

## **Procedural and Substantive Conceptions of Democracy in Four Arab Populations**

David Doherty  
Loyola University Chicago  
Political Science Department  
1032 W. Sheridan Road, Coffey Hall, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60660  
ddoherty@luc.edu  
773.508.3063 (voice)

Jessica Mecellem  
Loyola University Chicago  
Political Science Department  
1032 W. Sheridan Road, Coffey Hall, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60660  
jgawryn@luc.edu

**ABSTRACT:** Although previous work has examined the correlates of broad levels of support for democracy in the Arab World, we know little about what people in this region have in mind when they voice support for “democracy.” Many individuals in this region define democracy primarily in terms of the substantive outcomes (e.g., reduction of wealth inequality and provision of basic economic goods and services). Others define democracy in terms of the procedures that scholars typically see as the defining characteristics of democratic regimes. In this paper we examine the individual-level characteristics that lead people to define democracy in procedural, rather than substantive, terms. We focus on two classes of explanations: 1) knowledge-based factors that increase the likelihood that an individual learns to define democracy in formal, procedural terms and 2) factors that may lead individuals to project their substantive desires for improved economic conditions onto the (broadly supported) term “democracy.” We find that both learning and projection shape conceptions of democracy. We also find evidence that the correlates of conceptions of democracy vary across the four Arab populations we examine.

Although the concept of democracy is multifaceted, most scholarly definitions focus on the characteristics of the institutions and procedures used to make public policy. Democracies are typically identified as nations where citizens have regular opportunities to replace leaders through free elections, where electoral competition is robust, and where basic civil rights and liberties are protected. The widespread uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa—the “Arab Spring”—are frequently explained as driven by demands that authoritarian regimes be replaced with representative governments. In order to understand the prospects and long term support for democratic reforms it is important to examine how people in the region understand the concept of democracy. In other words, what are people in the region likely to look for when they assess whether their goal of democratic governance has been achieved.

We begin from the premise that support for the procedural elements of democracy are crucial to democratic institutions and stability. In order for a democratic system of governance to survive, citizens must be willing to see the democratic regime as legitimate so long as procedural standards are met—even when they are personally dissatisfied with the outcomes that the regime produces. Previous work has explored the predictors of stated support for democracy and levels of political tolerance with a particular eye toward the relationship between religiosity and feelings about democracy (Casanova 2005, Sarkissian 2011). Other work assesses the causes of support for Islamic rather than secular democracy (Tessler 2010). However, little work has examined what people mean when they say they support democracy.

Research in the American context finds that even in countries where there is a long history of democratic governance, many people lack an understanding of the basic contours of democratic political institutions and the policy-making process (e.g., Delli-Carpini and Keeter 1997). Many people report preferences for political processes like replacing elected representatives with unelected policy experts that are strikingly at odds with scholarly notions of democratic governance (Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002). In situations with long-standing institutions, these lacunae in people’s appreciation of democratic procedures may have few consequences because established political institutions are relatively stable and difficult to change. In contrast, in emerging democracies or situations where undemocratic governments

are being threatened, public understanding of and principled support for structural elements of a democracy may be essential to the prospects for lasting democratic institutions.

If support for democracy rests on expectations of substantial changes in redistributive policies or economic conditions, this support may falter if expectations are not met. Although some research finds evidence that democracy tends to reduce income inequality (e.g., Reuveny and Li 2003), there is little evidence of rapid reductions in income inequality or dramatically increased provision of basic services in new democratic regimes ( e.g. Bollen and Jackman 1985; Deininger and Squire 1996; Simpson 1990). Additionally, research finds that global trends in economic trade appear to be increasing inequality (e.g., Dreher and Gaston 2008). Thus, to the extent that a new democracy is able to address economic problems like income inequality and lack of access to basic resources, these effects may be dampened by factors beyond the new regimes control. Even if a new democratic regime succeeds in addressing the economic concerns of the public, democracy may prove fragile if people fail to object when leaders credited with improving conditions backslide on democratic procedures.

Using data from a survey conducted in four Arab populations – Algeria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Palestine, we examine how people define democracy. The survey included questions asking respondents to indicate what they saw as the most and second most important characteristics of a democracy. They were provided with two options that focused on the procedural aspects of a democracy (the opportunity to replace leaders through a voting process and freedom to criticize those in power) and two items that focused on substantive outcomes (low income inequality and provision of basic necessities). Over fifty percent of respondents in our sample indicated that one of the substantive outcomes was the most essential characteristics of democracy, with 31 percent prioritizing both of the substantive outcomes over the procedural options. This suggests that for many people in this region, assessments of the quality of a new democratic regime may rest on the substantive outcomes the government produces, rather than the procedural aspects of how the government operates.

We make three contributions to our understanding of how people in the Arab world understand democracy. First, we examine the correlates of how individuals conceive of democracy. Specifically, we

consider a variety of explanations for why some individuals see provision of substantive outcomes like low income inequality and provision of basic services as central to democracy while others define democracy in terms of procedural considerations. We find evidence that two broad dynamics shape understandings of the idea of democracy in the Arab world. First, those who are more likely to be knowledgeable about political matters—e.g., those with higher levels of education and those who report high levels of interest and participation in the political arena—are more likely to define democracy in procedural terms. Second, we find that, after controlling for factors that may directly affect formal knowledge about the meaning of democracy, individuals project what they see as particularly desirable outcomes onto the term “democracy.”

Second, we assess whether the correlates of how people understand the term “democracy” vary across political contexts. For the most part, the individual-level correlates of democracy are consistent across the four areas we study. However, we do find some evidence of differences across contexts. For example, female respondents are more likely than men to see substantive outcomes as the most important hallmarks of democracy in Jordan and Palestine, but this relationship is significantly weaker in Algeria and Lebanon. The most notable difference we find across models is that none of the individual level characteristics we examine significantly predict conceptions of democracy in Algeria. These findings suggest that the factors that affect how people understand and evaluate democracy may vary substantially across historical and cultural contexts.

Finally, in contrast to prior research that finds either inconsistent or insignificant relationships between religious observance (measured by reported frequency of reading the Quran) and attitudes related to democracy, we find robust evidence that individuals who read the Quran more frequently are more likely to define democracy in substantive terms (providing for the basic needs of the poor and reducing the income gap between the rich and poor). This relationship remains statistically significant after controlling for 22 additional measures of religious attitudes associated with Islamist conservatism. We also report findings from supplementary analysis where we find a strong negative relationship between Islamist conservatism and both diffuse and specific support for democracy but no relationship between

frequency of reading the Quran and support for democracy. These findings suggest that religious suggest that religious observance can significantly affect how people think about democracy in the Arab world and that observance should be treated as a concept that is distinct from attitudes about the role of Islam in politics or the appropriate role for women in society.

In the next section of the paper we discuss the concept of democracy and review previous research that has examined support for democracy, as well as some work that has examined how people define democracy. Then we present our theoretical expectations regarding how a variety of individual-level characteristics may shape people's understanding of democracy. We also discuss how previous work on public support for democracy can inform the question we address here. Next we describe our data and present our findings. In the final section of the paper we discuss the implications of our findings and suggest several avenues for future research.

### **Conceptions of Democracy**

When defining democracy, scholars typically point to structural aspects of a political system (e.g., Franck 1992, 64). Democratic theorists such as Schumpeter (1942), Dahl (1998), and Sorensen (1993) have all recognized the essential elements of democracy to be some combination of procedural structures such as free, fair and frequent elections, access to alternative sources of information, freedom of expression, or at the very least, under Schumpeter's narrow definition "the ability to choose between leaders at election time" (Sorensen 1993, 10). Some scholars (Sartori, 1987; Sorensen, 1993) note that substantive concerns may affect the viability of an effective democratic system, pointing out the difficulty for democratic procedures in contexts of extreme poverty (Held, 1997). However, these substantive elements are viewed as helpful preconditions for the establishment of structural democracy, not as definitions of democratic governance. The notion that particular procedural arrangements are at the core of the idea of democracy is also reflected in scholarly attempts to quantify democracy, such as the Polity IV project. These coding systems typically focus on procedural criteria such as the presence of institutions and procedures for the expression of public preference and constraints on government institutions and officials (Polity IV Global Report 2011, 6).

