

**Supplementary Information:
Conceptualizing and Measuring Support for Democracy:
A New Approach**

Contents

1	Further discussion of the nature and implications of our samples	1
2	Additional tables and figures	3
3	Further details on each sample	10

1. Further discussion of the nature and implications of our samples

Nature of our samples

We generally use quota samples, a type of non-probability sample widely used for online surveys. The two exceptions are the Portuguese and Taiwanese samples, which used probability sampling. In the former case, we ran our questions on the Portuguese sample of the CROss-National Online Survey 2 (CRONOS-2) Panel, which is affiliated with the European Social Survey. In the latter case, a dedicated random-digit dialing survey was run in Taiwan by the Election Studies Center at National Chengchi University. In the other 17 cases, we used online surveys with quota sampling.

The accuracy of nonprobability samples

Probability samples remain generally more accurate than nonprobability samples, even in developed polling markets such as the US and Western Europe (e.g., Cornesse et al. 2020). However, this depends in part on survey vendor, with some providing online quota samples that achieve more accurate population estimates than probability samples (Kennedy et al. 2016). In less developed regions, such as Latin America, the gap is larger with nonprobability samples significantly less accurate than probability samples (Castorena et al. 2023). This is due both to the difficulty of reaching certain groups of respondents, e.g., older, and lower social-economic status people, as well as a lack of incentive to do so (as online pollsters in developing countries generate most of their income from marketing surveys; Castorena et al. 2023). Online nonprobability samples are nevertheless usually diverse, and are often the only feasible option given that traditional face-to-face probability samples are prohibitively expensive.

Implications for the analyses

Our samples likely vary in accuracy. Those gathered by probability methods (Portugal and Taiwan) and fielded by renowned online pollsters in established markets (e.g., UK and US, where Yougov fielded the surveys; Rivers 2016) are probably fairly representative of true population opinion at the time of the surveys. In less developed polling markets, our inferences will be less representative of the true population opinion. In particular, we can expect that people who are older and have a lower socio-economic status are less likely to be included in samples from less-developed markets. We might expect that individuals with lower SES are less exposed to expert understandings of the concept of liberal democracy, with the result that their opinions are less conventional or less “constrained” (i.e., in the sense that Converse 1964 intended). Older people might have more conventional views of liberal democracy in long-established democracies (e.g., Claassen and Magalhães 2023), but might have more divergent and unconventional views where democratization (or autocratization) has occurred in recent memory. Included in the latter are all cases outside of North America and Western Europe. As such, by undersampling individuals who are older and have a lower SES, our samples from less developed markets likely undersample individuals who have less conventional and more divergent opinions about the institutions of liberal democracy. In other

words, our results likely understate the full extent to which publics in less developed countries have divergent and unconventional views of democracy.

Weights

We do not use sampling weights or post-stratification weights in our main analyses. Evidence shows that weighting generally does not reduce the bias of nonprobability samples (in contrast to probability samples). After reviewing 25 European and US studies, Cornesse et al. (2020) conclude: “[i]n sum, the majority of the research on weighting and accuracy finds that the inaccuracy of nonprobability samples cannot be reliably solved by weighting procedures” (p. 2). And a study of online non-probability samples from a less developed region (Latin America) reaches a similar conclusion: “[a]lthough weights improved our samples in some cases, they actually introduced additional errors in others. Post-stratification does not appear to be a reliable solution for improving online samples” (Castorena et al. 2023, 275-6). It appears that due to fundamental coverage errors in quota samples, the people who were not sampled cannot easily be simulated by weighting the respondents who were sampled.


In addition, including weights complicates latent variable analysis. Our main models require (1) a multidimensional latent variable model (2) with ordinal indicators. The software we use (the lavaan library in R) does not permit weights to be included. Since extant research indicates that weighting our analyses is unlikely to produce more accurate inferences, we prefer to retain the multidimensional latent variable model with ordinal indicators. In these supplementary materials (Figures S3 to S6), we replicate our analyses while including weights and relaxing the ordinality assumption (i.e., by treating the observed indicators as continuous).

References

- Castorena, Oscar, Noam Lupu, Maita Schade, and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2023. “Online Surveys in Latin America.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 56(2): 273–280.
- Claassen, Christopher, and Pedro C Magalhães. 2023. “Public Support for Democracy in the United States Has Declined Generationally.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 87(3): 719–732.
- Cornesse, Carina, Annelies G Blom, David Dutwin, Jon A Krosnick, Edith D De Leeuw, Stéphane Legleye, Josh Pasek, Darren Pennay, Benjamin Phillips, Joseph W Sakshaug, Bella Struminskaya, and Alexander Wenz. 2020. “A Review of Conceptual Approaches and Empirical Evidence on Probability and Non-probability Sample Survey Research.” *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 8(1): 4–36.
- Kennedy, Courtney, Andrew Mercer, Scott Keeter, Nick Hatley, Kyley McGeeney, and Alejandra Gimenez. 2016. Evaluating Online Nonprobability Surveys. Technical report Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/2016/05/02/evaluating-online-nonprobability-surveys/>.
- Rivers, Douglas. 2016. Pew Research: YouGov consistently outperforms competitors on accuracy. Technical report YouGov, <https://today.yougov.com/economy/articles/15393-pew-research-yougov>.

2. Additional tables and figures

Figure S1. Scree plots




Screeplots showing the eigenvalues of the first 10 principal components of each dataset, full 17-item batteries. The Kaiser criterion suggests that the number of dimensions varies from 3 to 5.

Table S1. Correlations between concise scale and other opinion variables

	Conserv. ideology.	Exec. approval	Populist attitudes	Political trust	Satisf. democ.	Strong leader	Democ. important	Democ. best	Democ. preferred
Argentina	-0.33								
Brazil	-0.26	-0.37	-0.03		-0.02	-0.42	0.34	0.32	0.38
Britain	-0.32		0.08	-0.01	-0.03	-0.73			0.34
Chile	-0.20								
Germany	-0.09	0.01		-0.02	-0.02	-0.60	0.24		
Greece	-0.20	-0.26	0.25		-0.24	-0.61	0.39	0.28	0.28
Hungary	-0.26	-0.30	0.03		-0.27				
Israel	-0.29		0.10		-0.14	-0.52	0.33	0.39	0.36
Mexico	-0.09								
Netherlands	-0.20				0.02				
Norway						-0.56		0.32	
Peru	-0.05								
Poland	-0.29	-0.44			-0.31	-0.51		0.22	0.26
Portugal	-0.07	0.00		0.19	0.14	-0.20	0.33		
Spain	0.04								
Taiwan		-0.35	-0.09		0.19			-0.07	0.04
Turkey	-0.01							0.26	
USA	-0.01	0.13				-0.50			
mean	-0.16	-0.11	0.06	0.05	-0.07	-0.52	0.33	0.25	0.28


Notes: only certain variables were asked in each survey.

Figure S2. Associations between CFA fit metrics and national covariates




Each plot shows a scatterplot between a fit metric for the unidimensional CFA model (in rows) and a national covariate (in columns). Solid orange lines indicate lowess fits and dashed teal lines indicate linear model fits.

Figure S3. Correlations between existing democracy measures and other covariates




Each plot shows the correlations between a particular measure of democracy and other covariates included in each sample. Each dot represents a bivariate correlation within a particular national sample.

