



**An Asian Barometer Conference on  
The State of Democratic Governance in Asia**

**Session I. A Historical and Theoretical Overview**

**Quality of Democracy and Regime Legitimacy in  
East Asia**

*By*

*Yun-han Chu*

*Min-hua Huang*

*Yu-tzung Chang*

*National Taiwan University*

# Quality of Democracy and Regime Legitimacy in East Asia\*

Yun-han Chu

Distinguished Research Fellow, Institute of Political Science, Academia Sinica  
yunhan@gate.sinica.edu.tw

Min-hua Huang

Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University  
mhhuang5103@ntu.edu.tw

Yu-tzung Chang

Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University  
yutzung@ntu.edu.tw

\*Paper prepared for delivery at an Asian Barometer Conference on “The State of Democratic Governance in Asia” organized by Program for East Asia Democratic Studies of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences, National Taiwan University, and co-sponsored by The Asia Foundation and Institute of Political Science at Academia Sinica, June 20-21, 2008, Taipei, Taiwan.

\*\* This is only a draft. Please do not quote without authors' written permission \*\*

## Quality of Democracy and Regime Legitimacy in East Asia

### I. Introduction

Over the last two decades, three organizing concepts – democratic transition, democratic consolidation and quality of democracy – have in turn guided the analysis of political change in the developing world. In the 1980s and early 1990s, much of the analysis of the concurrent movement toward democracy in the developing world was influenced by the pioneering work by Guillermo O’Donnell, Juan Linz and Lawrence Whitehead as well as that of Adam Przeworski.<sup>1</sup> Their analysis on democratic transition placed enormous emphasis on the analysis of the choices and strategic interactions of contending elites in an authoritarian regime and its democratic opposition.

Entering the second half of 1990s, the focus of the analysis on third-wave democracies has shifted to consolidation as most countries have moved beyond the stage of the introduction of democracy. While literature on democratic consolidation has varied greatly in terms of the breadth and depth of coverage of political arena, they share one central research question, i.e., the survivability of the new democratic regime.<sup>2</sup> This lopsided emphasis on the endurance of democracy was understandable but it also left social scientists, democracy practitioners, concerned citizens and aid agencies with a growing sense of dissatisfaction. As Philippe Schmitter pointed out that democracy may become consolidated at any level of quality, so long as citizens and politicians come to accept the rules of democratic competition.<sup>3</sup>

Over the last few years, a growing number of students of democracy have sought to develop means of framing and assessing the quality of democracy and identify ways to improve the quality of democratic governance.<sup>4</sup> This stream of theory,

---

<sup>1</sup> Guillermo O’Donnell, Juan Linz and Lawrence Whitehead. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.); Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reform in Eastern Europe and Latin American* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

<sup>2</sup> See for example, Richard Gunther, Nikiforos Diamandouros and Hans-Jurgen Puhle, eds. *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995); Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, Latin America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), Leonardo Morlino, *Democracy Between Consolidation and Crisis. Parties, Groups and Citizens in Southern Europe*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), and Larry Diamond, *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

<sup>3</sup> Philippe Schmitter, “The Ambiguous Virtues of Accountability,” in Larry Diamond and Leonardo Morlino eds., *Assessing Quality of Democracy* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005): 18-31.

<sup>4</sup> See for example, David Beetham, Stuart Weir, Sarah Raching, and Lan Kearton. *International IDEA Handbook on Democracy Assessment* (Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2001); David Beetham, “Towards a Universal Framework for Democracy Assessment,” *Democratization* 11 (April 2004): 1-17;

methodological innovation, and empirical research was prompted by a growing concern among social scientists, democracy practitioners and donor organizations that many third-wave democracies might be stuck in a low-quality equilibrium and run out of the steam of deepening democratic reform. Many empirical studies have shown that the gap between the reality and promise of democracy has been widening and there are widespread perceptions that democratically elected governments and officials are corrupt, incompetent and unresponsive and untrustworthy.<sup>5</sup> In a bulk of third-wave countries without concerted efforts to improve democratic quality it is unlikely that democracy can achieve a broad and durable legitimacy.

If deepening democratic reform is an imperative for all emerging democracies, it is even more so for young democracies in East Asia. In this region democracy not only faces gathering problem of growing popular dissatisfaction or even disillusion but some fierce competitors. Democracy has to compete not only with its predecessor that still lingers on in people's memory (sometimes in a nostalgic way) but also with its efficacious authoritarian and semi-authoritarian neighbors. In this context, the democratic future of East Asia depends very much on the emerging characteristics as well as the performance of the region's existing democracies.<sup>6</sup> If the perceived quality of democracy fails to live up to people's expectation, democracy will not be able to win over the heart of the people in the long run. Also, if democracy does not shine in the eyes of the people of East Asia, its demonstration effect will be very limited and the region's further democratization will be cast in doubt.

However the relationship between democratic legitimacy and quality of democracy is a complex one. The conventional wisdom holds that popular commitment to democratic regime will gain strength if the characteristics as well as the performance of the democratic regime are perceived to be superior to the old regime on some important indicators of good governance, such as political liberty, equality, rule of law, accountability, transparency, and responsiveness. On the other hand, symptoms of bad governance, such as rampant corruption, electoral fraud and protracted gridlock, corrode people's trust in democratic institution.<sup>7</sup>

---

David Altman and Anibal Perez-Linan, "Assessing the Quality of Democracy: Freedom, Competitiveness and Participation in Eighteen Latin American Countries," *Democratization* 9 (Summer 2002), 85-100; Larry Diamond and Leonardo Morlino eds., *Assessing Quality of Democracy* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005)

<sup>5</sup> Yun-han Chu, Larry Diamond and Doh Chull Shin, "Halting Progress in Korea and Taiwan," *Journal of Democracy*, 12, 1 (February 2001): 122-136; Micheal Bratton, Robert Mattes and E. Gyimah-Boadi. *Public Opinion, Democracy, and Market Reform in Africa* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Marta Lagos Cruz-Coke, "A Road with No Return?" *Journal of Democracy* 14, 2 (April 2003): 163-173.

<sup>6</sup> Yun-han Chu, "Third-Wave Democratization in East Asia: Challenges and Prospect", *ASIEN*, 100 (July 2006); Yutzung Chang, Yun-han Chu and Min-hua Huang, "The Uneven Growth of Democratic Legitimacy in East Asia," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 18 (Summer 2006): 246-255

<sup>7</sup> Michael Bratton and Robert Mattes. "Support for Democracy In Africa: Intrinsic Or Instrumental?"

There are two ways to make sense of people's evaluation of the quality of democracy. From the supply side, political leaders and institutions are oftentimes identified as major factors shaping the characteristics of a democracy. One can always trace the root cause of bad governance to corrupt politicians and faulty institutional design, which have failed to supply the valued properties of liberal democracy. The other side of the same equation, however, concerns the demand side. How people evaluate quality of democracy on various scores also depends on what and how much they expect out of a democratic regime. Some prior empirical research suggests that people holding stronger belief in liberal democratic values may demand more out of a democratic regime and become more critical of the actual performance of their real-life democracy. In this sense, "democrats" can be democracy's tough customers.<sup>8</sup> This is intrinsically not a bad thing because at the macro level the causal relationship may operate in a reverse way. At the macro level, strong aggregate demand based on widespread popular commitment to liberal democratic values may compel politicians and parties to deliver good governance, which in turn reinforces the legitimacy of the democratic regime.

In this paper, I aim to accomplish a three-fold analytical task. First, I review the recent efforts to conceptualize and measure quality of democracy by way of introducing a comprehensive battery for measuring some essential properties of liberal democracy. This battery was designed and employed by Asian Barometer Survey (ABS).<sup>9</sup> Next, I present an empirical assessment of the quality of East Asian third-wave democracies based on the data clued from the latest wave of ABS. I examine to what extent do East Asian citizens think their current regimes have embodied the essential properties of liberal democracy? What particular properties do they perceive to be most and least lacking in the regimes? Third, I explore the complex relationship among various aspects of quality of democracy, popular support for democracy and belief in liberal democratic values. Through a multivariate analysis, I identify dimensions of quality of democracy that are most important to the growth of

---

*British Journal of Political Science* 31 (2001): 447-474; Eric Chang and Yun-han Chu, "Political Corruption and Institutional Trust in East Asia," *Journal of Politics*, 68, 2 (May 2006).

<sup>8</sup> Yun-han Chu and Chin-en Wu, "The Voice of the People: How East Asians Evaluate the Quality of Democracy," paper presented at the 20th IPSA World Congress, Fukuoda, July 9-13, 2006.

<sup>9</sup> The Asian Barometer survey (ABS) represents the region's first collaborative initiative to develop a regional network of democracy studies based on surveying ordinary citizens. Between June 2001 and February 2003, the ABS implemented its first-round comparative survey in eight East Asian countries and territories, namely Japan, South Korea, Mongolia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, Hong Kong and China. The ABS launched its second-round survey in October 2005 and its geographical scope was enlarged to cover five more countries in the region. By July 2007 the fieldwork in South Korea, Mongolia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, Singapore and Japan was completed and the survey in China, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Cambodia and Malaysia. All ABS data were collected through face-to-face interviews of randomly selected eligible voters in each participating country. Interested readers are welcome to browse the project's website ([www.asianbarometer.org](http://www.asianbarometer.org)) for methodological details.

popular commitment to democracy. Also, I examine the syndrome of “disaffected democrats” and explore its implications for the development of liberal democracy.

## II. Conceptualizing and Measuring Quality of Democracy

The quality of democracy has recently become a subject of increasing and widespread concern in policy circles and the scholarly community. How well do democracies perform as governments by the people and for the people? What type of democratic regime is most likely to provide “kinder and gentler qualities of democracy”? What qualities of democracy do new democracies most lack? These questions have been raised in response to a growing sense of public discontentment with the democratic political process in both old and new democracies.<sup>10</sup>

In recent years, an increasing number of individual scholars and research institutions have attempted to address these questions by discerning the distinct qualities of democracy and distinguishing high-quality democracies from low-quality ones. In doing so, individual scholars and research institutions have employed a variety of political goals, principles, and values as criteria or standards for appraising the quality of democracy. The number of these criteria varies considerably from one study to another as do the substantive characteristics or natures of the criteria. Yet, all the research thus far seeks to assess the extent to which political regimes actually embody generic values of democracy and they satisfy some of its standard procedures or procedural norms.

