

Everyone Says Democracy

Research and political reasoning



Democracy measurement, institutional commitment and candidate choice

Purpose

Teach the separation of institutional concepts, response targets and political inferences. Article A provides useful evidence about response coherence while exposing a coverage tradeoff; Article B supports a bounded association between stronger liberal understandings and stronger rejection of non-liberal profiles, including own-party profiles. Preserve the narrower majoritarian-judicial relationship alongside failure of generalized worldview matching. Students should explain positive restraint as well as tolerated costs, distinguish lawful majority powers from control over independent findings, and design an unfamiliar for the same result comparison without inferring motives from choice alone.

Prepare the assignment

Use the simplified explanations inside the activity during class. The primary articles and further reading are optional for students. Give students time to read, ask questions and return to a passage while answering. Keep the primary sources available for your own checks.

Read the current teacher key and six-criterion rubric. Keep the Linked interviews A-D packet, Separate 200-person exercise, Neris panels and Sable case visibly separate.

Review the actual twelve-slot requirements, Cedar/Doran powers, both contextual interview sessions and authorized party decisions. Have students inspect full wording, not just target tags.

Set the instructor assignment switches and explain which workspaces, justifications and graph checks are required. Protect the initial Sable commitment before reveal; keep instructor worked answers out of student materials.

No advance student reading is required. Use the simplified explanations inside the activity, with time for questions, analysis and saved continuation across sessions.

A first class session with in-app reading

This suggested first class session starts with the in-app explanations. No advance reading is required. It is a planning example, not a measured completion time; use further sessions for the rest of the inquiry.

Phase	Min	Teaching move
Opening question	5	Begin from the fictional notice and save a first idea. No advance reading is assumed.

Phase	Min	Teaching move
Learn from the explanations	15	Read the two in-app explanations together. Ask students to say in their own words what was compared, what was found and one limit. Use the vocabulary help.
First evidence inquiry	15	Write an explanation and alternative, predict a new observation, then inspect the next record. Return to the explanations when needed.
Discuss the analysis	10	Compare evidence and reasons in pairs or small groups. Resolve unclear instructions before evaluating the argument.
Save and plan continuation	5	Save progress and a backup. Continue remaining data, decision, new-case and final-record tasks in further sessions.

Continue the complete inquiry

Continue the full inquiry from the saved stopping point. Read explanations during the activity whenever needed. Keep the data, decision, new-case prediction and reasoned revision, allowing time for questions and discussion. No human student completion time has been measured.

Teaching moves

Keep the exact question and same person in view. Ask separately what was classified, approved, called important and chosen. Record missing measurements rather than filling them from another respondent's pathway.

Ask students to explain an actual positive restraint case alongside a tolerating choice. Importance and a competing benefit may be parts of one account; a weak rating response does not identify a unique motive.

Have the sources change a research decision. Article A's omitted component raises a coverage question; Article B's general versus institution-specific findings change the scope of a prediction. Measured understanding is not an assigned treatment.

Audit respondent-ready text, complete options and both profiles before accepting domain/target tags. Probe interpretations in both contexts; separate coverage, coherence and equivalence. Compare appointment, dismissal, appeal and enforcement powers rather than judging appointment alone.

Require same-person/outcome rivals and all four factorial predictions. Distinguish assigned sponsor/order/implementation information from fallible reported beliefs; check

recall, intended beliefs, compliance and people missing at follow-up. In course tests, add a salience comparison and a rival to rehearsal before interpreting delayed results.

Respond to misconceptions

A broad democracy endorsement predicts rejection of every institution-weakening candidate.

The opening surveys are unlinked and no election is observed. The linked files and separate numerical exercise permit narrower questions, while candidate choice alone cannot reveal every judgment or future vote.

Understanding, recognition, approval, importance, satisfaction and choice are interchangeable answers.

Each names a different response target. Ask about the exact object and time period. Democratic-system satisfaction cannot be replaced by current-government satisfaction, and one response cannot separately observe two judgments.

More coherent answers guarantee full coverage and a valid country ranking.

Dropping an item may increase consistency while losing a component. The seven-item source battery omits elected decision-makers. Contextual meaning and measurement equivalence need their own evidence; a new draft is not a validated scale.

Elected appointment by itself identifies democratic or undemocratic control.

Cedar and Doran both use elected appointments. Their removal, appeal and compliance powers differ. Explain how the specific arrangement affects lawful majority policy and protection of election losers, without assuming every court decision is wise.

Random candidate features prove that changing understanding through a course will change votes.

The profiles were varied; understandings were measured. Hypothetical Polish comparisons do not estimate a civic-course or real-vote effect. A new assigned comparison needs baseline, immediate and delayed outcomes, implementation checks and credible rival predictions.