Figure S4. Model Fit, 1- vs. 2-Dimensional Support for Liberal Democracy, Weighted



CFI: Confirmatory Fit Index; RMSEA: Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation; SRMR: Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. Unidimensional fit metrics are shown in teal and two-dimensional metrics are shown in orange. Data are weighted and observed variables treated as continuous. A separate, orthogonal acquiescence factor is included. Solid vertical lines indicate thresholds typically used to indicate adequate fit. For each plot, cases are listed from better to worse fit.

Figure S6. Model Fit, Concise Support for Liberal Democracy Scale, Weighted



Fit metrics from one-factor CFA using concise 7-item scale. No acquiescence factor is included. Data are weighted and observed variables treated as continuous.

3. Further details on each sample

Argentina

Responsible author(s): Ryan Carlin (Georgia State University) and Rodolfo Sarsfield (Fundación Carolina/Autonomous University of Queretaro)

Funding: This sample was funded by the Department of Political Science at Georgia State University.

Fieldwork: Netquest fielded the survey to a sample of 1,018 adult residents of Argentina drawn from their Argentina panel. The fieldwork ran from 19 December 2022 until 23 December 2022. The following quotas were used to select the sample: sex, age range, region, and socio-economic status. The support for democracy battery was asked of the whole sample. Additional unrelated questions were asked after the battery. Netquest employed in-house attention checks.

Ethics: The survey was judged to be exempt by the Georgia State University Institutional Review Board on 9 December 2022 (IRB Number: H23291).

Question wording and translation: The country adjective “Argentine (argentinos)” was used where required. List of translated questions:

Preamble: ¿Está usted de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con los siguientes principios sobre cómo debe organizarse y gobernarse un sistema político?

FREXP1. La gente debe tener la libertad de criticar al gobierno incluso en tiempos de grandes crisis.

FREXP2. El gobierno debería poder censurar a los medios de comunicación que sean demasiado críticos.

FRASSC1. Este país estaría mejor si hubiera un solo partido político.

FRASSC2. El derecho a la protesta debe ser protegido incluso cuando los manifestantes causen molestias a los demás.

FRASSC3. El gobierno debería tener el poder de prohibir a las organizaciones que promuevan valores subversivos.

UNISUFF1. El derecho universal al voto debería ser cuestionado cuando muchos votantes estén mal informados y sean fáciles de engañar.

UNISUFF2. Todos los ciudadanos argentinos mayores de edad deberían tener derecho al voto, incluso los individuos con opiniones extremas.

DECELEC1. El gobierno funcionaría mejor si las decisiones se dejaran en manos de expertos independientes no electos en vez de en manos de los políticos o del pueblo.

DECELEC2. Las autoridades no electas, como las fuerzas armadas, nunca debería poder desautorizar a los políticos electos.

FRELECT1. Debemos respetar los resultados de las elecciones independientemente del partido que gane.

FRELECT2. Es justificable que los gobiernos manipulen las reglas electorales a su favor si sus oponentes también lo han hecho en el pasado.

JUDCNSTR1. Los tribunales argentinos deberían poder invalidar políticas del gobierno si considera que son ilegales.

JUDCNSTR2. El gobierno debería poder ignorar las sentencias judiciales que se consideren políticamente parciales.

LEGCNSTR1. Si el parlamento obstaculiza la labor del gobierno, el primero debe ser ignorado.

LEGCNSTR2. Los diputados deben poder cuestionar y supervisar las decisiones políticas tomadas por el gobierno, incluso cuando esto vuelva más lento el progreso.

EQLAW1. El gobierno debería ser capaz de influir en la interpretación de la ley para resolver problemas


sociales y políticos acuciantes.

EQLAW2. Todos los argentinos deben disfrutar de los mismos derechos legales, independientemente de sus creencias políticas.

Response set: 1 Muy de acuerdo, 2 Algo de acuerdo, 3 Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo. 4 Algo en desacuerdo, 5 Muy en desacuerdo, 6 No lo sé, 7 Prefiero no responder

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented each on a separate page. The items were not randomly ordered. An explicit “don’t know” option and an explicit “I prefer not to answer” options were presented to respondents but they were otherwise unable to skip questions. The following preamble was used ahead of the first four questions (FREXP1, FREXP2, FRASSC1, FRASSC2): “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?” The following restatement of the preamble was included before the next seven questions (FRASSC3, UNISUFF1, UNISUFF2, DECELEC1, DECELEC2, FRELECT1, FRELECT2), “Still speaking about how a political system should be organised, do you agree or disagree with the following principles?” Finally, before the last six questions (JUDCNSTR1, JUDCNSTR2, LEGCNSTR1, LEGCNSTR2, EQLAW1, EQLAW2) the following restatement of the preamble was included, “Talking again about how a political system should be organised, do you agree or disagree with the following principles?”

Figure S7. Response distributions, Argentina



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Britain

Responsible author(s): Christopher Claassen, University of Glasgow

Funding: This sample was funded by the ESRC via the NORFACE Joint Research Programme “Democratic Governance in a Turbulent Age,” which is cofunded by the European Commission through Horizon 2020 under grant agreement No 822166.


Fieldwork: Yougov fielded the survey to a sample of 4,069 adult residents of Great Britain drawn from their UK panel. The fieldwork ran from 3 October 2022 until 19 October 2022. This particular sample oversampled rural, Wales, and Scotland residents. Residents of Northern Ireland were not included in the sample. The following quotas were used: rural-urban, nation, age, gender, education, past vote, and political attention. The support for democracy battery was asked of half the total sample, who were randomly selected to receive these questions (vs questions on other topics). The total number of respondents who were asked the support for democracy questions is 2,071. This sub-sample reflects the characteristics of the larger sample, i.e., rural, Wales, and Scotland residents are overrepresented. Yougov prevents panellists from registering multiple accounts, monitors responses using techniques such as trap questions, identification of “speeders” or straight-line respondents, or panellists giving inconsistent answers over time (e.g. inconsistent year of birth). Panellists who fail these measures are flagged and removed from the active pool of survey respondents. No additional attention checks were conducted by the researcher.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the University of Glasgow College of Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee on 8 September 2022 (application no. 400220021).

Question wording and translation: The original English version of the items were used. British English spellings were used; “government”, “party”, and “MPs” were used instead of “president”, “candidate”, and “legislators”. The country adjective “British” was used where required.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented on three pages, each with a grid of 5-6 items. The items were randomly ordered across the pages and grids. An explicit “don’t know” option was presented to respondents but they were otherwise unable to skip questions. The following preamble was used on each of the three pages: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?”

Figure S8. Response distributions, Britain



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Brazil

Responsible author(s): Lucas Borba and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister

Funding: The survey implementation was funded by LAPOP Lab and Vanderbilt University.


Fieldwork: Netquest fielded an online survey with a sample of 1,516 voting-age Brazilians drawn from their Brazil panel. Data were collected between October 25 and 31, 2022, in the week prior to the presidential elections. The sampling method used quotas for age, gender, geographic region, and socioeconomic levels. There was no oversampling method used. The support for democracy battery was asked of all respondents at the beginning of the survey after the questions that were used for the quotas. LAPOP screened the sample using attention checks.

Ethics: The survey falls under a set of activities exempted from review and authorized under the Vanderbilt University Institutional Review Board (Protocol # 200472), March 25, 2020.

Question wording and translation: The questions and wording were derived from the translated version of the questionnaire used for this project in Portugal and were further adapted to suit the Brazilian context. For instance, certain terms like “parliament” were replaced with “congress.” Additionally, the spellings of the questions were adjusted from European Portuguese to Brazilian Portuguese. Other questions used to measure criterion variables and demographics were drawn from the Brazilian questionnaires of LAPOP’s AmericasBarometer and World Values Survey.

