

CSES Module 5 Pretest Report:

SOUTH KOREA

August 31, 2016



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
BACKGROUND	3
METHODOLOGY	3
Sample	3
Representativeness	4
DISTRIBUTIONS OF KEY VARIABLES	6
ATTITUDES ABOUT ELITES	6
OUT-GROUP ATTITUDES	
NATIONAL IDENTITY	
FACTOR STRUCTURE	10
HOW THE ITEMS PERFORM AS SCALES	12
ATTITUDES ABOUT ELITES	12
Correlations	12
Factor Analysis.	12
Cronbach's Alpha.	14
OUT-GROUP ATTITUDES	14
Correlations	14
Factor Analysis	14
Cronbach's Alpha.	14
NATIONAL IDENTITY	15
Correlations	15
Factor Analysis.	15
Cronbach's Alpha	16
ADDITIONAL MEASURES	
POLITICS IN THE MEDIA (Q02)	17
INTERNAL EFFICACY (Q03)	17
CORRUPTION (Q07)	18
ATTITUDES TOWARDS REDISTRIBUTION (Q08)	18
SATISFACTION WITH DEMOCRACY (Q19)	19
GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE (Q9)	20

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Gender	4
Table 2. Age	4
Table 3. Education	4
Table 4. Income	4
Table 5. Election Interest	5
Table 6. Attitudes About Elites: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations	7
Table 7. Out-Group Attitudes: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations	8
Table 8. Importance of National Identity: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations	9
Table 9. Pattern Matrix for Three Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation	10
Table 10. Pattern Matrix for Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation	11
Table 11. Polychoric Correlation Matrix for Attitudes About Elites	12
Table 12. Pattern Matrix, Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation, Attitudes About Elites	13
Table 13. Cronbach's Alpha, Attitudes About Elites	
Table 14. Polychoric Correlation Matrix for Out-Group Attitudes	14
Table 15. Pattern Matrix, Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation, Out-Group Attitudes	14
Table 16. Cronbach's Alpha, Out-Group Attitudes	15
Table 17. Polychoric Correlation Matrix for National Identity	15
Table 18. Pattern Matrix, Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation, National Identity	15
Table 19. Cronbach's Alpha, National Identity	16
Table 20. Politics in the Media	17
Table 21. Internal Efficacy	18
Table 22. Corruption	18
Table 23. Attitudes Towards Redistribution	19
Table 24. Satisfaction with Democracy	19
Table 25. Government Performance	20

INTRODUCTION

This report is an overview of the performance of the CSES Module 5 pretest conducted in South Korea in April 2016. The module was implemented in South Korea as part of a post-election study—the 20th National Assembly Election Survey—with data collected between 14th and 23rd of April 2016. The data were collected after the general election held on Wednesday 13th April. A proportional quota sampling method was used and the sample size is N=1,199 respondents.

In South Korea, the pilot was prepared by PI Nam Young Lee and conducted by the Korean Social science Data Center.

Analyses for this report were conducted by Yioryos Nardis, with assistance from Lauren Guggenheim, Kirill Kalinin, and Linda Kimmel, all at Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan.

BACKGROUND

The CSES Module 5 was designed to introduce new measures of political populism to the CSES and investigate the notion of divided democracies. Core objectives of the module were to allow researchers to account for variation in the contestation of political elites and 'populist' attitudes across democracies, examine how 'populist' perceptions shape electoral behavior, and explore the distribution of populist attitudes cross-nationally. The module accounted for three core components, or dimensions, of populist attitudes: (1) attitudes towards political elites and electoral democracy, (2) attitudes towards out-groups within society, and (3) perceptions of "the people" and attachment to the nation. The CSES Planning Committee Module 5 Report further discusses these underlying dimensions, as well as possible sub-dimensions, and expands on the theoretical basis for the module.

The goal of the pretest was to (1) examine the distribution of answers to the questions in the CSES Module 5, and (2) determine how the measures performed as scales representing specific dimensions of populism.