Debrief questions

Which positive finding survives the limitations of each source?

What changed within one person's supplied comparison, and what remains unmeasured?
Which institution does your instrument cover poorly, and why is that sacrifice defensible?
What do the exact dismissal, appeal and compliance powers imply for election losers?
Which observation would distinguish your two accounts of the same outcome?
What delayed pattern would challenge your course explanation, and what other account could still fit it?

Assessment within six scoring homes

Score six criteria once each on a 0–3 scale, for a maximum of 18: Source contribution and measurement; Linked process and positive restraint; Same-person/outcome rival discrimination; Lawful feasible decision and operational instrument; Numerical interpretation and representation; Unfamiliar transfer and revision. Use 0 for missing or materially inaccurate reasoning, 1 for emerging work with an unsupported link, 2 for developed, mostly correct bounded reasoning, and 3 for convincing, specific evidence with a credible rival or limit. Detailed descriptors are feedback anchors and add no separate score. Tags, budgets, word floors and keyed choices record structural completion; they do not validate a scale or identify a motive. Party preference, political agreement, grammar, help use and changing one's mind for its own sake are not criteria.

Source contribution and measurement

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Does a concrete procedure/comparison or positive finding from each paper change the instrument or inference? Preserve coherence/coverage/equivalence, generalized-versus-judicial scope and randomized features versus measured understandings. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Does a concrete procedure/comparison or positive finding from each paper change the instrument or inference? Preserve coherence/coverage/equivalence, generalized-versus-judicial scope and randomized features versus measured understandings. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Linked process and positive restraint

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Does costly restraint in D or Bea accompany an explained tolerating choice using actual within-person changes and missing comparisons? Keep Linked interviews A–D separate from the Separate 200-person exercise. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Does costly restraint in D or Bea accompany an explained tolerating choice using actual within-person changes and missing comparisons? Keep Linked interviews A–D separate from the Separate 200-person exercise. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Same-person/outcome rival discrimination

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Do both processes explain one named person's same outcome with genuinely different predictions? Check voter-type coexistence, all relevant factorial cells, assigned versus measured factors and fallible belief/mediator evidence. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Do both processes explain one named person's same outcome with genuinely different predictions? Check voter-type coexistence, all relevant factorial cells, assigned versus measured factors and fallible belief/mediator evidence. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Lawful feasible decision and operational instrument

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Inspect exact wording/options/context/profiles, twelve slots, six targets, four domains, justified reuse/omission, double-barrels and government/system satisfaction. Check authority, rights, powers and separate party-decision evidence; defensible political disagreement is allowed. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Inspect exact wording/options/context/profiles, twelve slots, six targets, four domains, justified reuse/omission, double-barrels and government/system satisfaction. Check authority, rights, powers and separate party-decision evidence; defensible political

disagreement is allowed. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Numerical interpretation and representation

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Check “among whom?”, numerator/base and forward/reverse interpretation without pooling or causal-cure claims. For Neris, inspect axis unit, title, unequal bases and population limits. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Check “among whom?”, numerator/base and forward/reverse interpretation without pooling or causal-cure claims. For Neris, inspect axis unit, title, unequal bases and population limits. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Unfamiliar transfer and revision

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Does the precise ST-03 classification/choice link revise with sponsor/order/credibility/implementation uncertainty intact? Check course immediate/delayed pathway differences, salience and another rehearsal rival. The optional later raw case requires chosen measures and record-specific lawful-reform/suspension comparison before hints; help use has no grade penalty. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Does the precise ST-03 classification/choice link revise with sponsor/order/credibility/implementation uncertainty intact? Check course immediate/delayed pathway differences, salience and another rehearsal rival. The optional later raw case requires chosen measures and record-specific lawful-reform/suspension comparison before hints; help use has no grade penalty. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Worked data and case interpretation

Instructor reference. Keep these calculations and case interpretations separate from learner commitments until the corresponding work has been attempted. All local case data and added teaching examples are fictional; article findings retain their stated sources, units and uncertainty.

Unlinked opening surveys

The fictional 88% broad-label approval and the separate candidate popularity survey supply no individual joint table. They do not permit a calculation of how many democracy endorsers choose Vale, how many reject the exact promise or how they will vote. Linked interviews A-D are four separate qualitative pathways; none is identified within the Separate 200-person exercise.

Choice within a named row

In the Separate 200-person exercise, 72 of the 120 respondents who recognized and disapproved of the breach choose Vale: $72/120 = 60\%$. The other two distinct rows each contain 32 Vale choosers among 40 respondents: $32/40 = 80\%$. These calculations describe choice within the named response groups, not the cause of choice.