In his pioneering work, Arend Lijphart compared the quality of democracy in 36 countries and concluded that consensus democracy tends to be the “kinder and gentler” form of democracy.<sup>11</sup> In assessing and comparing the quality of these democracies, he considered a large number of democratic political values and principles, including representation, equality, participation, proximity, satisfaction, accountability, and majority rule. In their seminal attempt to assess the quality of democracy in Latin American countries, David Altman and Anibal Perez-Linan considered a more limited set of criteria — participation, competition, and civil liberty.<sup>12</sup> Besides individual scholars, a number of national and international institutions have also made serious efforts to assess the quality of democracy. Most notably, the International Institute of Democracy and Electoral Assistance in

---

<sup>10</sup> For the analysis of popular disenchantment in established democracies, see for example, Pippa Norris, ed., *Critical Citizens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Susan J. Pharr and Robert D. Putnam, eds., *Disaffected Democracies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

<sup>11</sup> Arend Lijphart. *Patterns of Democracy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999): 275.

<sup>12</sup> David Altman and Anibal Perez-Linan, “Assessing the Quality of Democracy: Freedom, Competitiveness and Participation in Eighteen Latin American Countries,” *Democratization* 9 (Summer 2002), 85-100.

Stockholm has launched a multinational project assessing the democratic political practices of new democracies.<sup>13</sup> Two basic principles of representative democracy underlie its assessment framework. They are popular control and political equality. From these principles, the IDEA derived seven standards: participation, authorization, representation, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and solidarity. These standards were used to measure the democratic strength of particular countries.

Larry Diamond and Leonardo Morlino have put forward a most systematic conceptual scheme to date for identifying the essential properties of liberal democracy. They began their analysis by offering clear-cut definitions of the terms “democracy” and “quality,” and then tried to integrate the two into a multidimensional conception of democratic quality. They posited that democracy requires four elements at the minimum: 1) universal, adult suffrage; 2) recurring, free, competitive and fair elections; 3) more than one serious political party; and 4) alternative sources of information. They further reasoned that there must be some degree of civil and political freedom beyond the electoral arena, permitting citizens to articulate and organize around their political beliefs and interests to make truly meaningful, free and fair elections possible. In addition, formal democratic institutions should be sovereign in fact, that is they should not be constrained by elites or external powers that are not directly or indirectly accountable to the people. Furthermore, they suggested that once a regime meets these basic conditions, it can be further analyzed if and to what extent it achieves the three main goals of an ideal democracy—political and civil freedom, popular accountability and political equality—as well as broader standards of good governance, such as transparency, legality, and responsible rule.<sup>14</sup>

Quality usually refers to one of three following things: procedure, content or result. From the perspective of quality in terms of procedure, they identify five dimensions: the rule of law, participation, competition, and accountability, both vertical and horizontal, on which democracies vary in quality. From the perspective of quality in terms of content, they identify two dimensions: respect for civil and political freedoms, and the progressive implementation of greater political equality. From the perspective of quality in terms of result, they identify one key dimension, i.e., responsiveness, which links the procedural dimensions to the substantive ones by measuring the extent to which public policies correspond to citizen demands and preferences, as aggregated through the political process.

Riding on the tail of their intellectual advancement, Asian Barometer Survey developed and employed a full array of indicators that correspond to the eight dimensions mentioned above in its latest wave of region-wide comparative survey.

---

<sup>13</sup> Beetham et. al., *International IDEA Handbook on Democracy Assessment*.

<sup>14</sup> Larry Diamond and Leonardo, “Introduction” in Larry Diamond and Leonardo eds. *Assessing Quality of Democracy* (2005): x-xi.

For most of the eight dimensions, ABS typically designed two or three indicators. There are two major exceptions. First we broke down “Rule of Law” dimension into two sub-dimensions, one measuring “law-abiding government” and the other “corruption”. This is necessary we believe that to capture the extraordinary impact of political corruption in shaping people’s orientation toward democracy. Next, we broke down participation dimensions into three sub-dimensions, namely electoral participation, political interest and political efficacy. All together ABS employed the following twenty items to cover the eight dimensions:

## **A. Rule of Law**

### ***Law-abiding government***

- 1) Our current courts always punish the guilty even if they are high-ranking officials.
- 2) How often do national government officials abide by the law?

### ***Corruption***

- 1) How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in the national government?
- 2) In your opinion, is the government working to crackdown corruption and root out bribes?

## **B. Competition**

- 1) Political parties or candidates in our country have equal access to the mass media during the election period.
- 2) How often do you think our elections offer the voters a real choice between different parties/candidates?
- 3) On the whole, how would you rate the freeness and fairness of the last national election?

## **C. Participation**

### ***Electoral Participation***

- 1) In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they were away from home, they were sick or they just didn’t have time. How about you? Did you vote in the election [the most recent national election, parliamentary or presidential] held in [year]?
- 2) Thinking about the national election in [year], did you attend a campaign meeting or rally?
- 3) Thinking about the national election in [year], did you try to persuade others to vote for a certain candidate or party?



### ***Political Interest***

- 1) How interested would you say you are in politics?
- 2) How often do you follow news about politics and government?

### ***Political Efficacy***

- (1) I think I have the ability to participate in politics.
- (2) Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.

### **D. Vertical Accountability**

- 1) People have the power to change a government they don't like.
- 2) Between elections, the people have no way of holding the government responsible for its actions.
- 3) How often do government officials withhold important information from the public view?

### **E. Horizontal Accountability**

- 1) When the government breaks the laws, there is nothing the legal system can do.
- 2) To what extent is the legislature capable of keeping the government in check?

### **F. Freedom**

- 1) People are free to speak what they think without fear.
- 2) People can join any organization they like without fear.

### **G. Equality**

- 1) Everyone is treated equally by the government.
- 2) People have basic necessities like food, clothes, and shelter.

### **H. Responsiveness**

- 1) How well do you think the government responds to what people want?
- 2) How likely is it that the government will solve the most important problem you identified within the next five years?

For the sake of measurement quality, we intentionally avoid following the same question format for all twenty-five items.<sup>15</sup> Some questions were phrased as a

---

<sup>15</sup> Multi-format and multi-indicator approach is widely regarded as a prudent strategy to enhance the reliability of one's measurement.

descriptive (factual) statement to solicit agreement or disagreement from the respondents. A disagreement means that the respondents don't think the description fit the current situation. An example is the first item for measuring Rule of Law, "Our current courts always punish the guilty even if they are high-ranking officials", which is followed by a four-point response grid, ranging from "Strongly Agree," "Somewhat Agree," "Somewhat Disagree," to "Strongly Disagree."<sup>16</sup> Also, not all the questions are phrased in positive direction. Some of them are intentionally set in a negative tone. For example, the second question measuring vertical accountability, which reads, "Between elections, the people have no way of holding the government responsible for its actions." Disagreement to this statement is taken as a positive assessment.

At the same time, many questions were phrased as an interpolative statement to solicit a substantive response from the interviewees. The second item for measuring "Law-Abiding Government" belongs to this category. After we prompted our respondents with the statement, "How often do national government officials abide by the law?" they were asked to select one out of four substantive response categories: "Always," "Most of the Time," "Sometimes," "Rarely".<sup>17</sup>

Most of the twenty-five questions follow either one of these two formats with the exception of three items for measuring level of "electoral participation", which were designed as dichotomous variables getting straight "Yes" or "No" answer.

Given the constraints of questionnaire space, respondents' patience and their willingness to cooperate, we were not able to employ as many indicators as necessary to match the full breadth and depth of the conceptual scheme developed by Larry Diamond and Leonardo Morlino. But the twenty-five-item battery the second-wave ABS employed, we believe, represents the most comprehensive and systematic effort thus far to empirically assess the quality of democracy through survey research in East Asia or anywhere in the world.

Our approach privileges public opinion survey because epistemologically we believe that quality, like beauty, is assumed to lie in the eye of the beholder or the person experiencing the democracy. Regardless of how international donors or academic think tanks rate the extent of democracy in a given country, this form of regime will be consolidated only when the bulk of the public believes that democracy actually is better for their society and that democracy of an acceptable quality is being supplied. In a nutshell, the citizens are the final judges of the legitimacy as well as the characteristics of their democracy. Public opinion surveys such as Asian Barometer offers a valuable vantage point on whether the citizenry considers that political institutions produce an acceptable degree of democracy and deliver an acceptable

---

<sup>16</sup> All together, there are nine items following this format. Please refer to Appendix A for details.

<sup>17</sup> The verbal response grid for this type of question is custom made for each question. Please refer to Appendix A for the complete wording of each question.

level of good governance.

### III. Assessing Quality of Democracy in East Asia

The ABS conducted its second-round survey in the region's six third-wave democracies, namely South Korea, Taiwan, Mongolia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand (which was a democracy before the military coup of September 2006) and East Asia's only established democracy, Japan, between October 2005 and May 2007.<sup>18</sup> During the same period, the survey was also implemented in Malaysia, Singapore and Hong Kong, being popularly referred to as Asia's semi-democratic regimes, plus Vietnam, one of the region's fast-growing transitional societies.<sup>19</sup> Surveys in semi-democratic regimes and transitional societies can serve as useful cases of reference for comparative research.<sup>20</sup> Altogether 13,700 East Asian citizens were interviewed with each country surveying more than 1,000 adults.<sup>21</sup>

In Table 1.1 thru 1.11, I report the percentage distribution of positive evaluation based on each of the twenty-five questions. I group our eleven countries into four groups, established democracy, emerging democracies, semi-democratic regimes and transitional societies in recognition of the significant difference among them in terms of institutional setting and trajectory of regime evolution.

For the sake of space, all four-point response grids were collapsed into dichotomous variables and only the percentage of giving a positive answer is reported in the tables. All questions are given an ID code, which corresponds to its serial number in the original questionnaire. For instance, 59.6% in the second row of the first column in Table 1.1 means that 59.6% of our Korean respondent answered "Strongly agree" or "Somewhat agree" to Q104, which reads "Our current courts always punish the guilty even if they are high-ranking officials." Another example, 23.6% in the second row of the sixth column in Table 1.2 means that less than a quarter of our Mongolian respondents answered either "Hardly anyone is involved" or "Not a lot of officials are corrupt" to Q118, which reads "How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in the national government?" Lastly, answers to all twenty questions are aligned in one direction, i.e., positive assessment (which

---

<sup>18</sup> The second-round ABS survey in Thailand was conducted in April and May of 2006, just four months before the military coup.

<sup>19</sup> The survey in Cambodia was completed by early June but it is too late to include it in this analysis. Also, the survey in the PRC is still underway and is expected to be finished by the end of July.

<sup>20</sup> All surveys were conducted through face-to-face interviews with a randomly selected sample of respondents that represents the adult population in each country. The research instrument was translated into local languages. Trained fieldworkers conducted each interview in the local language of the respondent's choice.

<sup>21</sup> Hong Kong is the only exception where budget constraints and high degree of demographic homogeneity justified a smaller sample (N= 849).

means better quality or more democratic).

Also for each of the eight dimensions (or eleven if their sub-dimensions are also counted separately) some summary statistics for an easy grasp of the overall picture. For instance, 9.4% in the second column of the second last row of Table 1.1 means that in South Korea only 9.4% of the respondents gave positive answers to both items measuring the extent to which the functioning of the current political system conforms to rule of law.