METHODOLOGY

Sample. The sample consisted of individuals aged 19 to 85 years old (i.e., born between 1931 and 1997). Data for several demographic variables were collected, including age (i.e., year of birth), gender, education, income, and political interest.

Demographic variables were cleaned and recoded. Refusals and "Don't Knows" were recoded as missing. To construct the age variable, D01 (Year of birth) was subtracted from 2016. Ranges were then constructed from the resulting ages. D07 was used to create the income variable.

For these demographic variables, descriptive statistics are described below in Tables 1-5.

Representativeness. A proportional quota sampling method was implemented. Therefore, weights were not provided.

Table 1. Gender

	Freq.	Percent
Male	594	49.54
Female	605	50.46
Total	1,199	100

Table 2. Age

	Freq.	Percent
18-30	210	17.51
31-40	220	18.35
41-50	270	22.52
51-60	240	20.02
Over 60	259	21.6
Total	1,199	100

Table 3. Education

	Freq.	Percent
Complete /not complete middle school	79	6.59
Complete/not complete high school	524	43.70
Complete/not complete college	280	23.35
Complete university	316	26.36
Total	1,199	100

Table 4. Income

	Freq.	Percent
Less than 1,000,000	27	2.25
1,000,000 ~ 1,990,000	79	6.59
2,000,000 ~ 2,990,000	188	15.68
3,000,000 ~ 3,990,000	279	23.27
4,000,000 ~ 4,990,000	333	27.77
5,000,000 ~ 5,990,000	210	17.51
6,000,000 ~ 6,990,000	50	4.17
More than 7,000,000	33	2.75
Total	1,199	100

Table 5. Election Interest

	Freq.	Percent				
Very interested	138	11.51				
Somewhat	513	42.79				
interested						
Not very	427	35.61				
interested						
Not at all	121	10.09				
interested						
Total	1,199	100				
Notes. Election Interest is Q01: How interested would you						
say you are in this election?						

DISTRIBUTIONS OF KEY VARIABLES

Tables 6-8 below show the frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations of each of the items contributing to the scales for Attitudes about Elites, Out-Group Attitudes, and National Identity. To investigate whether missing data could be a problem, we provide the percentages of "don't know" responses and respondent refusals for each item.

ATTITUDES ABOUT ELITES

The following questions on attitudes toward the elite are included in Module 5:

- Q04_1 In a democracy it is important to seek compromise among different viewpoints.
- Q04_2 Most politicians do not care about the people.
- Q04_3 Most politicians are trustworthy.
- Q04_4 Politicians are the main problem in [COUNTRY].
- Q04_5 Having a strong leader in government is good for [COUNTRY] even if the leader bends the rules to get things done.
- Q04_6 The people, and not politicians, should make our most important policy decisions.
- Q04_7 Most politicians care only about the interests of the rich and powerful.
- Q04_8 Poor people should have a greater voice in politics.

Table 6 shows that the variables are normally distributed. The only question that exhibited some skewness is Q04_1 "In a democracy it is important to seek compromise among different viewpoints", where most respondents skewed towards agreeing. In fact, 80.47% of respondents either strongly or somewhat agreed with this statement. There do not appear to be notable issues with the questions comprising the Attitudes about Elites dimension in Table 6. Overall, the percent missing is very low.

