

Spring 2010

Malagasy Conceptions of Good Governance and Democracy

Molly Fredrickson
SIT Study Abroad

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection

 Part of the [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fredrickson, Molly, "Malagasy Conceptions of Good Governance and Democracy" (2010). *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. 818.
https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/818

This Unpublished Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Study Abroad at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

Malagasy Conceptions of Good Governance and Democracy

By Molly Fredrickson

Academic Director: Roland Prichett

Local Academic Advisor: RASOLO Andre

Spring 2010

Acknowledgements

A special thanks to all of the people who participated in this study and survey; especially to the Alliance Francais, the FJKM church in Isoraka, the American Cultural Center, the University of Antananarivo, and the teachers at Jesosy Mamosy. Thanks also to RASOLO Andre for his suggestions, contacts, and guidance. Thank you to Hanta RAONIVOLOLONA, Candy, and Alise for helping me find groups to survey.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Historical and Current Political Conditions	5
Methodology	11
Findings & Analysis: Good Governance	17
Findings & Analysis: Elections and Democracy	25
Conclusion	34
End Notes	37
Appendix	38
Bibliography	44

Introduction

Democracy is a universal concept that has spread rapidly throughout the world in the 20th century with the end of colonialism and the rise of large international organizations. Democracy in Madagascar was officially declared in 1960 after 65 years under French colonial rule. Over the 50 years of its independence, Madagascar has faced several political crises and has struggled with development and poverty. Democracy was brought to Madagascar by the French which means that the Malagasy people were not given much choice for their form of government and since independence have had trouble maintaining a democracy and all of the principles it entails. This raises the question: what do Malagasy people conceive of as a good government?

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of Malagasy expectations for a government and what the Malagasy people consider to be good governance and a democracy. The basic assumption of this study is that good governance and the way democracy is manifested varies from culture to culture. The objectives of this study are:

- To learn what Malagasy people expect from the government, political parties, and the opposition.
- To gain an understanding of what role and powers Malagasy people feel they should have in governance.
- To learn what role the international community should take in Malagasy politics
- To form a Malagasy definition of democracy
- To gain an understanding of the problems facing democracy and good governance in Madagascar from the point of view of the Malagasy people

This study is significant in building good governance and democracy in Madagascar. The information that this study gathers can help to inform members of the government, political

parties, the opposition, and the civil society of what Malagasy people want them to do and what roles they should be fulfilling. The study can also help inform Malagasy government on the principles that are important to Malagasy people. It also reveals several of the major problems that Malagasy citizen see with democracy and governance in Madagascar which can lead to ideas and plans for solutions to these problems so that democracy and good governance can be achieved in Madagascar. This study can also contribute to work and research in the field of government and democracy. Therefore, this study is significant for both practical and academic purposes.

Historical and Current Political Conditions

The political history of Madagascar is a tradition of strong government, oppression, and abrupt and often violent changes of power. For hundreds of years, Madagascar was divided into many independent kingdoms. Towards the end of the 18th century and into the 19th century, the Merina monarchy of the central highlands began to take over smaller kingdoms and unite the island under one monarchy. The Merina monarchy forged relationships with other countries and promoted trade between the island and foreign merchants; however, the expansion of their kingdom resulted in violent oppression and large numbers of slaves to do the monarch's bidding. The Merina monarch and any other smaller kingdoms were brought to an end in 1896 when France invaded and asserted itself as the colonial ruler, hence bringing Madagascar under French colonial rule.

French colonial rule was characterized by a repression of Malagasy people and culture and the promotion of French ideas and interests. Following the conquest of Antananarivo, the capital, which assured the French authority, there were a series of measures taken to ensure their

power which included brutally murdering several Malagasy officials and sending Queen Ranaivalona III into exile while extinguishing any other smaller kingdoms or rebel groups. After this initial period of conquest, “Madagascar was remodeled in pursuit of a French dream of shaping the island and its people in conformity with French ideas and values” (Randrianja and Ellis 155). After the Second World War, Malagasy freedom movements, such as the Mouvement Démocratique de la Rénovation Malgache (MDRM), began to gain power and momentum with the Malagasy citizens in a struggle to become independent of France. The conflict between these freedom movements and the French authorities resulted in widespread violence and repression for several years following the end of World War II. With pressure building from the international community to end colonialism, France began the transition from colonialism by granting universal suffrage and creating an autonomous Malagasy government. Philibert Tsiranana was instated as the first president of the Republic of Madagascar in the late 1950s.

The Tsiranana government maintained close ties with France while controlling the power of the government. Tsiranana’s party, *Partie Social-Démocrate* (PSD), received a majority of the legislative seats in the 1960 elections by virtue of a manipulative electoral law which produced a very small, weak opposition. Tsiranana indicated to a news source once that “we allow the opposition to exist, but not to act” (Randrianja and Ellis 182). The Tsiranana government ruled for 12 years, maintaining the supremacy of his party in the government and occasionally using brutal means to suppress rebellion or opposition of any kind. In early 1972, “Tsiranana stood as the sole candidate for presidential elections and received a third seven-year mandate with the support of no less than 99 per cent of voters” (Randrianja and Ellis, 185). However, this was not to last when the death of a student as a result of police brutality triggered massive demonstrations in Antananarivo in May of the same year. When authorities opened fire on the protesters, church

groups stood against the government. Under immense pressure, Tsiranana resigned his post and handed power to the military just nine days after the demonstrations began.

After a few years of a military junta running the country, Admiral Didier Ratsiraka came to power in 1975. In order to legitimize his claim to power, a referendum was organized that required voters to state an opinion on three questions put into one implying changes to the constitution, acceptance of socialism, and acknowledgement of Ratsiraka as the leader. As a result of “the weight of the government administrative machine, 96 per cent approved the new constitution” (Randrianja and Ellis, 1993). This resulted in a change in the organization of government which gave Ratsiraka control over the other branches of government. The Ratsiraka administration also began the process of “Malgachization,” which marginalized French influences and promoted Malagasy language and culture. After several years of attempting at a socialist state, Madagascar was unable to service its debts and was forced into liberalization through their agreements with the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. Ratsiraka’s popularity continued to fall and by the last 1980s, the opposition led by Albert Zafy was able to begin campaigning against Ratsiraka. Under pressure from the opposition and the aftermath of widely publicized violent oppression, Ratsiraka resigned to be succeeded by Zafy.