Table 1.1 shows that in most East Asian countries a majority of people expressed some confidence in the independence of their judicial system when it comes to punishing wrong-doing high-ranking officials. Citizens in semi-democratic regime tend to place more confidence than citizens in emerging democracies in the independence of the judiciary. Most notably Singaporean citizens registered the highest level of confidence in judicial independence with 84.1% of the respondents giving a positive answer. Among established and emerging democracies, Taiwan fares rather poorly on this measure where only 44.6% think that “our current courts always punish the guilty even if they are high-ranking officials.”

Table 1.1 also show that when it comes to the second criterion of law-abiding government, in all East Asian emerging democracies only a tiny minority believe think that their national government officials always or most of the time abide by the law. In Thailand and South Korea, only 16% and 17% of the respondents respectively gave a positive answer. The popular perception on this score in semi-democratic regimes varies greatly. In Singapore 77% of the respondents believe that their national government always or most of the time abides by the law while in Malaysia only 37.1% thinking the same way. By and large, citizens in emerging democracies gave a more disparaging assessment than their counterpart in semi-democratic regimes.

The summary measure also shows the same pattern. For instance, Singaporean system (with 65.6 % of respondents giving a positive answer to both items) conforms to the criteria of law-abiding government far better than any of the East Asia emerging democracies. In all six of them, less of a quarter of their citizens gave a thumb up to both items.

Table 1.2 shows that combating corruption is a major challenge to East Asian young democracies. On the second question, among the six third-wave democracies, only a minority believes that in the national government “hardly anyone is involved” in corruption or “not a lot of officials are corrupt. The only exception is Thailand where 62% of people offering a positive evaluation. In Mongolia and Taiwan, only 23.6% and 29.3% respective of our respondents gave a positive answer. This suggests that a majority of Taiwanese and Mongolian citizens believe that in their respective national government “most officials are corrupt” or “almost everyone is corrupt”. This

is a very disparaging assessment. On the third question, in most East Asian countries more than half of the population think the government is working to crackdown corruption and root out bribes. But in the Philippines only 35.2% and in Japan only 32.3% think that way. On both account, Singapore fares far better than the rest with 90.2% of Singaporeans believing most officials in national government are not corrupt and 76.9% believing that the government working seriously to crackdown corruption and root out bribes.

In Table 1.3, we found that in citizens' view most East Asian young democracies by and large meet the minimum standard of allowing for competitive, free and fair elections. Most citizens in East Asian emerging democracies think that in their country "political parties or candidates have equal access to the mass media during the election period." But in Singapore, only 52.3% of our respondents think that political parties or candidates have equal access to the mass media. Next, a majority of citizens in East Asian emerging democracies consider the country's last national election is largely free and fair. Taiwan is a notable exception, where partisan control of the Central Election Commission has been an outstanding issue and only 48.8% of the respondents evaluate the freeness and fairness of the presidential election in 2004 positively. However, the perceived fairness and freeness of the election varies greatly among semi-democratic regime. In Hong Kong only 38% of our respondents (which is lowest level registered among all eleven cases) believe the territory's last Legislative Council election is largely fair and free but an overwhelming majority (87.3%) of Singaporeans do believe that.

On the question "whether our elections offer the voters a real choice between different parties/candidates", the picture is more mixed. In Thailand and Indonesia, citizens are more positive about the choices the election has to offer while a majority of voters in South Korea and the Philippines don't feel that way. On this measure, the difference between the emerging democracies and semi-democratic regime looms large. Many citizens in Singapore and Hong Kong don't think their election offer a meaningful choice. Only 49.6% of Singaporeans and only 43.7% of Hong Kong people feel that "elections offer the voters a real choice".

Table 1.4 shows that level of participation varies significantly among East Asian countries. Mongolian voters are most active in taking part in electoral process with 26.8% engaging in all three types of activities – voting, attending rallies and persuading others how to vote – and 40.1% engaging in two out of three. Adding the two together, more than two third (66.9%) of the Mongolian electorate have participated in at least two election-related activities during the last national election. In contrast, Singaporeans are least active with less than 1% of its citizenry taking part in all three activities. In Hong Kong, level of electoral participation is also

depressingly low, with only 1.6% of respondents attending campaign meeting or rally and only 4.7% tried to persuade others to vote for a certain candidate or party during the last election. Apparently, the non-competitiveness of the electoral process in the these two semi-democratic systems turned off most voters. In most other East Asian young democracies, the level of electoral participation is comparable to the established democracies in the West.

[Table 1.1 thru Table 1.4 about here]

Table 1.5 shows that in most East Asian democracies, a sizable portion of citizens are interested in politics and a great majority of the electorate follow news about politics and government regularly. In Japan, 68.% of the citizens expressed they are at least somewhat interested in politics and virtually all of them (over 95%) follow news about politics and government at least once or twice every week. For the semi-democratic regimes, the public's interest in politics is comparatively low. In both Singapore and Hong Kong, less than a quarter of the citizenry expressed interest in politics. However, even in Singapore and Hong Kong, a great majority of the respondents still follow news about politics and government regularly. It is reasonable to assume that in most emerging democracies the public pay attention to news about politics and government because they are both interested in politics and in need of the information for practical purposes. In Singapore and Hong Kong people follow news about politics and government perhaps primarily out of practical consideration.

Table 1.6 reports the level of political efficacy across East Asia. In most East Asian societies a great majority of citizens don't think they have the ability to participate in politics and feel that it is difficulty to understand politics and government as they seem so complicated. For instance, in Japan only 19.1% of the respondents agreed that "I think I have the ability to participate in politics" and only 34.9% *disagreed* with the statement that "sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like can't really understand what is going on."<sup>22</sup> The major exceptions are citizens in Thailand and Mongolia, who expressed a rather high level of confidence in participating in politics and a very high of confidence in understanding what is really going on. The difference on this measure between democratic regimes and non-democratic regimes is not very visible. For the region as a whole, only 11.7% (see the second last row of the right most column) of East Asian citizens enjoy a very high sense of efficacy, i.e., registering positive responses on both measures and 40% of them acquire some sense of efficacy, expressing confidence on

---

<sup>22</sup> All the figures reported here are percentage of positive evaluation, i.e., higher quality or more democratic. So a disagreement to this statement is counted as positive evaluation.

either one of the two measures. This implies that almost half of the East Asian citizenry suffer from a very low sense of efficacy.

[Tables 1.5 and 1.6 about here]

Table 1.7 shows that most East Asian emerging democracies meet the minimum standard of vertical accountability for an electoral democracy, i.e., throwing the rascal out through voting. In all six young democracies a majority feel that their current system gives them “the power to change the government people don’t like” with the exception of South Korea. In contrast, sense of exercising vertical accountability through election is relatively low among Singaporeans (51.7%) and Hong Kong citizens (only 28.3%). At the same time, much fewer people feel that they can “hold the government responsible for its action between elections.” This is a widely shared perception across all emerging democracies. On the question of transparency, arguable a pre-requisite for effective vertical accountability, the picture is more mixed. In Thailand, Indonesia, Hong Kong and Singapore, most people think that only “sometimes” or “rarely” do “government officials withhold important information from the public view”. In South Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan, Mongolia, Malaysia and Vietnam only a minority feel that way, suggesting that many citizens suspect that government officials “always” or “most of the time” withhold important information from the public. On this last question, one can interpret its meaning and cross-country variation in a totally opposed way. It is plausible to argue that most people in Thailand (where 69.4% of the respondents believing in government transparency) do not necessarily know how much they don’t know while skeptical citizens in South Korea (where only 24.6% of respondents believing in government transparency) maybe know something about “known unknown”. However, popular perception of a lack of transparency still matter. It tends to undermine people’s trust in democratically elected government and political institutions.

Table 1.8 reports the findings from our measures for horizontal accountability. It shows in most East Asian emerging democracies, many people sense that “when the government breaks the laws, there is nothing the legal system can do.” The perception that the judicial system cannot keep a law-breaching government in check is most strongly felt among citizens in Mongolia, Taiwan, South Korea and Thailand. In South Korea, only 23.2% of our respondents answered “strongly disagree” or “somewhat disagree” to this question (Q107). When it comes to the question about legislative oversight, more people think “the legislature is capable of keeping the government in check”. In virtually all young democracies, slightly more than 50% of the citizenry sense that the legislative is “very capable” or “capable” of doing so, with

Thailand being the only exception. On the other hand, the number of people who don't think effective legislative oversight has been in place remains considerably large. The proportion of the respondents who think the parliament is wielding effective oversight is surprisingly high in the three semi-democratic regimes, with Singapore surging to the top. This perception perhaps stems from their constitutional arrangements that underscores the supremacy of the parliament..

For the measurement of the freedom dimension, the paired set that ABS employed address freedom of speech and freedom of association respectively. Table 1.9 shows that on both scores most East Asian citizens think that their political system permits citizens to articulate and organize around their political beliefs and interests. The only exception is Singapore, where only 38.8% of our respondents agreed that “people are free to speak what they think without fear and only 46.2 % felt that “people can join any organization they like without fear.” In virtually all East Asian young democracies, either one of the two indicators get positive responses from more than two thirds of their citizenry. However, our survey also shows that most East Asian democracies are still far from being “completely free”. In South Korea, only 51.2% of our respondents gave a positive response to both questions. This summary measure in a few other East Asian third-wave democracies also projects a not so reassuring picture as it hovers around 60%. The country where freedom is most lacking is Singapore, where it drops to 31.8%.

[Table 1.7 thru Table 1.9 about here]

Table 1.10 reports the distribution on the paired questions on equality. The result from the first question suggests that in East Asian third-wave democracies, equal treatment remains an unfulfilled promise for most citizens. The percentages of positive assessment in Mongolia, the Philippines and Taiwan are all below 50%. The three semi-democratic regimes fare substantially better on this score than most East Asian young democracies. On the question of guarantee of basic socio-economic necessities, most East Asians countries turn in some encouraging figures. However, there are two puzzling figures which require further investigation. On the question asking whether “people have the basic necessities like food, clothes, and shelter,” the percentage of giving positive assessment by respondents from South Korea, one of the most affluent countries, is surprisingly low (29.1%) while the ratio from the Philippines, one of the socio-economically less developed countries, is impressively high (83.2%).