Table 6. Attitudes About Elites: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations

Table 6.7 tellea	%	%	% Neither	%	%	13			
	Strongly	Somewhat	Agree nor	Somewhat	Strongly				
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree				
Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	%DK	%Ref.	М	SD
Q04_1									
Important to									
seek									
compromise	19.45	61.02	14.67	4.11	0.75	0.50	0	2.06	0.76
Q04_2 Most									
politicians									
do not care	12.61	38.01	30.99	16.62	1.75	0.17	0	2.57	0.97
Q04_3 Most									
politicians									
are									
trustworthy	1.42	13.90	25.96	41.29	17.42	0.42	0	3.59	0.98
Q04_4									
Politicians									
are the main									
problem	11.96	40.72	28.18	15.97	3.18	0.25	0	2.58	0.10
Q04_5									
Having a									
strong									
leader	11.71	35.20	31.02	18.06	4.01	0.25	0	2.67	1.03
Q04_6 The									
people									
should make									
policy									
decisions	7.60	33.67	39.68	17.46	1.59	0.17	0	2.72	0.89
Q04_7 Most									
politicians									
care only									
about the									
rich	14.31	43.60	31.13	9.46	1.51	0.33	0	2.40	0.90
Q04_8 Poor									
people -									
greater									
voice	6.78	34.42	44.39	12.81	1.59	0.42	0	2.68	0.84

Note. N=1,199. DK is "Don't Know" responses and Ref. is refusals.

OUT-GROUP ATTITUDES

The following attitude questions were asked about out-groups:

Now thinking about immigrants. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement?

Q05a. Ethnic minorities should adapt to [COUNTRY]'s way of life.

And now thinking specifically about immigrants: Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements?

Q05b. Immigrants are generally good for [COUNTRY]'s economy.

Q05c. [COUNTRY]'s culture is generally harmed by immigrants.

Table 7 below shows the percentages, means, and standard deviations for attitudes about outgroups. The variables are normally distributed and as above, there is little item-missing data. It should be noted however, that for Q05a the original CSES questionnaire referred to 'ethnic minorities' and not 'immigrants', but 'immigrants' was used in the South Korean questionnaire.

Table 7. Out-Group Attitudes: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations

		%	% Neither	%	%				
	% Strongly	Somewhat	Agree nor	Somewhat	Strongly				
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree				
Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	%DK	%Ref.	М	SD
Q05A									
Immigrants									
should adapt	15.43	48.46	26.61	7.42	1.17	0.92	0	2.30	0.86
Q05B_1									
Immigrants									
good for									
economy	5.92	40.78	37.20	12.84	2.17	1.08	0	2.64	0.86
Q05B 2									
Culture									
harmed by									
immigrants	5.67	25.94	41.12	22.52	3.75	1.00	0	2.93	0.93

Note. N=1,199. DK is "Don't Know" responses and Ref. is refusals.

NATIONAL IDENTITY

In addition to the previous group of questions the following questions on national identity were included in order to understand respondents' views on national self-determination:

Some people say that the following things are important for being truly [NATIONALITY]. Other says they are not important.

How important do you think each of the following is... very important, fairly important, not very important, or not important at all?

Q06_1. To have been born in [COUNTRY].

Q06 2. To have lived in [COUNTRY] for most of one's life.

Q06_3. To be able to speak [COUNTRY NATIONAL LANGUAGES].

Q06_5. To respect [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] political institutions and laws.

Q06_6. To feel [COUNTRY NATIONALITY].

Q06_7. To have [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] ancestry.

Item *Q06_4*. To be [COUNTRY DOMINANT RELIGION] was excluded from the South Korean questionnaire. Table 8 shows that across the remaining six measures, most respondents tended to think that a sense of South Korean identity is very important or fairly important to being Korean. The measures are similarly distributed and the percent missing is very low.

Table 8. Importance of National Identity: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations

				% Not				
	% Very	% Fairly	% Not Very	Important				
	Important	Important	Important	at All				
Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	%DK	%Ref.	М	SD
Q06_1 Born in								_
South Korea	36.45	49.29	12.51	1.58	0.17	0	1.79	0.71
Q06_2 Lived in								
South Korea	40.37	43.79	14.10	1.50	0.25	0	1.77	0.74
Q06_3 Speak								
Korean	45.20	39.70	13.43	1.42	0.25	0	1.71	0.75
Q06_5								
Respect South								
Korean laws	43.79	44.04	11.26	0.5	0.42	0	1.68	0.69
Q06_6 Feel								
South Korean	38.45	49.29	10.09	1.83	0.33	0	1.75	0.71
Q06_7 Have								
South Korean								
ancestry	30.36	41.03	21.77	6.42	0.42	0	2.05	0.92

FACTOR STRUCTURE

Because populism is thought to have three main dimensions in the Module 5 proposal, we conduct an exploratory factor analysis on the populism measures, fixing the number of dimensions to three. We conduct a factor analysis with principal component factoring using oblimin (an oblique) rotation, allowing the factors to be correlated.