Much of the existing research on public attitudes and beliefs about democracy focus on levels of support for democracy writ large and specific concepts often associated with democracy (e.g., free speech, tolerance, etc). For example, support for democracy has been linked to basic socioeconomic and demographic characteristics within the population. Shafiq (2009) and Fattah (2006) found higher levels of education and income to be positively correlated with support for democracy in multiple Muslim majority countries, and Ciftci (2010) also found support for the positive role of education. Tezcur (2011) finds evidence that the relationship between both education and age and support for democracy in Iran is mediated through satisfaction with the regime. Tezcur does not find gender to be a significant predictor of support for democracy in Iran, although in his study of thirty two Muslims populations Fattah (2006) finds that females tend to be more supportive of democracy. He also found mixed results suggesting that in fourteen of thirty-two Muslim populations, age is positively associated with support for democracy.

Partly stemming from concerns that Islam may be incompatible with liberal democracy (e.g., Huntington 1993; 1996), a great deal of research has examined the role of religion in shaping support for democracy in the Arab World. Broadly speaking, these measures of religious orientation fall into two categories: 1) measures of frequency of religious observance and 2) more specific measures of Islamist conservatism and support for a strong role of religion in the political arena. Findings regarding the relationship between religious observance and support for democracy have been mixed at best. Some scholars find no evidence of a statistically significant relationship between observance and support for democracy (Ciftci 2010; Fish 2010) and other dispositions often associated with democracy (e.g., tolerance; Sarkissian 2011). Others find some evidence of a negative relationship in some countries (Fattah 2006; Tezcur 2011) but no relationship or positive relationships in others (Fattah 2006).

Evidence regarding the relationship between other religious dispositions and support for democracy and democratic ideals has also been mixed. Cifti (2010) finds a negative relationship between support for political Islam and support for democracy, but Fattah (2006) does not. Sarkissian (2011) finds that higher support for religion in politics is associated with lower levels of tolerance toward minorities. Pepinsky and Welbourne (2011) find an overall negative relationship between religious piety and support

for redistributive policies, aimed at lower income inequality, although there was a positive relationship in four of the nineteen countries surveyed.

In order to understand the implications of responses to broad questions about support for “democracy,” it is important to examine what people mean when they say they support democracy. Individuals may vary greatly in terms of what they have in mind when they say they support “democracy” (Miller, Hesli and Reisinger 1997; King et al. 2003; Schedler and Sarsfield 2007). Inconsistencies and conflicts in how people understand the idea of democracy are further highlighted by evidence from the U.S. (e.g., Hibbing and Theiss-Morse 2002) and comparative literature (e.g., Tezcur 2011) that stated support for democracy can coexist with support for undemocratic ideals and procedures. For example, Tezcur finds that although between seventy-seven and ninety-three percent of respondents in Vietnam, Jordan, Egypt and Iraq consider civil rights to be an essential element of democracy, majorities of these countries also report the belief that “army take-over would not necessarily undermine democratic rule” (4).

Clearly this data suggests that reported support for democracy does not always coincide with a conventional understanding of the concept. When Tezcur isolated those individuals who support democracy and express a conventional understanding of the concept, he found that religiosity is negatively associated with support for democracy at the .001 level of significance (34). Tezcur’s results demonstrate the importance of clearly identifying what respondents mean when they report support for democracy.

### **Variation in Public Conceptions of Democracy in the Arab World**

In the analysis we present below, we conceive of conceptions of democracy as ranging from “substantive” to “procedural.” Respondents on the substantive end of the scale define democracy primarily in terms of the substantive outcomes it may produce; those on the procedural end instead point to formal rules and institutions (e.g., regular elections and protection of civil liberties) as the hallmarks of

democracy.<sup>1</sup> Broadly speaking we expect two types of factors to affect where people fall on this “procedural conceptions of democracy” continuum. The first are *knowledge* based factors, encompassing individual-level characteristics that might affect the likelihood that the individual has been exposed to scholarly, procedural definitions of democracy. Conceptions of democracy may also be based upon *projection*, or an association of the word “democracy” with any number of positive abstract ideas. Over 80 percent of respondents in each of the four populations surveyed here agreed “Democracy may have its problems but is better than any other form of government.” As Schedler and Sarsfield argue, “[d]emocracy’s almost universal acceptance as an abstract value may lead people to...profess rhetorical ‘preferences for democracy’ that are devoid of any concrete content” and that in many cases, democracy may be a “concept[] that designate[s] something valuable without naming its substance” (2007, 639). Thus, we expect that people who are particularly concerned with remedying substantive economic problems will tend to project these substantive desires onto the idea of democracy.

### ***Knowledge Based Factors***

We posit that four factors related to knowledge will be associated with procedural conceptions of democracy: education, age, interest in politics, and political participation. Education has been linked to development of democratic attitudes by multiple scholars (Ekehammar, Nilsson & Sidanius, 1987; Inkeles & Smith, 1974). We expect that those with higher levels of education are more likely to have been exposed to scholarly, procedural definitions of democracy. Thus, we expect better educated individuals to be more likely to define democracy in these terms. Similarly, because *ceteris paribus*, they have been exposed to more information, older individuals may be more likely to be familiar with procedural definitions of democracy and, thus, be more likely to define democracy in this way. We also consider the possibility that the relationship between age and conceptions of democracy is curvilinear due to historical factors such as a failed democratic movement that strongly affected how one generation of individuals thinks about democracy.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note that other scholars have drawn similar distinctions between public conceptions of democracy. For example, Bratton and Mattes (2001), contrast intrinsic support for democracy and democratic institutions with instrumental support for democracy as a means to substantive ends.



Individuals with higher levels of political interest are also more likely to spend time learning about and engaging with political content in critical ways, and to simply think more about the topic (Judd & Krosnick 1989). Furthermore, political cognition literature suggests that higher levels of interest in politics are associated with greater political sophistication (Luskin 1987, 889). Thus, we expect those who are more interested in politics to be more likely to define democracy in formal, procedural terms. Similarly, those who actively participate in the political activities have direct experience with the procedural elements of governance. People who have voted in elections, engaged in protests, or organized petition campaigns are more likely to point to structural factors that provide avenues for citizens to influence government policy as essential to democracy.

### ***Projection Based Factors***

As discussed above, large majorities of the respondents in our sample express support for the idea of a democratic system of government and we expect a variety of individual level characteristics to lead people to project their desire for specific substantive outcomes onto the term democracy. Specifically we expect people who are particularly concerned with remedying economic inequalities and ensuring that everyone's basic needs are met to tend to define democracy as a system that produces these outcomes. We focus on four individual level characteristics: family income, subjective assessments of economic conditions, religious observance, and gender.

There are two reasons to expect that individuals who have greater economic resources are more likely to conceive of democracy in terms of procedural characteristics rather than substantive outcomes. The first is simply that, because they are less likely to be directly affected by concerns like social inequality or lack of basic goods and services, individuals with greater resources are less likely to project remedying these problems onto the idea of democracy. The second reason is that according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, if basic necessities are taken care of, an individual has greater freedom to think about and pursue more abstract self fulfillment issues (1943). These two related factors suggest a dynamic where people who do not have to worry constantly about feeding their family are less likely to project the substantive goal of addressing economic problems onto the idea of democracy. Thus, we expect that

individuals with greater levels of resources will tend to identify procedural elements as the hallmarks of democracy, whereas individuals with lower levels of resources will be more likely to project their needs onto their choice of the essential elements of democracy.

We also consider the possibility that subjective assessments of both personal and national economic conditions also lead people to project their desire for improved economic conditions onto the concept of democracy. For example, those who view the economy as the most important issue facing the country or say that their personal or national economic conditions are poor may be more likely to define democracy in substantive terms. We note that there is an important difference between objective economic circumstances and subjective assessments of economic conditions. Although these concepts are related, objective economic conditions are a better measure of the extent to which economic concerns are salient in an individual's day to day life. In contrast, assessments of national economic conditions – and even an individual's subjective assessment of their own economic circumstances – may be shaped by satisfaction with existing governing institutions, media exposure, and a variety of other factors.