Lastly, in Table 1.11 I examine the outcomes from two most encompassing questions dealing with the responsiveness of government. The overall picture is not



very encouraging. On the first question, a majority of people in the six emerging democracies don't think that the government is "very responsive" or "largely responsive" to what people want. In South Korea, Mongolia and the Philippines, the percentage of respondents believing the governing is "very responsive" or "largely responsive" is below one third. Paradoxically, the proportion of positive answers to the first question is much higher in Singapore and Malaysia. Actually Singapore is the only East Asian country where two third of its citizenry perceive their government being responsive to what people want. On the second question, the contrast between democratic regimes and semi-democratic regime is less salient. Citizens in Japan are most pessimistic about the likelihood that the government will solve the most important issue that they identified. Only 21.6% of our Japanese respondents answered "very likely" or "likely" to this question. This reflects the wide perception among the Japanese about the intractability of many daunting challenges -- from economic stagnation, runaway fiscal deficit, to adverse demographic trend -- facing this only established democracy in the region. Citizens in Vietnam, one of the region's fastest growing economies, are most optimistic, with 77.9% believing that it is likely or very likely that the government will solve the problem they concern most.

[Tables 1.10 and 1.11 about here]

Overall speaking, our survey shows that for the great majority of East Asian citizens in emerging democracies, their respective political system is still far from being a high-quality democracy. Most third-wave democracies systems in the region are still lacking many of the highly valued properties of liberal democracy. In particular, three procedural dimensions, controlling corruption, horizontal accountability and rule of law are most lacking in most countries. Also, the result dimension in terms of responsiveness has ample room for improvement. In stark contrast, East Asian semi-democratic regimes are faulty in terms of competition, freedom, vertical accountability, and participation. But in the eyes of its citizens, these regimes deliver a high-quality governance in terms of rule of law, controlling corruption, horizontal accountability, equality and responsiveness. Democracy in East Asia is indeed facing some fierce competitors.

#### IV. Quality of Democracy and Orientations toward Democracy

After reviewing the general situation of democratic quality in East Asia, we now turn to two inter-related analytical issues. First, what are the implications of people's assessment of democratic quality for the legitimacy of democratic regime? Which

aspects of quality of democracy are more important to the growth of popular support for democracy? Second, how do people's political values shape their assessment of the properties of democracy? Do people holding stronger belief in liberal democratic values become more critical of the actual performance of their democracy?

To address these two issues, I need to employ additional two batteries: one for measuring strength of popular support for democracy and the other strength of liberal democratic value orientation. For each of them, ABS has designed a fully-fledged battery.

The ABS battery for gauging popular support for democracy is designed around the premise that normative commitment to democracy comprises of many attitudinal components. These attitudinal components include the following five attitudinal dimensions, namely the *desirability of democracy*, *preferability of democracy*, the *suitability of democracy*, the *efficacy of democracy*, and the *priority of democracy*. Desirability of democracy refers to the degree which citizens want their country to be democratic now. Preferability of democracy refers to the belief that democracy is always superior or more preferable to any other forms of government. Suitability of democracy refers to the degree of which citizens feel that democracy is appropriate for their country. Efficacy of democracy dwells on the effectiveness of democratic regime in dealing with the country's major problems. Priority of democracy focuses on how important democracy is as compared with other desirable societal objectives. ABS has designed specific items for measuring the five attitudinal components mentioned above.<sup>23</sup>

The ABS also employed a series of questions that probe respondents' value orientations toward some fundamental organizing principles of liberal democracy, such as rule of law, liberty and freedom, popular accountability and separation of power.<sup>24</sup> Their responses to this battery reveal both the substance and depth of their commitment to liberal democratic norms.<sup>25</sup>

In Table 2.1, I first examine the relationship between people's perceived quality of democracy with their satisfaction with democracy. The later is measured with a widely used four-point item asking "Are you satisfied with the way democracy works in our country, are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?"<sup>26</sup> I

---

<sup>23</sup> Please refer to Appendix A for the wordings of the five-item scale.

<sup>24</sup> Please also refer to Appendix A for the wordings of this nine-item scale.

<sup>25</sup> This value-orientation battery was originally designed by Hu Fu. This scale treats pro-authoritarian legitimacy orientations and pro-democratic values as the two sides of the same coin. It was designed to measure not just belief in democratic norms but also mass belief and attitudes that are typically nurtured under authoritarian or anti-democratic regimes. See Fu Hu and Yun-han Chu. "Neo-Authoritarianism, Polarized Conflict and Populism in a Newly Democratizing Regime: Taiwan's Emerging Mass Politics." *Journal of Contemporary China*, 5, 11 (1996): 23-41.

<sup>26</sup> The validity of this measure for semi-democratic and non-democratic regime is understandably dubious. However, nearly all of the region's semi-democratic and non-democratic regimes claim to be

calculate correlations coefficients between the summary scores on the eleven dimensions or sub-dimensions of quality of democracy with this four-point scale for each of the eleven country samples as well as the merged cross-national sample. This exercise reveals how much people's perceived properties of the political system shape their overall satisfaction with democracy.<sup>27</sup> All eleven correlation coefficients for the merged sample (in the right-hand most column of Table 2.1) are statistically significant and they are all in the positive direction. This means the better the perceived qualities the higher the satisfaction. Among the possible sources of people's dissatisfaction with the way democracy work, responsiveness and controlling corruption, and competition carry the most important weigh (registering the three largest coefficients). Equality and law-abiding government are important sources for satisfaction with democracy. It is also interesting to know that while some of our surveyed countries are full democracies by conventional standard, but the patterns of correlation coefficients observed are not very different from Japan and East Asian emerging democracies. For example, in Malaysia, responsiveness, controlling corruption and competition are also the three most important factors shaping people's satisfaction with the way democracy works. These three properties also consistently loom large in East Asian six emerging democracies.

[Table 2.1 about here]

Symptoms of bad governance not only cause people's dissatisfaction with democracy, they also erode people's support for democracy itself. Table 2.2 reports the correlation coefficients between the summary scores on the eleven dimensions or sub-dimensions of quality of democracy with that of five-item scale for measuring popular support for democracy.<sup>28</sup> I calculate correlations coefficients for each of the eleven country samples as well as the merged seven-nation sample. All eleven correlation coefficients for the merged sample (in the right-hand most column of Table 2.2) are statistically significant and they are all in the positive direction. This means that people's perceived properties do matter. The higher their evaluation the stronger their support for democracy. This applied to all eleven dimensions. However,

---

some variants of democracy, this measure can be viewed as functionally equivalent to the evaluation of the overall performance of the present-day political system, regardless its level of democratic development.

<sup>27</sup> It also serves the purpose of a methodological check. If our various measures of quality of democracy are valid and reliable, most of them should be significantly correlated with satisfaction with democracy.

<sup>28</sup> To measure the overall level of normative commitment to democracy, we constructed a 6-point index ranging from 0 to 5 by counting the number of pro-democratic responses on the five dimensions discussed above.

certain dimensions matter more than others. The most important qualities are two sub-dimensions under the broad concept of “participation”, namely sense of political efficacy and interests in politics. This means people who are more attentive to politics and enjoy a higher sense of political empowerment are more likely to acquire a strong commitment to democracy. Next to political participation, responsiveness, controlling corruption, and competition are also important qualities affecting people’s commitment toward democracy.

[Table 2.2 about here]

This generalization applies to most of the countries we surveyed. However there are some notable exceptions. In Mongolia, other than sense of political efficacy and political interest, citizens’ perceived quality of democracy does not seem to have much impact on their commitment to democracy. This is perhaps because on measures of democratic quality, most Mongolians gave an equally disparaging assessment across the board. In addition, certain dimensions may matter more for some countries than others. For instance, in South Korea and Taiwan, perceived quality on the horizontal accountability dimension turns out to be more important than controlling corruption or responsiveness. This suggests that under their respective semi-presidential regime, effectiveness horizontal accountability is a property that concerns citizens more saliently than elsewhere. Lastly, the patterns of correlation coefficients that we observed among East Asian emerging democracies are once more quite similar to that of semi-democratic or even non-democratic regime. For example, for Taiwan the three most important qualities are political efficacy, political interest and responsiveness. Exactly the same ranking order was also found in Malaysia.

Table 2.3 allows us to explore the phenomenon of “disaffected democrats”. It reports the correlation coefficients between summary scores of eleven quality dimensions with the arithmetic sum of the nine-item battery for measuring belief in liberal democratic values. It by and large confirms our expectation that the stronger people believe in liberal democratic values the more critical they become in evaluating to what extent their democracy (or current regime) deliver the valued properties. In the left-hand most column, one finds that all eleven coefficients are all negative. Some are quite significant, such as the correlations with responsiveness, competition, freedom, equality and responsiveness. Others are negligible, such as the correlations with political efficacy, political interest, vertical accountability and horizontal accountability.

For most of the dimensions (or sub-dimensions) that carry quite significant correlative coefficients in the total sample, a rather similar pattern of relationship can be also found in virtually all eleven countries. The stronger people belief in liberal

democratic values, the more critical they become when it comes to evaluating the properties of the political system. Given the present state of democratic practice in most East Asian countries, it is not surprising at all that respondents with higher expectation are likely to be less satisfied with the current practice. Thus, they are more likely to give a lower rating of the current system. This holds true for many properties such as law-abiding government, competition, freedom, equality, and responsiveness. But there are some notable exceptions. In some countries, belief in liberal democratic values can reinforce level of individual political interest and sense of political efficacy. This holds true for people living under democratic regimes, such as Japan, Taiwan and Indonesia.

[Table 2.3 about here]

## V. Exploring the Theoretical Significance of Quality of Democracy through Regression Analyses

Last, I explore the complex relationship through regression analyses. I regress summary score of support for democracy on the following independent variables: summary score of each of the eleven quality dimensions (or sub-dimensions), cumulative sum of the liberal democratic value battery, two measures of people evaluation of the economic conditions (one for the country's overall economic condition and the other personal economic condition). I include the last two measures because there has been a on-going debate among students of democracy over whether the delivery of material goods is more or less important than the delivery of desired political goods, i.e., good democratic governance, in sustaining citizens' support for democracy.<sup>29</sup> It is theoretically interesting to gauge the relative explanatory power of perceive quality of democracy against that of a most frequently cited competing factor explaining the level of popular support for democracy.<sup>30</sup>

For the sake of the space, the outcomes of the regression analysis are summarized in Table 3 at the risk of oversimplification.<sup>31</sup> For each of the twelve models (eleven for individual countries and one of the merged sample), I use numerical number to highlight the importance of each variable in explaining the level of popular support of democracy. "1" means the most important factor (carrying a biggest standardized regression coefficient), "2" the second most important factor, and

---

<sup>29</sup> Michael Bratton and Robert Mattes, "Support for Democracy In Africa: Intrinsic Or Instrumental?" *British Journal of Political Science* 31 (2001): 447-474.

<sup>30</sup> For example, Pippa Norris ed. *Critical Citizens: Support for Democratic Government* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999)

<sup>31</sup> Interested readers can refer to Table 4.1 thru 4.12 in Appendix B for the complete results.

etc. Only factors that carry statistically significant regression coefficients are identified.