How were the items presented to respondents? The items were not presented in a random order but followed the prespecified questionnaire instead. The following preamble was presented to respondents before the battery: “do you agree or disagree with the following principles about the organization and operation of a political system?” After that, each item was presented on a single page. The option to respond don’t know or skip a question was not initially presented to respondents. If they tried to skip a question, they were reminded that a question should be answered but they were given the option to continue without answering.

Figure S9. Response distributions, Brazil



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Chile

Responsible author(s): Ryan Carlin (Georgia State University) and Rodolfo Sarsfield (Fundación Carolina/Autonomous University of Queretaro)

Funding: This sample was funded by the Department of Political Science at Georgia State University.


Fieldwork: Netquest fielded the survey to a sample of 1,017 adult residents of Chile drawn from their Chile panel. The fieldwork ran from 19 December 2022 until 23 December 2022. The following quotas were used to select the sample: sex, age range, region, and socio-economic status. The support for democracy battery was asked of the whole sample. Additional unrelated questions were asked after the battery. Netquest used in-house attention checks.

Ethics: The survey was judged to be exempt by the Georgia State University Institutional Review Board on 9 December 2022 (IRB Number: H23291).

Question wording and translation: The original Spanish version of the items were used. The country adjective “Chilean (chilenos)” was used where required.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented each on a separate page. The items were not randomly ordered. An explicit “don’t know” option and an explicit “I prefer not to answer” options were presented to respondents but they were otherwise unable to skip questions. The following preamble was used ahead of the first four questions (FREXP1, FREXP2, FRASSC1, FRASSC2): “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?” The following restatement of the preamble was included before the next seven questions (FRASSC3, UNISUFF1, UNISUFF2, DECELEC1, DECELEC2, FRELECT1, FRELECT2), “Still speaking about how a political system should be organised, do you agree or disagree with the following principles?” Finally, before the last six questions (JUDCNSTR1, JUDCNSTR2, LEGCNSTR1, LEGCNSTR2, EQLAW1, EQLAW2) the following restatement of the preamble was included, “Talking again about how a political system should be organised, do you agree or disagree with the following principles?”

Figure S10. Response distributions, Chile



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Germany

Responsible author(s): Kathrin Ackermann, University of Siegen

Funding: This sample was funded by the Excellence Strategy of the German Federal and State Governments at Heidelberg University as part of the project “Experienced solidarity: values, motives and practices in caring communities and social volunteering (EXPSOLIDARITY).”

Fieldwork: Respondi (now part of Bilendi) fielded the survey to a sample of 2500 adult residents of Germany drawn from their online access panel. The fieldwork ran from 12 December 2022 until 29 December 2022. Quotas were used for the German Bundesländer (subnational units), gender, age groups and education. The polling firm dropped “speeders” from the sample.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the IRB of the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences at Heidelberg University on 9 November 2022 (FESS-HD-2022-007).

Question wording and translation: The following German translations of the items were used:

FreeExp1: Die Menschen sollten die Freiheit haben, die Regierung zu kritisieren, auch in Zeiten einer großen Krise.

FreeExp2: Die Regierung sollte in der Lage sein, Medien zu zensieren, die zu kritisch sind.

FreeAssc1: Unserem Land würde es besser gehen, wenn es nur eine politische Partei gäbe.

FreeAssc2: Das Recht zu protestieren sollte geschützt werden, auch wenn die Protestierenden anderen Unannehmlichkeiten bereiten.

FreeAssc3: Die Regierung sollte die Macht haben, Organisationen zu verbieten, die staatsfeindliche Werte vertreten.

UniSuff1: Das allgemeine Wahlrecht muss in Frage gestellt werden, wenn so viele Wähler schlecht informiert sind und leicht in die Irre geführt werden können.

UniSuff2: Alle erwachsene Deutsche sollten das Recht haben, zu wählen, auch wenn sie extreme Ansichten haben.

ElecDecMk1: Unsere Regierung würde besser funktionieren, wenn Entscheidungen von nicht gewählten, unabhängigen Experten getroffen würden und nicht von Politikern oder dem Volk.

ElecDecMk2: Nicht-politische Autoritäten, wie die Kirchen, sollten niemals in der Lage sein, gewählte Politiker zu überstimmen.

FFElect1: Wir sollten die Wahlergebnisse respektieren, unabhängig davon, welche Partei gewinnt.

FFElect2: Regierungen sind berechtigt, Wahlregeln zu ihren Gunsten auszulegen, wenn ihre Gegner dies in der Vergangenheit ebenfalls getan haben.

JudCnstr1: Deutsche Gerichte sollten in der Lage sein, die Bundesregierung zu überstimmen, wenn politische Maßnahmen als illegal erachtet werden.

JudCnstr2: Die Bundesregierung sollte die Möglichkeit haben, Gerichtsurteile zu ignorieren, die als politisch voreingenommen angesehen werden.

LegCnstr1: Wenn der Bundestag die Arbeit der Bundesregierung behindert, sollte er ignoriert werden.

LegCnstr2: Die Bundestagsabgeordneten sollten in der Lage sein, politische Entscheidungen der Regierung zu hinterfragen und zu überwachen, auch wenn politische Prozesse dadurch verlangsamt werden.


EqLaw1: Die Regierung sollte in der Lage sein, Gesetze großzügig auszulegen, um dringende soziale und politische Probleme zu lösen.

EqLaw2: Alle Deutschen sollten unabhängig von ihren politischen Überzeugungen die gleichen Rechte haben.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented randomly ordered. The ques-

tions were programmed as forced choice, that means that the respondents could not skip questions. No explicit “don’t know” option was presented to respondents. The following preamble was used: “Im Folgenden werden mögliche Grundsätze eines politischen Systems aufgeführt. Bitte geben Sie an, inwiefern Sie diesen zustimmen oder sie ablehnen.“

Figure S11. Response distributions, Germany



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Greece

Responsible author: Eri Bertou

Funding: This sample was funded by the Department of Political Science at the University of Zurich.


Fieldwork: The survey was fielded online using Qualtrics to a sample of 989 adult residents (18-65 years of age) of Greece drawn from the Greek panel of Dynata. The survey was fielded between June 20 and July 8, 2022. The following quotas were used to select the sample: Gender and Age group (5 categories). The polling firm was responsible for removing "speeders".

Ethics: The survey was judged to be exempt from ethics review by the University of Zurich.

Question wording and translation: The translated versions of the items were used. For the Greek political system "government", "party", and "MPs" were used instead of "president", "candidate", and "legislators". The country adjective "Greek" was used where required. For item DECELEC2 the institution of the "Greek Orthodox Church" was used.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented individually, one on each page. The items were randomly ordered. There was no explicit "don't know" option presented to respondents, but they were able to skip questions. The following preamble was used on each of the three pages: "Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?"

Figure S12. Response distributions, Greece



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Hungary

Responsible author(s): Sergiu Gherghina (University of Glasgow) and Daniel Oross (Centre for Social Sciences Budapest)

Funding: This sample was funded partly by the internal research support of the Centre for Social Sciences Budapest and partly through the grant “Democratic Innovations and Hungarian Parties” Postdoctoral Excellence Program (PD_131408), National Research and Development Fund of the National Research, Development and Innovation Office.

