APPENDIX 1

Sampling and Fieldwork Methods

The East Asia Barometer project was inaugurated in June 2000, with its headquarters at the Department of Political Science at National Taiwan University. At the time of the first round of surveys (2001 through 2003), the project consisted of thirty-one collaborating scholars from eight East Asian countries and the United States, and five international consultants who were involved in similar projects in other regions. Coordination for the surveys was supported by grants from the Ministry of Education of the Republic of China, National Taiwan University, and the Academia Sinica. Local survey administration was supported by other funding, mostly local.

Leaders of the eight local teams and the international consultants collaboratively drew up a 125-item core questionnaire designed for a forty- to forty-five-minute face-to-face interview. The survey was designed in English and translated into local languages by the national teams. Between July 2001 and February 2003, the collaborating national teams administered one or more waves of this survey in eight Asian countries or territories.

Further information on sampling and methodology is available on the project Web site at http://www.asianbarometer.org/newenglish/surveys/SurveyMethods.htm.

KOREA SURVEY

The South Korea survey was conducted in February 2003, by the Survey Research Center at Korea University. The survey population was defined as all Korean nationals aged twenty and older with the right to vote residing in the territory of South Korea, except the island of Cheju-do, which has 1.2% of the population.

Sampling was conducted in four stages. At the first stage, the country was geographically stratified into sixteen strata—seven metropolitan cities and nine provinces (*do*). Each province was further stratified into two substrata (urban and rural). At the second stage, the administrative subdivisions (*dong*) of the respective metropolitan cities and those (*dong* or *ri*) of the respective provincial substrata were identified. From these subdivisions preliminary sampling locations were randomly selected according to probability proportionate to their population size. At the third stage, urban districts (*ban*) and rural villages were randomly selected as primary sampling units from the respective preliminary sampling locations. Six to eight households from a district and twelve to fifteen from a village were randomly selected. Finally, at the household level, the interviewers were instructed to select for interview the person whose birthday came next.

If no one was at home at a household, or if the adult selected for interview was not at home, the interviewer was instructed to call back two times. A total of 3,224 addresses were selected. At 649 addresses, there was no one at home after two callbacks so that the household residents could not be enumerated and a respondent could not be selected. Of the 2,575 households where an individual name could be selected by the birthday method, thirty-two individuals were not interviewed because they were too old or infirm or were absent from the household; 630 refused; and 413 were not completed because of the respondent's impatience, a common problem in surveys in Korea. Of 2,575 voters sampled, we completed face-to-face interviews with 1,500, registering a response rate of 58%.

Fieldwork was undertaken by regularly employed interviewers of the Garam Research Institute. Each interviewer participated in a one-day orientation session and completed three trial interviews. Twenty percent of the completed interviews were randomly selected for independent validation.

The EAB core questionnaire for the project was the main part of the South Korea survey. Interviews were conducted in Korean. The mean length of interviews was sixty minutes, with a range from fifty to ninety minutes.

SPSS chi-squared tests were performed to determine the comparability of subsamples defined by gender, age, and region with the corresponding segments of the survey population, as defined in the 2000 report of the Population and Housing Census of the National Statistical Office. The subsamples matched the population segments with respect to gender, age, and region of residence, so no weighting variable was constructed.

PHILIPPINES SURVEY

The Philippines survey was conducted in March 2002 by Social Weather Stations, an independent, nonstock, nonprofit social research organization. It yielded 1,200 valid cases out of 3,059 sampled cases for a response rate of 39.2%.

In the conduct of the survey, the Philippines was divided into four study areas: the National Capital Region (NCR), Balance Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. The targeted sample size of each study area was set at three-hundred voting-age adults (aged eighteen and older), for a total sample size of 1,200. Within each of the four study areas, multistage sampling with probability proportional to population size (PPS) was used in the selection of sample spots. In the NCR, sixty precincts were sampled from among the seventeen cities and municipalities in such a way that each city or municipality was assigned a number of precincts that was roughly proportional to its population size. An additional provision was that at least one precinct must be chosen within each municipality. Precincts were then selected at random from within each municipality by PPS. In the other three study areas, each study area was divided into regions. Sample provinces for each region were selected by PPS, with the additional provision that each region must have at least one sampled province. Within each study area, fifteen municipalities were allocated among the sample provinces, and selected from within each sample province with PPS, again with the provision that each province must include at least one municipality. Sixty sample spots for each of the major areas were allocated among the sample municipalities. The spots were distributed in such a way that each municipality was assigned a number of spots roughly proportional to its population size. Sample precincts (urban) or sample barangays (rural) within each sample municipality were selected using simple random sampling.