The third republic was ushered in with the adoption of a new constitution by referendum that would diminish the powers of the executive branch. In 1994, the World Bank, the IMF and several other donors suspended aid to Madagascar as a result of continued corruption and indiscipline; therefore, “President Zafy arranged another constitutional referendum intended to reestablish a strong executive presidency and to reaffirm his position in the face of the National Assembly” (Randrianja and Ellis, 2004). However, this led to his impeachment the following year by the National Assembly.

Ratsiraka returned to power in the 1997 elections and met stiff competition against the mayor of Antananarivo, Marc Ravalomanana, in the 2002 elections. After intense campaigning, polling, and vote estimating, the results indicated that Ravalomanana had received 46.2% and Ratsiraka 40.9% which meant that there would need to be a run-off election. Ravalomanana demanded a recount, Ratsiraka refused and the situation degenerated to a low-intensity civil war. Eventually, Ravalomanana declared himself president and received the blessing of the courts, forcing Ratsiraka into exile.

The Ravalomanana administration was marked by economic growth, but politics as usual. Before his political career, Ravalomanana had created a large company specializing in dairy products that perhaps made him more economically adept and he set into motion an ambitious development plan known as “Madagascar Action Plan” (MAP). However, he was unable to separate his business interests with the affairs of the state and began to manipulate and dominate the entire agro-products sector with his political power. His power continued to grow: “A constitutional referendum in April 2007 increased presidential powers and made English an official language, among other changes. Ravalomanana’s authority was bolstered again in September, when his TIM party won 106 of the 127 seats in the National Assembly” (Freedom House 2009). In 2005, the government “shut down a popular Protestant charismatic church that was winning followers from the more traditional Protestant movement, to which Ravalomanana belongs” (Freedom House 2009). In addition, Ravalomanana was caught in a scandal involving the selling of Malagasy land to foreign holders, buying a second presidential plane, pocketing 60 million Euros, and shutting down opposition media sources. Despite the economic development that Ravalomanana had brought to Madagascar, his policies and methods of governing still marginalized the opposition and deprived citizens of rights.

In early 2009, large demonstrations started in Antananarivo led by Andry Rajoelina, member of the opposition and mayor of Antananarivo, against President Ravalomanana. Demonstrations spread throughout the country; all of Ravalomanana's warehouses and factories were destroyed in the process. Presidential guards opened fire on a group outside of the presidential palace during a demonstration which caused the military to withdraw their support. By March, Ravalomanana was forced to resign passing power to the military that passed it to the leader of the opposition, Andry Rajoelina. In the year that has passed, the international community has had the leaders of the four parties, Ravalomanana, Rajoelina, Ratsiraka, and Zafy, negotiate and create the High Transitional Authority who's main objective was to organize elections. Negotiations have fallen through and the government is no closer to elections; meanwhile, there have been significant restrictions on assembly, expression, and media. This is the political environment in which I have conducted my study.

This history highlights several characteristics of Malagasy government. Nearly all governments were centered on a very strong and powerful leader or group. This has prevented a strong opposition from gaining power through elections or through governmental procedures. Many times the opposition has had to take measures outside of the government to gain power; this has resulted in several presidents being forced to leave office rather than have power pass peacefully following an election. There has also been an apparent pattern in corrupted or disputed elections. Extensive power held by the executive and manipulative election/referendum strategies have led to several amendments to the constitution which serve the interests of the government rather than the citizens. Finally, with so much power concentrated in the government, there has been a long history of repression of citizens' rights such as expression and press as well as some outright acts of violence and abuse against citizens. This history

contributes to the way that Malagasy people think about politics and to the way that their ideas can be understood.

Several organizations have done research and analysis of Malagasy politics and public opinion. Freedom House has looked specifically at the government and human rights. In the 2009 Country Report, Madagascar received a score of 4 for political rights and 3 for civil liberties with a score of 7 being the most free. Madagascar is considered “partly free” as a democracy; however is considered “not free” in regards to freedom of the press. The report details that corruption, problems with elections, and democratic transitions are among the greatest problems with democracy in Madagascar. From an international and scientific point of view, democracy in Madagascar is lacking.

The results of the Afrobarometer 2008 survey give insights into Malagasy citizens’ points of view on the economy, the government, and democracy. The results indicate that citizens, particularly in the country, feel insecure against crime and concerned over economic development. Incidences of corruption have decreased since the 2005 report. “The proportion of citizens who express their satisfaction on the effectiveness of the communes and on their integrity for the way of using resources is at the time weak and decreasing in relation to 2005” (p. 2)¹. The report also finds that Malagasy people are extremely attached to democratic principles; however, there is very low participation in political life. Therefore, these results indicate that Malagasy people are concerned for their physical and economic security, have little trust in the government and their ability to use resources, and are attached to democratic principles, but many do not participate in political life. This background provides the basis for my survey and the analysis of the findings.

Methodology

In order to achieve my stated objectives, I created a survey that I would have groups of Malagasy citizens complete with their opinions. This survey can be found in the Appendix. Many of the questions were open-ended and did not provide any options for answers, but required the respondent to write the responses in his or her own words. I chose to design the survey this way in order to avoid any bias from my part and to allow the respondents to express their ideas in their own words. The survey consisted of four parts of questions: elections, roles of the parts of government, democracy, and education. Because election reports from Madagascar have shown very low voter participation in election, I asked whether the respondent had participated in the last presidential, legislative, or mayoral election. I chose to ask about multiple elections in order to determine whether the type of election affects the turnout. I then asked for the reason the respondent chose to vote or not to vote. This question was meant to provoke answers that would help to understand respondents' attitudes towards the government and their role as a citizen. Elections are an integral part of a functioning democracy, therefore voter turnout and voter efficacy (the power each citizen feels they have with their vote) are important points to gather information on.

