CSES Planning Committee. Module 6 Draft Proposal

"Representative Democracy under Pressure"

Module 6 subcommittee:

Marina Costa Lobo (Chair), Universidade de Lisboa

Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Universität Mannheim

David Sulmont, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

Markus Wagner, Universität Wien

December 2021

Executive Summary

- The broad theme of Module 6 is "Representative democracy under pressure", following agreement in the CSES Planning Committee meeting in Lausanne, February 2020 and the virtual Plenary meeting in November 2021.
- The Module includes three blocks of items: Block 1 focuses on the functioning of the democratic system and perceptions on system outputs; Block 2 concentrates on representation with a special focus on gender representation and representative democratic procedures; Block 3 deals with alternative preferences of government.
- The impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which affects all countries, and may have important consequences for society and the quality of democracy, has been taken into account in each block, as it reinforces the validity of the Module's theme.
- We have fielded two calls for proposals, a broad one and another focusing just on Covid in 2019/2020. The Module, while forming a cohesive whole, draws extensively on proposals received, as explained below. We therefore hope to maximize use of the Module by meeting researchers' agendas.

Introduction

2019 marked the 30th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, a moment which signaled the end of the Cold War, and the dawn of an era of democratization in the world. 30 years on, some have argued that the world is entering a period of "democratic recession" (Diamond 2015) or "democratic backsliding" (Bermeo 2016), others point to the fact that in several countries, alternative regimes to liberal democracy have gained support in public opinion over time (Steenekamp and du Toit 2017). Despite the fact that this diagnosis has been contested (Levitsky and Way 2015), the evidence does seem to be gathering strength (Mainwaring and Bizzarro 2019). According to the most recent Freedom House Report, "2018 recorded the 13th consecutive year of decline in global freedom (…) Between 2005 and 2018, the share of not free countries rose to 26 percent, while the share of free countries declined to 44 percent" (Freedom House 2019, 1).

What is new about these trends is that this decline in Freedom is affecting a variety of countries in every single region of the globe, from the United States to Brazil to Austria (The Economist Intelligence Unit 2019, 7). Latin America has also not escaped this trend (Zechmeister and Lupu 2019; Corporación Latinobarómetro 2019; Lagos 2019). Mainwaring and Bizzarro, come to a similar conclusion while surveying the fate of third wave democracies:

> "Among the 91 new democracies that emerged during the third wave, 34 experienced breakdowns, often in short order. In 28 cases, democracy stagnated after the transition, usually at a fairly low level, and in two others it eroded. There have been some successes; 23 regimes achieved major democratic advances between their first year of democracy and 2017." (Mainwaring and Bizzarro 2019, 100).

Understanding and explaining this decline in democracy is a challenge the CSES should take on. Moreover, the impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which affects all countries, and may have important consequences for society, as well as the quality of democracy, highlighting the importance of conducting a survey which assesses trends in democracy worldwide.

CSES has a global vocation, gathering election studies from over 50 countries around the world in the Americas, Asia, Europe and Africa. It is really one of the few research projects which has this broad scope, and the only one which focuses on post-electoral attitudes and behavior. Therefore, the CSES is best placed to analyze the causes and consequences of this emerging trend of a decline in democracy around the world, among old and new democracies. In addition, CSES has, from the outset, had the goal of understanding how electoral systems and the electoral process contribute to democracy. For the last 25 years it has built up a longitudinal perspective on the way in which these attitudes shape democracy, which can be put to good use when considering how a module that considers the declining democracies should be formulated.

Finding a Theme for Module 6 followed a wide process of consultation with colleagues. The CSES Subcommittee for Module 6 received 22 proposals for the questionnaire. Following discussion, a broad consensus was reached on several proposals that pertain to democratic attitudes. We also launched a second call, for Covid-related proposals in the Summer of 2020, which found only limited resonance (three proposals) and led to the inclusion of a small number of additional items related to the pandemic.

In this draft we provide an overarching framework under the broad umbrella of "representative democracy under pressure", which is composed of three blocks of items. Namely, how well the democratic system works, and perceptions of system outputs; representation with a special focus on gender representation and representative democratic procedures; and alternative preferences of government. We then explain what items were included in each block of questions and how they relate to the proposals received by the Committee. Next, we present the questionnaire which was formulated. At the end we provide information of the question sources, with a view to place these in a comparative perspective with other surveys, as well as longitudinally, with CSES previous modules.

