

HOW EAST ASIANS VIEW DEMOCRACY

HOW EAST ASIANS VIEW DEMOCRACY

Edited by Yun-han Chu, Larry Diamond,
Andrew J. Nathan, *and* Doh Chull Shin



COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Publishers Since 1893

New York Chichester, West Sussex

Copyright © 2008 Columbia University Press

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

How East Asians view democracy / edited by Yun-han Chu . . . [et al.].

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-231-14534-3 (cloth : alk. paper) —

ISBN 978-0-231-51783-6 (e-book)

1. Democracy—East Asia—Case studies. 2. Democracy—East Asia—Public opinion. 3. Public opinion—East Asia. 4. East Asia—Politics and government—21st century. I. Zhu, Yunhan. II. Title.

JQ1499.A91H69 2008

321.8095—dc22

2008007235



Columbia University Press books are printed on permanent and durable acid-free paper.

This book is printed on paper with recycled content.

Printed in the United States of America

c 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

References to Internet Web sites (URLs) were accurate at the time of writing. Neither the editors nor Columbia University Press is responsible for URLs that may have expired or changed since the manuscript was prepared.

Note to Readers

For more published and unpublished research based on the surveys, please see www.asianbarometer.org.

To Professor Fu Hu,
Pioneer, Inspiration, Example:
His research and teaching over the decades
set the agenda for our work.

CONTENTS

List of Figures and Tables ix

Acknowledgments xiii

1. Introduction: Comparative Perspectives on Democratic Legitimacy in East Asia 1
YUN-HAN CHU, LARRY DIAMOND, ANDREW J. NATHAN, AND DOH CHULL SHIN
2. The Mass Public and Democratic Politics in South Korea: Exploring the Subjective World of Democratization in Flux 39
DOH CHULL SHIN AND CHONG-MIN PARK
3. Mass Public Perceptions of Democratization in the Philippines: Consolidation in Progress? 61
LINDA LUZ GUERRERO AND ROLLIN F. TUSALEM
4. How Citizens View Taiwan's New Democracy 83
YU-TZUNG CHANG AND YUN-HAN CHU
5. Developing Democracy Under a New Constitution in Thailand 114
ROBERT B. ALBRITTON AND THAWILWADEE BUREEKUL
6. The Mass Public and Democratic Politics in Mongolia 139
DAMBA GANBAT, ROLLIN F. TUSALEM, AND DAVID DA-SHUA YANG
7. Japanese Attitudes and Values Toward Democracy 161
KEN'ICHI IKEDA AND MASARU KOHNO

8. Democratic Transition Frustrated: The Case of Hong Kong	187
WAI-MAN LAM AND HSIN-CHI KUAN	
9. China: Democratic Values Supporting an Authoritarian System	209
TIANJIAN SHI	
10. Conclusion: Values, Regime Performance, and Democratic Consolidation	238
YUN-HAN CHU, LARRY DIAMOND, AND ANDREW J. NATHAN	
<i>Appendix 1. Sampling and Fieldwork Methods</i>	259
<i>Appendix 2. Research Protocol</i>	268
<i>Appendix 3. Coding Scheme for Open-Ended Question on Understanding of Democracy</i>	270
<i>Appendix 4. Question Wording</i>	275
<i>Works Cited</i>	281
<i>Contributors</i>	297
<i>Index</i>	301

FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1.1.	Indicators of Democratic Consolidation	5
Table 1.2.	Survey Schedules and Sample Sizes of First-Wave EAB	6
Table 1.3.	Meaning of Democracy	12
Table 1.4.	Citizen Empowerment	15
Table 1.5.	Perceptions of the Past Regime	17
Table 1.6.	Perceptions of the Current Regime	18
Table 1.7.	Perceived Change from Past to Current Regime	20
Table 1.8.	Support for Democracy	22
Table 1.9.	Authoritarian Detachment	25
Table 1.10.	Correlation Between Authoritarian Detachment and Support for Democracy	26
Table 1.11.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy	28
Table 1.12.	Expected Change from Current to Future Regime	30
Table 1.13.	Commitment to Rule of Law	33
Table 2.1.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: Korea	44
Figure 2.1.	Perceived Regime Change: Korea	45
Table 2.2.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: Korea	47
Table 2.3.	Perception of Political Corruption at National and Local Levels: Korea	50
Figure 2.2.	Trust in Institutions: Korea	51
Figure 2.3.	Democratic Support: Korea	55
Figure 2.4.	Authoritarian Detachment: Korea	56
Figure 2.5.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: Korea	57

