Cultural indicators and democratic audits

Class 6: STM103
Structure of Class

I. Recap: FH, Polity, Cheibub indicators

II. IDEA: What are the pros and cons of the democratic audit designed by International IDEA?

III. Survey data: What are the pros and cons of the survey measures?

IV. Report I: Applying the indicators
Questions

Which of these approaches (a democratic audit or representative surveys) would you advocate using as a policy analyst working, for example, in a multilateral organization, a national NGO, as a journalist/commentator, and as an official of a national government?

How would you justify your personal preferences and remarks to the critic of your views working in the World Bank and/or a national government?
Online resources for this class

1. International IDEA ‘State of Democracy Project’ <www.idea.int>

2. World Values Survey 1981-2006
   www.worldvaluessurvey.org

3. Globalbarometers
   www.globalbarometer.net
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia Comparative Data</td>
<td>ACE E-University Knowledge Network</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altimeter Survey</td>
<td>Afrobarometer</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Survey of Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom House</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience Transformation Index</td>
<td>Germanwatch Foundation and the Center for Applied Research (CARe), Munich University</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Index</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressi-Rothstein (CRI) Human Rights Database</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson, Carnegie University, Lexington, KY, USA, and Princeton, NJ/USA</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption Perceptions Index</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Policy and Institutional Assessment</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia Barometer</td>
<td>East Asia Business Network</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Quality Database</td>
<td>International IDEA, Stockholm University</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurobarometer</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE Index</td>
<td>Copenhagen Center for Political Economy</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Empowerment Measure</td>
<td>UNDP Human Development Report Office</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Accountability Report</td>
<td>One World Trust</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/flagship/governance_indicators_project.html
I. Recap:
FH, Polity IV, Przeworski/Cheibub
I: Why use indicators?

**Diagnosis** (what’s wrong?)
- Needs assessment is the first stage in identifying priorities for reform
- Benchmarks can be a conditional criteria for distribution of aid e.g. used by the MCA
- Ranking can be an external ‘shaming’ pressure mechanism on governments eg TI
- Can be an internal mechanism for reform dialogue

**Analysis** (what works?)
- Change in rankings helps to identify effective policies/strategies for reducing corruption, improving transparency, strengthening accountability, etc

**Prescription** (how can good governance be strengthened?)
- Classifies best regimes dentifies policy options and solutions
Advantages of FH Measure?

1. Allows global comparison of nation states and independent territories
2. Time-series analysis: 1972-date
3. Quantifiable yardstick of political development
4. Continuous measure not a simple dichotomy
5. Commonly used in research, so facilitates replicability across different studies
6. In practice the scale is strongly correlated with other common measures of democratization
Disadvantages of FH Measure?

1. Reliability/subjectivity of evaluations?
2. Indicators or evaluations reflect US/Western values?
3. Consistency of evaluations across time and place?
4. Limitations of information sources in some states
5. ‘Floor’ and ‘ceiling’ effects: compressed scale?
6. Excludes economic dimension (?)
7. Excludes direct democracy
8. Single indicator is less useful for policy evaluation
II. IDEA’s Democratic Audit

Details: see www.idea.int ‘State of Democracy’
International IDEA

- **International IDEA** founded 1995 in Stockholm
- **Mission:** The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) is an intergovernmental organization that supports sustainable democracy worldwide. Its objective is to strengthen democratic institutions and processes.
- **Strategies:** International IDEA acts as a catalyst for democracy building by providing knowledge resources, expertise and a platform for debate on democracy issues.
- It works together with policy makers, donor governments, UN organizations and agencies, regional organizations and others engaged in democracy building.
- International IDEA’s **areas of expertise** include: constitution-building processes, electoral processes, political parties, democracy and gender, and democracy assessments.
IDEA’s Pilot Studies

Pilot studies in Bangladesh, El Salvador, Italy, Kenya, Malawi, New Zealand, Peru and South Korea

Other audits in Australia, Canada, Russia and South Africa, Chile, Moldova, Sweden, and Sri Lanka

"The assessments are aimed at raising public awareness, sparking discussions and helping identify areas for reform. The project does not place countries in a ranking order, but rather focuses on progress or setbacks experienced by democracies around the world." International IDEA 20 March 2002
IDEA’s Democratic Audit

- In-depth critical audit of multiple *qualitative* dimensions of democracy
- Focuses on democratic performance beyond elections
- Suitable for developed *and* developing countries
  - Democracy is an incomplete process
  - eg National audits established in UK, Sweden, Australia, Canada
- Reform and policy-oriented
  - Best for evaluation of policy options and reforms
  - Identifying different weaknesses more useful than single measure
  - Useful tool for civic society promoting self-critical debate
  - Led to practical constitutional reforms eg UK elections
- Benchmark report that generates *internal* public discussion, awareness and debate by citizens
Components of Democracy

IDEA's Democratic Audit

- **A guaranteed framework of equal citizen rights**, including access to justice and the rule of law, as well as the freedoms of expression, association and assembly, and the basic economic and social rights to enable citizens to exercise these freedoms effectively.