The third projection related possibility that we examine is that more religiously observant individuals may tend to project their desires onto the definition of democracy. For example, Davis and Robinson (2006) argue that structural and scriptural elements unique to Islam encourage Muslims to support redistributive government policies (See also Wilson 1997).<sup>2</sup> Thus, we expect that more religiously observant individuals will project this normative preference regarding wealth distribution and ensuring that basic needs are met onto the concept of democracy. However, we note that Pepinsky and Welbourne's (2011) analysis of piety (in models based on two sets of religious belief and value indicators) and preference for redistributive government policies suggests that greater piety among Muslims is not consistently related to support for distributive policies.

Finally, we assess whether gender affects how people define democracy. There is a great deal of debate regarding whether women tend to be more oriented toward nurturing, more sympathetic to the

---

<sup>2</sup> In Jordan and Palestine all respondents identified as Muslim. The religious identification question was not asked in Algeria. In Lebanon approximately half of respondents identified as Christian. We include an indicator for "Christian" in our models to account for these individuals.

needs of the poor, and broadly more affected by, and concerned with, ensuring that basic needs within the family and surrounding society are met (e.g., Goldberg and Kremen 1990; Popova 2002; Elmelech and Lu 2004). To the extent that women are systematically more concerned with these matters than men, we would expect to find that women are more likely to project their desire for economic concerns to be addressed onto the concept of democracy.

### *Variation across Political Contexts*

Here we consider how the political and social conditions vary in each of the four populations surveyed. Of the four populations surveyed only the Lebanese population could be considered as living under semi-democratic governance. According to the Polity IV dataset, which measures regime type on a scale of -10 (closed autocracy) to +10 (full democracy) Lebanon scored a 7 (6-10 are considered democratic scores). Due to the allocation of government positions based on the diversity of religious and sectarian groups, the country has a unique power sharing construct.

Jordan and Algeria are less democratic, scoring 3 and 2 respectively on the Polity IV scale. Both countries have strong executive branches dominated by a hereditary monarchy and a military/one-party-system, respectively. The 2004 Algerian presidential elections were notable for their transparency and considered by global electoral groups to be generally free and fair with pronounced competition<sup>3</sup>. However, the legislature and judiciary are subordinate to the executive which is controlled by the military generals and the *Front de Liberation Nationale* party. Jordan is considered to have a functioning legislature, unique in the region for its elected Islamist representatives. However since 2002, coercion and repression have increased and both the legislature and the judiciary are highly influenced by the executive.

Finally, the Palestinian territories have what could be seen as a truncated and divided executive, with Hamas ruling in the Gaza Strip since its democratic electoral victory in 2006, and the Palestinian Authority ruling in the West Bank. There was at the time of the survey, no real cooperation between the two groups. The 2006 elections in which Hamas won a majority of seats in the parliament were

---

<sup>3</sup> Polity IV Algeria country Report. <http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/Algeria2010.pdf>. Accessed November 3, 2011.

unilaterally rejected by the Quartet (the US, UK, EU and Russia) and Israel, resulting in economic sanctions on the Palestinian territories, non-recognition of Hamas and imprisonment (and in some cases assassination) of Hamas legislative representatives.<sup>4</sup>

According to UNICEF, literacy rates in the Palestinian territories for the population over 15 years of age was 95% between 2005 and 2010. Literacy rates in Jordan and Lebanon were, according to the World Bank 92.2% and 89.6% respectively in 2007.<sup>5</sup> Algerian literacy rates are significantly lower than the other three populations, with a level of 72.6% of the adult population considered literate in 2006. Unemployment rates are difficult to assess since the incumbent government sometimes underreports. For example in Algeria, the government officially states that unemployment was at around 10% during the time of the survey. However, the US State Department estimates that unemployment is actually closer to 30%. Unemployment rates cited by both the US State Department and the World Bank for Jordan are around 13%, and for Lebanon around 9%. Some of the most reliable statistics are collected by the Israeli Human rights center B'tselem. They reported that unemployment was at 33% in the Occupied Territories as a whole (32% in the West Bank and 36.3% in the Gaza Strip) in 2003.<sup>6</sup> B'tselem also notes that the poverty rate<sup>7</sup> was at 47% for the Occupied territories as a whole in 2003 (37% in the West Bank and 64% in the Gaza Strip).

These differences in the current and historical conditions may affect how people define democracy. These effects may take two forms. First, we may find that “average” definitions of democracy vary across populations—people in some countries may tend to define democracy in more procedural terms than those in other countries. Second, the correlates of how people define democracy may vary

---

<sup>4</sup> Due to continued Israeli occupation and settlement building since 1967, measurement of ongoing governance in the Palestinian territories is complex. Polity IV does not include the territory in their dataset.

<sup>5</sup> The World Bank measures literacy rates as “the percentage of people ages 15 and above who can, with understanding, read and write a short, simple statement on their everyday life.” <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.ADT.LITR.ZS/countries/DZ-JO-LB-SY?display=graph> Accessed November 3, 2011.

<sup>6</sup> Here we have cited what B'tselem calls the adjusted unemployment rate which counts those who are unemployed and actively seeking employment and “also includes “discouraged workers,” who are not employed and have stopped seeking jobs due to pessimism regarding the prospect of actually finding work.” [http://www.btselem.org/freedom\\_of\\_movement/unemployment\\_statistics](http://www.btselem.org/freedom_of_movement/unemployment_statistics) Accessed November 3, 2011.

<sup>7</sup> B'tselem measures poverty rate “based on daily per capita income below \$2.1.” *ibid*.

across contexts. In other words, the factors that predict procedural conceptions of democracy in one context may not predict them in another context. Because the four areas we focus on here differ along a wide variety of dimensions, our expectations regarding each type of effect are necessarily speculative.

It is also possible that varying economic and political conditions across populations could differentially affect average conceptions of democracy. The previous literature widely demonstrates that predictors for democracy vary across countries (Fish 2002; Fattah 2006; Ciftci 2010 etc.). This would imply that different groups might be more or less likely to base their reported support for democracy on projection or knowledge. In the cases of Palestine and Algeria, at the time of the survey, democratic elections had been recently held that were widely considered to be free and fair (in 2006 in Palestine and 1991 and 1992 in Algeria) but that were nevertheless abandoned by incumbent powers when the religious party was predicted to win. It is possible that within these populations, more religious respondents (who supported those parties) would be more likely to choose procedural elements over substantive options because their desire is for the procedural elements that would have allowed religious parties to participate in government.

Since respondents in Lebanon have experienced some form of representative government their opinion of the efficacy of this government likely affects whether they view procedural elements to be essential to democracy. If they view their unique representative structure as largely corrupt they may be more likely to point to substantive outcomes as essential to democracy. However, since Lebanese and Jordanian respondents are on average better off than respondents in Algeria and Palestine, it is possible that they will not be as concerned with provision of basic necessities and therefore conceive of democracy in more procedural terms. On the other hand, literacy rates are higher in Palestine, Lebanon and Jordan than in Algeria, indicating that individuals in those populations might be somewhat more likely to value procedural elements.

### **Procedural Understandings of Democracy in Arab World**

Our analysis uses the public opinion data collected during the first wave of the Arab Barometer Survey (2006-2008). The analysis that follows is based on respondents who provided usable responses to

the two questions about the meaning of democracy, as well as responses to all of the correlate measures we use in our analysis. Our total sample size is 4,026, with 1,078 respondents from Jordan, 1,129 from Palestine, 792 from Algeria, and 1,027 from Lebanon. We provide summary statistics for our full sample, as well as broken down by the four political regions, in Appendix Table A1.

### *Measuring Procedural Understanding of Democracy*

Our key variable of interest is based on responses to the following question: “People often differ in their views on the characteristics that are essential to democracy. If you have to choose only one thing, what would you choose as the most important characteristic, and what would be the second most important?” Respondents were presented with four characteristics (labels we use below presented in parentheses): 1) Opportunity to change the government through elections (*elections*); 2) Freedom to criticize the government/ those in power (*free speech*); 3) A small income gap between rich and poor (*income equality*); and 4) Basic necessities like food, clothing, shelter for everyone (*basic necessities*).

