

1 Introduction

Since political theory took its “deliberative turn” (Dryzek 2000) in the 1990s, empirical political science has increasingly turned towards deliberation as well. There have been numerous studies about its requirements and consequences. This paper is concerned with the latter. Deliberative theory along with empirical science has developed manifold assumptions about the effects of deliberation, including transformation of preferences, epistemic quality, consensus and accommodation, as well as side-effects on civic virtues like political trust (cf. ???). Given the current decline of trust in governments and political institutions in many democracies across the world (cf. Foa & Mounk 2016), deliberation could be seen as a process to arrive at legitimate decisions in societies of increasing complexity (see for example: Habermas (1994: 7–8); Warren & Gastil (2015: 562)). This paper seeks to investigate what can be theorized as a side-effect of deliberation: political support for the regime. This study differs from previous ones in the following terms: It is the first to examine the effects of deliberation on regime support in a cross-national framework across a large dataset of 306,047 respondents from 113 countries across all continents. Moreover, the analysis is not restricted to democratic regimes, but also includes non-democracies.¹ Therefore, a recent theoretical development, the conceptualization of deliberation outside of democratic contexts, so called *authoritarian deliberation*, is taken into account (see: He (2014); He & Warren (2011); He & Thøgersen (2010)).

The main research question of this thesis states as follows: *What role does Deliberation play for regime support across the world?* The following section establishes the theoretical framework of political support and derives possible determinants of regime support. Next, the concept of deliberation is clarified and the link between deliberation and regime support is drawn, from which hypotheses are derived (Section 2). The next section presents the research design of this study and the results of the analysis (Section 3). In the end, the findings of the analysis will be summarized and the conclusion gives an answer to the research question along with a discussion of implications for further research (Section 4).

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 4.4864×10^4 .

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

¹For the purposes of this paper we consequently refer to political systems as non-democratic in accordance with the Polity IV project classification of autocracies and anocracies.

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).

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 than 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 Theory

2.1 Subcaption 1

2.1.1 Subsubcaption 1

2.1.2 Subsubcaption 2

2.2 Subcaption 2

3 Methods and Data Preparation

3.1 Subcaption 1

4 Analysis

4.1 Subcaption 1

5 Conclusions

5.1 Subcaption 1

6 References

- Dryzek, John S. 2000:** *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Foa, Roberto Stefan & Mounk, Yascha 2016:** The democratic disconnect, *Journal of Democracy* 27, pp. 5–17.
- Habermas, Jürgen 1994:** Three normative models of democracy, *Constellations* 1, pp. 1–10.
- He, Baogang 2014:** Deliberative culture and politics: The persistence of authoritarian deliberation in china, *Political Theory* 42, pp. 58–81.
- He, Baogang & Thøgersen, Stig 2010:** Giving the people a voice? Experiments with consultative authoritarian institutions in china, *Journal of Contemporary China* 19, pp. 675–92.
- He, Baogang & Warren, Mark E. 2011:** Authoritarian deliberation: The deliberative turn in chinese political development, *Perspectives on Politics* 9, pp. 269–89.
- Warren, Mark E & Gastil, John 2015:** Can deliberative minipublics address the cognitive challenges of democratic citizenship?, *The Journal of Politics* 77, pp. 562–74.