Whole-sample choice

The Vale choice counts sum to $72 + 32 + 32 = 136$. Across the entire fictional group, $136/200 = 68\%$ choose Vale. The remaining counts sum to $48 + 8 + 8 = 64$, so $136 + 64 = 200$. This is a teaching-sample proportion, not an electorate prediction or either article's result.

Reversed conditional bases

Among people who did not recognize the violation, Vale choice is $32/40 = 80\%$. Among Vale choosers, nonrecognition is $32/136 \approx 23.5\%$. The numerator is the same 32, but the starting groups differ. The latter cannot be replaced by $32/40$. Neither proportion proves a motive, an information deficit in every chooser or an information lesson's effect.

Neris unequal-panel representation

In the fresh fictional panel record, East is $12/30 = 40\%$, Central is $20/100 = 20\%$, and West is $18/60 = 30\%$ selecting a profile retaining protected opposition reporting. Central has the largest raw count but the lowest within-panel rate. Use one percent axis with all exact counts and bases visible. The panels are separate from the other datasets; representativeness, assignment and motives are unknown.

Fixed instrument budget

Ten single items at one slot each plus one paired comparison costing two slots gives $(10 \times 1) + 2 = 12$. The pair needs two complete profiles, a choice prompt and all choice options. A proposed extra item requires an explicit replacement within the same fixed budget. Across the instrument, all four named domains and six required targets must appear; every target is not required in every domain. Coverage tags do not turn a question asking about two things at once into two observations.

Review the workspace products

Your respondent-ready twelve-slot instrument

Require ten actual single questions and one complete two-slot pair, every response label, exact legal/context description and both profiles. Check the fixed 12-slot cost, courts/elections/media/equal-rights coverage and the six required targets. Verify the object of importance and democratic-system satisfaction, explicit missing coverage, defensible analytical reuse and absence of questions asking about two things at once. Evaluate both 90-minute contextual interview plans through paraphrase and response reasoning, later equivalence evidence and a bounded within-context claim. Inspect the connected defense of linked restraint, tolerated cost, unmeasured links and an authorized Unity board or Harbor platform decision; no poll alone proves that proposed elite response.

Your next-study and course-test table

Require accounts of the same person/unit's same outcome, separate assigned factors and measured beliefs, sponsor/order checks and all four subsidy-by-implementation cells with party held constant. Inspect exact classification, approval/importance and choice measures, comprehension and believed implementation/credibility; bound conclusion if a manipulation fails. The course portion needs assignment/comparison, baseline/immediate/delayed patterns, compliance and people missing at follow-up, a salience comparison or intermediate measure, and a rival to a rehearsal interpretation. Recall gain with unchanged unfamiliar choice can also reflect weak transfer, ceiling or noise. Defended retention or revision can earn full credit; neither this design nor the optional later dossier establishes actual learning or voting effects.

All seven evidence check keys

What does a concrete question add?

Check comparison. Which evaluation most directly addresses the team's claim?

Supported option C: The score may measure a coherent court-related commitment; it needs a coverage defense before representing the wider institutional concept.

Stronger answers moving together does not restore omitted components. A useful narrower score can be defended, but its label must match its coverage; neither how consistently answers fit together nor coverage alone establishes cross-country equivalence.

Rationale to inspect: Name an omitted institutional component and explain why your score label fits or exceeds the objects actually measured. Identify the local or across settings comparison you defend.

Article A: Our Measurement Approach, concise battery, and note 8. Local follow-up invented.

Tolerance or positive demand?

Check scope. Which next research plan preserves the scope of that result?

Supported option A: Investigate the particular judicial relationship and its conditions without assuming every understanding seeks every matching institutional position.

The broad model and an attribute-specific association are different claims. The narrower relationship can motivate a new profile comparison; measured understandings still do not become assigned causes.

Article B: H1a/H1b, individual-level results, and partisan-choice tests.

Approve the civic-course claim?

Check transfer. Which proposed comparison is most informative about those different changes?

Supported option D: Use a credible assigned comparison, distinct legal-knowledge and support measures, and delayed unfamiliar candidate choices with competing benefits.

Separate measures and a credible comparison can test distinct pathways; delayed unfamiliar items address rehearsed answers. Even this design needs attention to compliance, people missing at follow-up and hypothetical-choice limits before electoral claims.

Article B randomizes candidate profiles; civic education appears as a practical proposal in the conclusion, not an evaluated intervention.

What should the public headline say?

Check ruling. Which public claim keeps the observed outcome and proposed political chain distinct?

Supported option B: The linked responses can inform a careful account of candidate costs; whether a party changes nomination or policy requires evidence of its rules and decisions.

A voter-response pattern may enter an actor's expectations, but nomination rules, legal constraints and actual actor decisions are additional links. Neither source estimates this entire political chain.