Below are results fixing factors to three (Table 9) and with an unfixed number of factors (Table 10).

Table 9. Pattern Matrix for Three Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Uniqueness
Q04_1 Important to seek compromise	.34			.79
Q04_2 Most politicians do not care		.68		.54
Q04_3 Most politicians trustworthy		69		.51
Q04_4 Politicians are the main problem		.57		.67
Q04_5 Having a strong leader			.33	.83
Q04_6 The people should make policy decisions			.70	.51
Q04_7 Most politicians care only about the rich		.62	.43	.43
Q04_8 Poor people-greater voice			.71	.46
Q05A Immigrants should adapt	.44			.79
Q05B_1 Immigrants good for economy				.91
Q05B_2 Culture harmed by immigrants				.86
Q06_1 Born in South Korea	.71			.49
Q06_2 Lived in South Korea	.71			.50
Q06_3 Speak Korean	.69			.52
Q06_5 Respect South Korea's laws	.58			.62
Q06_6 Feel South Korean	.64			.57
Q06_7 Have South Korean ancestry	.73			.46

Notes. Principal component factors. Rotated solution. For ease of interpretation, blanks represent loadings less than .3.

In the three factor solution, the factors differ from the dimensions proposed in the report. Most of the measures on Attitudes About Elites load on two separate factors, while the Out-Group Attitudes do not load significantly on any one factor. Factor 2 represents trust in politicians, while factor 3 seems to represent the desire for people to be more involved in public policy. The measures about the importance of national identity all load on same factor.

Table 10. Pattern Matrix for Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Uniqueness
Q04_1 Important to seek compromise			.75			.41
Q04_2 Most politicians do not care		.65				.54
Q04_3 Most politicians trustworthy		71				.48
Q04_4 Politicians are the main problem		.61				.58
Q04_5 Having a strong leader			.52			.69
Q04_6 The people should make policy						
decisions				.71		.48
Q04_7 Most politicians care only about						
the rich		.55		.46		.42
Q04_8 Poor people-greater voice				.80		.34
Q05A Immigrants should adapt			.56		.48	.41
Q05B_1 Immigrants good for economy					.69	.50
Q05B_2 Culture harmed by immigrants					.71	.42
Q06_1 Born in South Korea	.69					.48
Q06_2 Lived in South Korea	.67					.48
Q06_3 Speak Korean	.72					.47
Q06_5 Respect South Korea's laws	.59					.57
Q06_6 Feel South Korean	.73					.47
Q06_7 Have South Korean ancestry	.73					.43

Notes. Principal component factors. Rotated solution. For ease of interpretation, blanks represent loadings less than .3.

In the open factor solution, shown in Table 10, Factor 1 represents the importance of national identity. The measures on Attitudes About Elites load on three separate factors. Factor 2 represents trust in politicians, while factor 3 seems to represent the importance of political leadership. Factor 4 seems to represent the desire for people to be more involved in public policy. The final factor represents Out-Group Attitudes where unlike in the three factor solution, all variables load onto one factor.

HOW THE ITEMS PERFORM AS SCALES

The next set of analyses investigates how well each set of items, or dimensions, scale. Scaling is examined using correlations and Cronbach's alpha. We also look at the dimensionality of each set of items using factor analysis. To look at the correlations, we use polychoric correlation coefficients. These allow for the use of ordinal variables with a small number of response options (where the underlying trait being measured is assumed to be continuous). They can be interpreted the same way as a Pearson's coefficient.