The second part asked respondents to define the roles of each part of the government and society. In determining what is considered "good governance" to the Malagasy people, it seems most useful and significant to gather ideas on what a government should do and what respondents feel the government's role is in the country. Madagascar has over a hundred political parties; however, in the past several years, the government has been dominated by a single party. In addition, the opposition has been almost consistently a weak entity since Madagascar's first president Tsiranana. However, multiple parties and a vocal opposition are essential components

to a healthy democracy. Therefore, I asked respondents to define, in their own opinion, the role of political parties and the opposition in order to learn whether or not these components were of value to Malagasy citizens. Democracy as a form of governance requires the participation of citizens and society as a whole; therefore, I also asked the respondents to define the role that the civil society and each citizen should fulfill. Throughout Madagascar's independence, there has been significant influence from the international community, particularly in the current crisis which has evoked some criticism from the Malagasy press and citizens. Therefore, I asked the respondents to define what they feel the role of the international community should be in the governance of Madagascar. With all of these questions, I was seeking responses that would help me understand what Malagasy citizens wanted and expected from their system of governance; in essence, their ideas of what good governance is.

The third section of questions centered on democracy and principles of democracy. According to the Afrobarometer report, many Malagasy people could not define democracy, but were very attached to democratic principles and structures. I asked the respondents to rank their value of certain democratic principles (freedom of press, freedom of speech and expression, protection of minority rights, and separation of powers) on a scale of one to five – five being very important and one being not important at all. Nearly all democracies in the world have a written constitution that organizes and defines the government and guarantees certain individual freedoms to the citizens. I asked the respondents to explain the importance of the constitution in order to learn about Malagasy attitudes towards this document and its value. Democracy requires an access to government and proper representation; therefore, I asked the respondents to share the ways in which they influence government. I then asked each respondent for a personal definition of democracy followed by the question asked what problems exist in Madagascar's

democracy. These questions were included in order to find opinions on certain principles of democracy and also to learn what exactly Malagasy people see as democracy and what stands in their way of achieving democracy.

The final section asked respondents about the means for educating Malagasy citizens on aspects of good governance and democracy. I asked specifically for ideas on education on democracy, good governance, individual rights, and the struggle against corruption. Since Madagascar has a large youth population, a high illiteracy rate, and the majority of the population living in rural areas, there are challenges to bringing about change and informing citizens on these concepts. The objective of the question was to find out how citizens felt change could be brought about. The responses had the potential to indicate important cultural areas such as music, education, and community involvement.

In order to find groups of Malagasy citizens to complete these surveys, I visited churches, cultural centers, and the University of Antananarivo. I used these sources to create diversity in my sample. I gathered surveys from a group of members of FJKM church and a group of teachers at a Church of Jesus Christ school. I gathered surveys from language classes at the American Cultural Center and the Alliance Francais. I used surveys in Malagasy, French, and English so the respondent would have a choice to use their preferred language. The responses in Malagasy were translated by a translator to English. I collect a total of 136 surveys with a total of 38 male respondents, 94 female respondents, and 4 respondents who chose not to reveal their gender. The range of the age of the respondents is between 18 and 61. Thirteen respondents did not choose to reveal their age; however, of the respondents that did choose to reveal their age, over half are under the age of 30. The cultural centers and the university tended to have younger

respondents; therefore, the church groups were helpful in contributing larger numbers of older respondents.

Upon receiving a group of responses, I entered all of the responses together into a field journal where I analyzed the group's responses to each question, looking for patterns and similarities in the answers and their continuity with other groups. After receiving and individually processing all of the surveys, I created a comprehensive chart for each question on the survey. I created several general categories of answers for each question based on the responses that I had evaluated and assigned each individual answer to one or more general category, depending on the answer, to produce comprehensive results of the surveys. From this information, I was able to see which responses were more the most frequent from all of the 136 surveys.

Throughout my evaluation of the survey responses, I found that certain questions received an unusually large number of mixed responses or responses that did not answer the question asked which must be taken into consideration in the analysis and evaluation of this study. In asking about the role of civil society, I received many diverse responses and after categorizing the responses, I found that there were more results for the category of "Other" than any other category. I noticed that several responses did not describe the civil society, but the society as a whole, which for this study are considered to be two separate entities. This seems to indicate that the question may not have been well understood, in particular, the term that I used was not well understood by all of the respondents. This question and its responses will be discussed further in the analysis.

The section where respondents ranked the value they held for specific democratic principles received results that were in conflict with responses of other questions on the

questionnaire. For example, many responses defined democracy as the freedom of expression and expressed that one problem with democracy in Madagascar was that people were not free to express themselves; however, the results from ranking the principles of freedom of speech and press showed that there were several responses ranking them at a three or lower, meaning that they were not important. It may be that this question was unclear to some respondents. Since several respondents indicated that a problem with democracy in Madagascar is the lack of respect for freedom of speech or press, it may be that some respondents interpreted the question on values not as their own individual value, but the value that the present government or society places on those democratic principles. Despite some confusion over this section, I believe that many respondents interpreted the question as I meant it; therefore I feel that it is still valid for analysis.

The final section of the survey on educating Malagasy citizens received many responses that did not answer the question asked. The final four questions asked for the respondents' ideas on the means for teaching Malagasy citizens about democracy, good governance, individual rights, and the struggle against corruption; however, many respondents did not some or any of these questions and many also responded with definitions of democracy, good governance, or individual rights or a personal idea of how to overcome corruption or some other answer that did not answer the question. In each question, it was clearly asked "what are means of education for Malagasy citizens . . .;" therefore, I find it unlikely that the question was misunderstood from its phrasing. This section was at the end of the survey, which consisted of two pages of open-ended questions, and it generally took around a half an hour to complete. One possibility is that respondents were tired of filling out the survey and chose not to answer the question or were not reading the questions in their entirety or taking the time to understand them which had led to

answers that focused on only one part of the questions. In future research this should be taken into consideration and amended in some way; however, for the intents and purposes of this study, the responses for this section were too few and too scattered to properly analyze.

This methodology, while I feel it was the best for the scope and time allotted for the study, has a few weaknesses that should be considered in the evaluation of this study and future research. The sample that I use for my study is limited in gender, ages, location, and level of education. Because my methodology uses written responses, all of my respondents had to be literate. This creates a bias toward the opinions of literate citizens who have at least some education since nearly 60% of Madagascar's population is illiterate. In addition, all of my surveys were taken by groups in the capital city of Antananarivo, an urban area. This creates a bias for the opinions of citizens who live in an urban environment and who receive much more information on the government, despite that 80% of the population lives in a rural environment where access to information is considerably more limited. And finally, my study does not equally represent men and women and different age groups which creates some bias toward women's opinions and opinions of younger people. However, despite these weaknesses in my sample, it is sufficient for the scope and constraints on time and location of this study.