Within each sampled unit, interval sampling from a randomly chosen starting point was used to draw five households. In each selected household, a respondent was randomly chosen among the household members of a given sex (to assure a fifty-fifty stratification by sex) who were eighteen years of age and older, using a Kish grid. A respondent not contacted during the first attempt was visited a second time. If the respondent remained unavailable, a substitute was interviewed who possessed the same attributes as the original respondent in terms of sex, age bracket, socioeconomic class, and work status. The substitute respondent was taken from another household beyond the covered intervals in the sample precinct or barangay.

The questionnaire was incorporated within an omnibus survey, in which the EAB module was asked first, followed by a number of items comparing foreign and domestic companies and seeking opinions on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).Interviews were conducted face to face. The EAB module was translated from English into Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilonggo, Ilocano, and Bicolano; Philippine-specific questionnaire items were translated from a Tagalog master version into the other four local languages (as well as into English to serve as a check on the meaning of the Tagalog original). All five Philippine languages (i.e., excluding English) were used in administering the questionnaire, depending on the language spoken by the respondent.

Interviewers were professional interviewers of NFO-Trends, a private market research survey group. In addition to general training, they underwent a minimum of

three days of specific training on this questionnaire before going into the field. Supervisors observed at least 10% of field interviews. Spot checks were undertaken after 30% of interviews were completed, after 60% completion, and after 90% completion of interviewing. During spot checking, about 20% of the unsupervised interviews were reviewed with respondents or conducted again.

Since the sample contained three hundred individuals from each of four unequally-sized major areas of the country, weighting variables were constructed to weight each case proportionately to the population size of the area where the individual was interviewed.

TAIWAN SURVEY

The Taiwan survey was conducted in June and July 2001 by the Comparative Study of Democratization and Value Changes Project Office, National Taiwan University. The target population was defined as ROC citizens aged twenty and over who had the right to vote. This population was sampled according to the Probabilities Proportionate to Size (PPS) method in three stages: counties and towns, villages and precincts (*li*), and individual voters. Taiwan was divided into eight statistically distinct divisions. Within each division, four, six, or eight counties or towns were selected; from each of these two villages or precincts were selected; and in each of these between thirteen and sixteen individuals (not households) were sampled. In the municipalities of Taipei and Kaohsiung, only precincts and individuals were sampled.

The sampling design called for 1,416 valid interviews. In order to replace respondents who could not be contacted or who refused to be interviewed, a supplementary pool of fifteen times the size of the original sample was taken. If a respondent could not be interviewed, he or she was replaced by a person from the supplementary pool of the same gender and age. Of the original sample, 714 of 1,416 were successfully interviewed for a success rate of 50.4%. To produce the other 701 successful cases, a total of 1,727 supplementary respondents were contacted. Overall, we attempted to interview a total of 3,143 people and successfully completed 1,415 interviews for a response rate of 45.0%.

A chi-squared test showed that the procedure oversampled citizens between the ages of thirty and fifty, and those with educational levels of senior high school and above. Although the sample passed the chi-squared test for gender, it contained about 4% fewer males and 4% more females than expected. Weighting variables for the sample were therefore calculated along the three dimensions of gender, age, and educational level using the method of raking.

The questionnaire used in Taiwan was composed of the core questionnaire used in all participating countries and a supplementary module employed in the three predominantly Chinese societies of China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.

The interviews were conducted by 140 university students. Over three hundred students interviewed for these jobs; we chose among the applicants based on their ability to communicate in both Mandarin and Taiwanese, previous interviewing experience, and our geographic needs. The interviewers were overseen by fifteen supervisors, most of whom had previously served as interviewers in a survey on the 2000 presidential election. All interviewers attended a day-long training session.

Of the interviews, 64.8% were conducted predominantly or exclusively in Mandarin, 14.1% were conducted predominantly or exclusively in Taiwanese, and 20.5% used a mixture of Mandarin and Taiwanese. The remaining 0.6% were conducted in other languages.