Representative Democracy under Pressure, Measures and Variables of Interest

The alarming nature of reports on the state of democracy is not that recent. In fact, it has already led to a substantial amount of scholarly literature on the subject. An increasing number of studies have monitored the widespread dissatisfaction with government performance, as well as distrust of political institutions (Dalton 2004). Norris (1999) introduced the concept of critical citizens, who are those who, despite being committed to the principles of democracy, nonetheless are increasingly critical of the way democracy works.

Indeed, when moving from the country analysis to the individual level analysis of democratic attitudes, a fundamental starting point is the measurement of satisfaction with democracy (SWD). In a seminal study on the meaning of SWD, Linde and Ekman (2003) found the following:

> "Departing from a theoretical multidimensional model of political support, and drawing on large-scale public opinion surveys, (…) the survey item 'satisfaction with the way democracy works' is not an indicator of support for the principles of democracy. Rather, it (…) taps the level of support for the way the democratic regime works in practice (…) this item is far from a perfect indicator of support for the performance of a democratic regime, since it is highly sensitive to different institutional contexts." (p. 391)

The authors argue for a cautious approach when analyzing political support and legitimacy, by including multiple indicators. Thus, even though SWD should be an anchor question for Module

6, it is important to reflect on the other indicators which need to be included as well, namely trust in political institutions.

Rising levels of dissatisfaction with democracy have been the focus of study, as well as probing the causes for this change in attitudes towards how democracy works in practice. Explanations for dissatisfaction with democracy could be related both to issues of system performance, as well as quality of representation (Norris 1999; Rothstein 2009; Dahlberg and Holmberg 2014). Indeed, Norris' study on critical citizens noted that these tended to exhibit higher levels of education, and political information. The author was quite optimistic in suggesting that these citizens were holding democratic institutions to higher standards, and making demands on them, to become more representative. Other authors maintain that both the procedural features (the "input" side) and the outcomes of democratic systems (liberty, equality, public services and distribution of material goods) are key elements to evaluate the quality of democracy (Morlino 2004; 2007).

When considering the improvement of institutions, the need for better *electoral* institutions seems to loom large in this "input" driven explanatory model of democratic dissatisfaction. In addition, we know from the literature on democratic backsliding (Bermeo 2016) that, increasingly, the deterioration of democracy can be detected through electoral manipulation. Thus, the quality of electoral processes needs to be at the center of the *input* dimension of the investigation into the dissatisfaction with democracy.

Not only do electoral processes need to be at the center of the "input" driven model of democratic dissatisfaction. When considering the deficit in the quality of representative democracy, one emerging issue is the degree of participation as well as representation of women in political institutions. In some European countries, the role of women in politics has been emerging as a potential cleavage with attitudes towards women important factors of voting behavior. CSES Module 6 will thus innovate in bringing the deficit of women's participation as a potential factor of democratic (dis)satisfaction.

When considering the "output" factors which may drive support for democracy, several issues need to be considered. Namely, it has been argued that performance may be judged by citizens not only in terms of outcomes such as economic growth or a functioning health care system, but also in terms of *quality* of governance such as effective, non-corrupt institutions (Magalhães 2014; Dahlberg, Linde, and Holmberg 2015; Kotze and Garcia-Rivero 2017).

Going beyond the issues of variables which may influence (dis)satisfaction with democracy, it is important to measure support for different *models* of democracy, namely a plebiscitary vs. a technocratic or a "stealth" model of democracy (Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002; del Río, Navarro, and Front 2016; Font, Wojcieszak, and Navarro 2015). To date, not enough research has been undertaken on this front (Bertsou and Pastorella 2017) for lack of the necessary data

concerning preferences for either model of democracy. Citizen dissatisfaction due to inputs or output deficits are very much related to preferences regarding the degree of involvement of citizens, politicians, businesspeople, or experts generally in the political process. Given these multiple issues which may have an impact on representative democracy, we have opted to propose three different, but interrelated blocks of items which we present below.

