



## Seminar Paper

# Direct Democracy in Europe

A Cross-National Examination of the Link Between Direct  
Democracy and Satisfaction with Democracy in 31 countries

Author: Fabio Votta, B.A.  
Email: fabio.votta@gmail.com  
Student ID: 2891518

Author: Rosa Seitz, B.A.  
Email: rosa.marie.seitz@gmail.com  
Student ID: 2876533

Date of Submission: 30.03.2018

### Abstract

This seminar paper seeks to investigate deliberation and its relationship to regime support across the world. This is accomplished by exploring the relevant literature and deriving hypotheses from it, which are subsequently tested by using survey data covering 113 countries and 306,047 individual respondents. Given that self-reported regime support is expected to be biased, a weight is applied to account for possible distortions of the data, though results are also reported for the unweighted variable due to the experimental nature of this weight. As this paper is the first known to the authors that examines the effect of deliberation on regime support in a cross-country design, the used deliberation measurement, the Deliberative Component Index from the “Varieties of Democracy”-Project, is examined in a thorough manner and analyses are conducted for its components as well. The analysis finds contradictory evidence for the proposed hypotheses. Deliberation seems to increase regime support first and foremost in democracies, the results in non-democracies and the complete sample are ambiguous and less robust. Furthermore, an exploratory mediation analysis is conducted, to test whether the macro-effect of deliberation on regime support is mediated through democratic performance evaluation on the individual level. The findings of the analysis suggest that further studies in the field should investigate the relationship between deliberation and regime support as well as democratic performance evaluation in greater detail and find possible methods to remedy bias in self-reported regime support. Moreover, more sensible ways to measure deliberation on the country level are necessary, as it is highly correlated with democracy, although some interesting deviations could be found within the subsamples as well as in regards to the individual components.

Seminar: Representative, direct and cooperative participation in comparison

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Subcaption 1 . . . . .	4
1.2	Subcaption 2 . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Theory</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Subcaption 1 . . . . .	5
2.1.1	Subsubcaption 1 . . . . .	5
2.1.2	Subsubcaption 2 . . . . .	5
2.2	Subcaption 2 . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Methods</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Subcaption 1 . . . . .	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Subcaption 1 . . . . .	5
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>5</b>
5.1	Subcaption 1 . . . . .	5
	<b>References</b>	<b>6</b>

## List of Figures

## List of Tables

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Subcaption 1

## 1.2 Subcaption 2

This is a great way to test whether 1233.34 really works in the way it is intended to work. This is different though because 34.876 might be better actually. Or how about  $4.4864 \times 10^4$ .

1233.34

1233.34

1233.34

The following subsection will conceptualize regime support and introduce possible explanatory frameworks that were gathered from the relevant literature (Section 2.1). In this section, the concept of deliberation is clarified (Section 2.2) and a link between deliberation and regime support is established, from which research hypotheses are subsequently derived (Section 2.3).

# 2 Theory

## Some Citations

This is an example introduction. Let's cite someone here (Easton 1965). And in text as well: Habermas (1994) says that we can cite people in text. Or we can write the name, and then use the citation thingy to print the year: Blabla states something about something (1975). Or how about multiple citations (Habermas 1994; Habermas 1994). Or we citation with a little of text around it (for example see Habermas 1994: 92-93).

ALLE Zitierweisen von Zotero gibts HIER.

## More Citations

Blah blah (cf. Easton 1965: 33–5; also Easton 1975: 2).

Blah blah (Easton 1975: 33–5, 38–9).

Blah blah (Easton 1975; Habermas 1994).

Smith says blah (1975).

Easton (1975) says blah.

Habermas (1994: 33) says blah.

## 2.1 Subcaption 1

### 2.1.1 Subsubcaption 1

### 2.1.2 Subsubcaption 2

## 2.2 Subcaption 2

# 3 Methods

## 3.1 Subcaption 1

# 4 Analysis

## 4.1 Subcaption 1

# 5 Conclusions

## 5.1 Subcaption 1

## References

**Easton, David 1975:** A re-assessment of the concept of political support, *British journal of political science* 5, pp. 435–57.

**Easton, David 1965:** *A systems analysis of political life*. New York: John Wiley.

**Habermas, Jürgen 1994:** Three normative models of democracy, *Constellations* 1, pp. 1–10.