Fieldwork: NRC fielded the survey: the online fieldwork ran from 5 to 13 October 2022. The sample is representative for Hungarians aged 18-65 regarding gender, age, education, type of settlement and region. The polling firm screened respondents by considering overall response duration, frequency of non-attitudes, and consistency in reported choices about similar questions.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Centre for Social Sciences Budapest on 15 September 2022 (1-FOIG/51-3/2020)

Question wording and translation: The Hungarian version of the items were used. The translation was done by the two responsible authors and then checked by the survey team at the Centre for Social Sciences Budapest to harmonize it with standard items used in other surveys conducted in Hungary. The Hungarian version of the “technocratic rule” item (DECELEC1) was not included in the study as it did not ask respondents to choose between “non-elected independent experts” on the one hand, and “politicians or the people” on the other.

How were the items presented to respondents? The items were presented in three blocks, randomized within. An explicit “don’t know” option was presented to respondents, but they were otherwise unable to skip questions.

Mennyire ért egyet az alábbi állításokkal?

- Az emberek súlyos válságok idején is szabadon bírálhatják a kormányt.
- A kormánynak jogot kell adni arra, hogy cenzúrázza a túlzottan kritikus médiaforrásokat.
- A tüntetéshez való jogot akkor is védelmezni kell, ha a tüntetők kellemetlen helyzetbe hoznak másokat.
- A kormánynak lehetőséget kell adni arra, hogy betiltson felforgató szervezeteket.
- A kormánynak lehetőséget kellene adni arra, hogy felfüggeszse a törvényeket annak érdekében, hogy élető társadalmi és politikai problémákat megoldjon.
- Minden magyar állampolgárnak egyenlő jogokkal kell biztosítani, politikai nézeteitől függetlenül.

Kérjük jelölje meg, mennyiben ért egyet az alábbi, választásokra vonatkozó állításokkal.


- Magyarország jobban működne, ha csak egy politikai párt lenne.
- Az általános választójog értelmét megkérdőjelezi, amennyiben sok választó gyengén informált és könnyen félrevezethető.
- Minden felnőtt magyar állampolgárnak joga van szavazni, még a szélsőséges nézeteket valló egyéneknek is.
- A választási eredményeket tiszteletben kell tartani, függetlenül attól, melyik párt nyeri a választásokat.
- A kormányoknak joguk van a saját javukra megváltoztatni a választási szabályokat, ha azt korábban az ellenfelek is megtették a maguk javára.
- A kormányoknak jogukban áll a bírósági ítéleteket figyelmen kívül hagyni, amennyiben azok politikailag ellentmondásosnak tekintik.

Kérjük jelölje meg, mennyiben ért egyet az alábbi, politikai döntéshozatalra vonatkozó állításokkal.

- A politikától független szervezetek, így például a Honvédség, sohasem szabad, hogy felülírják a választott politikusok döntéseit.
- A magyar bírói szervezetnek jogában áll felülrni a kormány szakpolitikai döntéseit, ha azok jogtalanok.
- Amennyiben az Országgyűlés hátráltatja a kormány munkáját, akkor döntéseit figyelmen kívül lehet hagyni.
- Az Országgyűlési képviselőknek jogukban áll a kormány döntéseinek ellenőrzése és megkérdőjelezése, akkor is, ha azáltal a politikai döntéshozatal folyamata lelassul.

Response set: 1) Teljes mértékben egyetért; 2) egyetért; 3) is-is; 4) inkább ellenzi; 5) nagyon ellenzi; 99) Nem tudja / nem válaszol

Figure S13. Response distributions, Hungary



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Israel

Responsible author(s): Amnon Cavari, Reichman University

Funding: This sample was funded by the Institute for Liberty and Responsibility at Reichman University.

Fieldwork: The survey was done by iPanel, an online survey company in Israel. iPanel fielded the survey to a sample of adult residents of Israel drawn from their Jewish and Arab panels. All Arab respondents were offered to take the survey in Hebrew or in Arabic. The fieldwork ran in both panels from August 9, 2023 to August 20, 2023. iPanel sent 10,305 requests to the Jewish panel and 5,949 requests to the Arab panel. That resulted in 1,207 respondents in the Jewish sample (12%), and 305 respondents in the Arab sample (5%). The sample is representative of Israeli adult population (internet users), with some deviations from Israeli population based on ethnic, age, gender, and religious distributions in Israel. Two attention check questions were employed in the survey. Failing on either disqualifies the response, who is dropped.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the Reichman University Ethics Committee on July 22, 2023.


Question wording and translation: The original Hebrew version of the items were used to best match the English language and with required adjustments to the Israeli political system. The Israeli version of the “non-political authority” item (DECELEC2) was not included in the study as it did not ask respondents to evaluate a specific non-political authority.

How were the items presented to respondents? The items were presented on four pages, each with a grid of 4-5 items. The items were randomly ordered across the pages and grids. An explicit “don’t know” option was presented to respondents, but they were otherwise unable to skip questions. The following preamble was used on each of the three pages: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised?”

Figure S14. Hebrew questionnaire

אנשים צריכים להיות חופשיים לבקר את הממשלה גם בתקופה של משבר
נכון לאפשר לממשלה לצנזר ערוצי תקשורת שהיא רואה כביקורתיים מדי כלפיה
הזכות להפגין צריכה להיות מוגנת גם כאשר המפגינים יוצרים אי נוחות לאחרים
לממשלה צריכה להיות הסמכות להחרים את הפעילות של ארגונים שמקדמים ערכים חתרניים
אזרחים ישראלים צריכים להנות מאותן זכויות ללא קשר לעמדתם הפוליטית
היה טוב יותר לו במדינה הייתה רק מפלגה אחת
נכון לשקול מחדש את הזכות הגורפת לבחור כאשר מצביעים רבים כל כך חסרי ידע ומולכים שולל בקלות
לכל אזרח ישראלי צריכה להיות הזכות לבחור לכנסת, גם אם עמדתיו קיצונית
יש לכבד את תוצאות הבחירות, לא משנה מי נבחר
נכון לאפשר לממשלה לשנות את כללי הבחירות במידה וממשלה בראשות מפלגה יריבה עשתה זאת בעבר
הממשלה שלנו תתפקד טוב יותר אם החלטות יתקבלו על ידי מומחים לא נבחרים במקום פוליטיקאים
אסור שמוסדות לא נבחרים יוכלו לגבור על החלטות של נבחרים ציבור
לבית המשפט העליון צריכה להיות הסמכות לגבור על החלטת ממשלה כאשר הוא סבור שהממשלה פועלת באופן לא
חוקי.
לממשלה צריכה להיות הסמכות להתעלם מפסיקה של בית המשפט העליון אם היא סבורה שהפסיקה מבטאת הטיה
פוליטית
אם הכנסת מגבילה את עבודת הממשלה, יש להתעלם מהכנסת
יש לאפשר לחברי כנסת לבקר את הממשלה גם אם זה מאט את עבודת הממשלה
יש לאפשר לממשלה לסטות מהחוק על מנת לפתור בעיות חברתיות ופוליטיות
השלטון בישראל מקבל את ההחלטות ביחס למה שקורה במדינה, ולמדינות זרות אסור להתערב
יש לאפשר לממשלה להפר הסכמים בינלאומיים, אם הדבר נדרש כדי להתמודד עם צרכים ביטחוניים או כלכליים
"נא לסמן" מסכים ולא מסכים באותה מידה

Figure S15. Response distributions, Israel



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Mexico

Responsible author(s): Darren Hawkins and Darin Self, Brigham Young University

Funding: This sample was funded by internal funding from Brigham Young University.