Rationale to inspect: Identify the respondent outcome observed, specific party decision proposed and one missing actor/rule/incentive link.

Article A: measurement and limits. Article B: main results. Bellmere records invented.

Read a subgroup rather than the whole sample

Check data-read. Among participants who recognized and disapproved of the breach, what share chose Candidate Vale?

Supported option A: 60%, from 72 divided by 120.

The requested subgroup contains 120 participants; 72 of them chose the candidate, giving 60%.

The display is a teaching exercise, not an estimate from either published paper.

Test a headline with the linked table

Check data-infer. A briefing claims, "Most people who chose Vale did not recognize the breach." Which calculation directly tests that claim?

Supported option D: About 24%, from 32 people who did not recognize the violation out of 136 Vale choosers.

The three choice counts sum to 136; 32 of those choosers did not recognize the breach. $32/136 \approx 23.5\%$, contradicting "most" in this exercise. The rate does not establish why anyone chose Vale or what a lesson would change.

Rationale to inspect: Complete "Among ___, the numerator is ___ and the denominator is ___." Contrast people who did not recognize the violation among choosers with choosers among people who did not recognize the violation, then assess "most".

The display is a teaching exercise, not an estimate from either published paper.

Choose a display with the right unit and base

Check data-design. A designer wants to compare the share selecting that profile within each panel. Which representation preserves that target?

Supported option B: Plot 40%, 20% and 30% on one 0–100% scale, label them shares within each panel, and retain bases 30, 100 and 60 in the table.

Each numerator uses its own panel base. The common percent axis compares within-panel shares, and the exact table preserves unequal bases. It does not identify a cause or national rate.

Rationale to inspect: Explain which numerator, denominator, axis unit and title must agree. State what this display cannot establish about a national population or cause.

Neris and all counts are new fictional practice data, unrelated to either real paper or Bellmere dataset.

Instructor controls and the 5907 panel

Open Instructor controls and enter 5907 for this activity. This opens the local workbench, including task keys and check answers. To manage online classes, connect the saving service and enter 5907 again in the server workbench. Canvas remains a separate login and assignment.

Set the default Class or Fun route and which routes are available. Assignment switches cover research notes, political decision, data, unfamiliar transfer, structured workspaces, written justifications, the representation check and optional frontier availability or requirement. Select full or core response guidance; choose unlimited retries or first recorded answers, and feedback after submission or on request. Method hints, unrelated worked examples, badges and deliberate note reuse can also be assigned.

Save and export the assignment settings, or import a compatible settings file and inspect the staged changes before saving. Learner preferences include reading size, high contrast, reduced motion, art visibility and guided responses. Settings, learner work and display preferences are separate records.

Review the six human criteria and task key separately from completion. Load the learner record or an explicitly submitted snapshot to record a score and evidence for each criterion; do not treat word floors, mechanical checks or supported factual choices as a semantic grade.

The private instructor recovery key is separate from 5907; use it to reopen your owned classes. Instructor sessions and class ownership remain isolated. The server workbench can save defaults, create owned classes, update assignment switches and view explicitly submitted snapshots. Private personal drafts are not silently turned into submissions. Keep local progress and settings backups as well.

Private drafts consent and submission

Online saving is optional. Connecting to a saving service does not upload or submit the device draft. Use Save online personal draft only when you want to create or update that personal copy; keep its private recovery key and your local JSON backup.

A personal online draft is not an instructor submission. To submit through a configured hosted class, find the class with its student submission code, review the destination, apply the assignment switches if requested, complete the Class record and save the current version online. Tick the explicit consent box and use Submit this response snapshot.

Submission sends that version to the identified class. Later edits stay personal until you explicitly submit again. This hosted-class route is separate from the Canvas assignment and its upload confirmation.

Device backups and Canvas

Keep compatible progress JSON and settings backups. A readable TXT or PDF export supports review; the JSON preserves continued work. Saving in the player, saving a personal online draft and explicitly submitting to a hosted class are different actions. Canvas remains a separate assignment upload; verify its requested format and submission receipt.

Research sources

Christopher Claassen and 21 coauthors (2024 / 2025 issue). Conceptualizing and Measuring Support for Democracy: A New Approach. *Comparative Political Studies*. 58(6): 1171–1198 · DOI 10.1177/00104140241259458

[Complete primary text](#)

Natasha Wunsch, Marc S. Jacob, and Laurenz Derksen (2025). The Demand Side of Democratic Backsliding: How Divergent Understandings of Democracy Shape Political Choice. *British Journal of Political Science*. 55: e39, 1–22 · DOI 10.1017/S0007123424000711

[Complete primary text](#)