Figure 1. Representative Democracy under Stress- Framework for Analysis

Trust and Support for Democracy & system outputs	Representation & Representative democratic procedures	Alternative Types of Government

Trust and Support for Democracy
 - Satisfaction with Democracy
 - Support for Democracy in principle
 - How democratic is country
 - Covid impact on society/ democracy
 	
 - Trust in Institutions (inc. scientists)
 	
 System Outputs
 - Government performance
     - General
     - Citizens treated fairly
     - Adequate healthcare
     - Handling the consequences of covid-19
	Electoral Process
	 - Satisfaction with variety of choice in election
	 - Satisfaction with vote
	 - Fairness of elections
	
	 Gender and Representation
	 - Satisfaction with number of women in Parliament
	 - Attitudes towards women in power during public health/economic crisis.
	 - Attitudes towards gender policies
	
	 Media
	 - Media use during campaign
		- Support for strong executive
		 - Support for courts' role in political process
		 - Support for government by:
		 - Business leaders
		 - Independent experts
		 - Citizens in Referendums

In the rest of the document we therefore introduce potential questions for each of the blocks outlined above and the way in which they relate to proposals made to the CSES.

How Well the Democratic System Works & System Outputs

Measures of democratic attitudes were proposed by a sizable number of responses to the CSES Call for Questions. Theoretically they made references to a variety of themes, most prominently among them the current debate about democratic backsliding, the worldwide crisis of liberal democracy and its challenge through plebiscitarian and executive-dominated populism and the concomitant intensification of political and societal polarization and identity politics. This development bears the potential to erode the normative foundations and institutional architecture of liberal democracy with its emphasis on minority protection and the containment of governmental power through the separation of powers and in particular an independent judiciary as well as elected representatives as core agency of authoritative decision-making. Since elections are at the heart of this model of democracy, this is a theme of crucial relevance for the CSES.

We anchored the instrument in the standard question about respondents' satisfaction with democracy which was suggested by several proposals (Pilet et al. 2019; Ridge 2019) and has

anyway been a standard ingredient of the CSES during all previous waves. This instrument is often interpreted as a measure of "specific" support for democracy. It concerns the way democracy has been implemented in a particular political system and the actual functioning of its political process. Thus, it is related to the output dimension of democratic politics. Taking up an impulse from Ridge's proposal about "democratic commitment" we complemented this question with a set of three items that indicate more principled, "diffuse" support of the notion of a democratic political order as such (partly asking for comparative assessments vis à vis non-democratic regimes). To obtain a complete picture of respondents' more general stances towards democracy we also found it important to include a measure that registers people's perceptions of the extent to which their own political system actually qualifies as democratic. Finally, we include an item to measure the extent to which the respondent considers that the coronavirus pandemic has affected the country's society and democracy.

To address the more specific level of attitudes towards democratic regimes' institutional architecture we included a set of standard questions about confidence in institutions and groups, following the proposal by Pilet et al. However, for lack of space we limited the range of institutions addressed by this question to the following institutions: parliament, government, the judiciary, political parties, traditional news media, social media and scientists. While parliament, government and parties pertain to elections and representation, including the judiciary makes sure that also the specific role of the courts and the rule of law within the separation of powers is covered. The latter also responds to the proposal by Driscoll and Nelson (2019), although in a more expansive fashion, since the proposal itself focused more narrowly on Supreme Courts within Presidential systems.

We propose a set of items aiming to elicit respondents' process preferences with regard to the locus of power in political decision-making. They are inspired by several proposals, most prominently the very extensive one by Pilet et al. However, not all categories of potentially powerful actors proposed by these colleagues could be adopted in our draft. We concentrated on those that we felt were most interesting from the point of view of a comparative study of global scope and with reference to the overall theme of liberal democracy under challenge – these items are discussed at length. First, to address the recent populist drive towards strong executive-dominated leadership we included an item about desirable governmental leadership strength. Adopting items along these lines was present in different module 6 proposals (Kodastinova 2019; McCoy et al. 2019; Driscoll and Nelson 2019).

System Outputs

To analyze the output factors that can explain different levels of (dis)satisfaction with democracy, we propose a general question on the performance of government and a set of indicators that tap three dimensions of the outcomes of democratic performance that can be important for citizens. One dimension corresponds to the fulfillment of basic needs that, according to several classic studies (Inglehart 1997; Inglehart and Welzel 2005), can shape citizen's attitudes towards the political system: material and physical security. In that sense, we propose a question about the evaluation of the economy (sociotropic) and for the country's capacity to guarantee that all groups in society are treated fairly. Within this first dimension, we also added an item on the government's handling of the consequences of the covid-19 crisis.