The first two response options (*elections* and *free speech*) refer to procedural characteristics of a democracy—two of the characteristics often cited as the core defining characteristics of a democracy (e.g., Schedler and Sarsfield 2007, 639). Approximately 29 percent of respondents identified *elections* as the most important characteristic of a democracy and about 20 percent indicated that *free speech* is the most important characteristic. The latter two characteristics (*income equality* and *basic necessities*) refer to substantive outcomes that some may expect democracy to produce, but few scholars would argue that these outcomes are defining characteristics of a democracy. Twenty-three percent of respondents indicated that *income inequality* was the most important characteristic of a democracy and 28 percent said that providing *basic necessities* was the most important characteristic.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Table 1 presents a cross tabulation of the characteristics respondents identified as the most and second most important characteristics of a democracy. The distribution of response indicates that fewer than 18 percent (6.6 + 11.3) of responses cited the two procedural criteria as the first and second most important characteristics of democracy; over 31 percent cited the two substantive criteria as most

important. The remaining respondents either selected one of the procedural characteristics as the most important characteristic and a substantive criteria as the second most important (31 percent), or vice versa (19.8 percent).

We combined these responses into an index of “procedural understanding of democracy” ranging from 0 to 3. Respondents who chose both substantive criteria are scored as 0. Those who chose a substantive criterion as the most important characteristic of democracy and a procedural criterion as the second most important were scored as 1. Respondents who chose a procedural criterion as the most important and a substantive characteristic as the second most important are placed at 2 on the scale. Finally, respondents who cited the two procedural criteria (in any order) are scored as 3.

The importance of examining the individual level factors that shape conceptions of democracy can be illustrated by examining the correlation between our measure and several measures of support for non-democratic government behavior. For example, those who identify procedural criteria as the most important characteristics of democracy are less likely to agree that “violation of human rights in [their country] is justifiable in the name of promoting security and stability” ( $p < .01$ ). They are also more likely to say that it is a bad idea for their country to be governed by a “strong non-democratic leader that does not bother with parliament and elections” or to have “experts rather than government make decisions according to what is best for the country.” These relationships suggest that individuals who understand democracy in procedural terms are less likely to acquiesce to non-democratic means that may lead to desirable substantive ends like security or more “expert” decisions.

#### *The Correlates of Individuals’ Understanding of Democracy*

We present our analysis of the correlates of procedural understandings of democracy in Table 2. The model presented in column (1) focuses on demographic factors including: gender, age, age-squared (to account for the possibility of a curvilinear relationship between age and understandings of democracy), frequency of reading the Quran, education, income, and an indicator for respondents who did not provide their income (these respondents were set to the mean on the income scale; full question wording and coding details are presented in the Appendix).

The findings in Table 2, column (1) conform to our expectations. The analysis supports our expectation that individuals who are particularly likely to be concerned with ensuring that basic economic needs are met and reducing disparities between the wealthy and the poor project these concerns onto the broadly supported abstract notion of “democracy.” Women were more likely to see substantive outcomes as the hallmarks of democracy than men. Specifically, after controlling for the other characteristics in the model, women on average were approximately one quarter of a unit lower on the outcome scale than men. Similarly, we find support for our expectation that more religiously observant individuals are more likely to project an ideal of social equality and relief for the economically disadvantaged onto the idea of democracy. This relationship is fairly modest in size—those who report reading the Quran every day or nearly every day score 0.15 units lower on the procedural conception of democracy scale than those who report not reading the Quran—but is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). We also find that more economically advantaged individuals are more likely to define democracy in procedural terms while those who are disadvantaged tend to define democracy in terms of the substantive outcomes it may provide. Specifically, those in the highest income decile within their geographical area are expected to score approximately 0.26 units higher on the outcome measure than those in the lowest decile.<sup>8</sup>

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

The analysis presented in Table 2 also supports for our expectation that a procedural understanding of democracy can be acquired more directly through education or direct engagement in the political arena. For example, in the column (1) specification, individuals with a graduate degree are estimated to score approximately .53 units higher on the procedural understanding of democracy scale than illiterate respondents. The fact that this relationship persists after controlling for a variety of other demographic variables—most notably family income—suggests that formal education affects how

---

<sup>8</sup> In supplementary analysis (available from the authors) we find that this relationship is essentially unchanged when education is modeled more flexibly as a series of indicators for each level of education. These indicators also did not significantly improve the fit of the model beyond that provided by the linear education measure. Thus, in the analysis that follows we rely on the linear measure of education.



individuals conceive of democracy independent of the relationship between education and an individuals' material interest in the redistribution of wealth and provision of basic needs.

In columns (2) and (3) we extend our baseline demographic model by adding two measures of political engagement—levels of interest and participation in politics. These variables measure respondents' level of engagement with political matters. Including these variables significantly improves the fit of the model and the coefficient on the interest in politics scale is independently significant and substantively large. Respondents scoring highest on this scale score almost half of a unit higher on the outcome measure than those scoring lowest on this scale. The interest in politics and participation scales are significantly correlated with one another (Pearson  $r=.419$ ) and the coefficient on the participation measure is independently significant in a model (see Appendix Table A2) that excludes the interest in politics measure ( $b=.200$ ,  $p<.01$ ). In column (3) we replace the two separate measures with a measure calculated as the mean of the participation and political interest measures. As expected the coefficient on this variable is a statistically significant and strong predictor of understanding of democracy.

In column (4) we consider the possibility that subjective assessments of economic conditions affect individuals' understanding of democracy beyond their personal objective financial circumstances. We include measures of 1) whether the respondent identified the economy as an important problem facing the country, 2) respondents' subjective assessments of their family's current economic situation, and 3) assessments of the overall economic conditions in the country. None of these variables reaches conventional levels of statistical significance. These null findings do not change in models where only one of the three measures is included or in models where the political interest and participation measure is excluded (see Appendix Table A2). Thus, our evidence suggests that objective economic circumstances, rather than subjective assessments of “pocketbook” or “sociotropic” conditions shape understandings of democracy in this region. In column (5) we estimate the column (4) specification as an ordered logit model and find that the substance of our findings is not affected by this estimation approach.

#### *Variation Across Countries*

The results presented in Table 2 also indicate that mean scores on our procedural conception of democracy outcome measure vary across countries after controlling for the other variables in our models. On average, respondents from Palestine were significantly more likely to cite procedural criteria as the hallmarks of democracy than respondents from Algeria and Lebanon (excluded category). Respondents from Jordan were the least likely to cite procedural criteria as the most important.<sup>9</sup>

An additional possibility is that the relationships between individual level characteristics and conceptions of democracy vary across contexts. In Table 3 we estimate the column (1) and (4) specifications presented in Table 2 separately for each of the four geographical regions in our sample. Additionally we present tests of the equality of coefficients across models.<sup>10</sup> For the most part, the pattern of relationships between individual level characteristics and understanding of democracy are consistent across geographic units. However, there are some exceptions. The relationship between gender and our outcome is somewhat weaker, but still negative, in Algeria and Lebanon than in Jordan and Palestine (though this difference does not reach conventional levels of statistical significance in the extended model). In column (8) we also find evidence that respondents in Lebanon who viewed the economy as an important problem were more likely to define democracy in substantive terms.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

The models presented in Table 3 also indicate that the relationship between education and understanding of democracy varies across geographic units ( $p < .01$ ). However, this significant difference is primarily driven by Algerian respondents. In each of the three other areas the relationship between education and procedural understanding of democracy is positive and statistically significant (differences in the effect of education across these three areas all fall short of conventional levels of statistical significance;  $p > .05$ ). In contrast, among Algerian respondents the coefficient on education not only falls

---

<sup>9</sup> Tests based on the Table 2, column (1) specification indicate that all country differences are statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ), except for the difference between Algeria and Lebanon ( $p = .300$ ).

