

Everyone Says Democracy

Research and political reasoning



Democracy measurement, institutional commitment and candidate choice

Your task

Start without advance reading. Use the explanations inside the activity. People can endorse the word democracy while answering differently about a specific institution or candidate. In this inquiry, you advise fictional Bellmere's election commission. Examine the conclusion connecting a broad survey answer to future political behavior. Read the two studies closely: one investigates a measure of institutional support, while the other relates measured understandings to responses to varied candidate profiles. Follow the same respondent across only the comparisons actually supplied. Keep those linked interviews separate from the numerical exercise and any new panel record. You will write a respondent-ready instrument under a fixed twelve-slot budget, defend its coverage and test how its wording is understood. A new public-media case then requires an account, a rival and differing predictions before later evidence arrives. Preserve legal distinctions, missing measurements and your initial commitments. Your final argument should explain a positive finding as well as its limits, identify a feasible next comparison and show why you retained or revised your conclusion.

Explain the studies using the in-app explanations

Article A · Explain the study

Use the Article A explanation here; no journal reading is required.

1. Name one democratic protection the survey measures. How did the researchers check whether answers fit together?
2. What improved when the survey was shortened, and which part was left out? Consistency and including all important parts are separate questions.
3. Why does a useful local score not automatically allow a fair ranking of countries? Use the explanation, keeping Bellmere separate.

Article B · Explain the study

Use the Article B explanation here; no journal reading is required.

1. What candidate features were changed at random? Which beliefs about democracy were measured instead?
2. Explain the broad idea that everyone prefers candidates matching their views. Compare it with the actual findings about judicial appointments and public media.
3. How can the broad idea fail while a narrower relationship remains? State one limit of this Polish study of hypothetical choices.

Use both studies

Use the two article explanations here; no journal reading is required.

1. Compare two expectations: people with strong liberal commitments reject violations more, or people generally favor candidates matching their own views.
2. Use the candidate-study findings and one survey-design detail from Article A to assess those expectations.
3. How would that change a survey or candidate comparison you propose? What remains untested? You will make a new prediction before the later record in the Sable case.

Before you start

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

Read both assigned source explanations and specified article sections. Separate what was varied experimentally from what was measured about people.

Prepare a question ledger: exact wording, response target, person or group, changed feature, held-alike features and missing observations.

Check the assigned requirements and Canvas destination. Plan independent time for complete instrument wording, profiles and explanations beyond the guided session.

Work through the inquiry

Set the starting inference

State what the commission is claiming and the evidence it would need. Give your own political account and a serious alternative. Keep a reported answer, a legal rule and your proposed explanation in separate sentences.

Reconstruct and connect the studies

Explain the measurement study's procedure, useful finding and coverage cost. Explain the candidate study's general and narrower predictions against its results. Use one concrete detail from each source to change an conclusion or a proposed question.

Inspect linked records

Predict before opening each record. Track the same person's exact classification, approval, importance and choice across supplied comparisons. Write 'not collected' for missing measurements. After later evidence becomes available, identify the precise observation your account must now explain.

Name the numerical starting group

Keep Linked interviews A-D, the Separate 200-person exercise and the fresh panels distinct. For each requested proportion, complete 'Among whom, how many did what?' before calculating. Compare reversed conditional questions and explain the limit of the descriptive result.

Draft the twelve-slot instrument

Write ten single items and one two-slot candidate pair: $10 + 2 = 12$. Supply every question, response label, legal context and both complete profiles. Cover courts, competitive elections, public media and equal legal rights, and all six required targets somewhere. Each single response observes one judgment; extra tags cannot repair a question asking about two things at once. Include democratic-system satisfaction for a named period. Defend omissions, contextual interviews and an authorized political next step.

Transfer, revise and synthesize

In Sable, commit an account, for the same result rival and differing predictions before the later record. Define what you vary, measure and hold alike; complete both factors and all four cells where required. After reveal, defend retention or revision and build the next-study/course table with immediate and delayed expectations. Distinguish assigned information from beliefs, check comprehension and compliance, then connect the completed work in your final brief.

Vocabulary

Democratic understanding

What a person regards as essential to democracy. This differs from approving every institution or recognizing a particular action.

Recognition

Classification of an exact action against a stated democratic standard. Legal recall and approval are separate responses.

Approval

A favorable or unfavorable judgment of a named action, right or institution. State the precise object being approved.

Importance

Reported importance of a right in itself or in a particular choice. Name which; a self-report is not automatically a measured causal weight.

Satisfaction

Evaluation of how a specified system or government has performed during a named period. Democratic-system satisfaction and government satisfaction have different targets.

Candidate choice

Selection between complete profiles containing several features. Choosing a profile does not separately record approval of each feature.

Content coverage

The parts of a concept represented by the questions. Closely correlated answers can still leave an important component unmeasured.

Measurement equivalence

Evidence that an item or scale has comparable meaning and measurement relationships across settings. Identical words alone do not establish it.

Conditional percentage

A proportion within the starting group named by the question. Reversing that group changes the quantity you calculate.

Rival explanation

A different process for the same person or unit's same outcome, with a comparison producing at least one different expected observation.

Read and explain the graph

Read the record's where the evidence came from, exact outcome, panel labels and unit. Keep this display separate from other interview and survey datasets.

Match each mark to its numerator and its own panel base in the accessible table. Calculate rates from those matched quantities.

Check that the axis uses a common scale and the caption shows unequal bases. Distinguish a comparison of counts from a comparison of within-panel percentages.

State the observed pattern and identify missing sampling, assignment or belief information. A graph cannot supply a motive or an intervention effect by itself.

Six assessment criteria

Your instructor reviews these six actual criteria once each on a 0 to 3 scale, for a maximum of 18. Completion and factual checks record work; they do not grade the argument. A supported retention of an earlier account can earn full credit.

1. Source contribution and measurement
2. Linked process and positive restraint
3. Same-person/outcome rival discrimination
4. Lawful feasible decision and operational instrument
5. Numerical interpretation and representation
6. Unfamiliar transfer and revision

The shared progression is 0 for missing or materially inaccurate work, 1 for emerging reasoning, 2 for developed reasoning, and 3 for convincing, specific and bounded reasoning. Your evidence, assumptions and feasible comparison matter; political agreement, prose polish, help use and changing your mind are not grading criteria.

Save and export your work

Use the app's local save and export functions regularly. Browser progress is tied to the current browser and device; clearing its data can remove it.

Export a progress backup before switching device or browser. Import through the app and check your source notes, saved commitments and current responses.

Reuse your own notes through the available controls, then revise them into the current argument. Keep the copied record's where the evidence came from and distinguish it from later edits.

Before submission, save a readable print or text export and a progress backup. Inspect the complete instrument, study table, rationales and final brief in the readable file.

Optional private online saving

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.

Submit separately to Canvas

Use Print to save a readable PDF or use the text export, following your instructor's file requirement. Open the exported file and check the complete questions, all options and profiles, study table and final brief. Next, open the separate Canvas assignment and upload the requested file. The module's save, print and export actions do not submit your work to Canvas.