The cross-national regression analyses yield some interesting results. First, for the eleven countries as a whole (please refer to the column on the far right of Table 3), a burgeoning civic culture is the most important foundation for the popular support of democracy. The elements of this civic culture include interest in political affairs, beliefs in liberal democratic values and sense of political efficacy. Indicator of these three variables emerge as the first, second and fifth most important explanatory variables for democratic legitimacy. Attentive citizens tend to support democracy more and this is true for both emerging democracies and semi-democratic regimes. Citizens holding stronger belief in liberal democratic values are more inclined to support for democracy. This factor ranks as the number one factor in Hong Kong, South Korea and Mongolia and the second most important factor in Singapore, Taiwan and Japan. Its overall effect is perhaps even stronger than this under-specified regression model can show. Part of its conducive effect for the growth of popular support may be neutralized by its influence over people's assessment of quality of democracy.<sup>32</sup>

Next, the delivery of some valued properties of liberal democracy is more important than the delivery of economic goods in sustaining people's support for democracy. Among the most valued properties of liberal democracies, competition, responsiveness, controlling corruption and meaningful popular (vertical) accountability and freedom are the most important ones. They rank the third, fourth, sixth, seventh, and tenth most important explanatory variables in cross-national analysis. They also rank very high in most single-country analyses. For example, competition is among the top four factors in Vietnam, Hong Kong, Mongolia and Japan. Controlling corruption is also among the top four factors in Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines and Korea. Vertical accountability matters very much for citizens in Singapore, the Philippines, Thailand and Taiwan. Freedom is also one of the top factors in Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand and Mongolia. Other valued properties such law-abiding government, equality and horizontal accountability are not significantly important for the region as a whole but they matter for some countries.

Third, improvement in the country's overall economic conditions and in personal economic conditions is not the most important factors for sustaining popular support for democracy. In the cross-national context, they are the eighth and ninth factor in order of importance. Their explanatory power virtually disappears in the context of

---

<sup>32</sup> This suggests that to capture the full causal effect of this variable, we need to specify a structural equation model, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

most single country analyses except Vietnam and Japan where national economic conditions does matter a great deal. This suggests that there exists much less variation in people's evaluation of economic conditions within a single country than that is the case across countries. People of the same country oftentimes converge on the reading of the economic condition, either at the macro or micro level.

[Table 3 about here]

Fourth, the estimates of most single-country model do not deviate too much from the estimates based on the merged eleven-country data. This means there are some common causal mechanisms running through all East Asian countries, including emerging democracies and semi-democratic regimes.

Lastly, one should exercise some caution in generalizing the findings based on one round of cross-national survey. The importance of some factors might not surface in cross-sectional analysis. For instance, one may suspect that the importance of freedom to popular support for democracy cannot be fully appreciated without longitudinal data or without an explicit comparison with the old regime. Since this is a property which is least lacking in most countries at the time the survey is implemented. Most citizens have taken the freedom they enjoy for granted.

## VI. Tentative Conclusion

Our empirical analyses confirm that in East Asia popular support for democracy depends on to a large extent whether the citizenry experiences that political institutions produce an acceptable degree of democracy and deliver an acceptable level of good governance. At the same time, the perceived quality of democracy is also shaped by what citizens expect out of and demand from their political leaders and institutions.

The growth of democratic legitimacy is also shaped by some short-term factors, such as economic performance, as well as by some long-term forces, such as values change. It is important to know that citizens in East Asian democracies are able to distinguish between the political and economic dimensions of regime performance. This means a large number of citizens may come to value democracy for the political goods it produces even when its economic performance is perceived to be sluggish. This is a no small point because most East Asian emerging democracies are not likely to repeat its past record of miraculous growth. Over the long-term, the state's overall capacity in the provision of a stable and enabling economic environment is severely constrained by the forces of globalization.

For East Asian citizens, of all of the properties people expect out of liberal democracy, nothing is more important than the responsiveness of the government to their needs and concerns. On this score, democratically elected governments do not necessarily fare better than non-democratic regimes in the eyes of their citizens. Equally important are maintaining a competitive electoral system and the delivery of clean politics. Most of the emerging democracies are rated more favorably on the former but not the latter. This suggests that all East Asian democracies desperately need more serious attempts to strengthen the legal deterrence against the corruption of elected politicians. They all need more rigorous regulations on campaign finance and financial disclosures to arrest the encroachment of money politics. At the same time, it is imperative to strengthen the independence and integrity of the judicial branch making it less susceptible to political influence. Without this a systematic crackdown on the unethical conducts of elected politicians remains an illusive goal.

In the future, we need more research on ways to improve democratic quality. Drawing on experiences of East Asia, one can identify at least three important sets of factors that are significantly associated with the quality of democracy. First, mass political culture matters. If a majority of citizens are attentive to political affairs and firmly endorse the principle of freedom and rights protection, limited government, democratic accountability, and rule of law, state officials will feel compelled to follow the procedure of good democracy. State officials violating individual freedom and or engaging in illegal practices and corruption will definitely worry about being replaced through elections. Second, political elite matters. Lack of strong commitment of a country's significant leaders of opinion, culture, business, and social organizations, and all major leaders of government and politically significant parties to democratic norms and procedures is a sure recipe for cooking low quality of democracy. Lastly, civil societies also play an important role in determining the quality of democracy. A strong civil society and a tradition of civil engagement are also crucial in shaping politicians and parties' incentives. Under such circumstance, the civil society as a whole is more likely to generate strong constraints on state officials.



*Tables*

**Table 1.1 Law-abiding Government: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society		
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	All
Q104 Our current courts always punish the guilty even if they are high-ranking officials	48.7%	59.6%	44.6%	58.0%	73.6%	63.1%	82.7%	84.1%	68.8%	77.5%	79.5%	66.9%
n	1064	1212	1556	1192	1486	1188	1569	1001	1207	848	1175	13498
Q113 How often do national government officials abide by the law?	37.7%	17.0%	37.4%	31.3%	16.5%	25.4%	29.5%	77.7%	37.1%	53.4%	71.6%	37.9%
n	1066	1212	1553	1165	1332	1204	1548	996	1195	843	1171	13285
Both	24.2%	9.4%	19.0%	18.1%	10.7%	18.2%	24.0%	65.5%	27.8%	43.7%	61.5%	27.5%
Either Q104 or Q113	38.1%	57.8%	41.0%	49.8%	56.0%	50.1%	58.9%	26.9%	47.8%	42.6%	22.3%	45.6%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

Note: The number of valid cases (n) varies from one statistic to another because we left out people answering “do not understand the question” or “decline to answer”. “Hard to say” is counted as a non-positive answer.

**Table 1.2 Controlling Corruption: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society		
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	All
Q117 How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in your local/municipal government?	53.9%	54.5%	30.9%	38.8%	70.4%	50.5%	56.0%	--	52.4%	73.8%	77.5%	55.0%
n	1065	1212	1549	1173	1480	1187	1515	--	1202	847	1192	12422
Q118 How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in the national government?	50.7%	49.5%	29.3%	32.4%	62.0%	23.6%	46.7%	90.2%	50.5%	--	67.6%	49.1%
n	1065	1212	1547	1171	1480	1196	1520	952	1204	--	1188	12535
Q120 In your opinion, is the government working to crackdown corruption and root out bribes?	32.3%	44.6%	64.2%	35.2%	62.8%	53.0%	54.3%	76.9%	64.3%	90.1%	79.2%	58.9%
n	1065	1212	1557	1166	1438	1202	1546	947	1209	848	1190	13380
All of Q117 Q118 Q120	21.2%	26.5%	16.0%	10.7%	37.4%	10.8%	24.5%	68.2%	34.3%	70.1%	51.3%	22.4%
Any two of Q117 Q118 Q120	28.7%	25.3%	16.8%	19.9%	23.7%	27.9%	24.3%	--	18.0%	--	25.8%	20.0%
Only one of Q117 Q118 Q120	15.7%	18.6%	37.8%	29.0%	16.6%	35.1%	23.0%	17.2%	25.3%	23.1%	14.8%	21.0%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.3 Competition: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society		
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	All
Q105 Political parties or candidates in our country have equal access to the mass media during the election period	59.6%	66.3%	64.5%	58.0%	63.4%	63.4%	78.4%	52.3%	59.8%	76.4%	81.1%	65.8%
n	1064	1212	1514	1171	1485	1184	1381	983	1193	845	1156	13188
Q114 How often do you think our elections offer the voters a real choice between different parties/candidates	44.2%	47.4%	52.7%	39.0%	60.4%	50.6%	78.2%	49.6%	50.0%	43.7%	76.6%	55.0%
n	1066	1212	1542	1176	1426	1196	1553	991	1181	843	1191	13377
Q43 On the whole, how would you rate the freeness and fairness of the last national election	64.5%	57.3%	48.8%	55.3%	69.6%	69.4%	85.0%	87.3%	73.7%	38.0%	85.7%	67.4%
n	1067	1212	1520	1180	1478	1187	1567	988	1199	839	1192	13429
All of Q105 Q114 Q43	22.3%	22.0%	18.7%	13.0%	30.3%	26.4%	45.6%	31.3%	27.4%	19.2%	60.6%	29.3%
Any two of Q105 Q114 Q43	36.0%	37.3%	34.7%	35.8%	31.4%	35.9%	29.3%	28.3%	34.7%	33.0%	20.6%	32.4%
Only one of Q105 Q114 Q43	29.0%	30.3%	26.2%	33.4%	17.4%	23.3%	8.6%	28.8%	23.2%	31.9%	10.3%	23.0%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.4 Electoral Participation: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime			Transition Society	All
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	
Q38 Did you vote in the election?	85.1%	68.2%	82.6%	80.6%	87.5%	86.4%	93.3%	62.3%	59.4%	44.4%	85.8%	77.5%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700
Q40 Did you attend a campaign meeting or rally?	21.1%	21.0%	13.4%	23.2%	23.7%	65.8%	23.4%	10.2%	26.6%	1.6%	53.9%	26.2%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700
Q41 Did you try to persuade others to vote for a certain candidate or party?	6.9%	16.9%	16.1%	19.8%	19.7%	33.4%	12.3%	2.7%	14.6%	4.7%	--	15.3%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	--	12500
All of Q38 Q40 Q41	5.0%	7.7%	6.2%	11.1%	7.5%	26.8%	7.4%	0.9%	8.3%	1.2%	52.8%	7.7%
Any two of Q38 Q40 Q41	17.4%	17.6%	15.4%	17.8%	25.2%	40.1%	18.6%	7.3%	16.9%	3.5%	--	21.7%
Only one of Q38 Q40 Q41	63.4%	47.9%	62.9%	54.8%	57.8%	25.1%	66.3%	57.8%	42.0%	40.2%	34.4%	51.2%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.5 Political Interest: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime			Transition Society	All
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	
Q49 How interested would you say you are in politics?	68.8%	43.0%	32.5%	52.3%	73.3%	59.0%	34.2%	23.6%	40.9%	24.1%	74.4%	48.4%
n	1066	1212	1580	1194	1527	1210	1581	1008	1215	847	1196	13636
Q50 How often do you follow news about politics and government?	95.5%	89.9%	72.1%	77.7%	90.8%	90.1%	66.5%	75.9%	70.4%	69.6%	90.9%	80.7%
n	1066	1212	1579	1191	1534	1209	1588	1010	1216	849	1197	13651
Both	68.0%	41.8%	29.9%	44.7%	71.3%	57.1%	29.8%	22.3%	36.1%	22.1%	73.2%	45.6%
Either Q49 or Q50	28.0%	49.2%	44.1%	39.1%	19.4%	34.6%	39.8%	54.4%	38.8%	49.2%	18.3%	37.1%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.6 Political Efficacy: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime			Transition Society	
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	All
Q127 I think I have the ability to participate in politics	19.1%	28.5%	35.9%	28.1%	78.2%	59.7%	30.5%	22.2%	38.2%	10.6%	39.9%	37.4%
n	1064	1212	1550	1180	1497	1202	1534	1004	1205	839	1133	13420
Q128 Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on	34.9%	40.6%	24.2%	39.2%	11.6%	29.7%	20.4%	27.3%	25.6%	20.0%	41.7%	28.0%
n	1064	1212	1561	1181	1491	1200	1528	1005	1197	846	1114	13399
Both	10.8%	14.4%	13.7%	9.3%	8.0%	18.0%	8.8%	9.2%	11.4%	4.4%	20.0%	11.7%
Either Q127 or Q128	32.2%	40.2%	31.1%	46.8%	70.4%	52.4%	30.5%	30.2%	39.5%	21.4%	34.3%	40.0%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.7 Vertical Accountability: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society		
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	All
Q103 People have the power to change a government they don't like.	56.7%	44.1%	60.9%	67.3%	78.6%	82.6%	69.7%	51.7%	76.6%	28.3%	59.6%	63.1%
n	1064	1212	1548	1193	1506	1193	1539	1001	1204	846	1119	13425
Q106 Between elections, the people have no way of holding the government responsible for its actions.	27.8%	35.7%	34.2%	47.0%	34.2%	27.4%	46.5%	40.2%	31.0%	--	47.6%	37.2%
n	1064	1212	1548	1173	1417	1124	1435	978	1168	--	1087	12206
Q112 How often do government officials withhold important information from the public view?	38.6%	24.6%	43.2%	41.8%	69.4%	36.1%	65.0%	65.7%	37.6%	63.0%	16.7%	45.8%
n	1066	1212	1545	1147	1452	1188	1524	985	1194	846	1175	13334
All of Q103 Q106 Q112	8.7%	4.5%	11.5%	9.5%	15.6%	7.6%	18.5%	15.9%	8.5%	18.3%	3.3%	10.0%
Any two of Q103 Q106 Q112	29.9%	23.4%	30.4%	41.3%	45.1%	35.3%	39.1%	34.8%	35.1%	--	33.8%	33.0%
Only one of Q103 Q106 Q112	36.7%	44.1%	36.5%	36.6%	21.9%	39.8%	24.4%	32.6%	41.6%	54.2%	31.3%	31.9%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.8 Horizontal Accountability: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society		
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	All
Q107 When the government breaks the laws, there is nothing the legal system can do.	26.8%	43.2%	39.2%	51.6%	47.0%	23.2%	62.2%	64.2%	44.0%	--	66.0%	46.7%
n	1064	1212	1534	1174	1475	1180	1511	982	1196	--	1094	12422
Q115 To what extent is the legislature capable of keeping the government in check?	40.3%	53.0%	53.0%	59.9%	46.5%	55.4%	66.0%	80.8%	66.8%	58.6%	81.1%	59.8%
n	1066	1212	1530	1149	1311	1199	1535	984	1183	846	1181	13196
Both	14.5%	25.2%	25.3%	27.6%	20.2%	13.0%	40.4%	51.6%	31.9%	--	54.7%	28.3%
Either Q107 or Q115	37.9%	45.9%	36.4%	49.8%	37.5%	49.9%	37.2%	34.8%	43.4%	--	26.5%	37.3%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700