It should also be mentioned that during the course of this study, I made changes and revisions to my course of action. I had originally planned to gather information not just from citizens, but also from members of the civil society and members of the government. I had conducted one interview with a member of the civil society. However, after receiving over one hundred completed surveys, I decided that the information from citizens would overshadow the information from other areas and make the results too unbalanced. Therefore, my study has focused only on the ideas and opinions of citizens.

Findings & Analysis: Good Governance

The first part of the survey focused on good governance. The responses from the survey defined the roles of government, political parties, the opposition, civil society, each citizen, and the international community. These definitions contribute to understanding what Malagasy citizens view as a good governance. The responses indicate that Malagasy citizens are in general agreement over certain role, unsure over some, and conflicted over others.

Through grouping answers and examining written answers, I have found several popular categories and several responses that have the most relevance for the respondents among responses describing the roles of each part of the government. In describing the role of government, I found 180 responses to be placed in categories (Appendix Table 1). Of these responses, 46 indicated, in some way, that the role of the government is “to serve the needs and to protect the interests of the citizens.” This was followed by 36 responses indicating that it is the government’s role “to develop the country economically, socially, and/or politically” and 22 responses indicating that it is “to create and carry out laws and policies.” Other categories that received higher numbers describe the government’s role as maintaining order and security and managing national affairs. There were several responses that made specific comments about development including building infrastructure, managing the economy and natural resources, and providing social services to the population. These were separate categories, but are significant to the description of the role of government.

These findings indicate that Malagasy citizens have a strong concept of the role government expecting it to serve their needs and protect their interests including the social, economic, and political development of the country and maintaining order and security. The government is also responsible for creating and carrying out laws and policies that support the

needs of the citizens. According to RABOANARISON RAMANAMISATA T.N. Holiniaina, “the government [has] to define and apply laws, define development policy, correct economic problems, produce public services, and protect citizens.” RALANTOAVIELO Henintova specifies that the role of the government, “it is to contribute to the development of the country. It must improve the conditions of the life of each citizen in the possible measure.”² These responses explain thoroughly the expectations of many respondents for the government; in essence, the government’s role, whether it be developing the country or carrying out laws, is to serve the interests and improve the lives of the Malagasy citizens.

Altogether, 127 responses were categorized to describe the role of political parties (Appendix Table 2). By far, the most significant and popular response was that political parties should “propose ideas on policy and advise and criticize the government” with 50 responses. The categories that followed were “educating citizens” and participating in elections and supporting candidates” with 13 and 12 responses, respectively. Like the responses for the role of the government, there were several responses that gave details contributing to these popular responses. Several responses indicate that political parties represent the ideas of groups of citizens and that political parties are a vehicle for citizens’ opinions. Interestingly, several responses stated that political parties should contribute to the development of the country.

As the findings have shown, many respondents believe that the role of political parties is to suggest ideas and propose policies in order to help and advise the government. However, as several respondents point out, their role should include much more. The role of political parties, according to RAKOTOVAO Fara, includes “educating citizens and voters in the functioning of the political and electoral system, balancing opposing demands and converting them into general policies, mobilizing citizens into participating in political decision, [and] training candidates for

public office.” Political parties protect the integrity of democracy as RATOVOHERY Nisirtoa indicates that the role of political parties is “to establish diversity in the [country] in order to avoid [dictatorship].” Therefore, political parties should be an entity that works in the government on behalf of the citizens, learning about and promoting their interests, and protecting democracy by offering many ideas and points of view.

The findings for the role of the opposition indicate that respondents have a clear idea of what the role of the opposition should be. Of the 146 responses that I categorized for this question in Appendix Table 3, 75 of the responses indicated in some way that the role of the opposition is “criticize the current government.” This idea was shared by over half respondents, which has the greatest consensus among responses of any of the questions asking for the role of a part of government. The second most popular category had 30 responses that indicated that the opposition should “give ideas and propose solutions.” Other common responses on the role of opposition indicate that the opposition exists to balance the government and to inform citizens about the government. In sum, the responses are generally in favor of the opposition being a critic and another point of view in the government.

The findings suggest that the role of the opposition is to criticize the government and to propose solutions with their criticism, creating a balance in the government, and also to inform citizens (perhaps through the criticism) about governmental actions. RANDRIANARINONY Brunel explains that “the role of the opposition is to criticize the government in place in order to have a certain stability of the system.” Over half the respondents expressed this sentiment in some way, indicating that having an entity within the government to maintain a balance of powers and ideas and to keep the government from ignoring certain issues are important to the Malagasy people. In addition, the opposition should “question the government of the day and

hold [them] accountable to the public” (RAKOTOZAFY Lala Fanta Nirina). This suggests the need and desire to have transparency in the government and to keep citizens informed of government actions.

Responses for the role of civil society are mixed and lack a particular category that is more popular than the others. Of the 119 responses that I gathered from this question (Appendix Table 4), 24 responses fell into the category of “other,” which means that there were 24 responses that were unique and could not be categorized with another response. In other words, 20% of the responses had different and separate definitions for the civil society. Of the categories that represent common responses, “preserving and valuing the citizens’ interests” and “educating the citizens” were the most popular with 19 responses each. In addition, 14 responses indicated that the role of civil society is to be a “mediator or intermediary between the citizens and the government.” It should be mentioned, that there were several responses that indicated that the civil society should “contribute to the development of the country.” From these categories, many respondents define civil society as an entity that works with the citizens and for the citizens when it comes to government matters; however, many respondents could not identify or define a role for the civil society.