Fieldwork: This survey was fielded to 2,401 respondents in Mexico using a Qualtrics survey administered to respondents by the survey company Netquest. In Mexico, the survey ran from May 27, 2023 to June 23, 2023. We used recommendations from Netquest to set nationally representative quotas in each country. We set quotas based on age, gender, and region. Our survey included an experiment featuring two treatment groups and one control group. All respondents in the survey received the support for democracy battery. However, analysis of the performance of the support for democracy battery focuses only on respondents in the control group ($N = 734$). No attention checks were conducted.

Ethics: The survey was judged to be exempt by the Brigham Young University Internal Review Board in April 2023 (IRB2023-133).

Question wording and translation: The Spanish translations of the questions used in Argentina and Chile was also used in Mexico.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented on individual pages with the question at the top and each answer option listed below each question. These pages were randomized so that all questions were presented in random order. All questions were forced responses so that respondents could not skip questions. However, they were able to select “I don’t know” and “prefer not to answer” as answer options for all questions.

Figure S16. Response distributions, Mexico



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Netherlands

Responsible author(s): Maurits J. Meijers & Andrej Zaslove

Funding: This sample was funded by the Dutch Science Council (NWO) via the Veni grant awarded to Maurits Meijers for the project “Credible or Capricious: The Reputational Cost of Party Policy Change”, under grant number VI. Veni.191R.018.

Fieldwork: The data was collected between March 22nd and March 30th, 2023, with the use of an online survey sent out to adult Dutch citizens. The data was collected by the Dutch research institute Kieskompas – Election Compass which maintains several panels internationally. The respondents have signed up to participate in political and societal research through their usage of Voting Advice Applications developed for Dutch media. The survey participants provided their informed consent before participating in the survey. The panel of respondents was invited to participate in the survey on the 22nd and 23rd of March, 2023. Of the 14123 participants invited to take the survey, 4344 valid responses were recorded, of which 4201 were weighted. In order to provide nationally representative population estimates, the data was subsequently weighed using poststratification, employing a joint demographic distribution of age, sex, educational attainment, ethnic background and geographic region with the use of 2023 census data from the CBS Golden Standard. An additional correction for vote recall was implemented (source: Kiesraad; verkiezingsuitslagen.nl). Two attention checks were in the survey before the democracy items. The attention checks are taken from Berinsky et al (2014) and adapted to the Dutch context.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the Ethics Assessment Committee Faculty of Law and Nijmegen School of Management of Radboud University Nijmegen on 16 November 2022 (approval number: EACLM Ref No: 2022.14).

Question wording and translation: The original English version of the items were translated to Dutch. “Government” (regering), “party” (Partij), and “MPs” (Tweede Kamerleden) were used instead of “president”, “candidate”, and “legislators”. The country adjective “Dutch” (Nederlandse) was used where required. List of items (Netherlands):

FREXP1. Mensen moeten vrij zijn om de regering te bekritisieren, zelfs in tijden van ernstige crisis.

FREXP2. De regering zou in staat moeten zijn al te kritische mediabronnen te censureren.

FRASSC1. Dit land zou beter af zijn als er maar één politieke partij was.

FRASSC2. Het recht om te protesteren moet worden beschermd, ook als demonstranten anderen tot last zijn.

FRASSC3. De regering zou de macht moeten hebben om organisaties te verbieden die ontwrichtende waarden uitdragen.

UNISUFF1. Het universeel stemrecht moet in twijfel getrokken worden wanneer zoveel kiezers slecht geïnformeerd zijn en makkelijk misleid worden.

UNISUFF2. Alle volwassen Nederlandse burgers moeten het recht hebben om te stemmen, zelfs mensen met extreme opvattingen.

DECELEC1. Onze regering zou beter functioneren als beslissingen werden overgelaten aan niet-gekozen onafhankelijke deskundigen in plaats van aan politici of het volk.

DECELEC2. Niet-politieke autoriteiten, zoals het leger zouden nooit verkozen politici moeten kunnen overrulen.

FRELECT1. We moeten de resultaten van verkiezingen respecteren, ongeacht welke partij wint.

FRELECT2. Regeringen hebben het recht de verkiezingsregels in hun voordeel te wijzigen als hun tegenstanders dat in het verleden ook hebben gedaan.

JUDCNSTR1. Nederlandse rechtbanken moeten de regering kunnen overrulen als regeringsbeleid als onwettelijk wordt beoordeeld.

JUDCNSTR2. De regering moet uitspraken van rechtbanken die als politiek partijdig worden beschouwd, kunnen negeren.

LEGCNSTR1. Als de Tweede Kamer het werk van de regering belemmert, moet het worden genegeerd.

LEGCNSTR2. Tweede Kamerleden moeten politieke beslissingen van de regering in vraag kunnen stellen en kunnen controleren, zelfs als dit de vooruitgang vertraagt.


EQLAW1. De regering moet de wet kunnen omzeilen om dringende sociale en politieke problemen op te lossen.

EQLAW2. Alle Nederlanders zouden dezelfde wettelijke rechten moeten hebben, ongeacht hun politieke overtuiging.

Response categories: 1. Helemaal niet mee eens 2. Niet mee eens 3. Niet mee eens en niet mee oneens 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal mee eens 6. Weet ik niet / zeg ik liever niet

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented on three pages, each with a grid of 5-6 items. The items were randomly ordered across the pages and grids. An explicit “don’t know” option was presented to respondents but they were otherwise unable to skip questions. The following preamble was used on each of the three pages: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?” (Translation: “Bent u het eens of oneens met de volgende principes voor hoe een politiek systeem georganiseerd en bestuurd moet worden?”)

Figure S17. Response distributions, Netherlands



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Norway

Responsible author(s): Sirianne Dahlum, University of Oslo

Funding: This sample was funded by the Norwegian Research Council, via a Young Researcher Talent grant awarded to Sirianne Dahlum (University of Oslo) for the project “When will citizens defend democracy?” (DefDem).

Fieldwork: The survey was fielded by YouGov to a sample of 1000 Norwegian citizens, selected from YouGov’s panel of Norwegian registered users. Only those who were selected from this panel were allowed to take part in the survey. The fieldwork ran from 5 January 2023 until 15 January 2023. In order to provide nationally representative population estimates, the data was weighed based on gender, age and region. Yougov employed in-house quality controls of the sample.

Ethics: The survey was collected as part of a larger research project approved by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data.

Question wording and translation: The survey was translated to Norwegian. “Government” was translated to “myndighetene” in FREXP2 and UNISUFF1, to “regjeringer” in FRELECT2, “regjering” in JUDCNSTR2, LEGCNSTR1 AND LEGCNSTR2 and “staten” in EQLAW1. List of items:

FREXP1. Folk burde stå fritt til å kritisere myndighetene selv i alvorlig krisetid.

FREXP2. Myndighetene burde kunne sensurere medier som er for kritiske.

FRASSC1. Dette landet ville vært bedre stilt hvis det bare fantes ett politisk parti.

FRASSC2. Retten til å protestere burde bli beskyttet selv når protest-deltakere er til ulempe for andre.

UNISUFF1. Den universelle stemmeretten burde stilles spørsmål ved når så mange velgere er dårlig informert og blir lett misledet.

UNISUFF2. Alle voksne nordmenn burde ha rett til å stemme, og selv individer som holder ekstreme synspunkter.

DECELEC1. Myndighetene våre ville kunne styrt bedre dersom beslutninger ble tatt av ikke-valgte uavhengige eksperter heller enn politikere eller folket.

DECELEC2. Ikke-politiske autoriteter, som militæret, burde aldri kunne overstyre viljen til valgte politikere.