The second dimension concerns a question about the government's ability to provide adequate healthcare for all citizens. This taps the general perceptions of governments' social welfare performance, as well as eliciting public opinion on the way in which each government has dealt with the public health challenge of Covid-19.

Representation & Representative Democratic Procedures

Under the block of questions which deal with representation and representative democratic procedures we include a number of items, which deal with the electoral process, gender representation, and media exposure.[1]

On the quality of the electoral process, we focus on how elections are conducted and how politicians and governments are chosen, drawing on the Plescia et al. (2019) proposal. The main questions concern satisfaction with the voting process, specifically: (a) the variety of choice in the last election; and (b) one's own decision not to vote or one's own decision to vote for the party/candidate you voted for. A complementary item included perceptions of fairness of elections.

Concerning gender representation, our proposal draws on Alexander et al. (2019) as well as Fraile et al. (2019). In the first question we seek the perceptions on the proportion of women in parliament. This item is useful to contextualise perceptions on gender policies.

Two questions aim to measure respondents' attitudes towards women in politics more generally, moving beyond numerical representation, combined with perceptions of leadership during a crisis, which were put forward in two proposals following the Covid Call for proposals (Smith, 2020; Piscopo and Franceschet, 2020). Namely, the items ask whether men are better political leaders than women in both a public health and economic crises. A final item in this section aims

---

[1] There is a possibility that media items be included in the core part of the questionnaire.

to elicit attitudes towards policies which promote gender equality, namely whether policies to increase the representation/improve status of women have gone too far.

Module 6 also aims to integrate the use of media in the analysis of electoral behavior and system attitudes. For decades, the role of the (traditional) news media for their audience's democratic attitudes has been controversially debated (Newton 2017; van Aelst 2017). Responding to the rapid change that many countries' media systems have been undergoing in recent years, it has in a similar vein been asked whether political attitudes, views on democracy, as well as views about politicians may be changing or becoming more polarized through extensive use of social media (e.g. Klein and Robinson 2020). The latter may also have an effect on participation (Boulianne 2015). Despite several anecdotal evidence pointing to the importance of social media use for the outcomes of elections, in actual fact very little is known in a comparative perspective of the causes and consequences of traditional, but in particular also social media use for political attitudes and electoral behavior. We therefore include an instrument that registers the relevance of media as sources of electoral information during campaigns in a way that strikes a balance between the necessary specificity of media channels (de Vreese and Neijens 2016), suitability for comparative research of a worldwide scope (Schmitt-Beck 2012), and efficiency in terms of questionnaire space.

Alternative Preferences of Government

Connected to the broad goal of understanding representative democracy under stress, there are more specific lines of argument where proposals referred to research on process preferences, that is, citizens' conceptions of ideal governance. Where should the locus of control ultimately reside, with elected representatives, or rather with experts, businesspeople, or the citizens themselves? We include here three items. The first two relate to research about "stealth democracy" and address authoritative decision-making by businesspersons and experts. The latter also refers to Flores' more extensive proposal about "technocratic" governance (Flores 2019). The third item queries whether respondents would prefer a more direct democracy, as suggested, besides Pilet et al., also by Flores (2019). It elicits views about the role of referendums; Pilet et al. proposed to include also items about new modes of citizen engagement like mini-publics (composed of small groups of citizens chosen by lot). We find this interesting and theoretically relevant, but nonetheless refrained from including the proposed items because we doubt that relevant numbers of respondents will have sufficient knowledge of such democratic innovations to express meaningful opinions, so that the proposed, rather simple measurement would presumably not work.

Therefore, as can be gauged from the account of items included, no single proposal was accepted in its entirety. Instead, we sought to capture the main questions posed by a number of proposals

that address the broad theme of "Representative Democracy under Pressure". In this way, we hope to provide a Module that will allow very different perspectives on the ways in which our political systems are evolving.