According to the findings for the role of the civil society, it seems that there is some confusion over what the civil society is. To begin, there were more responses that were unique and different than there were responses that were shared. In addition, there were several responses that described what would be considered society such as “the role of the civil society is to choose a good president for themselves, for the future of the people”³ (ALIMA Felixa) or “to continue to live”⁴ (RAZAFINTOANDRO Evelyne). However, of the responses that did refer to the civil society, it indicates that Malagasy people expect civil society to work with the

government on behalf of the interests of the citizens and help the citizens better understand their role in a democracy. The confusion over the definition and concept of civil society may be a result of the small role that the civil society has played in the history of Malagasy politics. According to RASOLO Andre, there is one non-governmental organization for every 100,000 citizens in Madagascar, whereas in the United States there is one non-governmental organization for every 300 citizens. Therefore, some citizens may not be familiar with the term civil society nor with the role they play. However, for those who do understand the function of civil society, it helps the government by voicing the concerns of the citizens and it helps to educate citizens on the civic principles.

The findings for the role of each citizen offer several popular ideas on what the role of each citizen should be. Of the 170 responses that I gathered and categorized for this question in Appendix Table 5, the category “participate in elections” was the most popular with 37 responses. This was followed by the categories “to respect the laws and the constitution” and “to know and to exercise their rights and responsibilities” with 29 and 22 responses, respectively. Despite several categories being more popular than others, most categories for this question received a relatively significant number of responses. Some of the responses are details or specifics of others for example, 17 respondents indicated specifically that citizens should express their opinions and give advice, which would fall under “to know and exercise rights and responsibilities,” as would “participate in elections.” Other responses indicate that citizens take an active role in public life by participating in political life and activities, being knowledgeable or aware of events in the country, and working and contributing to the development of the country. Therefore, these responses seem to suggest that the role of the citizen is to know and

exercise their rights and responsibilities, such as by voting and expressing their opinions, as well as being active in and knowledgeable of political life and respecting the laws and constitution.

Respondents seemed to create a definition of the role of each citizen as being political active and conscientious. Many responses indicated that citizens must vote, know and exercise their rights and responsibilities, and know and follow the laws. There is a degree of vagueness in the general term “rights and responsibilities;” however, more specific responses seem to give details to this term. RANDRIANARISOA Voahangy indicates that “The role of each citizen is to know all their rights and obligations and to express their opinions about leader’s behaviors which can have an impact on their life.” Many respondents stated that citizens must vote which is a universal right protected by the constitution and quite a few, like RANDRIANARISOA, feel that expressing opinions in general is important for citizens. Some take this a step forward, by insisting that “each citizen should be well-informed about country’s life; they have to follow what happens in the country” (ANDRIANJAFITSARA Raissa). Beyond voicing opinions and voting, some respondents believe that a citizen also “has to participate in community development activities and taking part in community decision making” (HERIMAMATRATRA Tanjona). Therefore, responses seem to begin to define “rights and responsibilities,” but there were many responses that did not expand beyond this term. This seems to indicate that citizens feel that they should be active in following and influencing the government and contributing to the development of communities and the country; however the exact means for doing this are not always clear. RAHARISOA Hanitra suggests that “[civics] should be taught to the people,” which seems to indicate that more education is needed to help citizens achieve their role and know specifically what that role entails.

According to the findings on the role of the international community, it seems that many respondents see their role as passive, while others define their role as somewhat more active in the Malagasy government. Of the 142 responses, 48 respondents indicated that the role of the international community should be “to advise and to mediate” (Appendix Table 6). This is a significant number, roughly a third of the responses. This is followed by the categories “to help and support the government” and “to help with the development of the country” with 20 responses each. Though, these categories received fewer responses, it indicates that there are a significant amount of respondents who feel the international community should play a more active role than as mediator or advisor. There were a few categories that were less popular, but had some shared responses that demonstrate this divide further. Several respondents indicated that the international community should observe or supervise the government, but not take direct action in government; however, other respondents indicated that the international community should intervene during a crisis or in the case of bad governance and give a solution. Therefore, the findings on the role of the international community are mixed between the international community having an active role or a passive role.

Responses on the role of the international community in the Malagasy government indicate a conflict within Malagasy attitudes toward the international community. There are many Malagasy who believe that “the international community should only be mediators and advisors in respecting the principle of non-interference but at the same time should be neutral by not choosing a party”⁵ (RAMIARINARIVO Tiana Lalaina Nandranina). However, this position is contrasted with others that claim the international community should take a more active role in the government by “helping the government in their tasks, react, and even take measures when the government or something wrong happens” (RANDRIAMASY Matthieu Tahina). Others still

feel that the international community should be particularly active during a crisis as RAMANANKASINA Annick suggests that “the international community should take a responsibility to help Malagasy people and take decision instead of the government during this crisis.” Therefore, the responses do not render a definition for the role of the international community, but suggest that it is definition that Malagasy people struggle to define and come to a consensus on.

A historical perspective may further contribute to the understanding of these definitions or lack of definitions. With a history of strong government that has a record of manipulating referendums and denying rights to citizens to further its own power, the definition for the role of the government found from this study focuses on the government as working for the interests of the people rather than for themselves. Also, the definitions of both political parties and the opposition suggest that Malagasy people want a balanced government that considers many ideas and points of view and has a strong opposition. This is in stark contrast to their history of one-party government and tradition of weak opposition. These responses seem to indicate a desire to break away from the habits of the past and bring about a responsible, balanced government.

Madagascar’s political history is full of instances where international players seized considerable power in Madagascar which may have led to the opinion that the international community should play a considerably smaller role. Others may be more effected by the frequent political crises and see the international community as a stabilizing force that may be necessary at times for Madagascar. As a result of this recent history, it may take more time for Malagasy citizens to come to a shared idea of what role the international community should be.

The definition of the role of each citizen contrasts with the 2008 Afrobarometer report on citizen participation. The results from this survey suggest that Malagasy citizens should be active

in political life by voting, expression opinions, being knowledgeable on current events, etc. However, the 2008 Afrobarometer report indicated that Malagasy citizens have low participation rates: many do not bring problems to the attention of the government and only a small percentage take part in political demonstrations or street marches. This may indicate that Malagasy people feel they should be active, but are in some way inhibited from doing so.

Development arose in this section as a reoccurring theme seen as a category for nearly all parts of government. With the exception of the role of the opposition, there were at least a few respondents who listed “contributing to development” as role for each part, including political parties and citizens. The prevalence of this response across the survey indicates that it has great significance and importance to Malagasy people which is closely associated with the government and society. According to these results, it seems that everyone in the country, whether as an individual or as a group, should be working to develop the country. As Madagascar has been working toward development in different forms since its independence, it seems to have come to the forefront as a major goal or objective for Malagasy people. Therefore, development is an important goal that Malagasy citizens expect all parts of government to contribute to.