To check the quality of the data collected, we conducted post-tests of all 1,415 cases. Fifteen percent of these were done in person and the other 85% were conducted by telephone. Kappa values for all eight of the variables retested ranged between .328 (fair) and .860 (almost perfect). None of the kappa values fell in the "poor" or "slight" ranges, evidence that the data possess a fairly high degree of reliability.

THAILAND SURVEY

The Thailand survey was conducted in October and November 2001 by King Prajadhipok's Institute, an independent, publicly-funded research institute chartered by the Thai Parliament.[1]

The sampling procedure had three stages. In the first stage, fifty legislative constituencies were randomly selected from among four hundred across the nation. In the second stage, one hundred voting districts (precincts) were randomly selected from within the fifty constituencies. Because Thai constituencies and districts are of relatively equal population size, it was not necessary to use probability proportionate to size (PPS) methods. Finally, respondents' names were randomly sampled from voting lists from these districts. All persons aged eighteen and over are named on these voting lists, with the exception of a few small categories disenfranchised under the voting law. If selected respondents were unavailable, substitutes of the same gender were obtained from names on either side of the chosen respondent on the voting list. Such substitutions occurred in 116 cases. The procedure yielded 1,546 cases. After disqualifying fifteen for noncompletion of the questionnaire, the sample was reduced to 1,531.

The sample was consistent with census data with respect to gender and region, but failed the chi-squared test with respect to age. A weighting variable was constructed using gender and age statistics.

The questionnaire included all of the questions in the core survey, with about a dozen additional Thailand-specific questions. The interviews were conducted under the supervision of regional coordinators who accompanied teams of field workers, distributed and collected questionnaires, and checked to see that returned questionnaires had been completed. The coordinators were university professors who were paid to

coordinate the study. The interviewers, who were students at regional universities, were paid for each interview. The interviews were conducted in the local dialects, including Malay in the southern provinces, except when the respondent preferred to speak in Central Thai. The language of each interview is coded in the data.

MONGOLIA SURVEY

The Mongolia survey was conducted from October through December 2002 by the Academy of Political Education, in cooperation with the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences. The Academy of Political Education is a nongovernmental, nonprofit, nonpartisan institution established in 1993, to support and strengthen democratization and civil society in Mongolia.[2]

A one-stage probability sample was constructed of Mongolian citizens aged eighteen and older. We selected 1,150 from Mongolia's six provinces (*aimag*) and two cities with a probability proportional to size, based upon population data in the *Mongolian Statistical Yearbook* (National Statistical Office of Mongolia 2001). As a supplement, two thousand parliamentary election voter registration lists from the General Election Commission of Mongolia were used to check the number of citizens aged eighteen and older in selected provinces and cities.

A selection table was used to select the individual respondent within the sampled household. A sampled respondent who was not available was replaced by another respondent from the original sample. At initial contact, respondents were asked to agree to an interview and the interview was scheduled for a later time. The survey yielded 1,144 valid cases out of 1,200 sampled cases for a response rate of 95.3%.

The interviewers were twenty-four staff of the academy (twenty-two researchers and two technical staff) and twenty volunteer students of sociology from the Mongolian National University. Interviewers underwent one week of training in September 2002. The survey administered the project's core questionnaire, as translated from English to Mongolian, with a number of adjustments to accommodate Mongolian election dates and political party names. Questionnaires were administered face to face, in the Mongolian language.

Compared to national population statistics from the 2000 census, the sample overrepresented respondents aged forty through sixty-four, females, and those from certain regions. The sample is therefore weighted using the method of raking to correct for these three biases.

JAPAN SURVEY

The Japan survey was conducted by the Department of Social Psychology, University of Tokyo, in January and February 2003. It yielded 1,418 valid cases out of 2,000

sampled cases for a response rate of 70.9%. The target population was the voting age population in all forty-seven prefectures. The method was a two-stage random sample from the population of individual males and females twenty years and older throughout Japan.

The first-stage sampling units were districts established in the 2000 national census. The number of units was calculated so that the sample size in each unit would be about thirteen. This led to a first-stage sample of 157 districts, consisting of 122 cities or wards and thirty-five towns or villages. In the second stage of sampling, respondents were selected from voter lists, or in some districts complete residence registries, using an equal interval selection method. Voter lists and residence registries are substitutable because the proportion of residents disqualified from voting is small.

