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Reading reflection: What are the main points of debate that arise for you after completing the reading? Main points of debate   
Christopher Anderson and Christine Guillory’s article “ Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy: A Cross-National Analysis of Consensus and Majoritarian Systems” explores the concept of democracy through the eyes of winners and losers of a democratic competition. Losers in an election system are less satisfied with a government compared to the winning side of an election. The authors say that there is a need for the political system to treat winners and losers equally after an election in order for citizens to experience democratic governance (Anderson and Guillory, 1997, pg. 67). The reading provides useful information, but there are some points of debate that require reflection.   
Firstly, the authors mention that citizens who comprehend the political process have a positive view of democratic governance. Only through the belief that contribution in the political process has an effect on decision-making can one perceive the government positively. This is especially true because there is a sizable number of the population that does not vote. Such people may not pride themselves as being on the winning side, or understand the political process, but still contribute in institution of policy. In addition, losers in election also put together their ideas in government policy.   
Secondly, the point that political institutions determine satisfaction with democracy is debatable. It is true that political institutions determine the relationship of the majority and minority. Even so, the majority may still show dissatisfaction with the government if they fail to implement the manifesto or policies they promised during an election period. The government has a duty to serve all citizens, no matter who voted in their favor. Political institutions must serve all citizens equally, and besides, there is no possible way that they can know who voted and who did not vote. Selfish interests by politicians still dominate public duty, and those with political connections, and not the majority, are likely to benefit and show satisfaction in the government.   
Thirdly, it is necessary to look economic performance as a variable that affects citizen satisfaction with democracy ((Anderson and Guillory, 1997, pg. 79) Economic performance valuations affect all citizens, whether they are the majority or minority, and for that reason, the level of citizen satisfaction with democracy is not measurable. All citizens, whether in the winning or losing team, are bound to show unrest if the economy does not favor their growth as individuals. There is no possible way that the government can only satisfy the economic interests of the people who voted them into government. Any economic decision affects the whole society as a whole. In the main, this indicates that satisfaction with democracy goes further beyond whether one is in the majority or the minority.   
In conclusion, it is evident that the particular political context in which a person exists influences their viewpoints. Although the majority side appears more satisfied than the minority in most democracies, several other factors determine citizen satisfaction with democracy. In the end, both sides of the political divide benefit from government policies depending on their interests in development. The level of satisfaction in governance by the majority is not as exaggerated as the authors try to say, but still is an important factor to consider.   
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