

Keanu Shui

POL-258-01

Professor Lussier

Percentage of people who say that generally speaking, they *need to be careful* in dealing with people

Q: 57	Indonesia	South Korea	Malaysia	Russia
% who claim to “Need to be very careful”	94.81	67.07	80.43	76.09
# of Observations	3199	1245	1313	1765

Percentage of people who *always* vote in National Level Elections

Q: 222	Indonesia	South Korea	Malaysia	Russia
% of people who Always vote in National Level Elections	83.45	66.67	46.00	44.29
# of Observations	3167	1245	1313	1768

Percentage of people who say they would *never* contact a government official for social activism or political action

Q: 214	Indonesia	South Korea	Malaysia	Russia
% of people who would never contact a government official	63.21	45.46	32.60	35.71
# of Observations	3186	1245	1313	1711

2024 Freedom House scores:

Indonesia: 57/100 Partly Free

South Korea: 83/100 Free

Malaysia: 53/100 Partly Free

Russia: 13/100 Not Free

- 1) I chose these questions due to their ability to recognize indicators of democracy while showing the level of trust in a state's government alongside voter turnout to analyze systemic trends in the data. For my 1st question, these issues communicate the general level of safety in each country and emphasize an indicator between high sentiments of safety correlating to the building of democratic regimes. My 2nd question introduces the theme of national voter participation in elections to further analyze if any discrepancies exist within various regime types. This includes if national voter participation will lead to survival based on the hope for representation and issues being heard to quell the potentiality for uprisings. My final question looks at the percentage of people who are willing to voice concerns with authorities which indicates the necessity to

decipher citizen participation and its effects with intentional changes in existing governmental structures. I believe higher levels of national voter participation, higher general levels of safety, and lower levels of people who would never contact government officials are all indicators of a state that is sustaining or has obtained an established democracy.

- 2) I have chosen the countries Indonesia, which is a hybrid regime, South Korea which is a democracy, Malaysia which is a hybrid regime, and Russia which is authoritarian.
- 3) After analyzing all questions, the most notable difference is with Question 222 asking about the percentage of voter participation in national elections. Indonesia led the highest percentage with 83.45%, a hybrid regime. This finding is vital to understanding the political landscape especially as Malaysia, another hybrid-regime, is in close in geographic location with Indonesia, an indicator based on Gerring's long-term factors yet has almost half as low turnout at 46% national participation. This shows that there is a distinct reason and difference why Indonesia has a significantly higher national voter turnout. An explanation may be based on the complete lack of political freedoms of Indonesia and the crucial necessity for survival under Suharto's authoritarian regime.
- 4) Yes, I see a relationship between the percentage who claim to be very careful when dealing with people and the type of regime. Specifically, in regard to Question 57, in my sample of 4 countries, cases of respondents who claim they need to be careful were the lowest at 67.07% in South Korea, a democracy. However, both hybrid regimes reported the highest percentages when considering the need to be careful when dealing with people, as Indonesia had 94.81% and Malaysia with 80.43% of respondents selecting this widespread feeling. This shows that the higher percentage of people who feel they need to be more careful, the more likely a state is to be

autocratic. I recognized that for Q222, which analyzes national election turnout; both Malaysia and Russia, which are hybrid and authoritarian regimes have notably close percentages; while South Korea, a democracy has about 20% more turnout than the others. This trend shows that with a higher national election turnout, the more likely a state is to be a democracy. The only exception to this finding is Indonesia, a hybrid regime; I theorize is partly due to its citizens willingness to participate due to its historical authoritarian president halting numerous civil liberties.

- 5) I see a connection between the agency-based structure of self-expression values and Q214.

Question 214 showcases how Indonesia had the highest percentage of 63.21 from the countries surveyed who would never contact a government official as a method to engage in social activism. Malaysia and Russia have close percentage rates of citizens who would contact a government official showing a correlation between similar numbers of citizens feeling inclined to utilize their self-expression values which showcases potential similarities between each state because of these factors. Another correlation is to note that South Korea, Russia, and Malaysia have a significantly higher percentage of the number of respondents who would contact an official, however all three countries have a fewer number of respondents than Indonesia. These correlations between South Korea, Russia, and Malaysia in comparison with Indonesia convey how self-expression values may give inference to alternative methods of self-expression or a lack thereof.

There is a connection between Dahl's electoral democracy, the Conceptual Scheme reading further considering the procedural minimum, and Question 222 which focuses specifically on the percentage of people who always vote in national level elections. Malaysia and Russia each have about less than half of Indonesia's percentage of citizens who always vote and participate in the

electoral process showing a potential correlation between percentage who always vote and aspects of electoral democracy in their political institutions. Another thought-provoking correlation is the number of observations for South Korea, Malaysia, and Russia all having similar numbers in terms of respondents to the number of people who choose to always vote while Indonesia varies drastically. Dahl's electoral democracy correlates to all countries surveyed due to underlying considerations such as if a country has free and fair elections, competition, inclusive suffrage, and a significant number of other factors. The implications of electoral democracy across these correlations suggest commonalities as seen with South Korea, Malaysia and Russia that can only be specifically analyzed with a more extensive continuation of research.

- 6) Based on my limited analysis as of currently, if in the instance of more time was available, I would hope to explore other cases similar to Indonesia which in my sample of questions and countries, appears to be a "trend-breaker" as it defies patterns in regime-types and further describes a hidden story about the true nature of contemporary Indonesia. I would do this by selecting the same 3 questions, but now with a larger sample of countries to effectively see if in the case of Indonesia is common in hybrid regimes or actually Malaysia is the outlier. This will allow me to see if Indonesia's transitional fight for democracy has led to its responses in my selected questions 55, 214, and 222.

Sources and assistance list:

2024 Freedom House Freedom Map

World Values Survey Master Questionnaire

Professor Lussier's office hours

Feedback notes from initial submission

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Glynn, A., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Pemstein, D., ... Wang, Y. (2020). Conceptual Scheme. In *Varieties of Democracy: Measuring Two Centuries of Political Change* (pp. 27–42). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). The Causal Link between Democratic Values and Democratic Institutions: Empirical Analyses. In *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (pp. 173–209). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.