- **Institutions of representative and accountable government**, including not only free and fair elections to provide the means for popular choice and control over government, but also procedures to ensure the continuous accountability of officials, elected as well as non-elected, to the public.

- **A civil or democratic society**, including free and pluralistic media of communication, and the civic associations, consultative processes and other forums necessary to ensure popular participation in the political process, and to encourage government responsiveness to public opinion and the more effective delivery of public services.
Audit’s Dimensions

1. Nationhood and identity
2. The rule of law and access to justice
3. Civil and political rights
4. Economic and social rights
5. Free and fair elections
6. Democratic role of political parties
7. Government effectiveness and accountability
8. Civilian control of the military and police
9. Minimizing corruption
10. The media in a democratic society
11. Political participation
12. Government responsiveness
13. Decentralisation
14. International dimensions of democracy
International IDEA State of Democracy Project

www.idea.int/ideas_work/14_political_state.htm

It will help you to understand the different dimensions of democracy, and what is involved in a democracy assessment.

You can use our framework as a tool to critically assess your own democracy, both its strengths and limitations.

Encourage deliberation among NGOs, parties, and politicians.
Pros and cons of an audit?
Advantages of Audits?

- Stimulates deliberation and self-diagnosis within the community
- Applicable to multiple cultures/contexts/states/groups, with priorities determined by each community – national ownership
- Focuses on identifying problems and evaluating policy reforms, not just explanation/analysis
Disadvantages of Audits?

- Strong assumptions about public deliberation especially in societies with little experience of democracy or with limited free speech
- Open to manipulation by ruling elites, or bias towards established interests/ middle class?
- Indicators reflect ‘Western’ liberal assumptions?
- Process of endless debate can delay and derail practical reforms as much as facilitate them
- Limited use for systematic comparative analysis by international agencies
III: Survey data
Survey resources

- Representative samples of public opinion
- Time-series data monitor trends
- Most common indicators
  - Identification with the nation-state
  - Support for democratic ideals
  - Satisfaction with regime performance
  - Confidence in regime institutions
  - Attitudes towards incumbent officeholders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Series started (i)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total nations (latest survey) (ii)</th>
<th>Data downloadable (iii)</th>
<th>Coordinating Organization</th>
<th>Online resources Http://</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Data and continuity guides from ZUMA, Cologne Archive: www.gesis.org/en/data_service/eurobarometer |
| European Values/ World Values Study- Study      | 1981-1983          | Approx. 5 years | 92                                | Public archives         | Ronald INGLEHART, of Research,  
Organizing and data: www.worldvaluessurvey.org/ | Organizing:  
www.izs.org/  
Data and continuity guide from the ZUMA Cologne Archive: www.gesis.org/en/data_service/issp/ |
| International Social Survey Program (ISSP)      | 1985               | Annual      | 38                                | Public archives         | Secretariat: Bjern HENRICHSEN, Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD),  
Organizing:  
http://www.csess.org | Organizing and data:  
http://www.csess.org |
| Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)   | 1996-2001          | Module every 5 years | 31                                | Public archives         | Secretariat: David HOWELL, ISR, . Chair: Ian McAllister, ANU | Organizing and data:  
http://www.cses.org |
| Comparative National Election Study             | 1990               | Irregular   | 19                                | Public archives         | Richard GUNTHER,  
Organizing and data: www.cnep.ics.ul.pt/ |  
Global-barometers, including:  
New Barometers                                  | 1991               | Irregular   | 16                                | Public archives         | Richard ROSE, CSPP,  
Organizing and data:  
www.cspp.strath.ac.uk |  
Afrobarometer                                   | 1999               | Annual      | 18                                | Public archives         | Michael BRATTON ( ), Robert MATTES (IDASA, SA) and Dr E. GYIMAH-BOADI (CDD ) | www.afrobarometer.org |
| Latino-barometer                                | 1995               | Annual      | 18                                | Tables only             | Marta , MORI,  
Organizing and data: www.latinobarometro.org |  
Asian barometer                                  | 2001               | Annual      | 17                                | Yun-han                   | www.eastasiabarometer.org  
http://www.asianbarometer.org |  
Arab Barometer                                   | 2005               | Annual      | 5                                 | Mark Tessler,  
Organizing and data: www.arabbarometer.org/ |  
The European Social Survey (ESS)                 | 2002               | Biennial    | 21                                | Public archives         | Roger JOWELL, Center for Comparative Social Surveys,  
Organizing:  
http://naticent02.uuhost.uk.uu.net  
Data from the Norwegian archive: http://ess.nsd.uib.no |  
Transatlantic Trends                             | 2002               | Annual      | 13                                | Public archives         | Mr William Bohlen, German Fund of the and the Compagnia di San Paolo | http://www.transatlantictrends.org |
| The Pew Global Attitudes Survey                 | 2002               | Irregular   | 54                                | Via website             | Andrew KOHUT, Director, The for the People & the Press | http://pewglobal.org/ |
| International Voice of the People              | 2002               | Annual      | 60                                | Only tables released    | Meril JAMES, Secretary  
General | www.voice-of-the-people.net/ |
89 Nations in the WVS 1980-2007