FRELEC1. Vi burde respektere valgresultatene, uansett hvilket parti som vinner.

FRELECT2. Regjeringer bør med rette kunne tilpasse valgregler til deres fordel, dersom motstanderne deres også gjort det samme tidligere.

JUDCNSTR1. Høyesterett burde kunne overstyre regjeringen dersom politikken vurderes som ulovlig.

JUDCNSTR2. Regjeringen burde kunne ignorere høyesterettsbeslutninger som anses som politisk vinklet.

LEGCNSTR1. Dersom Stortinget hindrer regjeringens arbeid, burde det bli ignorert.

LEGCNSTR12. Storingsrepresentanter burde kunne stille spørsmål ved og ettergå politiske beslutninger tatt av regjeringen, selv når dette hindrer fremgang.

EQLAW1. Staten burde kunne tøy lovverket for å løse presserende sosiale og politiske problemer.


EQLAW2. Alle voksne nordmenn burde ha de samme juridiske rettighetene, uavhengig av politisk oppfatninger.

How were the items presented to respondents?

Following a general introduction, the 17 items were presented sequentially, from FREXP1 to EQLAW2, one page each, in the original order for all respondents. The following preamble was used on each of the three pages: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be

organised and run?" (Translation: Er du enig eller uenig i følgende prinsipper for hvordan et politisk system burde bli organisert og styrt? ")

Figure S18. Response distributions, Norway



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Peru

Responsible author(s): Darren Hawkins and Darin Self, Brigham Young University

Funding: This sample was funded by internal funding from Brigham Young University.


Fieldwork: This survey was fielded to 2,189 respondents in Peru using a Qualtrics survey administered to respondents by the survey company Netquest. In Peru, the survey ran from May 27 2023 to June 28, 2023. We used recommendations from Netquest to set nationally representative quotas in each country. We set quotas based on age, gender, and region. Our survey included an experiment featuring two treatment groups and one control group. All respondents in the survey received the support for democracy battery. However, analysis of the performance of the support for democracy battery focuses only on respondents in the control group ($N = 676$). No attention checks were employed.

Ethics: The survey was judged to be exempt by the Brigham Young University Internal Review Board in April 2023 (IRB2023-133)

Question wording and translation: The Spanish translations of the questions used in Argentina and Chile was also used in Peru.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented on individual pages with the question at the top and each answer option listed below each question. These pages were randomized so that all questions were presented in random order. All questions were forced responses so that respondents could not skip questions. However, they were able to select “I don’t know” and “prefer not to answer” as answer options for all questions.

Figure S19. Response distributions, Peru



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Poland

Responsible author(s): Ben Stanley, SWPS University

Funding: This sample was funded by the Polish National Science Centre (Narodowe Centrum Naukowe, NCN) via the NCN OPUS 20 project “Partisan bias or indifference? Actually-Existing Democratic Values and their Consequences in Poland” (“Plemiennosc czy obojetnosc? Badanie rzeczywiscie istniejacych wartosci demokratycznych i ich konsekwencji w Polsce”) under grant agreement 2020/39/B/HS6/00853.

Fieldwork: PBS Sp z o.o fielded the survey to a sample of 3,002 adult residents of Poland drawn from their online panel. The fieldwork ran from 14 April 2023 until 27 April 2023. As this was the first wave of a three-wave panel survey, younger respondents were oversampled due to higher attrition rates among this demographic. An attention check was employed: respondents were asked to answer a question unrelated to the topic of the survey, identifying and correctly categorizing a simple image displayed on the screen.

Ethics: No ethical approval was required for the fielding of this survey.

Question wording and translation: The questions were translated into Polish by the responsible author (who is a fluent Polish speaker), in consultation with colleagues experienced in fielding public opinion surveys in Polish. The translated questions are as follows.

FREXP1. Ludzie powinni miec prawo do krytykowania rządu nawet w obliczu głębokiego kryzysu.

FREXP2. Rząd powinien miec mozliwosc cenzurowania mediow, ktore sa zbyt krytyczne.

FRASSC1. Lepiej by bylo, gdyby w tym kraju istniata tylko jedna partia polityczna.

FRASSC2. Należy szanowac prawo do protestu, nawet jesli protestujacy przeszkadzaja innym.

FRASSC3. Rząd powinien miec prawo do zakazywania dzialalnosci organizacji, ktore propaguja wywrotowe wartosci.

UNISUFF1. Należałoby zakwestionowac powszechne prawo do głosowania, skoro tak wielu wyborcow jest niedoinformowanych i łatwo daje sie wprowadzić w bład.

UNISUFF2. Prawo do głosowania powinni miec wszyscy dorośli Polacy, nawet osoby o skrajnych pogladach.

DECELEC1. Nasz rząd działalby lepiej, gdyby decyzje byly pozostawione nie wybieranym niezaleznyim ekspertom, a nie politykom czy ludziom.

DECELEC2. Wazne autorytety w naszym społeczeństwie, takie jak Kościół, nigdy nie powinni miec mozliwosci uchylania decyzji wybranych polityków.

FRELECT1. Należy szanowac wyniki wyborow, niezaleznie od tego, ktora partia je wygra.

FRELECT2. Rządy powinni miec prawo naginac zasady wyborcze na swoja korzysc, jesli w przeszlosci robili to rowniez ich przeciwnicy.

JUDCNSTR1. Sady powinny miec mozliwosc uchylania decyzji rządu, jesli poszczególne polityki zostana uznane za niezgodne z prawem.

JUDCNSTR2. Rząd powinien miec mozliwosc ignorowania orzeczen sadow, ktore sa uwazane za stronnicze politycznie.

LEGCNSTR1. Jesli parlament utrudnia prace rządu, powinien byc ignorowany.

LEGCNSTR2. Poslowie i senatorowie powinni miec mozliwosc kwestionowania i nadzorowania decyzji politycznych podejmowanych przez rząd, nawet jesli spowalnia to proces legislacyjny.


EQLAW1. Rząd powinien miec mozliwosc naginania prawa w celu rozwiazywania palacych problemow społecznych i politycznych.

EQLAW2. Wszyscy Polacy powinni miec takie same prawa, niezaleznie od swoich przekonan politycznych.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented on 17 successive pages, with the order randomised for each respondent. Respondents were presented with an explicit “Don’t know / Hard

to say” option, which appeared in a less prominent colour on the screen. Respondents could not proceed without giving an explicit answer. The battery of questions was preceded with the following preamble: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?” (Czy zgadzasz się lub nie zgadzasz się z następującymi zasadami organizacji i funkcjonowania systemu politycznego?)