<sup>10</sup> These tests are based on models pooling geographic units and including interactions between indicators for each unit and each of the individual-level characteristics we examine. The p-values reported in Table 3 are from F-tests of the joint significance of the *characteristic x geographic unit* indicator interactions for each characteristic.

short of conventional levels of statistical significance, but is also negative ( $p=.302$  and  $.316$  in the baseline and extended models, respectively).

More broadly, respondents from Algeria appear to constitute a unique case. While the joint significance of the covariates used in each of the two model specifications we examine is clearly statistically significant for Jordan, Palestine, and Lebanon ( $p<.001$  in all cases), these variables are not statistically significant predictors of understanding of democracy in Algeria ( $p=.459$  and  $.726$  for the baseline demographic and extended models, respectively).

#### *Understanding of and Support for Democracy: The Role of Religiosity*

Questions about religious dispositions and identities play a central role in much of the existing literature on attitude about democracy in the Arab world. Thus, in Table 4 we revisit the relationship we identified between frequency of Quran reading and substantive (rather than procedural) understandings of democracy. Specifically we consider the possibility that factors related to Islamist conservatism—e.g., attitudes regarding the response toward those who convert from Islam to another religion or acceptability of co-ed university classes—rather than the tendency to actively practice a religion that views responsibility to others (including the poor) as a key article of faith, can explain the finding we reported in Table 2.<sup>11</sup>

[TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

In Table 4, column (1) we re-estimate the model presented in column (4) of Table 2, restricting our sample to individuals who provided responses to 22 additional items measuring religiosity. With the exception of the coefficient on the indicator for Christian (Lebanon only) which is positive and statistically significant in Table 4, the sample restriction does not affect the substance of the findings discussed above. In column (2) we add a measure of Islamist conservatism. This measure is based on 22 items including levels of agreement with statements about the appropriate role of religion in politics (e.g. “Men of religion should not influence how people vote in elections”), the importance of a potential

---

<sup>11</sup> We note that the lowest education category is “illiterate.” Respondents in this category may not be capable of reading the Quran or any other text. However, in supplementary analysis we found that including an indicator for the “illiterate” category of the education variable does not substantively alter our findings.

spouse being devout, and the role of women in society (e.g., “A married woman can work outside the home if she wishes”). In each case, responses were provided using a four point scale. Items were rescaled to range from 0 to 1 with higher values corresponding to higher levels of Islamist conservatism. These items were then combined into a mean index (Cronbach’s alpha for 22 item scale = .852).

Two important findings emerge from the results in Table 4, column (2). First, the coefficient on the Islamist conservatism variable falls short of conventional levels of statistical significance ( $p=.112$ ). Second, including the Islamist conservatism variable does not affect the coefficient on frequency of reading the Quran variable. This suggests that although frequency of reading the Quran is significantly and positively correlated with the Islamist conservatism measure ( $r = .250$ ;  $p<.01$ ), the relationship between reading the Quran and substance-focused conceptions of democracy cannot be accounted for by this correlation. In column (3) we adopt a more flexible approach and enter all 22 religious items individually (coefficients are suppressed in the table to save space). Again, including these models does not notably affect the estimates of the other coefficients in the model. Most notably, the coefficient on the measure of frequency of reading the Quran remains negative and statistically significant ( $p<.01$ ).

Because the relationship between religiosity and beliefs and attitudes about democracy is an important area of inquiry in the areas we examine here, in supplementary analysis we compared the models presented in Table 4 with identical models predicting both specific and diffuse support for democracy (see Appendix Table A3).<sup>12</sup> In those models, frequency of reading the Quran does not significantly predict either type of support for democracy. However, we find a strong negative, statistically significant relationship between Islamist conservatism and both diffuse and specific support for democracy.

---

<sup>12</sup> Our measures of diffuse and specific support for democracy are based on those described by Ciftci (2010). The diffuse support for democracy measure is based on responses to one question that asked respondents about their level of agreement with the following statement: “Democracy may have its problems but is better than any other form of government” (“strongly disagree” [0] to “strongly agree” [3]) and evaluations of whether a democratic system of government is a good way of running the country (“very bad” [0] to “very good” [3]). The specific support measure is a mean index of three similar items where respondents indicated their level of agreement on a four point scale with three statements (reverse coded): 1) “In a democracy, the economy runs badly”; 2) “Democracies are indecisive and have too much quibbling”; and 3) “Democracies are not good at maintaining order.”

## **Conclusion**

We reported findings from a survey conducted in four populations in the Arab world. We found evidence supporting our expectations that both knowledge and projection based factors affect how people define democracy. Our analysis strongly supports our expectation that individual-level characteristics likely to affect levels of formal knowledge about political processes and structures lead people to define democracy in procedural terms: measures of education and political engagement were both strong predictors of defining democracy in procedural terms. Similarly, we found that those for whom economic concerns are less personally pressing are less likely to project a desire for redistributive economic outcomes onto the concept of democracy. In contrast, characteristics we expected to be associated with projecting substantive goals onto the concept of democracy were associated with defining democracy in substantive terms.

We also found several differences across the four populations we examined. For example, we found that respondents in the Palestinian territories—an area where questions related to appropriate political rules and procedures are widely debated, and with the highest literacy rate of the four populations—were more likely to define democracy in procedural terms than respondents in other populations. In contrast, respondents in Jordan were more likely to define democracy in substantive terms. We also found some evidence that the predictors of how people define democracy vary across populations. Most notably none of the factors we examine significantly predict how Algerians define democracy. Unfortunately, our data do not allow us to determine why this is the case. Nonetheless, consistent with previous research that finds that the predictors of support for democracy vary across countries, our findings highlight the importance of considering how cultural and historical factors shape how citizens understand and evaluate democracy.

Finally our findings contribute to our understanding of how Islam may affect the prospects for democracy in this region. Because Islam emphasizes provision of necessary resources to the poor, we expected to find that more religiously observant individuals would tend to project these desired ends onto their ideal of democracy. In other words, after controlling for other explanations, we expected more

religiously observant individuals to be more likely to define democracy in substantive terms. Our findings support this expectation. Notably, in additional analysis we found that this relationship is robust to the inclusion of a variety of variables that measure more specific—and more political—religious dispositions.

The findings enhance our understanding of the roots of popular support for democracy in areas where democratic institutions are fragile or non-existent and that have not traditionally been democratically governed. At the most basic level, they show that many people see democracy primarily as a means to economic ends. This raises the concern that large segments of the public in a fledgling democracy may be willing to discard a democracy that does not rapidly meet their expectations regarding these economic remedies. Along these lines, our findings suggest that when scholars consider the correlates of support for democracy in the Arab world it is important to unpack what exactly people are voicing support for. If the term “democracy” simply serves as a proxy for “better economic conditions,” then apparent variation in levels of support for democracy may reflect differences in levels of dissatisfaction with the status quo or broad hopes for an improved economic future rather than meaningful variation in commitment to democratic procedures.