Fieldwork was undertaken by regularly employed interviewers of Central Research Services, a marketing and public opinion research firm. The interviewers were trained survey fieldworkers, who received an additional orientation session for this survey.

The EAB core questionnaire formed the main part of the survey. Interviews were conducted in Japanese. The mean length of interviews was 40.8 minutes, with a range from fifteen to 107 minutes. The survey also included some additional variables, among them evaluation of the current cabinet, Inglehart's values scale, a daily life political intolerance scale, a private life orientation scale, a local politics conversation scale, a local area attachment scale, a generalized trust scale, and a portion of the values scale developed in Taiwan by Fu Hu.

The sample was weighted for gender, age, and education using the method of raking.

HONG KONG SURVEY

The Hong Kong survey was conducted from September through December 2001 by Kuan Hsin-chi and Lau Siu-kai under the auspices of the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong. It yielded 811 valid cases out of 1,651 sampled cases for a response rate of 49.12%. The target population was defined as Hong Kong people aged twenty to seventy-five residing in permanent residential living quarters in built-up areas.

The sampling method involved a multistage design. First, a sample of two thousand residential addresses from the computerized Sub-Frame of Living Quarters maintained by the Census and Statistics Department was selected. In selecting the sample, living quarters were first stratified with respect to area and type of housing. The sample of quarters selected was of the EPSEM (equal probability of selection method) type and was random in the statistical sense. Where a selected address had more than one household with persons aged twenty to seventy-five, or was a group

household (such as a hostel), a random numbers table preattached to each address was used to select one household or one person. If the drawn household had more than one person aged twenty to seventy-five, a random selection grid, i.e., a modified Kish grid, was employed to select one interviewee. A face-to-face interview was conducted to complete the questionnaire. The interviewers were recruited from the student body of the Chinese University. Apart from the core items, the questionnaire contained questions unique to the local context of Hong Kong.

SPSS nonparametric chi-squared tests were conducted to compare the gender, age, and educational attainment of the sample with the attributes of the target population as reported in the Hong Kong 2001 population census. The gender and educational attainment distributions of the sample did not differ significantly from those of the target population. Raking was used to generate a weighting variable to correct for the underrepresentation of the younger age group (aged from twenty to thirty-nine) in the sample.

CHINA SURVEY

The China survey was conducted from March through June 2002, in cooperation with the Institute of Sociology of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. It yielded 3,183 valid cases out of 3,752 sampled cases for a response rate of 84.1%. The sample represents the adult population over eighteen years of age residing in family households at the time of the survey, excluding those living in the Tibetan Autonomous Region. A stratified multistage area sampling procedure with probabilities proportional to size measures (PPS) was employed to select the sample.

The Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) employed in the sample design are counties (*xian*) in rural areas and cities (*shi*) in urban areas. In province-level municipalities, districts (*qu*) were used as the PSU. Before selection, counties were stratified by region and geographical characteristic and cities or districts by region and size. A total of sixty-seven cities or districts and sixty-two counties were selected as the primary sampling units, distributed among all province-level administrative units except Tibet. The secondary sampling units (SSUs) were townships (*xiang*) and districts (*qu*) or streets (*jiedao*). The third stage of selection was geared to administrative villages in rural areas and neighborhood committees (*juweihui*) or community committees (*shequ weiyuanhui*) in urban areas. We selected 249 administrative villages and 247 neighborhood or community committees in the third stage of the sampling process. A total of 496 sampling units were selected. Households were used at the fourth stage of sampling.

In the selection of PSUs, the National Statistical Bureau's 1999 volume of population statistics (Guojia tongjiju renkou tongjisi 1999) was used as the basic source for constructing the sampling frame. The number of family households for each county or city was taken as the measure of size (MOS) in the PPS selection process.

For the successive stages of sampling, population data were obtained from the All China Women's Association (ACWA), using data collected by that organization for a 2000 survey on women's status in China. For areas not covered in the ACWA survey, we asked local ACWA chapters to collect sampling data for us. For all village and neighborhood committee levels, household registration (*hukou*) lists were obtained. The lists were used as the sampling frame for the fourth stage of the sampling process.