Figure S20. Response distributions, Poland



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Portugal

Responsible author(s): Pedro C. Magalhães (ICS-ULisbon) and Laurits F. Aarslew (Aarhus University)

Funding: CRONOS 2 was part of an Horizon2020 project: Next Steps in Securing the Sustainability of the European Social Survey (ESS-SUSTAIN-2)

Fieldwork: The fieldwork of the 2nd country-specific CRONOS 2 wave took place between 11/01/23 and 08/02/23, corresponding to wave 6 of the CRONOS 2 panel. The CRONOS 2 sample was drawn from the European Social Survey's 10th round sample. In Portugal, the ESS sample is a two-domain design. The sampling frame is the list of addresses of domestic clients of the national electricity company, E-REDES. Frame coverage can therefore be assumed to be excellent. Initial analysis of the frame has established the number of addresses within each 4-digit postcode (CP) area in the country. The domains and the Probability Sample Units were defined by postcodes. Addresses correspond to a single dwelling. All CPs with fewer than 15,421 addresses form domain 1. A 3-stage clustered design is used in this domain. 152 CPs are selected with probability proportional to number of addresses. Within each selected CP, 17 addresses are selected. Domain 2 consists of all CPs with 15,421 or more addresses. A 2-stage unclustered design is used. CPs act as strata and 2,670 addresses are selected, the number in each stratum being proportional to the total number of addresses in the stratum. At each address of Domain 1 and Domain 2, one person aged 15 or over was randomly selected by the interviewer in the field. After the ESS in-person household interview was conducted, respondents were asked if they would be willing to join an online panel exclusively dedicated to 6 waves of the CRONOS 2 Survey (4 international and 2 country-specific). 714 accepted to be a part of this panel (out of 1838). Ultimately, after panel mortality, 379 respondents have completed wave 6. Fieldwork was managed by the ESS HQ at the City University of London, in coordination with the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon. An attention check question was included on the survey; "Please confirm that you read this question by selecting the value located at the top of the response scale, so that the value 1 is your answer."

Ethics: Approved by the Ethics Committee of the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon.

Question wording and translation: A Portuguese translation of the original English version of the items was used. "Governo(s)" (executive(s)) was used for "government", "deputados" (MPs) for "legislators", "partido" (party) for "candidate/party".

Preamble: Em que medida concorda ou discorda de cada um dos seguintes princípios sobre como um sistema político deve ser organizado e gerido?

FREXP1. As pessoas deveriam ser livres de criticar o governo, mesmo em tempos de grande crise.

FREXP2. O governo deveria poder censurar os meios de comunicação social que são demasiado críticos.

FRASSC1. Este país seria melhor se houvesse apenas um único partido político.

FRASSC2. O direito a protestar deve ser protegido mesmo quando os manifestantes incomodam os outros.

FRASSC3. O governo deveria ter o poder de proibir organizações que promovem valores subversivos.

UNISUFF1. O direito de todos e todas a votar deve ser questionado quando tantos eleitores estão mal informados e são facilmente induzidos em erro.

UNISUFF2. Todos os cidadãos portugueses adultos devem ter o direito de voto, mesmo indivíduos com opiniões extremistas.

DECELEC1. O nosso governo funcionaria melhor se as decisões fossem deixadas a peritos independentes não eleitos em vez de serem deixadas aos políticos ou ao povo.

DECELEC2. Autoridades não políticas, tais como as forças armadas, nunca devem poder sobrepor-se à vontade de políticos eleitos.

FRELECT1. Devemos respeitar os resultados das eleições, independentemente do partido que ganhar.

FRELECT2. Os governos têm justificação para dobrar as regras eleitorais a seu favor quando os seus adversários também o fizeram no passado.

JUDCNSTR1. Os tribunais portugueses devem ser capazes de anular decisões do governo se essas decisões forem consideradas ilegais.

JUDCNSTR2. O governo deveria poder ignorar as decisões judiciais que se considerem ser politicamente tendenciosas.

LEGCNSTR1. Se o Parlamento dificulta o trabalho do governo, deve ser ignorado.

LEGCNSTR2. Os deputados devem poder questionar e supervisionar as decisões políticas tomadas pelo governo, mesmo que isso abrande o progresso.


EQLAW1. O governo deve ser capaz de dobrar a lei para resolver problemas sociais e políticos urgentes.

EQLAW2. Todos os portugueses devem gozar dos mesmos direitos legais, independentemente das suas crenças políticas.

Response set: 1. Concordo totalmente, 2. Concordo, 3. Não concordo nem discordo, 4. Discordo, 5. Discordo totalmente

How were the items presented to respondents? Following a general introduction, the 17 items were presented sequentially, from FREXP1 to EQLAW2, one page each, in the original order for all respondents. The introduction stated: “As frases que se seguem exprimem alguns princípios sobre a organização de um sistema político. Diga, por favor, em que medida concorda ou discorda de cada um deles.” A “don’t know” option was not presented to respondents but they were able to skip questions.

Figure S21. Response distributions, Portugal



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

South Africa

Responsible author(s): Robert Mattes and Christopher Claassen

Funding: Funding provided by the School of Government and Public Policy Departmental Research Fund at the University of Strathclyde and the Leverhulme Trust, via a Philip Leverhulme Prize to Christopher Claassen.

Fieldwork: Geopoll fielded the survey to a sample of 500 adult South Africans from 20-25 June 2023. A non-representative sample was used, with respondents opting into the sample subject to quotas for age group, rural vs urban, race, and province. Respondents needed to have internet access to complete the survey. They were able to select one of five languages in which to receive the survey. Geopoll screened respondents according to the length of the interview and the extent of “straightlining”.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the University of Strathclyde School of Government and Public Policy Ethics Committee on 26 June 2023.

Question wording and translation: The British English version of the questionnaire was used as a baseline. Questions were slightly simplified to suit the mode of mobile phone text message. The words “government”, “party”, and “MPs” were used instead of “president”, “candidate”, and “legislators”. The country adjective “South African” was used where required. The English questionnaire was then translated into a further four South African languages: Afrikaans, Zulu, Xhosa, and Sotho.

FREXP1. People should be free to criticise the government even in times of great crisis.

FREXP2. The government should be able to ban media sources that are too critical.

FRASSC1. This country would be better off if there were only one political party.

FRASSC2. The right to protest should be protected even when protestors inconvenience others.

FRASSC3. The government should have the power to ban organisations which promote values that undermine our society.

UNISUFF1. The right of all citizens to vote must be questioned when so many voters are poorly informed.

UNISUFF2. All adult South Africans should have the right to vote, even individuals holding extreme views.

DECELEC1. Our government would run better if decisions were left up to non-elected independent experts rather than politicians or the people.

DECELEC2. Non-political authorities - such as business leaders - should never be able to overrule elected politicians.

FRELECT1. We should respect the results of elections - no matter which party wins.

FRELECT2. Governments are justified in bending electoral rules in their favour when their opponents have also done so in the past.

JUDCNSTR1. South African courts should be able to overrule the government if policies are judged to be illegal.

JUDCNSTR2. The government should be able to ignore court rulings that are regarded as politically biased.

LEGCNSTR1. If the National Assembly slows down the work of the government it should be ignored.

LEGCNSTR2. Members of Parliament should be able to question and oversee political decisions taken by the government.


EQLAW1. The government should be able to bend the law in order to solve pressing social and political problems.

EQLAW2. All South Africans should enjoy the same legal rights - regardless of their political beliefs.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were sent as text messages to respondents’

cell phones. The response options are numbered from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). A “don’t know” option was not included. Respondents responded by replying to each text message with a number corresponding to the response option they have selected. The entire survey, including all demographic questions and consent, was 24 items in length.

Figure S22. Response distributions, South Africa



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Spain

Responsible author(s): Maurits J. Meijers & Andrej Zaslove

Funding: This sample was funded by the Dutch Science Council (NWO) via the Veni grant awarded to Maurits Meijers for the project “Credible or Capricious: The Reputational Cost of Party Policy Change”, under grant number VI. Veni.191R.018.