References

Alexander, Amy, Tiffany Barnes, Elin Bjarnegard, Catherine Bolzendahl, Melanie Hughes, and Jessica Walters. 2019. "The Attitudinal Foundations of Gendered Political Inequality. CSES Module 6 Proposal."

Bermeo, Nancy. 2016. "On Democratic Backsliding." *Journal of Democracy* 27 (1): 5–19. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2016.0012.

Bertsou, Eri, and Giulia Pastorella. 2017. "Technocratic Attitudes: A Citizens' Perspective of Expert Decision-Making." *West European Politics* 40 (2): 430–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2016.1242046.

Boulianne, Shelley (2015). Social media use and participation: a meta-analysis of current research. *Information, Communication & Society* 18(5): 524-538.

Castorena, Oscar, and Sarah Graves. 2019. "Support for Electoral Democracy." In *Pulse of Democracy*, edited by Elisabeth J. Zechmeister and Noam Lupu. Nashville, TN: LAPOP. https://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/ab2018/2018-19_AmericasBarometer_Regional_Report_10.13.19.pdf.

Corporación Latinobarómetro. 2019. "Informe Latinobarómetro 2018." Corporación Latinobarómetro. http://www.latinobarometro.org/latdocs/INFORME_2018_LATINOBAROMETRO.pdf.

Dahlberg, Stefan, and Sören Holmberg. 2014. "Democracy and Bureaucracy: How Their Quality Matters for Popular Satisfaction." *West European Politics* 37 (3): 515–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2013.830468.

Dahlberg, Stefan, Jonas Linde, and Sören Holmberg. 2015. "Democratic Discontent in Old and New Democracies: Assessing the Importance of Democratic Input and Governmental Output." *Political Studies* 63 (S1): 18–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12170.

Dalton, Russell J. 2004. *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices : The Erosion of Political Support in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

De Vreese, Claes H., and Neijens, Peter (2016). Measuring Media Exposure in a Changing Communications Environment. *Communication Methods and Measures* 10(2-3): 69-80.

Diamond, Larry. 2015. "Facing Up to the Democratic Recession." *Journal of Democracy* 26 (1): 141–55. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2015.0009.

Doorenspleet, Renske. 2012. "Critical Citizens, Democratic Support and Satisfaction in African Democracies." *International Political Science Review* 33 (3): 279–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512111431906.

Driscoll, Amanda, and Michael Nelson. 2019. "Public Support for Judicial Institutions. CSES Module 6 Proposal."

Flores, Thomas. 2019. "Technocracy in the Minds of Voters. A Proposal for CSES Module 6."

Font, Joan, Magdalena Wojcieszak, and Clemente J. Navarro. 2015. "Participation, Representation and Expertise: Citizen Preferences for Political Decision-Making Processes:" *Political Studies*, February. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9248.12191.

Fraile, Marta, Dani Marinova, Carolina de Miguel Moyer, Jessica Fortin-Rittberger, Jessica Mendez, and Hilde Coffé. 2019. "Gender Equality in the Ballot Box. CSES Module 6 Proposal."

Freedom House. 2019. "Freedom in the World 2019: Democracy in Retreat." January 15, 2019. https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2019/democracy-in-retreat.

Hibbing, John R., and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs about How Government Should Work*. Cambridge Studies in Political Psychology and Public Opinion. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization : Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald, and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Klein, Elad, and Robison, Joshua (2020). Like, Post, and Distrust? How Social Media Use Affects Trust in Government. *Political Communication* 37(1): 46-64.

Kodastinova, Petia. 2019. "Capturing Authoritarian Attitudes among Citizens in Democracies around the World. CSES Module 6 Proposal."

Kotze, Hennie, and Carlos Garcia-Rivero. 2017. "Institutions, Crises, and Political Confidence in Seven Contemporary Democracies. An Elite-Mass Analysis." *Journal of Public Affairs* 17 (1–2): e1642. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1642.

Lagos, Marta. 2019. "El Fin de La Tercera Ola de Democracias." Corporación Latinobarómetro. http://www.latinobarometro.org/latdocs/Annus_Horribilis.pdf.

Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan Way. 2015. "The Myth of Democratic Recession." *Journal of Democracy* 26 (1): 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2015.0007.

Linde, Jonas, and Joakim Ekman. 2003. "Satisfaction with Democracy: A Note on a Frequently Used Indicator in Comparative Politics." *European Journal of Political Research* 42 (3): 391–408. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.00089.