The response rate for urban areas was lower than that for the rural areas. For urban area, the response rate was 82.5%, and rural areas it was 86.5%. Weighting variables for the sample were calculated along the three dimensions of gender, age, and educational level using the method of raking.[3]

The questionnaire used in mainland China varied from the core questionnaire used in the other societies in two ways. First, for all the questions in the core questionnaire asking respondents to compare the current situation in their society to that of the authoritarian past, we asked respondents to compare the current situation with that in Mao's period. Second, the questionnaire repeated some questions used in our 1993 mainland China survey, to facilitate possible cross-time comparison.

Retired middle-school teachers were employed as interviewers for the survey. Before interviews started, our collaborators in China contacted the association of retired middle-school teachers in the Dongcheng and Haidian districts in Beijing to ask their help in identifying newly retired teachers. We invited retired teachers aged fifty-five to sixty-two to apply for jobs as interviewers. About 150 retired teachers applied, and we chose sixty-seven as interviewers. The interviewers went through an intensive training program, which introduced basic concepts of social science research, survey sampling, and interview techniques, and familiarized them with the questionnaire to be used in the survey. After a course of lectures, the interviewers practiced among themselves and then conducted practice interviews with residents of a rural village near Beijing. At the end of the training course, interviewers were subjected to a rigorous test.

The mainland China team adopted two measures of quality control. First, we sent letters to prospective respondents, stating that an interviewer would come to his or her home to conduct an interview within a month. The letter included a self-addressed envelope and an evaluation form asking the respondent to report 1) whether the interviewer arrived as promised, and 2) the respondent's evaluation of the interviewer's attitude toward his or her job. Second, field supervisors randomly checked 5% of respondents to evaluate the quality of the interview. We informed interviewers about the control mechanisms to deter them from cheating.

Mandarin was used for most interviews. Interviewers were authorized to hire interpreters to deal with respondents unable to understand Mandarin.

APPENDIX 2

Research Protocol

The eight teams who administered the surveys adopted the following standards.

- *National probability samples* that give every citizen an equal chance of being selected for an interview. Whether using census household lists or a multistage area approach, the method for selecting sampling units is always randomized. The samples can be stratified, or weights can be applied, to ensure coverage of rural areas and minority populations in their correct proportions. As a result, samples represent the adult, voting-age population in each political system surveyed.
- A *standard questionnaire instrument* which contains a core module of identical or functionally equivalent questions across countries. Wherever possible, theoretical concepts are measured with multiple items in order to enable testing for construct validity. Item wording is determined by balancing various criteria, including the research themes emphasized in the survey, the comprehensibility of the item to lay respondents, and the demonstrated effectiveness of the item in previous surveys.
- *Intensive training of fieldworkers*, including supervisors and fieldwork managers. We recruit interviewers from among university graduates, senior social science undergraduates, or professional survey interviewers. All managers and supervisors have extensive field experience. Field teams pass through intensive, week-long training programs to become familiarized with our research instrument, sampling methods, and the cultural and ethical contexts of the interview. Guidelines are codified in instruction manuals that spell out procedures for the selection and replacement of samples, the validation of interview records, and the etiquette of conducting interviews.
- *Face-to-face interviews* in respondents' homes or workplaces in the language of the respondent's choice. In multilingual countries, local-language translations are prepared with the goal of accommodating every language group whose members

constitute at least 5% of the population. To check for accuracy, the local-language versions are screened through blind back-translation by a different translator and any discrepancies are corrected. Interviewers are required to record contextual information on any situations encountered during the interview.

- *Adherence to ethical codes with respect to studying human subjects.* Respondents are asked for voluntary consent to participate in the interview. Researchers are to pay due attention to any potential political, physical, or other risk to the respondent before, during, or after the interview. The privacy of the respondents is protected. The individual questionnaires and survey data are archived in such a manner that they cannot be linked to the individual respondent.
- *Quality control* by means of strict protocols for fieldwork supervision. To ensure data quality, all interview teams travel together under the direction of a field supervisor. Interviewers are debriefed each evening and instructed to return to the sampled household to finish any incomplete returns. Supervisors undertake random back-checks with respondents to ensure that sampling and interviews were conducted correctly.
- *Quality checks* are enforced at every stage of data conversion to ensure that information from paper returns is edited, coded, and entered correctly for purposes of computer analysis. Machine-readable data are generated by trained data entry operators and a minimum of 10% of the data is entered twice by independent teams for purposes of cross-checking. Data cleaning involves checks for illegal and logically inconsistent values.