World Values Survey

In WVS
- In WVS (89)
- Not (99)
WWS - Waves

- 1980-1984 - 22 nations
- 1990-1993 - 42 nations
- 1995-1997 - 53 nations
- 1999-2002 - 79 nations
- 2006-2007 – 42 nations to date
- Representative surveys per nation 1000
- New sources www.globalbarometer.org
  - Africa, Latin America, Asia, C&E Europe
IV: Applying indicators in your report
Report I: Diagnosis

Use selected indicators to write a professional report assessing and comparing the problems of democratic governance reform in one world region.

Select: Latin America and the Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, North Africa and the Middle-East, Western Europe.

The potential client for your report is a regional organization, an international agency or a bilateral donor. Your client has requested the report in order to identify the most pressing problems of democratic governance in the region, to prioritize their work with countries.

Your report will also be read and critiqued by representatives from governments and national stake-holders in the region so it needs to be carefully written and supported by direct evidence derived from the available datasets and from citations to existing research.

It has a professional readership so the presentation of effective graphs and figures are essential to summarize data, with more technical details confined to a technical appendix, and it should NOT be written as a personal essay or as an academic paper.

Your first report will also be the basis for subsequent assignments.
Report I: Choices

What indicators would you use (and why?)

What descriptive trends and summary regional benchmarks would you develop for comparison?

What additional information would you collect, to evaluate and measure political priorities in your region?

What secondary literature is available from research journals and monographs to support your argument?

As part of the exercise, you should justify your choice of criteria, measures, and evidence for a non-technical audience. The shared class dataset provides the following resources, along with many others:

1. Freedom House index of political rights and civil liberties
2. Polity IV Project Democracy and Autocracy scales
3. Cheibub and Gandhi Democracy-Autocracy classification
4. Vanhanen Democracy Index
5. World Values Survey/Global Barometers Attitudinal surveys
6. Kaufmann/Kray World Bank Institute Good governance indicators
7. Transparency International Corruption index
Report I: Professional Format

Total word length: 2,500-3,000 words (additional Technical Appendices do not count in the total). Your report should be structured with subheadings as follows.

- **Executive summary** (one page)
  - The key challenges facing democratic governance in the selected region
  - The plan for your report
  - Contents page

- **Brief summary** of the methodology and indicators used in the report, as well as the reasons for the selection and any caveats

- **Synopsis** focusing on the primary challenges facing the region under each of the following topics:
  - The socioeconomic context (demographics, development and economic indicators)
  - Trends and contemporary comparisons of regime types and levels of democracy
  - Summary of the types of executive and legislatures in the region
  - The role and types of elections and party systems in the region
  - The type of judiciary and the role of the courts in the region
  - The local and regional structure of governance in the region
  - The state of civil society and the role/structure of the news media

- **Conclusions and implications.**

- **Technical appendix** (including longer tables, larger graphs/figures, definition of indicators and sources, and any multivariate analysis tables, if used.)

- **Endnotes:** comprehensive list of literature and references used in the report.
Diagnostic discussion exercise

You are asked to use the following data for to help diagnose the key problems of democratic governance facing Arab States. Diagnosis involves assessing the key needs in the region, in comparison with other parts of the world and in comparison with previous time-periods.

Working in pairs, how would you interpret each of the following? What major problems emerge from the data?

You have 15 minutes to discuss in pairs then there will be a 15 minute plenary session to compare your analysis.
Measuring “good governance”? 

Online readings: www.worldbank.org

- Kaufman, Kraay and Zoido-Lobaton. Governance Matters V.
- World Bank Governance Indicators
- Interactive Governance Research Indicator Country Snapshot