The factor analyses use the same procedures as above. We again use oblimin (an oblique) rotation, allowing the factors to be correlated. Our expectation is that if multiple factors emerge from these sets of items, the factors should be associated with one another.

ATTITUDES ABOUT ELITES

Correlations. Table 11 shows the polychoric correlations between the Attitudes About Elites items. The table generally shows small to moderate correlations between the items. The importance of seeking compromise (Q04_1) is extremely weakly correlated with the other items. Likewise, having a strong leader (Q04_5) has only a very minor correlation with the other items. The negative coefficients for Q04_3 show that the direction of this item should be reversed to fit with this scale.

Table 11. Polychoric Correlation Matrix for Attitudes About Elites

	Q04_1	Q04_2	Q04_3	Q04_4	Q04_5	Q04_6	Q04_7	Q04_8
Q04_1 Important to seek								
compromise	1.00							
Q04_2 Most politicians do								
not care	0.05	1.00						
Q04_3 Most politicians								
trustworthy	-0.02	-0.29	1.00					
Q04_4 Politicians are the								
main problem	0.10	0.26	-0.25	1.00				
Q04_5 Having a strong								
leader	0.16	0.07	0.08	0.12	1.00			
Q04_6 The people should								
make policy decisions	0.12	0.08	-0.01	0.05	0.11	1.00		
Q04_7 Most politicians care								
only about the rich	0.13	0.38	-0.28	0.29	0.11	0.18	1.00	
Q04_8 Poor people-greater								
voice	0.06	0.14	-0.05	0.12	0.07	0.33	0.42	1.00

Factor Analysis. The factor loadings in Table 12 suggest that there are three factors (using oblimin rotation and pcf factoring, as above). The first factor seems to be distrust in political elites, the second factor appears to be a desire for an increase in democratic decision-making. The third factor contains the important to seek compromise and the notion of having a strong leader in power.

Table 12. Pattern Matrix, Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation, Attitudes About Elites

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Uniqueness
Q04_1 Important to seek				
compromise			.68	.53
Q04_2 Most politicians				
do not care	.68			.52
Q04_3 Most politicians				
trustworthy	71			.47
Q04_4 Politicians are the				
main problem	.63			.54
Q04_5 Having a strong				
leader			.76	.42
Q04_6 The people should				
make policy decisions		.74		.44
Q04_7 Most politicians				
care only about the rich	.56	.45		.42
Q04_8 Poor people-				
greater voice		.81		.32

Table 13. Cronbach's Alpha, Attitudes About Elites

				Average	
		Item-test	Item-rest	inter-item	Alpha if item
Item	N	correlation	correlation	covariance	deleted
Q04_1. Important to seek					
compromise	1193	.34	.13	.12	.52
Q04_2. Most politicians					
do not care	1197	.56	.33	.09	.46
Q04_3. Most politicians					
trustworthy	1194	.45	.20	.11	.52
Q04_4. Politicians are the					
main problem	1196	.54	.29	.10	.48
Q04_5. Having a strong					
leader	1196	.40	.12	.12	.55
Q04_6. The people					
should make policy					
decisions	1197	.43	.19	.11	.52
Q04_7. Most politicians					
care only about the rich	1195	.64	.46	.08	.42
Q04_8. Poor people-					
greater voice	1994	.50	.29	.10	.49
				Covariance	Alpha
Test scale				.11	.53

Notes. The direction of item Q04_3, Most Politicians Are Trustworthy was reversed.

Cronbach's Alpha. Table 13 shows the Cronbach's alpha for Attitudes About Elites as well as the alphas if each item is deleted. The alpha for Attitudes About Elites is .53. The items all perform quite equivalently and deleting any one item does not significantly improve the Cronbach's alpha for the scale.