**Table 1.9 Freedom: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime			Transition Society	All
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	
Q110 People are free to speak what they think without fear.	52.0%	56.5%	74.1%	67.4%	72.6%	69.1%	90.5%	38.8%	66.1%	84.0%	76.3%	69.0%
n	1064	1212	1565	1188	1486	1198	1580	1004	1208	848	1174	13527
Q111 People can join any organization they like without fear.	56.7%	64.3%	78.2%	66.0%	71.3%	79.7%	92.1%	46.2%	72.0%	80.5%	67.7%	71.5%
n	1064	1212	1560	1187	1486	1192	1563	1001	1205	845	1157	13472
Both	43.5%	51.2%	66.4%	54.6%	61.9%	60.5%	85.4%	31.8%	58.9%	74.4%	61.7%	60.3%
Either Q110 or Q111	21.4%	18.3%	16.7%	22.3%	14.0%	25.2%	7.9%	19.9%	18.6%	14.6%	15.2%	17.3%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.10 Equality: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime			Transition Society	All
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	
Q108 Everyone is treated equally by the government.	19.4%	13.0%	43.2%	37.7%	57.2%	34.2%	74.1%	68.6%	51.0%	63.5%	80.3%	49.5%
n	1064	1212	1566	1194	1506	1198	1567	1003	1211	847	1173	13541
Q109 People have basic necessities like food, clothes, and shelter.	64.9%	29.1%	64.3%	83.2%	89.3%	32.1%	75.3%	83.1%	80.1%	78.1%	83.2%	69.4%
n	1064	1212	1571	1199	1509	1202	1573	1010	1214	848	1176	13578
Both	17.1%	8.6%	36.2%	33.3%	52.2%	14.6%	63.9%	61.4%	46.8%	55.9%	74.7%	42.5%
Either Q108 or Q109	50.0%	25.0%	33.1%	53.8%	37.6%	36.3%	17.6%	27.5%	36.7%	29.2%	10.0%	32.1%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 1.11 Responsiveness: Percentage of Positive Evaluation**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime			Transition Society	All
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	Vietnam	
Q116 How well do you think the government responds to what people want?	33.3%	21.2%	36.3%	33.2%	50.3%	25.3%	45.8%	67.3%	57.0%	43.7%	80.3%	44.5%
n	1065	1212	1563	1185	1453	1206	1578	999	1200	846	1190	13497
Q102a How likely is it that the government will solve the most important problem you identified?	21.6%	--	30.3%	38.6%	61.5%	62.2%	78.6%	56.3%	53.3%	33.5%	77.9%	52.4%
n	1067	--	1572	1188	1472	1207	1521	992	1215	843	1172	12249
Both	10.5%	--	14.4%	17.4%	33.1%	19.1%	37.9%	42.9%	36.9%	18.8%	67.3%	27.4%
Either Q116 or Q102a	33.9%	--	36.8%	35.4%	35.6%	49.0%	41.7%	34.1%	35.1%	38.9%	19.6%	33.0%
n	1067	1212	1587	1200	1546	1211	1598	1012	1218	849	1200	13700

**Table 2.1 Correlation with Satisfaction with Democracy**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society	All	
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong		Vietnam
Law-abiding Government	0.267**	0.170**	0.250**	0.044	0.093**	0.136**	0.166**	0.279**	0.270**	0.126**	0.419**	0.281**
Controlling Corruption	0.207**	0.241**	0.298**	0.240**	0.270**	0.138**	0.240**	0.251**	0.414**	0.089**	0.369**	0.360**
Competition	0.344**	0.170**	0.336**	0.135**	0.282**	0.074*	0.232**	0.384**	0.437**	0.148**	0.537**	0.336**
Electoral Participation	0.068*	0.005	0.018	0.065*	0.046	0.008	0.027	0.028	0.082**	-0.035	0.152**	0.092**
Political Interest	0.029	-0.006	0.026	0.124**	0.125**	-0.003	0.004	-0.008	0.126**	-0.028	0.200**	0.085**
Political Efficacy	0.147**	0.156**	0.177**	0.114**	0.021	0.157**	0.135**	0.123**	0.183**	-0.032	0.249**	0.159**
Vertical Accountability	0.155**	0.118**	0.242**	0.009	0.111**	0.047	0.079**	0.159**	0.142**	0.193**	-0.029	0.135**
Horizontal Accountability	0.216**	0.184**	0.243**	0.116**	0.174**	0.099**	0.201**	0.277**	0.340**	0.191**	0.267**	0.260**
Freedom	0.239**	0.065*	0.188**	0.028	0.137**	0.065*	0.076**	0.173**	0.322**	0.139**	0.269**	0.140**
Equality	0.272**	0.192**	0.226**	0.124**	0.153**	0.099**	0.130**	0.269**	0.386**	0.203**	0.410**	0.283**
Responsiveness	0.298**	0.206**	0.254**	0.303**	0.244**	0.165**	0.255**	0.355**	0.425**	0.316**	0.508**	0.383**

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 2.2 Correlation with Support for Democracy**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society	All	
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong		Vietnam
Law-abiding Government	0.130**	0.150**	0.134**	0.030	0.019	-0.015	-0.021	0.036	0.101**	0.101**	0.282**	0.134**
Controlling Corruption	0.140**	0.180**	0.152**	0.131**	0.196**	-0.014	0.138**	0.051	0.232**	0.137**	0.147**	0.175**
Competition	0.147**	0.090**	0.096**	0.116**	0.146**	-0.109**	0.100**	0.023	0.155**	0.176**	0.359**	0.186**
Electoral Participation	0.005	-0.048	0.019	0.073*	0.094**	0.034	0.085**	0.081*	0.148**	0.141**	0.061*	0.109**
Political Interest	0.289**	0.019	0.264**	0.120**	0.205**	0.130**	0.247**	0.067*	0.258**	0.171**	0.390**	0.235**
Political Efficacy	0.691**	0.658**	0.643**	0.588**	0.647**	0.570**	0.702**	0.634**	0.657**	0.648**	0.710**	0.659**
Vertical Accountability	0.116**	0.079**	0.199**	0.094**	0.124**	-0.046	0.057*	0.149**	0.127**	0.073*	0.027	0.106**
Horizontal Accountability	0.135**	0.189**	0.198**	0.101**	0.010	-0.022	0.061*	0.016	0.187**	0.115**	0.263**	0.140**
Freedom	0.087**	0.029	0.142**	0.067*	0.142**	0.029	0.156**	-0.069*	0.177**	0.100**	0.189**	0.089**
Equality	0.031	0.111**	0.062*	0.127**	0.050	-0.016	0.028	-0.038	0.197**	0.028	0.277**	0.116**
Responsiveness	0.124**	0.170**	0.188**	0.129**	0.088**	0.004	0.098**	0.026	0.243**	0.036	0.251**	0.200**