Fieldwork: The data was collected between April 6 and May 2, 2023, with the use of an online survey sent out to adult Dutch citizens. The data was collected by the Dutch research institute Kieskompas – Election Compass which maintains several panels internationally. The respondents have signed up to participate in political and societal research through their usage of Voting Advice Applications developed for Spanish media. The survey participants provided their informed consent before participating in the survey. The panel of respondents was invited to participate in the survey on the 6th, 11th and 12th of April, 2023. Of the 53083 participants invited to take the survey, 3462 valid responses were recorded. In order to provide nationally representative population estimates, the data was subsequently weighed using poststratification, employing a joint demographic distribution of age, sex and educational attainment, with the use of data from the 2011 European census obtained from Eurostat (<https://ec.europa.eu/CensusHub2>). Two attention checks were included in the survey before the democracy items. The attention checks are taken from Berinsky et al (2014) and adapted to the Spanish context.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the Ethics Assessment Committee Faculty of Law and Nijmegen School of Management of Radboud University Nijmegen on 16 November 2022 (approval number: EACLM Ref No: 2022.14).

Question wording and translation: List of items (Español)

FREXP1. La gente debe ser libre de criticar al gobierno incluso en tiempos de gran crisis.

FREXP2. El gobierno debería poder censurar a los medios de comunicación que sean demasiado críticos.

FRASSC1. Este país estaría mejor si hubiera un solo partido político.

FRASSC2. El derecho a la protesta debe ser protegido incluso cuando los manifestantes molestan a los demás.

FRASSC3 (versión de la ola 2). El gobierno debería tener el poder de prohibir las organizaciones que promueven valores subversivos.

UNISUFF1. El derecho universal al voto debe ser cuestionado cuando tantos votantes están mal informados y son fácilmente engañados.

UNISUFF2. Todos los ciudadanos españoles mayores de edad deberían tener derecho al voto, incluso los individuos con opiniones extremas.

DECELEC1. Nuestro gobierno funcionaría mejor si las decisiones se dejaran en manos de expertos independientes no elegidos en lugar de los políticos o el pueblo.

DECELEC2. Las autoridades no políticas, como las fuerzas armadas, nunca deberían poder anular a los políticos e.

FRELECT1. Debemos respetar los resultados de las elecciones, independientemente del partido que gane.

FRELECT2. Los gobiernos están justificados para torcer las reglas electorales a su favor cuando sus oponentes también lo han hecho en el pasado.

JUDCNSTR1. Los tribunales españoles deberían poder anular al gobierno si se considera que las políticas son ilegales.

JUDCNSTR2. El gobierno debe poder ignorar las sentencias judiciales que se consideren políticamente parciales.

LEGCNSTR1. Si el parlamento obstaculiza la labor del gobierno, debe ser ignorado.

LEGCNSTR2. Los diputados deben poder cuestionar y supervisar las decisiones políticas tomadas por el gobierno, incluso cuando esto ralentiza el progreso.

EQLAW1. El gobierno debe ser capaz de torcer la ley para resolver problemas sociales y políticos acuciantes.


EQLAW2. Todos los españoles deben disfrutar de los mismos derechos legales, independientemente de sus creencias políticas.

Response categories: 1 Totalmente en desacuerdo, 2 En desacuerdo, 3 Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, 4 De acuerdo, 5 Totalmente de acuerdo, 6 No lo se / prefiero no contestar

How were the items presented to respondents?

The 17 items were presented on three pages, each with a grid of 5-6 items. The items were randomly ordered across the pages and grids. An explicit “don’t know” option was presented to respondents but they were otherwise unable to skip questions. The following preamble was used on each of the three pages: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?” (Translation: “¿Está usted de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con los siguientes principios sobre cómo debe organizarse y dirigirse un sistema político?”)

Figure S23. Response distributions, Spain



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Taiwan

Responsible author(s): Tsung-han Tsai

Funding: This sample was funded by the National Science and Technology Council, R.O.C., under grant MOST 110-2410-H-004-079-MY3.


Fieldwork: The survey was fielded by telephone from 22-27 June 2022 by the Election Study Center at National Chengchi University. The target population is eligible voters in Taiwan, i.e., Taiwanese citizens who are 20 years of age or older and reside in housing units. The sampling framework is constructed to ensure national representativeness, with participants selected via landline and mobile phones in a 2:1 ratio. The expected sample size is 1,200 with 800 from landline and 400 from mobile. The completed number of respondents is 1,158 in total with 757 from landline and 401 from mobile. Raking based on gender, age, education, and area is used as the weighting method. For the landline sample, the target population is clustered by county/city and then the method of probability proportionate to size (PPS) sampling is applied to obtain area codes. The last four digits are randomized to get the full telephone numbers. Lastly, a randomized procedure was used for respondent selection within household. For samples from mobile phone, the target population is clustered by mobile phone company and the sample size of each cluster is proportional to the usage share of these companies. The method of PPS sampling is applied to obtain the “company code” and then the last five digits is randomized to get the full cell phone numbers.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the Research Ethics Committee at National Chengchi University on 2 May 2022. The application number is NCCU-REC-202204-I017.

Question wording and translation: The original English version of the items were translated into Mandarin. The Mandarin version of the items were back-translated into English by google translate to check the consistency between the original English version and the translated version.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented to respondents one by one. The items were asked in the original order from FREXP1 to EQLAW2. The “don’t know” and “refuse to answer” options were not explicitly provided to respondents but respondents could say so if they insist. The following preamble was used at the beginning of asking the 17 items: “I am going to read several statements. Please tell me what your opinion about these statements is”.

Figure S24. Response distributions, Taiwan



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

Turkey

Responsible author(s): Anja Neundorf and Aykut Ozturk, University of Glasgow

Funding: The research producing this sample is generously funded by a European Research Council Consolidator Grant “Democracy under Threat: How Education can Save it” (DEMED) (Grant number: 865305).


Fieldwork: The sample is recruited between 15 December 2022 and 22 March 2023 through paid advertisements shown on Facebook and Instagram. Our sample includes 2,629 respondents, who answered at least one of the items of the support for democracy battery. Paid advertisements were stratified based on age, gender, and education to produce a more diverse sample. The final sample slightly overrepresents university graduates and slightly underrepresents older people. No attention checks were employed.

Ethics: The survey received ethical approval (number: 400210195) from the Ethics Committee of the College of Social Sciences at the University of Glasgow on May 17, 2022.

Question wording and translation: We translated the items into Turkish. Reflecting the presidential system in Turkey, our questions referred to “president” and “candidates.”

How were the items presented to respondents? Three items (UNISUFF1 FRASSC3 EQLAW1) were shown first. The remaining items were randomly assigned into one of the four matrices of 3 or 4 statements. An explicit “don’t know” option was presented to respondents, but they were also able to skip questions. The following preamble was used on each of the pages: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organised and run?”

Figure S25. Response distributions, Turkey



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.

United States

Responsible author(s): Yphtach Lelkes , University of Pennsylvania

Funding: The survey was funded by David Binder Research.


Fieldwork: This survey is based on 2,370 interviews conducted by YouGov on the internet of adults between May 27 and June 28, 2022. The sample was weighted according to gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, and US Census region based on voter registration lists, the U.S. Census American Community Survey, and the U.S. Census Current Population Survey, as well as 2020 Presidential vote. Respondents were selected from YouGov to be representative of adults. Yougov employed in-house attention checks.

Ethics: The survey was approved by the University of Washington IRB (STUDY00015749) in May 2022.

Question wording and translation: The original English version of the items was used. American English spellings were used. The country adjective “American” was used where required.

How were the items presented to respondents? The 17 items were presented on two pages, each with a grid of 8-9 items. The items were randomly ordered across the pages and grids. A don't know response was not included. The following preamble was used on each of the two pages: “Do you agree or disagree with the following principles for how a political system should be organized and run?”

Figure S26. Response distributions, United States



Bars show percentages selecting each response option. Data are not weighted.