OUT-GROUP ATTITUDES

Correlations. The table below (Table 14) shows the polychoric correlation matrix for Out-Group Attitudes. The correlations are similar in size, ranging from .19 to .26. Item 'Q05B_1 Immigrants good for economy' is positively correlated to items 'Q05A Immigrants should adapt' and 'Q05B_2 Culture harmed by immigrants'. It was expected to have a negative correlation with those two items.

Table 14. Polychoric Correlation Matrix for Out-Group Attitudes

	Q05A	Q05B_1	Q05B_2
Q05A Immigrants should adapt	1.00		
Q05B_1 Immigrants good for economy	0.26	1.00	
Q05B_2 Culture harmed by immigrants	0.20	0.19	1.00

Factor Analysis. The table below (Table 15) shows that there is only a single factor (using oblimin rotation and pcf factoring, as above). The items appear to tap the same underlying dimension of Out-Group Attitudes.

Table 15. Pattern Matrix, Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation, Out-Group Attitudes

Item	Factor1	Uniqueness
Q05A Immigrants should adapt	.72	.49
Q05B_1 Immigrants good for economy	.68	.53
Q05B_2 Culture harmed by immigrants	.63	.61

Cronbach's Alpha. Table 16 shows the Cronbach's alpha for Out-Group Attitudes as well as the alphas if each item is deleted. The alpha for Out-Group Attitudes is .40. Dropping any of the items does not improve the reliability of the scale.

Table 16. Cronbach's Alpha, Out-Group Attitudes

				Average	
		Item-test	Item-rest	inter-item	Alpha if item
Item	N	correlation	correlation	covariance	deleted
Q05A Immigrants should					
adapt	1188	.68	.27	.12	.26
Q05B_1 Immigrants good					
for economy	1186	.67	.24	.15	.31
Q05B_2 Culture harmed by					
immigrants	1187	.68	.21	.16	.36
				Covariance	Alpha
Test scale				.14	.40

Notes. The direction of item Q05b. Immigrants are generally good for [COUNTRY]'s economy was reversed.

NATIONAL IDENTITY

Correlations. The table below (Table 17) shows the polychoric correlation matrix for National Identity. The table generally shows moderate to large correlations between all the items.

Table 17. Polychoric Correlation Matrix for National Identity						
	Q06_1	Q06_2	Q06_3	Q06_5	Q06_6	Q06_7
Q06_1 Born in South Korea	1.00					
Q06_2 Lived in South Korea	0.58	1.00				
Q06_3 Speak Korean	0.49	0.50	1.00			
Q06_5 Respect South Korea's laws	0.37	0.32	0.45	1.00		
Q06_6 Feel South Korean	0.39	0.46	0.46	0.55	1.00	
Q06_7 Have South Korean ancestry	0.61	0.53	0.56	0.32	0.48	1.00

Factor Analysis. The factor loadings shown in Table 18, below, suggest that there is one factor for national identity (using oblimin rotation and pcf factoring, as above).

Table 18. Pattern Matrix, Unfixed Factor Solution Using Oblimin Rotation, National Identity

Item	Factor1	Uniqueness
Q06_1 Born in South Korea	.72	.48
Q06_2 Lived in South Korea	.72	.48
Q06_3 Speak Korean	.72	.48
Q06_5 Respect South Korea's laws	.60	.65
Q06_6 Feel South Korean	.69	.53
Q06_7 Have South Korean ancestry	.74	.45

Cronbach's Alpha. The results of these tests suggest that all items fit well in the National Identity scale. Deleting any one item does not improve the reliability of the scale.

