germany	93	Croatia	95	Azerbaijan	97
Norway	93	Uruguay	94	Dominican	90
Sweden	93	Spain	92	Republic	
Switzerland	91	East Germany	91	Turkey	89
Japan	88	Argentina	90	Yugoslavia	88
USA	88	Lithuania	86	Nigeria	87
Australia	83	South Africa	85	Peru	86
Finland	75	Africa		Georgia	85
		Estonia	85	Taiwan	83
		South Korea	84	Belarus	75
		Slovenia	82	Armenia	75
		Latvia	79	Ukraine	75
		Chile	79	Philippines	72
		Brazil	78	Moldova	71
				Russia	51
Mean	88		86		80

* Puerto Rico, Venezuela, Mexico are missing
 ** System Age: Gurr, POLITY III Dataset (ICPSR No. 09263)
 *** High Democracy = Freedom House 1996 Rating =/> 2
 Low Democracy = Freedom House 1996 Rating < 2

Measuring support for regime performance

- "People have different views about the system for governing this country. Here is a scale for rating how well things are going: (1) means very bad and 10 means very good. Where on this scale would you put the political system as it is today?"
- "How satisfied are you with how the people now in national office are handling the country's affairs? Would you say you are (4) very satisfied, (3) fairly satisfied, (2) fairly dissatisfied or (1) very dissatisfied?"
- "I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it (4) a great deal of confidence, (3) quite a lot of confidence, (2) not very much confidence, or (1) none at all?"
 - The Parliament
 - The Government in (Capital City)

Table 2.9 System Age, Level of Democracy, and Evaluation of Regime Performance (World Values Survey, 1994/97)

Systems Over 40 Years ^{**} , High Democracy ^{***} (1996)		Systems Under 20 Years, High Democracy (1996)		Systems Over 20 Years, Low Democracy (1996)	
Country	% High Regime Performance	Country	% High Regime Performance	Country	% High Regime Performance
Norway	70	South Africa	54	Azerbaijan	77
Switzerland	46	Chile	38	Taiwan	42
Sweden	33	Croatia	38	Philippines	41
USA	25	Brazil	28	Peru	32
Finland	23	Estonia	22	Yugoslavia	26
Australia	23	Slovenia	21	Turkey	25
West Germany	22	Uruguay	21	Georgia	21
Japan	12	Spain	18	Armenia	17
		Lithuania	17	Moldova	12
		Argentina	16	Nigeria	11
		Latvia	16	Ukraine	10
		East Germany	15	Belarus	8
				DominicanRep	6
				Russia	4
Mean	32		27		24

* Puerto Rico, Mexico, Venezuela do not fit any of the 3 categories
 ** System Age: Gurr, POLITY III Dataset (ICPSR No. 09263)
 *** High Democracy = Freedom House 1996 Rating =/> 2
 Low Democracy = Freedom House 1996 Rating < 2

Confidence in Parliament in the Nineties: Evidence from the World Values Survey

Country	A great deal or quite a lot of confidence (mid-90s, %)	Pattern of change as compared to the early 90s (%)		
		Increase	No change	Decline
Norway	69	+10		
South Africa	60			-6
Turkey	48			-9
Sweden	45		-2	
Estonia	44			-25
Mexico	43	+8		
Chile	38			-25
Nigeria	37			-17
Spain	37		-1	
Brazil	34	+10		
Finland	33			-3
Australia	30			-25
Belarus	30		+0.5	
USA	30			-15
West Germany	29			-21
Japan	27			-3
Lithuania	26			-39
Latvia	25			-47
Slovenia	25			-11
Russia	23			-24
East Germany	17			-24
Argentina	15		-1	

Klingemann's conclusions

- High support for political community
- High support for democratic ideals
- Mixed support for regime performance
- Why?
- What are the possible consequences?

Dalton: Conclusions

Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices

Compares advanced industrial democracies

- General trends in support vary across objects
- Most dramatic erosion in evaluations of politicians and elites –skepticism about authorities
- Feelings of mistrust have broadened to weaker evaluations of politicians and institutions
 - parties, parliaments, & institutions of representative democracy
 - Different periods in different nations
- Most people remain committed to democratic ideals, norms, or principles, or even strengthened support

Typology & Dalton's indicators

	Evaluative	Affective
Community	Best nation to live	National pride National identity
Principles	Demo best form of govnt	Democratic values
Performance	Satisfaction demo process	Approve govnt
Institutions	Performance of inst.	Trust in inst.
Authorities	Candidate evaluations	Trust politicians in general Party id.

Evidence of trends: US authorities

Crooked: "Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are (1958-1972: a little) crooked, not very many are, or do you think hardly any of them are crooked (1958-1972: at all)?"

Benefit few: "Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?"

Waste: "Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?"

Trust government: "How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right -- just about always, most of the time or only some of the time?"

Source: NES 1952-2000

3. Explanations?


- Policy performance eg economy
 - Yet not a consistent fall across nations
- Value change & postmaterialism
 - Pos. correlated to democratic norms
- Social capital
 - Yet this hasn't eroded in all societies
- Media effects
 - Media users (TV) not the source

Dalton's explanation

- High expectations of government yet problems of satisfaction in service delivery and responsiveness due to fragmentation of new policy issues, expansion of the agenda, strength of interest groups, and weakness of aggregating party institutions

Consequences?

- Eroding support in advanced industrialized societies for
 - politicians,
 - parties and
 - political institutions
- Less compliance eg paying taxes, respect for law, jury service
- Changing patterns of activism: from elections to protest politics
- Fuel support for institutional reform



Monday's class

Glenn Firebaugh. 2008. *Seven rules for social research* Ch 1 and 2