## Bibliography

- Almond, G. and Verba, S. 1963. *Civic Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Arab Reform Initiative, "Trends in Arab Public Opinion towards Reform," 8 July 2009, 11–15; available at [http://www.arab-reform.net/IMG/pdf/PDF\\_English\\_Pub\\_Op\\_Survey\\_January\\_2009-2.pdf](http://www.arab-reform.net/IMG/pdf/PDF_English_Pub_Op_Survey_January_2009-2.pdf) .
- Bollen, K., & Jackman, R. W. 1985. "Political democracy and the size distribution of income." *American Sociological Review*, 50, 438-457.
- Casanova, José. 2005. "Catholic and Muslim Politics and Comparative Perspective." *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*. Vol. 1, No. 2. Pp. 89-108.
- Chen, Jie, Yang Zhong and Jan William Hillard. 1997. The Levels and Sources of Popular Support for China's Current Political Regime. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 30 (1): 45-64.
- Ciftci, Sabri (2010). "Modernization, Islam, or Social Capital: What Explains Attitudes Toward Democracy in the Muslim World?" *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 43, pp. 1442-1470.
- Davis, Nancy J., and Robert V. Robinson. 2006. "The egalitarian face of Islamic orthodoxy: Support for Islamic law and economic justice in seven Muslim-majority nations." *American Sociological Review* 71:167-90.
- Deiningner, K., & Squire, L. 1996. "A new data set measuring income inequality." *World Bank Economic Review*, 10, 565-591.
- Dreher, Axel and Noel Gaston. 2008. "Has Globalization Increased Inequality?" *Review of International Economics* 16: 516-536.
- Ekehammar, B., Nilsson, I., & Sidanius, J. (1987). "Education and ideology: Basic aspects of education related to adolescents' sociopolitical attitudes." *Political Psychology*, 8, 395–410.
- Elmelech, Yuval, and Hsien-Hen Lu. 2004. "Race, Ethnicity, and the Gender Poverty Gap." *Social Science Research* 33 (1): 158–82.
- Fattah, Moataz. 2006. *Democratic Values in the Muslim World*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Fish, Steven M. 2011. *Are Muslims Distinctive? A Look at the Evidence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Geddes, Barbara, and John Zaller. 1989. Sources of Popular Support for Authoritarian Regimes. *American Journal of Political Science* 33(2): 319-347.
- Goldberg, Gertrude Schaffner, and Eleanor Kremen, eds. 1990. *The Feminization of Poverty: Only in America?* New York: Praeger.

- Huntington, Samuel. 1998. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Touchstone Books.
- Inglehart, R. 1988. "The Renaissance of Political Culture." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 82, Pp. 1023-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. *Culture Shift in the Advanced Industrial Countries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inkeles, A., & Smith, D. (1974). *Becoming modern: Individual change in six developing countries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jamal, Amaney and Mark Tessler. 2008. "Attitudes in the Arab World." *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 97-110.
- Judd, C. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The structural bases of consistency among political attitudes: Effects of political expertise and attitude importance. In A. R. Pratkanis, S. J. Breckler, & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Attitude structure and function* (pp. 99-128). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Luskin, Robert C. 1987. "Measuring Political Sophistication." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 31, No. 4, Pp. 856-899.
- Lewis, Bernard. "The Roots of Muslim Rage." *The Atlantic*. September 1990.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation, *Psychological Review* 50, 370-96.
- Pepinski, Thomas B. and Bozena C. Welborne. 2011. "Piety and Redistributive Preferences in the Muslim World." *Political Research Quarterly*. Vol. 64, No. 3.
- Platteau, Jean-Philippe. 2008. "Religion, politics, and development: Lessons from the lands of Islam." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. Vol. 68, Pp. 329-351.
- Polity IV Country Reports, North Africa and the Middle East.  
<http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity06.htm#naf> Accessed November 3, 2011.
- Popova, Daria. 2002. "The Impact of the Gender Composition of Households on Inequality and Poverty: A Comparison across Russia and Eastern Europe." *Communist and Post Communist Studies* 35 (4): 395-409.
- Rane, Halim, Mahmood Nathie, Ben Isakhan and Mohamed Abdalla (2011). "Towards Understanding what Australia's Muslims Really Think." *Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 47, pp. 124-143.
- Reuveny, Rafael and Quan Li. 2003. "Economic Openness, Democracy, and Income Inequality: An Empirical Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies* 36: 575-601.
- Sarkissian, Ani. 2011. "The Determinants of Tolerance in Arab Societies." *APSA 2011 Annual Meeting Paper*, Michigan State University, Department of Political Science.  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1901491](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1901491)
- Schedler, Andreas and Rodolfo Sarsfield. 2007. "Democrats with adjectives: Linking direct and indirect measures of democratic support." *European Journal of Political Research* 46: 637-659.



- Shafiq, Najeeb M. 2008. "Do Education and Income Affect Support for Democracy in Muslim Countries? Evidence From the Pew Global Attitudes Project." *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 29, pp. 461-469.
- Simpson, M. 1990. "Political rights and income inequality: A cross-national test." *American Sociological Review*, 55, 682-693.
- Tessler, Mark. 2002. "Islam and Democracy in the Middle East: The Impact of Religious Orientations on Attitudes toward Democracy in Four Arab Countries." *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 337-354.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. "Religion, Religiosity and the Place of Islam in Political Life: Insights from the Arab Barometer Surveys." *Middle East Law and Governance*, Vol. 2, pp. 221-252.
- Tezcur, Gunes Murat, Azadarmaki, Taghi , Bahar, Mehri and Nayebi, Hooshang. 2010. "Support for Democracy in Iran." *Political Research Quarterly*, Forthcoming.
- Wilson, Rodney. 1997. *Economics, ethics and religion: Jewish, Christian and Muslim economic thought*. New York: New York University Press.
- Zhong, Yang, and Jie Chen. 2002. To Vote or Not to Vote: An Analysis of Peasants' Participation in Chinese Village Elections. *Comparative Political Studies* 35(6): 686-712.

**Table 1. Distribution of Perceived Hallmarks of Democracy**

	<i>Second Choice</i>				
	Elections	Free Speech	Income Equality	Basic Necessities	Total
<i>First Choice</i> Opportunity to change the government through elections	-	11.3% (453)	8.1% (327)	9.7% (389)	29.0% (1169)
Freedom to criticize the government/ those in power	6.6% (265)	-	6.4% (258)	6.9% (277)	19.9% (800)
A small income gap between rich and poor	4.3% (172)	4.1% (164)	-	14.8% (594)	23.1% (930)
Basic necessities like food, clothing, shelter for everyone	5.9% (237)	5.5% (223)	16.6% (667)	-	28.0% (1127)
	16.7% (674)	20.9% (840)	31.1% (1252)	31.3% (1260)	100.0% (4026)

Note: "People often differ in their views on the characteristics that are essential to democracy. If you have to choose only one thing, what would you choose as the most important characteristic, and what would be the second most important?" Cell entries are percentages of respondents providing each combination of responses. Number of cases reported in parentheses.

**Table 2. Correlates of Conceptions of Democracy**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Procedural (0=neither procedural; 3=both procedural)				
Gender (1=female)	-0.232 [0.035]**	-0.179 [0.035]**	-0.184 [0.035]**	-0.185 [0.035]**	-0.315 [0.061]**
Age (in years)	-0.006 [0.007]	-0.009 [0.006]	-0.009 [0.006]	-0.009 [0.007]	-0.015 [0.012]
Age-Squared/100	0.010 [0.008]	0.013 [0.008]	0.013 [0.008]	0.013 [0.008]	0.023 [0.014]
Christian (1=yes)	0.043 [0.072]	0.056 [0.072]	0.054 [0.072]	0.052 [0.072]	0.113 [0.131]
Quran Reading (0=none; 1=every day/almost)	-0.148 [0.058]*	-0.180 [0.057]**	-0.180 [0.058]**	-0.179 [0.058]**	-0.327 [0.102]**
Education (0=illiterate; 1=MA or higher)	0.529 [0.078]**	0.423 [0.079]**	0.450 [0.079]**	0.445 [0.079]**	0.795 [0.140]**
Family Income (deciles: 0-1)	0.256 [0.069]**	0.208 [0.069]**	0.223 [0.069]**	0.204 [0.071]**	0.347 [0.124]**
Income Missing	0.004 [0.046]	0.005 [0.046]	0.005 [0.046]	0.007 [0.046]	0.012 [0.077]
Interest in Politics Scale (0-1)		0.448 [0.068]**			
Political Participation (0-1)		0.058 [0.067]			
Interest and Participation Index (0-1)			0.494 [0.079]**	0.492 [0.079]**	0.872 [0.139]**
Economy Most Important Problem (0-1)				-0.056 [0.044]	-0.103 [0.074]
Pocketbook Evaluation (0=very bad 1=verygood)				0.073 [0.073]	0.134 [0.126]
Sociotropic Evaluation (0=very bad 1=verygood)				0.010 [0.074]	0.043 [0.127]
Country (1=Jordan)	-0.241 [0.062]**	-0.120 [0.063]	-0.147 [0.063]*	-0.159 [0.068]*	-0.310 [0.122]*
Country (1=Palestine)	0.398 [0.060]**	0.425 [0.059]**	0.407 [0.059]**	0.375 [0.063]**	0.631 [0.109]**
Country (1=Algeria)	0.064 [0.061]	0.182 [0.063]**	0.152 [0.063]*	0.138 [0.068]*	0.219 [0.117]
Constant	1.149 [0.145]**	0.984 [0.144]**	1.015 [0.145]**	1.028 [0.153]**	
Observations	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026
R-squared	0.081	0.093	0.090	0.091	

Note: Results from OLS regression models, except column (5) which reports coefficients from an ordered logit model. Robust standard errors in brackets. \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%.