Table 19. Cronbach's Alpha, National Identity

				Average inter-	
		Item-test	Item-rest	item	Alpha if item
ltem	N	correlation	correlation	covariance	deleted
Q06_1 Born in South Korea	1197	.71	.58	.22	.75
Q06_2 Lived in South Korea	1196	.71	.57	.22	.75
Q06_3 Speak Korean	1196	.72	.57	.22	.75
Q06_5 Respect South					
Korea's laws	1194	.60	.43	.25	.78
Q06_6 Feel South Korean	1195	.69	.54	.23	.76
Q06_7 Have South Korean					
ancestry	1195	.76	.58	.20	.75
				Covariance	Alpha
Test scale				.22	.79

ADDITIONAL MEASURES

Although the focus of Module 5 is measuring populist attitudes, the broader purpose is to investigate divided democracies. Other measures were added to the module with this purpose in mind. Some of these measures are new to the CSES. We check their frequency distributions, means, standard deviations, and missing data (see Tables 20 to 24).

Overall, the levels of missing data are very low. The question about corruption (Table 22) has the most missing data (1.33%), and attitudes towards income redistribution has .5% missing data (Table 23). Additionally, it is worth noting that respondents feel that corruption is extremely widespread in South Korea (Table 22). Other questions were quite normally distributed.

POLITICS IN THE MEDIA (Q02)

How closely do you follow politics on TV, radio, newspapers, or the Internet? Very closely, fairly closely, not very closely, or not at all? (1 = 'very closely'; 4 = 'not at all')

Table 20. Politics in the Media

Categories	%
Very closely	5.6
Fairly closely	31.8
Not very closely	48.5
Not at all	13.4
Others (specify)	0.8
Missing	0
Mean	SD
2.7	0.8

INTERNAL EFFICACY (Q03)

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of the following statements:

You feel you understand the most important political issues of this country. (1 = 'strongly agree'; 5 = 'strongly disagree').

Table 21. Internal Efficacy

Categories	%
Strongly Agree	4.5
Somewhat Agree	39.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	42.0
Somewhat Disagree	12.8
Strongly Disagree	1.4
Missing	0
Mean	SD
2.7	0.8

CORRUPTION (Q07)

How widespread do you think corruption such as bribe taking is among politicians in South Korea: very widespread, quite widespread, not very widespread, or it hardly happens at all? (1 = 'very widespread'; 4 = 'it hardly happens at all')

Table 22. Corruption

10000 == 100000000000000000000000000000	
Categories	%
Very Widespread	24.9
Quite Widespread	65.1
Not Very Widespread	8.5
It Hardly Happens At All	0.2
Don't Know	1.3
Mean	SD
1.9	0.9

ATTITUDES TOWARDS REDISTRIBUTION (Q08)

Some people think that the government should cut taxes even if it means spending less on social services such as health and education. Other people feel that the government should spend more on social services such as health and education even if it means raising taxes. Where would you place yourself on this scale where 0 is "Governments should decrease taxes and spend less on services" and 10 is "Governments should increase taxes and spend more on services"?

Table 23. Attitudes Towards Redistribution

Categories		%
0 – Government should		
decrease taxes and spend le	:SS	
on services		1.1
	1	4.0
	2	5.8
	3	9.8
	4	15.5
	5	19.8
	6	20.4
	7	15.9
	8	5.6
	9	1.1
10 – Government should		
increase taxes and spend me	ore	
on services		0.6
Don't Know		0.5
Mean		SD
5.5		6.8

SATISFACTION WITH DEMOCRACY (Q19)

On the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in South Korea? (1 = 'very satisfied'; 4 = 'not at all satisfied')

Table 24. Satisfaction with Democracy

Category	%
Very satisfied	1.1
Fairly satisfied	42.6
Not very satisfied	49.6
Not at all satisfied	6.7
Missing	0
Mean	SD
2.6	0.6

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE (Q9)

Now thinking about the performance of the government of Geun-hye Park president in general, how good or bad a job do you think the government of Geun-hye Park president did over the past three years? Has she done a very good job? (1 = 'very good job'; 4 = 'very bad job')

Table 25. Government Performance

Category	%
Very good job	2.4
Good job	37.3
Bad job	48.7
Very bad job	11.59
Missing	
Mean	SD
2.7	0.7