Findings & Analysis: Democracy and Elections

The section on the survey on elections and democracy solicited information on how attached to democracy Malagasy citizens were and what they conceived of as being a democracy. This section also looked into problems Malagasy citizens saw with democracy and the government in order to gain a greater understanding of good governance and Malagasy democracy. These results complement and add to the results on good governance.

The findings for the section on elections reveal the voter turnout of the respondents in the survey and the reasons for choosing to vote or not to vote. As displayed in Appendix Table 7,

52.2% chose to vote and 47.8% chose not to vote, of 134 responses to the presidential elections. Of the 131 responses to the legislative elections, 31.3% chose to vote and 68.7% chose not to vote. Of the 123 responses to the mayoral elections, 45.5% chose to vote and 54.5% chose not to vote. From looking at these figures, it seems that the presidential election had the best turnout with just over half, followed by the mayoral, and finally the legislative elections which had the least participation out of all of the elections. It must be remembered in interpreting these figures that not all respondents were of voting age at the time which may skew the results slightly.

By looking at these figures, it is apparent that the presidential election had the highest turnout and the legislative had the lowest. This indicates that Malagasy people find the presidential elections more important to participate in than the mayoral or the legislative. ANDRIANBOLOLOMANANA Vola Finontsoa voted in the presidential and legislative elections, but not the mayoral and explained, “Malagasy suffered a long time ago, I wanted to change it by electing a new president; no, it was not interesting.” RATOVOHERY Nisirtoa voted in the presidential and mayoral elections, but not the legislative and explained, “we are fed up [with how] a deputy reacts when he gets power. He is supposed to represent the population’s voice by in Madagascar in general, deputies just think of their own interests.” These responses seem to indicate that Malagasy people feel that the results of the presidential election have a greater impact on the country than the others. These also suggest that candidates in legislative and mayoral elections are less appealing to Malagasy citizens, either they are simply not interesting or they appear corrupt or untrustworthy to voters. These sentiments may also be a result of Madagascar’s political history, where the majority of power was concentrated in the executive; therefore, citizens perceive the president as being the most well-disposed to implementing change. Therefore, these findings suggest that citizens are more likely to vote in a

presidential election because the perceived importance of the election is greater than the mayoral and legislative elections which lack appealing candidates.

The responses to why the respondent did or did not choose to vote were divided almost evenly between those reasons to vote and those reasons not to vote. Of the 75 responses that indicated reasons for voting in Appendix Table 8, 43 responses explained in some way that they voted because it was their “right or duty.” This was followed by 21 responses that indicate that they wanted to contribute to the country and they felt they were doing so by voting. Interestingly, only two responses indicated that the reason they voted was because they supported a candidate. Therefore, many voters who choose to vote did so because they feel it is their duty or a way in which they can contribute to their country.

The findings for the reasons that respondents did not vote indicate disinterest and disenchantment are leading factors. Of the 76 responses in Appendix Table 8, 15 respondents chose not to vote because they felt that the elections or the candidates were corrupt and that their vote would not make any difference in the outcome of the election. In addition to this, 12 respondents indicated that they had not bothered to get their electoral card and several others indicated that the elections were not interesting or they were busy that day. Therefore, responses indicate that many respondents chose not to vote because they felt their vote would be wasted or because they did not feel it was interesting or important enough.

Over half of the respondents that voted in elections indicated that their choice to do so was based on their sense of duty as a Malagasy citizen and their desire to exercise their rights as a Malagasy citizen. RANDRIAMIARISOA Haingo Lalaina explains that she chose to vote “parce que d’une part c’est un devoir mais également un droit. Ne pas participer a une élection signifierait renonce a ses droits.” RAZAFINJATOVO Taualy voted “because [he] thinks it’s a

duty for every citizen to vote and he can make a blank vote if he doesn't want to vote for a particular person." From the figures in the findings, it can be inferred that Malagasy people have a strong sense of duty as a citizen and manifest this duty by voting. These responses indicate how strong that sense is. Submitting a blank ballot is considered a better choice by some than not voting at all because as RANDRIAMIARISOA explained, not voting would be forfeiting the right. These responses are also in keeping with the role of each citizen as knowing and exercising their rights and responsibilities. After many years under colonial rule where Malagasy people were denied such rights, it seems that the Malagasy people have become proud and protective of their rights and duties.

Responses suggest there is a divide in voters in regards to voter efficacy. "Efficacy" is the perceived power that a voter feels his or her vote has in the outcome of an election. There were many respondents who explained the reason they chose to vote was to influence the government or contribute to change. SAMSON Liliane Judith voted "because I wanted to participate in changes which bring or will bring the candidates. The elections have a great impact on the the population."⁶ This demonstrates high efficacy among part of the voting population. On the other hand, several respondents chose not to vote because the elections or the candidate were corrupt and they did not feel that their vote would make a difference, or as RANDRIANANDIAINA Fanja Harivelo puts it, "in Madagascar, you can guess in advance who will be elected." This does not mean that Malagasy people do not still feel that voting is a right and duty that should be exercised; BRANDRUP Sylvie Rasendra explained that "it's [her] right to vote. But the problem is that the leader violates the right. They change the result of the election." Therefore, while efficacy is high among some Malagasy voters, corruption and untrustworthy leadership have discouraged citizens from voting despite their sense of duty.

The section on Malagasy ideas on democracy and its principles produced solid results and findings on its value, problems, and definitions. According to the respondents, the constitution has a very clear importance in both the government and the country as a whole. Of the 144 responses to this question illustrated in Appendix Table 9, 42 responses indicate that the importance of the constitution is “to define, organize, and limit the role of the government.” In addition, respondents also indicated that it is important as “the fundamental law and basis for the country” and “as a guide and reference for governmental actions,” with 26 responses grouped in each category. There were also several other responses that indicated specifically that the constitution keeps the government from abusing their power and that it protects the individual rights and freedoms of all the citizens. These results indicate a clear importance and definition of the constitution.