**Table 3. Correlates of Conceptions of Democracy: Differences Across Populations**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Procedural (0=neither procedural; 3=both procedural)								Test of equality of coefficients across models (p-value)	
	Jordan		Palestine		Algeria		Lebanon		Basic	Extended
Gender (1=female)	-0.286 [0.068]**	-0.251 [0.071]**	-0.369 [0.062]**	-0.270 [0.065]**	-0.124 [0.070]	-0.127 [0.072]	-0.121 [0.080]	-0.053 [0.081]	0.021	0.120
Age (in years)	-0.019 [0.013]	-0.023 [0.013]	-0.013 [0.011]	-0.014 [0.011]	0.008 [0.011]	0.009 [0.012]	0.007 [0.015]	-0.001 [0.015]	0.297	0.274
Age-Squared/100	0.023 [0.016]	0.026 [0.016]	0.023 [0.013]	0.023 [0.013]	-0.011 [0.013]	-0.012 [0.013]	0.001 [0.017]	0.008 [0.017]	0.210	0.175
Christian (1=yes)							0.018 [0.074]	-0.010 [0.074]	-	-
Quran Reading (0=none; 1=every day/almost)	-0.358 [0.108]**	-0.370 [0.108]**	-0.038 [0.112]	-0.122 [0.113]	0.009 [0.128]	0.002 [0.129]	-0.144 [0.116]	-0.186 [0.115]	0.100	0.150
Education (0=illiterate; 1=MA or higher)	0.507 [0.165]**	0.404 [0.173]*	1.011 [0.147]**	0.821 [0.154]**	-0.153 [0.149]	-0.150 [0.150]	0.748 [0.164]**	0.690 [0.163]**	0.000	0.000
Family Income (deciles: 0-1)	0.327 [0.129]*	0.291 [0.131]*	0.281 [0.122]*	0.225 [0.127]	0.214 [0.150]	0.214 [0.154]	-0.106 [0.169]	-0.110 [0.168]	0.199	0.278
Income Missing	-0.604 [0.196]**	-0.575 [0.189]**	-0.164 [0.097]	-0.168 [0.095]	0.074 [0.073]	0.072 [0.074]	0.075 [0.078]	0.063 [0.077]	0.003	0.003
Interest and Participation Index (0-1)		0.390 [0.190]*		0.655 [0.136]**		-0.041 [0.157]		0.666 [0.164]**	-	0.003
Economy Most Important Problem (0-1)		-0.117 [0.085]		0.079 [0.082]		0.091 [0.088]		-0.215 [0.093]*	-	0.035
Pocketbook Evaluation (0=very bad 1=verygood)		0.105 [0.149]		0.097 [0.121]		0.100 [0.174]		-0.083 [0.151]	-	0.769
Sociotropic Evaluation (0=very bad 1=verygood)		0.061 [0.127]		0.085 [0.128]		-0.055 [0.166]		-0.354 [0.203]	-	0.282
Constant	1.347 [0.263]**	1.359 [0.287]**	1.410 [0.235]**	1.131 [0.246]**	1.306 [0.283]**	1.221 [0.304]**	0.820 [0.320]*	0.905 [0.331]**	-	-
Observations	1078	1078	1129	1129	792	792	1027	1027		
R-squared	0.069	0.076	0.103	0.122	0.009	0.011	0.027	0.053		

Note: Results from OLS regression models. Robust standard errors in brackets. \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%. Columns (9) and (10) are based on OLS models including interactions between each covariate and country indicators. P-values test the joint significance of coefficients on country interactions associated with the covariate.

**Table 4. Religion and Conceptions of Democracy**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Procedural (0=neither procedural; 3=both)		
Gender (1=female)	-0.185 [0.045]**	-0.175 [0.046]**	-0.153 [0.047]**
Age (in years)	-0.005 [0.008]	-0.005 [0.008]	-0.006 [0.008]
Age-Squared/100	0.008 [0.010]	0.008 [0.010]	0.009 [0.010]
Christian (1=yes)	0.183 [0.095]	0.202 [0.097]*	0.198 [0.101]*
Quran Reading (0=none; 1=every day/almost)	-0.230 [0.075]**	-0.243 [0.076]**	-0.256 [0.077]**
Education (0=illiterate; 1=MA or higher)	0.589 [0.099]**	0.597 [0.100]**	0.569 [0.101]**
Family Income (deciles: 0-1)	0.187 [0.087]*	0.193 [0.088]*	0.189 [0.088]*
Income Missing	0.020 [0.060]	0.018 [0.060]	-0.001 [0.060]
Interest and Participation Index (0-1)	0.518 [0.098]**	0.520 [0.098]**	0.518 [0.099]**
Economy Most Important Problem (0-1)	-0.054 [0.055]	-0.056 [0.055]	-0.042 [0.055]
Pocketbook Evaluation (0=very bad 1=verygood)	0.073 [0.088]	0.075 [0.088]	0.075 [0.087]
Sociotropic Evaluation (0=very bad 1=verygood)	0.043 [0.091]	0.040 [0.091]	0.040 [0.092]
Islamist Conservatism Scale (0-1)		0.162 [0.173]	
Country (1=Jordan)	-0.032 [0.083]	-0.058 [0.088]	0.019 [0.097]
Country (1=Palestine)	0.456 [0.075]**	0.426 [0.080]**	0.483 [0.087]**
Country (1=Algeria)	0.034 [0.086]	0.002 [0.093]	0.085 [0.102]
Constant	0.862 [0.191]**	0.796 [0.202]**	0.689 [0.255]**
Includes 22 separate measures of religious attitudes?	No	No	Yes
Observations	2540	2540	2540
R-squared	0.097	0.097	0.110

Note: Results from OLS regression models. Robust standard errors in brackets. \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%.

**Table A1. Summary Statistics**

Variable	(1)
Procedural Conception of Democracy (0=neither procedural; 3=both procedural)	1.354 [1.101]
Gender (1=female)	0.482 [.4997]
Age (in years)	36.689 [13.5968]
Age-Squared/100	15.309 [11.833]
Christian (1=yes)	0.124 [.3298]
Quran Reading (0=none; 1=every day/almost)	0.599 [.3045]
Education (0=illiterate; 1=MA or higher)	0.510 [.2574]
Family Income (deciles: 0-1)	0.524 [.2588]
Income Missing	0.193 [.3945]
Interest in Politics Scale (0-1)	0.530 [.2945]
Political Participation (0-1)	0.325 [.2814]
Interest and Participation Index (0-1)	0.428 [.2421]
Economy Most Important Problem (0-1)	0.579 [.4283]
Pocketbook Evaluation (0=very bad 1=very good)	0.476 [.2582]
Sociotropic Evaluation (0=very bad 1=very good)	0.313 [.2913]
Country (1=Jordan)	0.268 [.4428]
Country (1=Palestine)	0.280 [.4493]
Country (1=Algeria)	0.197 [.3976]
Country (1=Lebanon)	0.255 [.436]
Observations	4026

Note: Cell entries are means. Standard deviations in brackets.