Table 2.4.	Current and Expected Future Regime Type: Korea	58
Table 3.1.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: The Philippines	67
Figure 3.1.	Perceived Regime Change: The Philippines	68
Table 3.2.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: The Philippines	69
Table 3.3.	Perception of Political Corruption at National and Local Levels: The Philippines	72
Figure 3.2.	Trust in Institutions: The Philippines	74
Figure 3.3.	Democratic Support: The Philippines	77
Figure 3.4.	Authoritarian Detachment: The Philippines	78
Figure 3.5.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: The Philippines	79
Table 3.4.	Current and Expected Future Regime Type: The Philippines	80
Table 4.1.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: Taiwan	93
Figure 4.1.	Perceived Regime Change: Taiwan	94
Table 4.2.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: Taiwan	96
Table 4.3.	Perception of Political Corruption at National and Local Levels: Taiwan	99
Figure 4.2.	Trust in Institutions: Taiwan	101
Table 4.4.	Satisfaction with the Way Democracy Works in Taiwan	103
Table 4.5.	Satisfaction with the Way Democracy Works: Correlation Analysis	104
Figure 4.3.	Desirability and Suitability of Democracy: Taiwan	105
Figure 4.4.	Democratic Support: Taiwan	106
Figure 4.5.	Authoritarian Detachment: Taiwan	107
Figure 4.6.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: Taiwan	108
Table 4.6.	Current and Expected Future Regime Type: Taiwan	109
Table 5.1.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: Thailand	121
Table 5.2.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: Thailand	122
Table 5.3.	Perception of Political Corruption at National and Local Levels: Thailand	125
Table 5.4.	Personal Experiences of Corruption by Setting (Rural/Urban)	126
Figure 5.1.	Trust in Institutions: Thailand	128
Figure 5.2.	Democratic Support: Thailand	130
Figure 5.3.	Authoritarian Detachment: Thailand	131
Figure 5.4.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: Thailand	132

Table 5.5.	Current and Expected Future Regime Type: Thailand	135
Table 6.1.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: Mongolia	144
Figure 6.1.	Perceived Regime Change: Mongolia	145
Table 6.2.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: Mongolia	147
Table 6.3.	Perception of Political Corruption at National and Local Levels: Mongolia	151
Figure 6.2.	Trust in Institutions: Mongolia	152
Figure 6.3.	Democratic Support: Mongolia	155
Figure 6.4.	Authoritarian Detachment: Mongolia	156
Figure 6.5.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: Mongolia	157
Table 6.4.	Current and Expected Future Regime Type: Mongolia	158
Figure 7.1.	Meaning of Democracy by Age Group	165
Table 7.1.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: Japan	166
Table 7.2.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: Japan	168
Table 7.3.	Time-Series Data on Cabinet Evaluation: 1979–2003	171
Table 7.4.	Perception of Political Corruption at National and Local Levels: Japan	173
Figure 7.2.	Trust in Institutions: Japan	174
Table 7.5.	Time-Series Data on Trust in Institutions, 1990–2003	175
Table 7.6.	“Politics Are Too Complicated to Understand”	176
Table 7.7.	“I Have No Say in What the Government Does”	177
Table 7.8.	System Responsiveness and Citizen Empowerment	178
Figure 7.3.	Democratic Support: Japan	181
Figure 7.4.	Authoritarian Detachment: Japan	182
Figure 7.5.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: Japan	183
Table 7.9.	Current and Expected Future Regime Type: Japan	184
Table 8.1.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: Hong Kong	194
Figure 8.1.	Perceived Regime Change: Hong Kong	195
Table 8.2.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: Hong Kong	196
Table 8.3.	Perception of Political Corruption: Hong Kong	199
Figure 8.2.	Trust in Institutions: Hong Kong	200
Figure 8.3.	Democratic Support: Hong Kong	203
Figure 8.4.	Authoritarian Detachment: Hong Kong	204
Figure 8.5.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: Hong Kong	205
Table 8.4.	Current and Expected Future Regime Type: Hong Kong	207
Table 9.1.	Correlation of Political Fear with NA and DK	214

Table 9.2.	Liberal Concepts of Democracy: China	217
Table 9.3.	Perceptions of Past and Current Regimes: China	219
Figure 9.1.	Perceived Regime Change: China	220
Table 9.4.	Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes: China	222
Table 9.5.	Perception of Political Corruption at National and Local Levels: China	226
Figure 9.2.	Trust in Institutions: China	229
Table 9.6.	Regression Analysis of Trust in Political Institutions: China	231
Figure 9.3.	Democratic Support: China	233
Figure 9.4.	Patterns of Commitment to Democracy: China	234
Table 10.1.	Average PDI of Perceived Performance of Current and Past Regimes	239
Table 10.2.	Regional Differences in Democratic Orientations	242
Table 10.3.	Impact of Regime Policy Performance on Support for Democracy	250
Table 10.4.	Impact of Modernization on Commitment to Rule of Law	253
Table 16.1.	Data Transformation for Ten Condensed Categories for Producing a Table of Cumulative Frequency Distribution	274