These findings indicate that Malagasy people consider the constitution to be important as a means of empowering and limiting government as well as empowering the citizens. According to RAZAFIMANANTENA Ny Tando, the constitution “is the basis of a state like a status in a company. The constitution enumerates clearly the power of the executive/legislative/judiciary, their functions, their roles, their composition, their functioning. But fundamental rights are also enumerated in the constitution.” Therefore, as this response has articulated and the majority of responses from the surveys have indicated, Malagasy people feel the constitution is important for the functioning of government and the limitation that it implies as well as for its protection of individual rights. In addition to this, “the constitution is considered as a guide for the government, a reference for the government in any kind of action or decision making. Thus the government should not beyond the constitution” (RAKOTOARISON Haja H). This indicates that the constitution is important in the daily workings of government work and should be

fundamental to all of the laws and policies. Several respondents noted the importance of the government staying within the limits of the constitution and RANDRIANANDRAINA Fanja Harivelo specifically indicates that “the constitution shouldn’t be changed even by the government.” These responses may be a reaction to the history of changes made to the constitution by presidents seeking to gain more power. Therefore, according to these findings, Malagasy people have a clear definition of the role of the constitution and feel that by respecting, referencing, and maintaining it, good governance will be achieved.

According to the results of the values of democratic principles, there is not a huge variation in the degree of value that the respondents attribute to the given democratic principles. Of all the principles listed and displayed in Appendix Table 10, freedom of speech and expression had the highest score (513), followed by separation of powers (497) and protection of minority rights (477), and freedom of the press rests with the lowest score (468). 58.8% of responses ranked freedom of speech and expression as “very important.” Separation of powers was ranked as “very important” by 54.4% of the respondents, but was also ranked “not important” by 11.2%; this principle had the second largest percentage of “most important”, but also the highest percentage of “not important.” Protection of minority rights was ranked “very important” by 49.9% of respondents and the percentage decreased with each lower rank of importance, though its value at the lower ranks are higher than those for freedom of speech and expression. The most interesting case is the freedom of the press of which the value was split between ranking “very important” and “important” (or a four and a five). 35.6% of respondents ranked this principle as “very important” and 36.4% of respondents ranked it as just “important.” Therefore, three principles of democracy are clearly considered “very important” by half or more of respondents, but freedom of press received more moderate scores. These findings seem to

indicate that Malagasy citizens place great importance on their freedom of expression and the separation of powers.

Responses on ways to influence the government seem to favor indirect means as opposed to direct means of influence. Of the 129 responses in Appendix Table 11, media and demonstrations (strikes) were the most popular options with 30 responses each. These options were followed by participating in elections and referendums with 24 responses. Several respondents suggest working through the civil society, joining a political party, and organized activities or events to influence public officials. There were a few responses suggesting that citizens could join the government or organize a meeting with public officials. Many of these responses are indirect ways of expressing views to the government; in these ways, it is done through large groups such as the civil society, demonstrations, and political parties or through the media, which speaks more to the public than specifically to the government. Therefore, the findings show that respondents seem to prefer indirect and group methods for influencing the government such as demonstrations, media, and elections, rather than individual and direct methods such as meetings or direct correspondence with public officials.

According to these findings Malagasy citizens prefer to use indirect means and large groups to influence public officials. This seems to suggest that Malagasy citizens do not feel empowered enough as an individual to bring concerns to the government. This may also result from perceived and real limitations on expression. Several respondents indicated that there is a fear in expressing opinions because “the government always oppresses people when they criticize” (RAKOTOVAO Fara). RANDRIANARISOA Voahangy points out that “some are put in jail because of their opinions.” Therefore, Malagasy people tend to seek less direct and less traceable ways to express their opinions and to influence the government. In this way too, groups

provide a certain degree of anonymity and protection from oppression or harassment by the government. Working through large groups also lends the power of many voices which tends strengthens the message. Thus, Malagasy citizens prefer to influence the government through media and street demonstrations to strengthen their message and to have a certain degree of personal protection.

According to the responses on the definition of democracy, many respondents define democracy through its principles and general ideas. The most common definition was “freedom of expression, speech, and press or some sort of variation (Appendix Table 12). Over 40% of the respondents (67 respondents of a total of 159) used this principle to define democracy. This category was followed with 31 respondents indicating that democracy was a “government of the people, for the people, and by the people” or “power to the people.” This response indicates that respondents acknowledge that democracy is a type of governance and that is directly related to the citizens. Several other responses included mention of elections as well as the power of the majority and referenced individual rights. Some responses included several principles or ideas of democracy, but there were very few comprehensive definitions for democracy. Therefore the results find that many respondents defined democracy through its principles and its attributes, particularly the freedom of expression, speech, and press.

This popular definition of democracy as the freedom of expression indicates that this particular principle of democracy is of special significance to Malagasy people. As the political history of Madagascar has demonstrated, the Malagasy people have experienced long periods where their freedom to express their opinions were greatly restricted. Under colonialism and since independence, the government has not been tolerant of criticism which has resulted in large street demonstrations and abrupt changes in government. Even at present, freedom of expression

is greatly limited and respondents indicate that there is a certain degree of fear in criticizing the government. Therefore, the attachment to this principle as a definition of democracy may be a result from its persistent limitation by the government throughout their history.

The responses on perceived problems with democracy in Madagascar indicate that there may be several problems to be tackled. Of the 145 responses categorized in Appendix Table 13, 37 respondents indicated that the problem with democracy in Madagascar is that democracy is widely misunderstood or that there are differing definitions of what a democracy is. Another problem, voiced by 34 respondents, is that the government does not respect democratic rules and is corrupt. Many respondents also indicated that there is a lack of freedom for citizens to express their opinions. There were also several responses stating that democracy does not even exist in Madagascar at this moment. Therefore, these results find that respondents perceive problems in the way democracy is defined such as freedom of expression.