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 2.3 Correlations with Belief in Liberal Democratic Values**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy						Semi-democratic Regime		Transition Society	All	
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong		Vietnam
Law-abiding Government	-0.002	-0.044	-0.236**	-0.163**	-0.301**	-0.245**	-0.113**	-0.267**	-0.240**	0.022*	-0.352**	-0.189**
Controlling Corruption	0.015	-0.103**	-0.172**	-0.060*	-0.258**	-0.119**	-0.069*	-0.319**	-0.152**	0.121**	-0.317**	-0.126**
Competition	-0.109**	-0.143**	-0.231**	-0.181**	-0.465**	-0.240**	-0.074**	-0.537**	-0.329**	-0.101**	-0.338**	-0.251**
Electoral Participation	-0.029	-0.080**	0.006	-0.101**	-0.115**	-0.009	-0.020	0.123**	-0.008	0.171**	-0.036	-0.128**
Political Interest	0.133**	-0.043	0.147**	-0.016	-0.027	-0.004	0.080**	-0.042	0.041	0.078*	-0.042	-0.037**
Political Efficacy	0.159**	0.052	-0.012**	-0.053	-0.135**	0.022	0.053*	-0.071*	-0.084**	0.047	-0.098**	-0.069**
Vertical Accountability	0.045	-0.037	-0.078**	0.000	0.023	-0.075*	0.012	0.071*	-0.036	-0.120**	0.160**	-0.060**
Horizontal Accountability	0.002	0.087**	-0.078**	0.050	-0.093**	-0.089**	-0.011	-0.107**	-0.124**	-0.082*	-0.052	-0.045**
Freedom	-0.023	-0.261**	-0.109**	-0.274**	-0.217**	-0.203**	-0.005	-0.375**	-0.320**	-0.041	-0.273**	-0.217**
Equality	-0.163**	-0.177**	-0.257**	-0.246**	-0.332**	-0.129**	-0.147**	-0.301**	-0.298**	-0.236**	-0.431**	-0.251**
Responsiveness	-0.086**	-0.134**	-0.137**	-0.129**	-0.318**	-0.153**	-0.094**	-0.336**	-0.255**	-0.153**	-0.262**	-0.245**

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 3: Most Important Factors Shaping Popular Support for Democracy**

Types of Regime	Established Democracy	Emerging Democracy					Semi-democratic Regime			Transition Society	All
	Japan	Korea	Taiwan	Philippines	Thailand	Mongolia	Indonesia	Singapore	Malaysia	Hong Kong	
Indicators of Quality of Democracy											
Rule of Law		6					5				
Controlling Corruption		3		1	2		3	4	4		6
Competition	4				7	3	6			2	2
Participation	5										
Political Interest	1		1	3	1	2	1		1	3	1
Political Efficacy			5		5						5
Vertical Accountability			3	4	4			1			7
Horizontal Accountability		2	6		6						5
Freedom			7		3	4	2	3			10
Equality		5		2							
Responsiveness		4	4						2		4
Economic Conditions											
Country's Economic Condition	3					5					3
Household Economic Condition		7					7				9
Belief in Liberal Democratic Values	2	1	2			1	4	2	3	1	4

**Appendix A**  
**Survey Questions**

**I. Indicators of Quality of Democracy**

**A. Rule of Law**

*Law-abiding government*

Q104) Our current courts always punish the guilty even if they are high-ranking officials.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q113) How often do national government officials abide by the law?

1. Always
2. Most of the time
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely

*Corruption*

1) How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in the national government?

2) In your opinion, is the government working to crackdown corruption and root out bribes?

**B. Corruption**

Q118) How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in the national government?

1. Hardly anyone is involved
2. Not a lot of officials are corrupt
3. Most officials are corrupt



4. Almost everyone is corrupt

Q120) In your opinion, is the government working to crackdown corruption and root out bribes?

1. It is doing its best
2. It is doing something
3. It is not doing much
4. Doing nothing

### **C. Competition**

Q105) Political parties or candidates in our country have equal access to the mass media during the election period.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q114) How often do you think our elections offer the voters a real choice between different parties/candidates?

1. Always
2. Most of the time
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely

Q43) On the whole, how would you rate the freeness and fairness of the last national election?

1. Completely free and fair
2. Free and fair, but with minor problems
3. Free and fair, with major problems
4. Not free or fair

### **D. Participation**

#### ***Electoral Participation***

Q38) In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not

able to vote because they were away from home, they were sick or they just didn't have time. How about you? Did you vote in the election [the most recent national election, parliamentary or presidential] held in [year]?

1. Yes
2. No

Q40) Thinking about the national election in [year], did you attend a campaign meeting or rally?

1. Yes
2. No

Q41) Thinking about the national election in [year], did you try to persuade others to vote for a certain candidate or party?

1. Yes
2. No

### ***Political Interest***

Q104) How interested would you say you are in politics?

1. Very interested
2. Somewhat interested
3. Not very interested
4. Not at all interested

Q50) How often do you follow news about politics and government?

1. Everyday
2. Several times a week
3. Twice or once a week
4. Not even once a week
5. Practically never",

### ***Political Efficacy***

Q127) I think I have the ability to participate in politics.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q128) Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

### **E. Vertical Accountability**

Q103) People have the power to change a government they don't like.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q106) Between elections, the people have no way of holding the government responsible for its actions.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q112) How often do government officials withhold important information from the public view?

1. Always
2. Most of the time
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely

## **F. Horizontal Accountability**

Q 107) When the government breaks the laws, there is nothing the legal system can do.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q115) To what extent is the legislature capable of keeping the government in check?

1. Very capable
2. Capable
3. Not capable
4. Not at all capable

## **G. Freedom**

Q110) People are free to speak what they think without fear.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q111) People can join any organization they like without fear.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

## **H. Equality**

Q108) Everyone is treated equally by the government.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q109) People have basic necessities like food, clothes, and shelter.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

## **I. Responsiveness**

Q116) How well do you think the government responds to what people want?

1. Very responsive
2. Largely responsive
3. Not very responsive
4. Not responsive at all

Q102a) How likely is it that the government will solve the most important problem you identified within the next five years?

1. Very likely
2. Likely
3. Unlikely
4. Very unlikely

## **II. Popular Support for Democracy**

### **A. Preferability**

Q121) Which of the following statements comes closest to your own opinion?

2. Democracy is always preferable to any other kind of government
3. Under some circumstances, an authoritarian government can be preferable to a democratic one
4. For people like me, it does not matter whether we have a democratic or a nondemocratic regime

### **B. Desirability**

Q98) Here is a scale: 1 means complete dictatorship and 10 means complete democracy To what extent would you want our country to be democratic now?

**C. Efficacy**

Q122) Which of the following statements comes closer to your own view?

1. Democracy is capable of solving the problems of our society
2. Democracy can not solve our society's problems

**D. Priority**

Q123) If you had to choose between democracy and economic development, which would you say is more important?

1. Economic development is definitely more important
2. Economic development is somewhat more important
3. Democracy is somewhat more important
4. Democracy is definitely more important
5. The two are equally important (recorded but not explicitly offered)

**E. Suitability**

Q98) Here is a similar scale of 1 to 10 measuring the extent to which people think democracy is suitable for our country. If "1" means that democracy is completely unsuitable for [name of country] today and "10" means that it is completely suitable, where would you place our country today?

1. Democracy is completely unsuitable
2. ....
3. ....
4. ....
5. ....
6. ....
7. ....
8. ....
9. ....
10. Democracy is perfectly suitable

**IV. Belief in Liberal Democratic Values**

A.

Q77) The most important thing for political leaders is to accomplish their goals even if they have to ignore the established procedure.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q134) Government leaders are like the head of a family; we should all follow their decisions.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q135) The government should decide whether certain ideas should be allowed to be discussed in society.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q136) Harmony of the community will be disrupted if people organize lots of groups.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q137) When judges decide important cases, they should accept the view of the executive branch.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q138) If the government is constantly checked [i.e. monitored and supervised] by the

legislature, it cannot possibly accomplish great things.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q139) If we have political leaders who are morally upright, we can let them decide everything.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q140) If people have too many different ways of thinking, society will be chaotic.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Q141) When the country is facing a difficult situation, it is ok for the government to disregard the law in order to deal with the situation.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

### **III. Economic Conditions**

#### **A. Country's Economic Condition**

Q2) How would you describe the change in the economic condition of our country over the last few years? Is it ...



1. Much better
2. A little better
3. About the same
4. A little worse
5. Much worse

**B. Household Economic Condition**

Q5) How would you compare the current economic condition of your family with what it was a few years ago? Is it ...