APPENDIX 3

Coding Scheme for Open-Ended Question on Understanding of Democracy

The Three-Digit Codes for Popular Understanding of Democracy

100 Interpreting democracy in generic (populist) terms
110 Popular sovereignty
111 Government of the people

120 Government by the people
121 People as their own master
122 Power of the people

130 Government for the people
131 Putting people's interest first
132 Care for people
133 Responsive to people's need
134 Governing in the interest of general welfare

140 Absence of nondemocratic arrangements
141 No dictator
142 No repression

200 Interpreting a democracy in terms of some key elements of liberal democracy
210 Freedom and civil liberty
211 Freedom in general
212 Freedom of speech/press/expression
213 Freedom of association
214 Political liberty
215 Protection of individual/human rights
216 Freedom from government repression

217 Freedom of participation
218 Freedom of belief
219 Freedom of individual choice

220 Political equality
221 One person, one vote
222 Equality before the law/justice
223 Nondiscrimination

230 Democratic institutions and process
231 Election, popular vote, or electoral choice
232 Parliament
233 Separation of power or check-and-balance
234 Competitive party system
235 Power rotation
236 Rule of law
237 Independent judicial
238 Majority rule
239 Respect for minority rights

250 Participation and citizen empowerment
251 Ability to change government
252 Voting
253 Direct participation
254 Demonstration
255 Voice one's concern

260 Social pluralism
261 Open society
262 Pluralist society

300 Interpreting democracy in terms of social and economic system
310 Free economy
311 Free market
312 Private properties/ownership
313 Free and fair competition
314 Personal economic opportunities
315 No central planning

320 Equality, justice, or fraternity
321 Social equality
322 Social justice
323 Fraternity
324 Equality of opportunities
325 Social rights or social entitlements
326 Welfare state
327 Socialism

328 Worker participation

330 Socioeconomic performance
331 Solve unemployment
332 Find anyone a job
333 Providing social welfare
334 Taking good care of the weak

400 Interpreting democracy in terms of good government
410 Good governance
411 Honesty
412 Responsible
413 Openness or transparent government
414 Fair treatment
415 Efficiency
416 No corruption
417 Law-abiding government (rule by law)
418 Social stability
419 Law and order

420 Reform in general
421 Political reform
422 Economic reform

500 Interpreting democracy in term of individual behaviors
510 Democratic style
511 Communication
512 Compromise
513 Rational
514 Tolerance
515 Taking into account all parties concerned
516 Freedom within legal limits
517 Respect for others' rights
518 No extremism

520 Duties
521 Citizen duties
522 Action within the limits of law
523 Bound by law

530 Individualism
531 Respect for individual privacy
532 Independence
533 Self-reliance
534 Having one's own views
535 Self-responsibility
536 Responsibility for one's own action/decision

540 Trust

600 Interpreting democracy in other broad and abstract terms
610 Political system
611 Governmental institution
612 Decentralization (local self-government)

620 Nationalism and statism
621 Better country
622 Wealthy state
623 National independence
624 Development of elite
625 Individual less important than nation

630 Stable and cohesive society
631 Patriotism
632 Solidarity
633 Harmony
634 No chaos, anarchy, or disorder

640 Other lofty elements
641 World peace
642 The commonwealth of the world

700 Conditions or prerequisites for democracy
710 Gradualism
711 Incremental
712 It takes time
713 No radicalism

720 Prerequisites
721 Democratic aptitude of citizens
722 Economic condition
723 Level of education
724 Fit our country's own conditions

800 Evaluation of democracy or democratic regime
810 Positive appraisal of democracy in general
811 The best or the better
812 Progressive
813 Universal acceptance
814 Global trend

820 Negative appraisal of democracy in general
821 Corrupt
822 Inefficient
823 Unstable, chaotic, anarchy
824 Conflict

825 Lead to injustice
826 Obstruct economic development
827 Focuses too much on individual interests, the worst system
828 Does not exist
829 We cannot have democracy

840 Positive appraisal of one's own country's (e.g., Taiwan's) democracy

850 Negative appraisal of one's own country's (e.g., Taiwan's) democracy

900 Reference or cognitive association
910 Country reference
911 Like United States, United Kingdom, Japan, etc.
912 Not like North Korea, etc.