Magalhães, Pedro C. 2014. "Government Effectiveness and Support for Democracy: Government Effectiveness and Support for Democracy." *European Journal of Political Research* 53 (1): 77–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12024.

Mainwaring, Scott, and Fernando Bizzarro. 2019. "The Fates of Third-Wave Democracies." *Journal of Democracy* 30 (1): 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2019.0008.

McCoy, Jennifer, Ioannis Andreadis, Kirk Hwkins, Alban Lauka, Levi Littvay, and Carlos Meléndez. 2019. "New Measures of Us vs Them Political Polarization and Democratic Erosion: A Proposal for CSES Module 6."

Morlino, Leonardo. 2004. "What Is a 'Good' Democracy?" *Democratization* 11 (5): 10–32.

———. 2007. "Explicar La Calidad Democrática: ¿Qué Tan Relevantes Son Las Tradiciones Autoritarias?" *Revista de Ciencia Política* 27 (2): 3–22.

Newton, Kenneth (2017). Political Trust and the Mass Media. In Zmerli, Sonja and Tom Van Der Meer (Eds.), *Handbook on Political Trust.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar (353-372).

Norris, Pippa. 1999. *Critical Citizens*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0198295685.001.0001.

Pilet, Jean Benoit, Camille Bedock, Nicole Curato, David Farrel, Brigitte Geissel, Kimmo Grönlund, Sofie Marien, Alan Renwick, Vincent Jacquet, and Min Reuchamps. 2019. "Citizen's Democratic Preferences and Voting". CSES Module 6 Proposal.

Piscopo, Jessica, and Susana Franceschet. 2020. "Persistence or Transformation? Gendered Leadership Stereotypes and Covid-19". CSES Covid-Call Module 6

Proposal.

Plescia, C., Blais, A., & Högström, J. (2019). Do people want a 'fairer' electoral system? An experimental study in four countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, doi: 10.1111/1475-6765.12372."

Ridge, Hannah. 2019. "Electoral Impact on Democratic Commitment. CSES Module 6 Proposal."

Río, Adrián del, Clemente Navarro, and Joan Front. 2016. "Ciudadanía, Políticos y Expertos En La Toma de Decisiones Políticas: La Percepción de Las Cualidades de Los Actores Políticos Importan." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, no. 154: 83–102.

Rothstein, Bo. 2009. "Creating Political Legitimacy: Electoral Democracy Versus Quality of Government." *American Behavioral Scientist*, October. https://doi.org/10.1177/000276420933879

Schmitt-Beck, Rudiger (2012), Comparing Effects of Political Communication. In Esser, Frank and Thomas Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The Comparative Handbook of Communication Research*. New York/London: Routledge (400-409).

Smith, Jessica. 2020. " A 'Feminised' Crisis? Desirable Leadership Traits in Times of Coronavirus". CSES Covid-Call Module 6 Proposal.

Steenekamp, Cindy, and Pierre du Toit. 2017. "The Evolution of Support for Democratic Regime Principles and Its Alternatives." *Journal of Public Affairs* 17 (1–2): e1644. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1644.

The Economist Intelligence Unit. 2019. "Democracy Index 2018: Me Too?" Economist Intelligence Unit. October 22, 2019. https://www.eiu.com/n/democracy-index-2018/.

Van Aelst, Peter (2017). Media Malaise and the Decline of Legitimacy: Any Room for Good News? In Van Ham, Carolien, Jacques Thomassen et al. (Eds.), *Myth and Reality of the Legitimacy Crisis. Explaining Trends and Cross-national Differences in Established Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (95-114).

Zechmeister, Elisabeth J., and Noam Lupu. 2019. "Pulse of Democracy." Nashville, TN: LAPOP. https://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/ab2018/2018-19_AmericasBarometer_Regional_Report_10.13.19.pdf.

DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE – CSES MODULE 6[2]

TRUST AND SUPPORT POR DEMOCRACY AND ALTERNATIVE TYPES OF GOVERNMENT

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements (RANDOMIZE ORDERING OF ITEMS):

Q04a Democracy is always and under all circumstances preferable to any other kind of government.
Q04b The courts should be able to stop the government acting beyond its authority.
Q04c Having a strong leader in government is good for COUNTRY even if the leader bends the rules to get things done.
Q04d Policies to increase the representation of women in politics have gone too far.

a) Strongly agree
b) Somewhat agree
c) Neither agree nor disagree
d) Somewhat disagree
e) Strongly disagree

Q06 On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means COUNTRY is not at all democratic, and 10 means COUNTRY is completely democratic, what position would you choose?

0 Not at all Democratic
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 Completely Democratic

I would now like to ask you a question about how much trust you have in certain institutions and groups. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if you trust it completely, trust it somewhat, not very much or not at all?

Q07a Parliament
Q07b Government
Q07c The judiciary
Q07d Scientists
Q07e The political parties
Q07f Traditional news media, such as newspapers, television or radio
Q07g Social media, such as Facebook, Twitter or Whatsapp *(Note to collaborators: please name the most appropriate examples for your country and election)*

a) Trust it completely

---

[2] The numbering and ordering of the Module's questions correspond to the numbering and ordering of the final CSES questionnaire.

b) Trust it somewhat
c) Do not trust it very much
d) Do not trust it at all

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements: Instead of elected politicians, the country would be run better if important political decisions were left up to…

5.1. Successful business leaders
5.2. Independent experts
5.3. Citizens in referendums

a) Strongly agree
b) Somewhat agree
c) Neither agree nor disagree
d) Somewhat disagree
e) Strongly disagree

ELECTORAL PROCESS

Q12 Are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with the variety of choice in the last election?

a) Very satisfied
b) Fairly satisfied
c) Not very satisfied
d) Not at all satisfied

Q11a FOR VOTERS WHO VOTED FOR A PARTY/CANDIDATE: Are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with your decision to vote for the party/candidate you voted for in the last election?

Q11b FOR VOTERS WHO VOTED FOR BLANK/INVALID: Are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with your decision to vote BLANK/INVALID in the last election?

Q11c FOR NON-VOTERS: Are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with your decision not to vote in the last election?

a) Very satisfied
b) Fairly satisfied
c) Not very satisfied
d) Not at all satisfied

NOTE: **Q13** to be asked immediately after the vote choice question.

Q13 In some countries, people believe that the elections are conducted fairly. In other countries, people believe that the elections are conducted unfairly. Thinking of the last election in [country], where would you place it on a scale of one to five where ONE means that the last election was conducted fairly and FIVE means that the last election was conducted unfairly?

1 : Last election was conducted fairly
2
3
4
5: Last election was conducted unfairly

GENDER

Q24 The current percentage of women in parliament after the most recent election is XX%. Thinking

about this percentage, would you say that it is too high, too low or about right?
a) Too high
b) Too low
c) About right

Please randomize **Q25a** and **Q25b**

Q25a Who is better suited to lead the country during a public health crisis: Male political leaders, female political leaders or both equally?

a) Always male political leaders
b) Usually male political leaders
c) Both equally
d) Usually female political leaders
e) Always female political leaders

Q25b Who is better suited to lead the country during an economic crisis: Male political leaders, female political leaders or both equally?

a) Always male political leaders
b) Usually male political leaders
c) Both equally
d) Usually female political leaders
e) Always female political leaders

SYSTEM OUTPUTS

Q08a Now thinking about the performance of the [government in [CAPITAL]/president] in general, how good or bad a job do you think the [government/president in [CAPITAL]] has done over the past [NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE LAST GOVERNMENT TOOK OFFICE, BEFORE THE CURRENT ELECTION] years? Has [it/he/she] done a very good job? A good job? A bad job? A very bad job?
a) A very good job
b) A good job
c) A bad job
d) A very bad job

Q08b And how good or bad a job do you think the [government/president in [CAPITAL]] has done over the past [NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE LAST GOVERNMENT TOOK OFFICE, BEFORE THE CURRENT ELECTION] years specifically in handling the consequences of the coronavirus pandemic? Has [it/he/she] done a very good job? A good job? A bad job? A very bad job?

a) Has [it/he/she] done a very good job?
b) A good job?
c) A bad job?
d) A very bad job?