1. Much better
2. A little better
3. About the same
4. A little worse
5. Much worse

## Appendix B

**Table 4-1 Regression Model -Japan**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.278	0.192		11.870	0.000
Rule of Law	0.020	0.103	0.007	0.198	0.843
Controlling Corruption	0.129	0.107	0.039	1.206	0.228
Competition	0.344	0.126	0.089	2.729	0.006
Participation	-0.226	0.089	-0.075	-2.547	0.011
Political Interest	0.889	0.106	0.255	8.379	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.099	0.087	0.034	1.132	0.258
Vertical Accountability	-0.045	0.122	-0.012	-0.370	0.712
Horizontal Accountability	0.179	0.107	0.057	1.681	0.093
Freedom	0.074	0.078	0.030	0.949	0.343
Equality	-0.084	0.102	-0.027	-0.817	0.414
Responsiveness	0.216	0.118	0.061	1.836	0.067
Country's Economic Condition	0.173	0.047	0.114	3.696	0.000
Household Economic Condition	-0.010	0.055	-0.005	-0.176	0.860
Democratic Values	0.059	0.007	0.236	7.952	0.000
R Square	0.199				
Adjusted R Square	0.188				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-2 Regression Model -Korea**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.746	0.128		21.434	0.000
Rule of Law	0.223	0.084	0.080	2.649	0.008
Controlling Corruption	0.259	0.082	0.098	3.150	0.002
Competition	0.095	0.097	0.030	0.978	0.328
Participation	-0.058	0.061	-0.028	-0.961	0.337
Political Interest	0.017	0.079	0.006	0.213	0.832
Political Efficacy	0.124	0.078	0.045	1.581	0.114
Vertical Accountability	-0.076	0.103	-0.022	-0.734	0.463
Horizontal Accountability	0.292	0.085	0.104	3.424	0.001
Freedom	-0.037	0.071	-0.016	-0.522	0.602
Equality	0.233	0.085	0.083	2.749	0.006
Responsiveness	0.217	0.075	0.088	2.879	0.004
Country's Economic Condition	0.044	0.042	0.032	1.038	0.300
Household Economic Condition	0.107	0.042	0.078	2.566	0.010
Democratic Values	0.035	0.007	0.152	5.191	0.000
R Square	0.110				
Adjusted R Square	0.100				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-3 Regression Model -Taiwan**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.385	0.125		19.053	0.000
Rule of Law	0.041	0.094	0.014	0.440	0.660
Controlling Corruption	0.134	0.100	0.040	1.341	0.180
Competition	-0.048	0.102	-0.014	-0.474	0.635
Participation	-0.136	0.073	-0.048	-1.863	0.063
Political Interest	0.547	0.063	0.235	8.722	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.239	0.085	0.074	2.796	0.005
Vertical Accountability	0.418	0.116	0.107	3.604	0.000
Horizontal Accountability	0.263	0.099	0.083	2.665	0.008
Freedom	0.230	0.091	0.071	2.540	0.011
Equality	-0.050	0.090	-0.017	-0.549	0.583
Responsiveness	0.291	0.097	0.088	3.000	0.003
Country's Economic Condition	0.053	0.033	0.044	1.611	0.107
Household Economic Condition	0.074	0.038	0.051	1.942	0.052
Democratic Values	0.030	0.008	0.102	3.736	0.000
R Square	0.165				
Adjusted R Square	0.156				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-4 Regression Model -Philippines**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.932	0.154		18.979	0.000
Rule of Law	-0.057	0.083	-0.022	-0.689	0.491
Controlling Corruption	0.254	0.092	0.092	2.764	0.006
Competition	0.159	0.108	0.049	1.477	0.140
Participation	0.095	0.073	0.040	1.303	0.193
Political Interest	0.205	0.080	0.080	2.579	0.010
Political Efficacy	0.024	0.084	0.009	0.288	0.774
Vertical Accountability	0.282	0.110	0.077	2.557	0.011
Horizontal Accountability	0.171	0.093	0.057	1.830	0.068
Freedom	0.012	0.072	0.006	0.170	0.865
Equality	0.233	0.088	0.087	2.650	0.008
Responsiveness	0.120	0.093	0.045	1.287	0.198
Country's Economic Condition	-0.056	0.037	-0.047	-1.495	0.135
Household Economic Condition	-0.077	0.039	-0.062	-1.957	0.051
Democratic Values	-0.006	0.007	-0.029	-0.910	0.363
R Square	0.067				
Adjusted R Square	0.054				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-5 Regression Model -Thailand**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.143	0.187		16.802	0.000
Rule of Law	-0.112	0.108	-0.032	-1.038	0.299
Controlling Corruption	0.454	0.103	0.148	4.430	0.000
Competition	0.244	0.116	0.078	2.115	0.035
Participation	0.109	0.081	0.040	1.357	0.175
Political Interest	0.487	0.090	0.161	5.423	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.280	0.115	0.070	2.431	0.015
Vertical Accountability	0.400	0.130	0.091	3.082	0.002
Horizontal Accountability	-0.205	0.093	-0.069	-2.209	0.027
Freedom	0.279	0.078	0.111	3.591	0.000
Equality	-0.192	0.102	-0.062	-1.885	0.060
Responsiveness	-0.042	0.103	-0.014	-0.409	0.682
Country's Economic Condition	-0.031	0.045	-0.021	-0.681	0.496
Household Economic Condition	-0.003	0.052	-0.002	-0.065	0.948
Democratic Values	-0.010	0.008	-0.041	-1.211	0.226
R Square	0.109				
Adjusted R Square	0.097				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-6 Regression Model -Mongolia**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.879	0.216		13.337	0.000
Rule of Law	0.101	0.076	0.049	1.342	0.180
Controlling Corruption	-0.032	0.090	-0.013	-0.357	0.721
Competition	-0.278	0.087	-0.115	-3.200	0.001
Participation	-0.006	0.062	-0.003	-0.094	0.925
Political Interest	0.323	0.085	0.127	3.813	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.054	0.070	0.025	0.766	0.444
Vertical Accountability	-0.116	0.099	-0.039	-1.163	0.245
Horizontal Accountability	-0.013	0.083	-0.005	-0.150	0.881
Freedom	0.162	0.068	0.081	2.381	0.017
Equality	-0.037	0.069	-0.019	-0.538	0.591
Responsiveness	0.073	0.096	0.027	0.753	0.451
Country's Economic Condition	0.106	0.045	0.078	2.367	0.018
Household Economic Condition	0.007	0.044	0.005	0.153	0.878
Democratic Values	0.025	0.007	0.128	3.846	0.000
R Square	0.056				
Adjusted R Square	0.043				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-7 Regression Model -Indonesia**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.547	0.172		14.849	0.000
Rule of Law	-0.295	0.102	-0.089	-2.901	0.004
Controlling Corruption	0.353	0.084	0.126	4.201	0.000
Competition	0.272	0.120	0.064	2.266	0.024
Participation	0.081	0.077	0.029	1.056	0.291
Political Interest	0.481	0.063	0.211	7.579	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.026	0.099	0.007	0.263	0.793
Vertical Accountability	0.129	0.113	0.031	1.139	0.255
Horizontal Accountability	0.026	0.102	0.008	0.252	0.801
Freedom	0.601	0.122	0.137	4.942	0.000
Equality	0.047	0.085	0.017	0.550	0.582
Responsiveness	0.067	0.102	0.020	0.658	0.511
Country's Economic Condition	-0.014	0.041	-0.010	-0.348	0.728
Household Economic Condition	0.094	0.042	0.064	2.250	0.025
Democratic Values	0.025	0.008	0.089	3.252	0.001
R Square	0.121				
Adjusted R Square	0.111				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy



**Table 4-8 Regression Model -Singapore**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.000	0.211		14.217	0.000
Rule of Law	0.061	0.128	0.019	0.479	0.632
Controlling Corruption	0.240	0.122	0.076	1.970	0.049
Competition	0.230	0.129	0.082	1.777	0.076
Participation	0.176	0.099	0.061	1.783	0.075
Political Interest	0.115	0.083	0.048	1.384	0.167
Political Efficacy	0.072	0.101	0.027	0.705	0.481
Vertical Accountability	0.439	0.110	0.141	3.994	0.000
Horizontal Accountability	-0.063	0.113	-0.022	-0.559	0.577
Freedom	-0.166	0.079	-0.082	-2.110	0.035
Equality	-0.140	0.103	-0.053	-1.361	0.174
Responsiveness	0.053	0.111	0.020	0.479	0.632
Country's Economic Condition	0.029	0.048	0.022	0.602	0.547
Household Economic Condition	0.045	0.049	0.033	0.924	0.356
Democratic Values	0.019	0.008	0.097	2.287	0.022
R Square	0.057				
Adjusted R Square	0.042				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-9 Regression Model -Malaysia**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.307	0.164		20.150	0.000
Rule of Law	-0.073	0.085	-0.029	-0.861	0.389
Controlling Corruption	0.232	0.090	0.088	2.592	0.010
Competition	0.083	0.100	0.030	0.833	0.405
Participation	0.096	0.063	0.046	1.513	0.131
Political Interest	0.386	0.068	0.180	5.673	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.132	0.086	0.047	1.534	0.125
Vertical Accountability	0.176	0.106	0.049	1.661	0.097
Horizontal Accountability	0.125	0.093	0.045	1.348	0.178
Freedom	0.140	0.081	0.064	1.736	0.083
Equality	0.137	0.090	0.058	1.528	0.127
Responsiveness	0.292	0.093	0.110	3.143	0.002
Country's Economic Condition	0.008	0.036	0.007	0.217	0.828
Household Economic Condition	0.031	0.039	0.024	0.795	0.427
Democratic Values	0.020	0.007	0.087	2.782	0.005
R Square	0.150				
Adjusted R Square	0.139				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-10 Regression Model -Hong Kong**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.466	0.244		10.089	0.000
Rule of Law	-0.071	0.125	-0.023	-0.569	0.569
Controlling Corruption	0.194	0.147	0.049	1.318	0.188
Competition	0.561	0.159	0.137	3.526	0.000
Participation	0.156	0.110	0.051	1.419	0.156
Political Interest	0.280	0.088	0.116	3.188	0.001
Political Efficacy	0.104	0.134	0.028	0.779	0.436
Vertical Accountability	0.186	0.122	0.056	1.518	0.129
Horizontal Accountability	0.165	0.098	0.065	1.694	0.091
Freedom	0.135	0.140	0.035	0.964	0.335
Equality	0.010	0.123	0.003	0.082	0.935
Responsiveness	-0.070	0.121	-0.023	-0.581	0.562
Country's Economic Condition	0.026	0.053	0.019	0.497	0.620
Household Economic Condition	-0.031	0.055	-0.021	-0.575	0.566
Democratic Values	0.042	0.009	0.174	4.660	0.000
R Square	0.105				
Adjusted R Square	0.089				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-11 Regression Model - Vietnam**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.341	0.285		4.702	0.000
Rule of Law	0.200	0.108	0.072	1.850	0.065
Controlling Corruption	-0.111	0.132	-0.030	-0.841	0.400
Competition	0.628	0.152	0.185	4.139	0.000
Participation	-0.105	0.054	-0.059	-1.931	0.054
Political Interest	0.645	0.084	0.254	7.691	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.100	0.076	0.041	1.326	0.185
Vertical Accountability	-0.070	0.107	-0.020	-0.649	0.517
Horizontal Accountability	0.242	0.108	0.077	2.243	0.025
Freedom	0.086	0.074	0.039	1.159	0.247
Equality	0.131	0.104	0.053	1.256	0.209
Responsiveness	-0.056	0.118	-0.018	-0.470	0.639
Country's Economic Condition	0.260	0.066	0.130	3.953	0.000
Household Economic Condition	0.085	0.050	0.056	1.694	0.091
Democratic Values	0.024	0.008	0.105	3.116	0.002
R Square	0.273				
Adjusted R Square	0.262				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy

**Table 4-12 Regression Model -Eleven countries**

	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.661	0.047		56.911	0.000
Rule of Law	0.018	0.028	0.007	0.623	0.533
Controlling Corruption	0.178	0.028	0.066	6.349	0.000
Competition	0.248	0.033	0.080	7.602	0.000
Participation	0.035	0.021	0.016	1.695	0.090
Political Interest	0.450	0.022	0.186	20.100	0.000
Political Efficacy	0.182	0.027	0.061	6.799	0.000
Vertical Accountability	0.183	0.033	0.051	5.624	0.000
Horizontal Accountability	0.055	0.029	0.020	1.923	0.054
Freedom	0.064	0.023	0.026	2.719	0.007
Equality	0.004	0.026	0.002	0.149	0.882
Responsiveness	0.217	0.030	0.079	7.199	0.000
Country's Economic Condition	0.061	0.012	0.053	5.108	0.000
Household Economic Condition	0.062	0.013	0.046	4.609	0.000
Democratic Values	0.019	0.002	0.089	9.542	0.000
R Square	0.124				
Adjusted R Square	0.123				

Dependent Variable: Democratic Legitimacy