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This is the first book to emerge from the Asian Barometer Survey, a comparative survey of democratization and value change across the region. The project was launched in 2000 under the name East Asia Barometer, with a three-year grant from the Ministry of Education of the Republic of China (Taiwan). Headquartered in the Department of Political Science of National Taiwan University (NTU) under the codirectorship of Yun-han Chu and Fu Hu, the East Asia Barometer survey involved more than twenty leading scholars from across the region and the United States.

This path-breaking project was built upon a substantial base of completed scholarly work in a number of East Asian localities. In Taiwan, Fu Hu launched the island's first scientific survey on citizens' political attitudes and political participation in 1975. Since then the NTU research team has conducted over seventeen island-wide face-to-face surveys under his leadership. In Hong Kong, Hsin-chi Kuan and Siu-kai Lau of the Chinese University of Hong Kong launched their first Hong Kong-wide survey research on popular values in the social, economic, political, and cultural realms in 1985. Since then they have implemented a series of extensive surveys on voting, political participation, and social indicators. In the Philippines, the country's first nonpartisan social research institute, the Social Weather Stations, established in 1985 and led by Mahar Mangahas and Linda Luz Guerrero, evolved into the country's leading nonprofit survey organization. In South Korea, Doh Chull Shin launched the Korean Democratization Survey (which later became known as the Korean Democracy Barometer

Survey) in 1988. Since then the project has been continually monitoring a triple transition—political democratization, cultural democratization, and economic liberalization—and its consequences for the quality of life. With the support of the Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation, National Science Foundation, and Henry Luce Foundation, between 1991 and 1994 the Taiwan and Hong Kong teams collaborated with Tianjian Shi, Andrew J. Nathan, and James Tong in a collaborative project for the comparative study of political culture and political participation in the three culturally Chinese societies—Taiwan, Hong Kong, and mainland China. This collaboration laid the foundation for the region-wide initiative that came into being in late 1999.

All the research teams and advisors who participated in the East Asia Barometer survey contributed to the development of the research agenda, conceptual framework, and survey instrument, in addition to implementing rigorous methodological criteria in their fieldwork. Hearty thanks are due to the following people and their survey teams: Ken'ichi Ikeda, Masaru Kohno, and Yasuo Yamada (Japan); Chong-Min Park, Hyeon-Woo Lee, and Ah-Ran Hwang (South Korea); Damba Ganbat and the team of the Academy of Political Education (Mongolia); Huoyan Shyu, Yu-tzung Chang, Yangchih Fu, Yung-tai Hong, and Alfred Hu (Taiwan); Hsin-Chi Kuan, Wai-man Lam, Timothy Ka-ying Wong, and Ma Ngok (Hong Kong); Tianjian Shi, Chih-yu Shih, Yung-tai Hong, and Yu-tzung Chang (mainland China); Mahar Mangahas and Linda Luz Guerrero (the Philippines); Robert Albritton and Thawilwadee Bureekul (Thailand).

For intellectual advice and guidance we thank Michael Bratton, Russell Dalton, Ronald Inglehart, Marta Lagos, Robert Mattes, William Mishler, and Richard Rose. For indispensable research assistance at various stages of the project we thank Nathan Batto, Tse-hsin Chen, Takashi Ooyama, David Da-hua Yang, and Fu-yi Yang. The talented and dedicated administrator of the project has been Kai-Ping Huang.

Taiwan's Ministry of Education, National Science Council, Academia Sinica, and National Taiwan University provided major funding support. Additional funding for individual surveys came from the Hong Kong Research Grants Council, the Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation, and the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea. The Henry Luce Foundation and the Taiwan Foundation for Democracy financed many of our conferences and field trips. Since 2005, the headquarters of the East Asia Barometer has been cohosted by the Institute of Political Science of the Academia Sinica (IPSAS) and the Institute for the Advanced Studies of Humanities and Social Sciences (ASHSS) of National Taiwan University; the project benefited

greatly from the generous support of these two institutions. We express particular thanks to Yu-shan Wu, director of IPSAS, and Tzong-ho Bao, dean of ASHSS. We are also grateful to the following institutions for their support: the Department of Political Science of National Taiwan University; the Hoover Institution and the Center for Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law at Stanford University; the Department of Political Science and the Weatherhead East Asian Institute at Columbia University; and the Department of Political Science at the University of Missouri.

HOW EAST ASIANS VIEW DEMOCRACY