Q26a How fairly do you think that all groups in society are treated in COUNTRY: very fairly, quite fairly, not very fairly or not fairly at all?
a) Very fairly
b) Quite fairly
c) Not very fairly
d) Not fairly at all

Q26b How well do you think that our political system guarantees adequate healthcare for all citizens: very well, quite well, not very well or not well at all?
a) Very well
b) Quite well
c) Not very well
d) Not well at all

MEDIA USE

During the recent election campaign, in a typical week, how many days did you:

Q02a Watch the news on a public television broadcaster? (*Note to collaborators: please name the most appropriate examples for your country and election of public television broadcaster if necessary*)

Q02b Watch the news on a commercial television broadcaster? (*Note to collaborators: please name the most appropriate examples for your country and election of commercial television broadcaster if necessary*)

Q02c Listen to the news on the radio?

Q02d Read newspapers?

Q02e Visit online news sites?

Q02f Use social media such as Facebook, Twitter, or Whatsapp to follow news about parties and candidates?(*Note to collaborators: please name the most appropriate examples for your country and election*)

    0. None/Zero days   -> GO TO QUESTION **Q03**
    1. One Day   -> GO TO QUESTION **Q03**
    2. Two Days   -> GO TO QUESTION **Q03**
    3. Three Days   -> GO TO QUESTION **Q03**
    4. Four Days   -> GO TO QUESTION **Q03**
    5. Five Days   -> GO TO QUESTION **Q03**
    6. Six Days   -> GO TO QUESTION **Q03**
    7. Seven Days

Q02g (This question should be asked only of respondents who answered "7. Seven Days" in **Q02f**). And how often during a typical day did you use social media such as Facebook, Twitter, or Whatsapp to follow news about parties and candidates - only about once per day, several times per day, or at least ten times per day?

    1. Only about once per day
    2. Several times per day
    3. At least ten times per day

CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC

(Note to collaborators: Covid may become less important over time. If this occurs, please insert the following clause at the start of the Coronavirus battery of questions (Q27a-d): "Thinking back to the Coronavirus pandemic…")f

Q27a How did the coronavirus pandemic affect how united society is in COUNTRY?

    a) Very positively
    b) Fairly positively
    c) Not at all
    d) Fairly negatively
    e) Very negatively

Q27b How did the coronavirus pandemic affect the functioning of democracy here in COUNTRY: very positively, fairly positively, not at all, fairly negatively or very negatively?

    a) Very positively
    b) Fairly positively
    c) Not at all
    d) Fairly negatively
    e) Very negatively

Q27c As viewed from today, how did the coronavirus pandemic affect your personal economic situation: very positively, fairly positively, not at all, fairly negatively or very negatively?

    a) Very positively
    b) Fairly positively
    c) Not at all
    d) Fairly negatively
    e) Very negatively

Q27d To the best of your knowledge, were you or anyone living with you infected with the coronavirus? Please indicate if you would rather not answer this question.

    a) Yes
    b) No
    c) I would rather not say

CORE QUESTIONS NEEDED

Satisfaction with democracy
Political interest
Retrospective economic perceptions
Internal political efficacy

SOURCES OF QUESTIONS

Q04a	Adapted from WVS Round 6, LAPOP Round 8, EVS Round 5
Q04b	ESS Round 6
Q04c	Asked in CSES Module 5
Q04d	Adapted from module proposal (Fraile et al. 2019)
Q06	Adapted from CSES Round 6, WVS Round 6, EVS Round 5
Q27a	New
Q27b	New
Q07a-g	Adapted from module proposal (Pilet et al. 2019)
Q05a-c	Adapted from module proposal (Pilet et al., 2019 Flores, 2019)
Q12	Adapted from module proposal (Plescia et al.2019)
Q11a-c	Adapted from module proposal (Plescia et al. 2019)
Q13	From module proposal (Plescia et al. 2019); also asked in CSES Module 1
Q24	Adapted from module proposal (Fraile et al. 2019)
Q25a	Adapted from module proposal (Piscopo and Franceschet, 2020.)
Q25b	Adapted from module proposal (Piscopo and Franceschet, 2020.)
Q08a	Asked in CSES Modules 2,3, 5
Q08b	New
Q26a	New
Q26b	New
Q02a-g	de Vreese and Neijens 2016, Schmitt-Beck 2012
Q27d	Adapted from European Social Survey- Covid 19 Module
Q27c	New