**Table A2. Correlates of Conceptions of Democracy: Robustness Checks**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	Procedural (0=neither procedural; 3=both procedural)										
Gender (1=female)	-0.232 [0.035]**	-0.182 [0.035]**	-0.215 [0.035]**	-0.179 [0.035]**	-0.184 [0.035]**	-0.230 [0.035]**	-0.235 [0.035]**	-0.233 [0.035]**	-0.233 [0.035]**	-0.185 [0.035]**	-0.315 [0.061]**
Age (in years)	-0.006 [0.007]	-0.009 [0.006]	-0.007 [0.007]	-0.009 [0.006]	-0.009 [0.006]	-0.006 [0.006]	-0.005 [0.007]	-0.006 [0.007]	-0.006 [0.007]	-0.009 [0.007]	-0.015 [0.012]
Age-Squared/100	0.010 [0.008]	0.013 [0.008]	0.012 [0.008]	0.013 [0.008]	0.013 [0.008]	0.011 [0.008]	0.010 [0.008]	0.010 [0.008]	0.010 [0.008]	0.013 [0.008]	0.023 [0.014]
Christian (1=yes)	0.043 [0.072]	0.056 [0.071]	0.047 [0.072]	0.056 [0.072]	0.054 [0.072]	0.037 [0.072]	0.046 [0.072]	0.044 [0.072]	0.040 [0.073]	0.052 [0.072]	0.113 [0.131]
Quran Reading (0=none; 1=every day/almost)	-0.148 [0.058]*	-0.178 [0.057]**	-0.161 [0.058]**	-0.180 [0.057]**	-0.180 [0.057]**	-0.146 [0.058]*	-0.150 [0.058]**	-0.148 [0.058]*	-0.147 [0.058]*	-0.179 [0.058]**	-0.327 [0.102]**
Education (0=illiterate; 1=MA or higher)	0.529 [0.078]**	0.424 [0.079]**	0.510 [0.078]**	0.423 [0.079]**	0.450 [0.079]**	0.527 [0.078]**	0.525 [0.078]**	0.531 [0.078]**	0.523 [0.078]**	0.445 [0.079]**	0.795 [0.140]**
Family Income (deciles: 0-1)	0.256 [0.069]**	0.208 [0.069]**	0.250 [0.069]**	0.208 [0.069]**	0.223 [0.069]**	0.254 [0.069]**	0.240 [0.071]**	0.254 [0.069]**	0.237 [0.071]**	0.204 [0.071]**	0.347 [0.124]**
Income Missing	0.004 [0.046]	0.005 [0.046]	0.005 [0.046]	0.005 [0.046]	0.005 [0.046]	0.004 [0.046]	0.006 [0.046]	0.005 [0.046]	0.006 [0.046]	0.007 [0.046]	0.012 [0.077]
Interest in Politics Scale (0-1)		0.468 [0.064]**		0.448 [0.068]**							
Political Participation (0-1)			0.200 [0.064]**	0.058 [0.067]							
Interest and Participation Index (0-1)					0.494 [0.079]**					0.492 [0.079]**	0.872 [0.139]**
Economy Most Important Problem (0-1)						-0.063 [0.044]			-0.063 [0.044]	-0.056 [0.044]	-0.103 [0.074]
Pocketbook Evaluation (0=very bad 1=very good)							0.072 [0.069]		0.071 [0.073]	0.073 [0.073]	0.134 [0.126]
Sociotropic Evaluation (0=very bad 1=very good)								0.032 [0.069]	0.003 [0.074]	0.010 [0.074]	0.043 [0.127]
Country (1=Jordan)	-0.241 [0.062]**	-0.123 [0.063]	-0.215 [0.062]**	-0.120 [0.063]	-0.147 [0.063]*	-0.241 [0.062]**	-0.248 [0.062]**	-0.252 [0.067]**	-0.250 [0.067]**	-0.159 [0.068]*	-0.310 [0.122]*
Country (1=Palestine)	0.398 [0.060]**	0.427 [0.059]**	0.393 [0.060]**	0.425 [0.059]**	0.407 [0.059]**	0.364 [0.063]**	0.397 [0.060]**	0.394 [0.060]**	0.363 [0.064]**	0.375 [0.063]**	0.631 [0.109]**
Country (1=Algeria)	0.064 [0.061]	0.181 [0.063]**	0.085 [0.062]	0.182 [0.063]**	0.152 [0.063]*	0.057 [0.062]	0.059 [0.062]	0.053 [0.066]	0.051 [0.066]	0.138 [0.068]*	0.219 [0.117]
Constant	1.149 [0.145]**	0.989 [0.144]**	1.109 [0.146]**	0.984 [0.144]**	1.015 [0.145]**	1.204 [0.149]**	1.116 [0.148]**	1.142 [0.146]**	1.171 [0.153]**	1.028 [0.153]**	
Observations	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026	4026
R-squared	0.081	0.093	0.083	0.093	0.090	0.081	0.081	0.081	0.082	0.091	

Note: Results from OLS regression models, except column (11) which reports coefficients from an ordered logit model. Robust standard errors in brackets. \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%.

**Table A3. Correlates of Specific and Diffuse Support for Democracy**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Specific Support for Democracy (0-3)			Diffuse Support for Democracy (0-3)		
Gender (1=female)	-0.018 [0.029]	-0.057 [0.029]	-0.041 [0.030]	0.037 [0.023]	0.002 [0.023]	-0.024 [0.024]
Age (in years)	-0.005 [0.005]	-0.005 [0.005]	-0.005 [0.005]	-0.003 [0.004]	-0.003 [0.004]	-0.003 [0.004]
Age-Squared/100	0.006 [0.006]	0.006 [0.006]	0.007 [0.006]	0.002 [0.005]	0.002 [0.005]	0.002 [0.005]
Christian (1=yes)	0.229 [0.061]**	0.152 [0.062]*	0.201 [0.063]**	0.276 [0.041]**	0.206 [0.042]**	0.268 [0.044]**
Quran Reading (0=none; 1=every day/almost)	-0.061 [0.048]	-0.011 [0.049]	-0.078 [0.048]	-0.040 [0.040]	0.005 [0.040]	-0.035 [0.039]
Education (0=illiterate; 1=MA or higher)	0.104 [0.066]	0.071 [0.066]	0.033 [0.064]	0.070 [0.051]	0.040 [0.051]	0.012 [0.050]
Family Income (deciles: 0-1)	0.028 [0.055]	0.004 [0.055]	-0.017 [0.054]	0.176 [0.043]**	0.154 [0.043]**	0.155 [0.042]**
Income Missing	0.079 [0.040]*	0.089 [0.039]*	0.081 [0.039]*	0.056 [0.033]	0.065 [0.032]*	0.075 [0.031]*
Interest and Participation Index (0-1)	0.196 [0.066]**	0.189 [0.066]**	0.123 [0.064]	0.342 [0.050]**	0.336 [0.050]**	0.309 [0.049]**
Economy Most Important Problem (0-1)	-0.031 [0.038]	-0.023 [0.038]	-0.033 [0.037]	0.006 [0.030]	0.014 [0.029]	0.005 [0.029]
Pocketbook Evaluation (0=very bad 1=very good)	-0.072 [0.059]	-0.081 [0.059]	-0.092 [0.058]	0.001 [0.047]	-0.007 [0.047]	-0.012 [0.046]
Sociotropic Evaluation (0=very bad 1=very good)	0.200 [0.061]**	0.212 [0.061]**	0.215 [0.058]**	-0.066 [0.049]	-0.056 [0.049]	-0.044 [0.048]
Islamist Conservatism Scale (0-1)		-0.649 [0.115]**			-0.590 [0.096]**	
Country (1=Jordan)	-0.084 [0.050]	0.021 [0.053]	0.012 [0.055]	-0.036 [0.041]	0.060 [0.044]	-0.033 [0.049]
Country (1=Palestine)	-0.137 [0.047]**	-0.019 [0.050]	-0.067 [0.054]	-0.174 [0.040]**	-0.067 [0.043]	-0.180 [0.046]**
Country (1=Algeria)	-0.136 [0.056]*	-0.008 [0.059]	-0.052 [0.064]	-0.148 [0.047]**	-0.031 [0.049]	-0.133 [0.056]*
Constant	1.623 [0.124]**	1.885 [0.131]**	2.305 [0.167]**	2.587 [0.102]**	2.825 [0.107]**	2.970 [0.133]**
Observations	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
R-squared	2540	2540	2540	2540	2540	2540
R-squared	0.040	0.053	0.128	0.102	0.118	0.176

Note: Results from OLS regression models. Robust standard errors in brackets. \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%.