920 Political figures (e.g., Sun Yat-sen, Lee Teng-hui, Abraham Lincoln, etc.)
921 Political parties or groups (e.g., DPP, KMT, etc.)
922 Other associations (state, politics, society)

097 No substance in answer
098 Don't know
099 No answer

TABLE 16.1 DATA TRANSFORMATION FOR TEN CONDENSED CATEGORIES FOR PRODUCING A TABLE OF CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

UNDERSTANDING DEMOCRACY AS:	CODES
1. Freedom and liberty	210–219
2. Political rights, institutions, and process	220–262
3. Market economy	310–315
4. Social equality and justice	320–334
5. Good government	400–422
6. In generic and/or populist terms	100–199
7. In other abstract and positive terms	500–642; 810–814
8. In negative terms	820–829
9. Others	Not listed
10. Don't know, no answer	097–099

APPENDIX 4

Question Wording

POPULAR UNDERSTANDING OF DEMOCRACY

The meaning of democracy:

What does democracy mean to you? What else?

Or

What for you is the meaning of the word *democracy*? What else? (OPEN-ENDED; ALLOW UP TO THREE RESPONSES)

EVALUATION OF REGIME TRANSITION

Evaluate the old regime:

Where would you place our country on this scale during the period of [name of the most recent government under authoritarian rule]? (RATING BOARD)

Evaluate the current regime:

Where would you place our country under the present government? (RATING BOARD)

APPRAISING DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Democratic Citizenship:

I have here other statements. For each statement, would you say you STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, or STRONGLY DISAGREE?

1. I think I have the ability to participate in politics.
2. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.
3. The nation is run by a powerful few and ordinary citizens cannot do much about it.
4. People like me don't have any influence over what the government does.

Perceptions of Corruption:

How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in your local/municipal government? Would you say . . . (SHOWCARD)?

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

How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in the national government [in capital city]? Would you say . . . (SHOWCARD)?

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

Have you or anyone you know personally witnessed an act of corruption or bribe-taking by a politician or government official in the past year? IF WITNESSED: Did you personally witness it or were you told about it by a family member or friend who personally witnessed it?

1. Personally witnessed
2. Told about it by a family member who personally witnessed
3. Told about it by a friend who personally witnessed

Institutional Trust:

I am going to name a number of institutions. For each one, please tell me how much trust you have in it. Is it: a great deal of trust, quite a lot of trust, not very much trust, or none at all?

The courts
The national government [in the capital city]
Political parties [not any specific party]
Parliament
Civil service
The military
The police
Local government
Newspapers
Television
The electoral commission [specify institution by name]
Nongovernmental organizations or NGOs

SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRACY

Desirability:

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? (RATING BOARD)

Suitability:

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? (RATING BOARD)

Efficacy:

Which of the following statements comes closer to your own view? (STATEMENT CARD)

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

Preferability:

Which of the following statements comes closest to your own opinion? (STATEMENT CARD)

1. Democracy is always preferable to any other kind of government.
2. Under some circumstances, an authoritarian government can be preferable to a democratic one.

3. For people like me, it does not matter whether we have a democratic or a nondemocratic regime.

Priority:

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

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. They are both equally important.

DETACHMENT FROM AUTHORITARIANISM

Reject "strong leader":

We should get rid of parliament and elections and have a strong leader decide things.

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

Reject "military rule":

The military should come in to govern the country.

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

Reject "no opposition party":

No opposition party should be allowed to compete for power.

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

Reject "experts decide everything":

We should get rid of parliament and elections and have the experts decide everything.

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

SATISFACTION WITH THE WAY DEMOCRACY WORKS

On the whole, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way democracy works in our country. Are you … (SHOWCARD)?

1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied.
3. Not very satisfied.
4. Not at all satisfied.

COMMITMENT TO THE RULE OF LAW*

We often talk about the character and style of political leaders. Please tell me how you feel about the following statements. Do you STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, or STRONGLY DISAGREE?

1. "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."
2. "The most important thing for a political leader is to accomplish his goals even if he has to ignore the established procedure."
3. "When judges decide important cases, they should accept the view of the executive branch."
4. "If the government is constantly checked [i.e., monitored and supervised] by the legislature, it cannot possibly accomplish great things."

* Disagreement with a statement is coded as showing commitment to rule of law.