These problems appear to be a result of a lack of civic education and the disproportionate amount of power held by the government. The result for the definition of democracy give support to the claim that many respondents make saying that the problem with democracy is that there are differing definitions. This can be attributed to the lack of education as RAKAKANDRAINA Hary indicates, “citizens aren’t educated enough and they have a misunderstanding of what is democracy, what are their rights and what are their duties.” If citizens are unsure as to what a democracy is or what their rights and duties are, this gives a strong government the advantage of wielding power over them. As many respondents indicated, corruption and abuse of power are major problems with democracy. These two problems may be linked in a circular cycle: the citizens are ignorant to democracy and their rights so government can take advantage of this and abuse their power; on the other hand, government has the power

to educate citizens, but do not in order to maintain power. However, the fact that so many respondents indicated that these were two major problems indicates that citizens are no longer ignorant to the abuses of the government.

These problems suggest that education would be a solution to some major problems with democracy in Madagascar. As the last section suggested, the government may not be the most reliable source for this education, but respondents indicated that part of the role of political parties and the civil society was to educate citizens on democracy and civics. Therefore, the roles of the parts of a good government would help to promote better democracy.

Malagasy citizens, overall, seem to favor democracy and democratic structures. Great importance was placed on democratic principles and structures such as the opposition which suggests that Malagasy people would be well served under a democratic form of government. Nearly all responses indicate a break from Madagascar's political history of strong, one-party government that abused the rights of the citizens. Malagasy people believe that the government should be balanced with an opposition and that the government and citizens should and must be free to express opinions and problems to the government in order for the government to serve their interests. In sum, good governance and democracy require forward movements, but are desired by the Malagasy people.

Conclusion

This study set out to learn what Malagasy citizens conceive of as good governance and democracy. Referencing points of previous research and important principles of democracy, I created a survey that covered elections, good governance, democracy, and civic education. The first three sections yielded solid and informative responses. The last section, whether due to the wording of the question, the placement of the survey, or misunderstanding, did not produce

many informative answers and was, consequently, excluded from the report. The responses to the first three sections brought a greater understanding of the concepts of good governance and democracy in Madagascar.

According to the findings for the questions on good governance, respondents create a concept of a responsible government and active citizens. The responses find that citizens seem to believe the government should be balanced with a strong opposition and active parties that works to serve the needs and protect the interests of the citizens. Citizens should actively participate in political life by both knowing and exercising their rights and responsibilities, which include voting, expressing opinions, and being knowledgeable about national events. There was some confusion over the meaning of civil society, but most responses seem to believe that the civil society should help citizens both to bring their problems to the government and to educate them on civil duties and democracy. Malagasy citizens seem to be conflicted over the role of the international community: whether their role should be active or passive in the Malagasy government. Responses also indicated an overwhelming importance on development and the responsibility for all citizens and parts of government to contribute to it. Therefore, good governance is defined, partially, through the principles of democracy.

The results of the section on democracy indicate a great attachment to democratic principles and awareness of problems in Madagascar's democracy. Many respondents indicated that democracy, as a definition, is the freedom of expression and freedom of speech and expression received the high value score when ranking democratic principles. However, respondents expressed value for freedom of expression as it is one of their preferred methods of influencing the government. Citizens also seem attached to the constitution and feel that it is essential for the functioning and limiting of government. Problems with democracy in

Madagascar result from the misunderstanding and differing definitions of democracy and a government that abuses its power, such as by limiting the rights of citizens. These findings complement and build on the findings for good governance.

After a history of oppressive and overly strong governments, Malagasy citizens seem to be making a break with the problems of the past and looking in a new direction. A good government would respect the rights of citizens and listen to their opinions, problems, interests, and needs. Government would be guided and limited by the constitution and balanced by a strong opposition and several political parties who would bring the needs of the people to the government through their platforms and manifestos. Citizens would participate actively in political life, free to express opinions and comfortable with voting in free and fair elections. Therefore, the Malagasy conception of good governance and democracy are linked through both structure and principles.

This research looks only at a small, limited group of citizens which leaves much room for future research and study on Malagasy conceptions of good governance and democracy. Citizens from different areas of the country and from rural environment would bring an even greater understanding of these concepts and may bring a greater understanding of geographical influence in Malagasy politics. Future research should look outside of citizens and gather information from members of the government, political parties, the opposition, civil society, and the international community in order to get a comprehensive understanding of how each part interprets its role in governance and democracy. Further research on this subject may contribute to a greater understanding of democracy and governance in cultural terms and the field of political and cultural studies.

End Notes

1. La proportion de citoyens qui manifestent leur satisfaction sur l'efficacité des communes et sur leur intégrité dans le mode d'utilisation des ressources est a la fois faible et en baisse par rapport a 2005
2. C'est de contribuer au développement du pays. Il doit améliorer dans la mesure du possible les conditions de vie de chaque individu.”
3. Le rôle de la société civile, c'est de choisir le bon président pour eux, pour l'avenir de future des peuples.
4. Continuer à vivre.
5. La communauté international devrait seulement être des médiateurs et des conseillers tout en respectant le principe de non ingérence mais devrait également être neutre seulement dit ne pas prendre de partie.
6. Parce que je voulais participe aux changements qu'apportent ou que vont apporter les candidats. Les élections ont beaucoup d'impacte sur la population.

Appendix

Table 1. Role of Government

What is the role of the government?	# of Respondents
Maintaining security and/or order	12
Managing national affairs	17
Political, economic and social development	36
Serving the needs and protecting the interests of the citizens	46
Respecting the constitution/democracy	4
Create and carry out laws and policies	22
Disribution of wealth and/or provide social services	7
Manage the economy and resources/environment	8
Build infrastructure	3
Forge and maintain international relationships	4
Aid and advise the president	2
To be the executive power	7
Other	12
Total	180

Table 2. Role of Political Parties

What is the role of political parties?	# of Respondents
Educate the citizens	13
Propose ideas on policies/advise & criticize government	50
Contribute to the development of the country	7
Help citizens voice their opinions	5
Participate in elections/support a candidate	12
Control/participate in political life	5
Help the government	5
Carry out policy	2
Recruit/represent members with the same convictions	6
Compete against other parties/provide options for citizens	3
I do not know	1
Other	18
Total	127

Table 3. Role of the Opposition

What is the role of the opposition?	# of Respondents
To criticize the current government	75
To balance the government	12
To act against the government when it is undemocratic	8
To give ideas and propose solutions	30
To support candidates in elections	3
Informing citizens about the government	4
Other	14
Total	146

Table 4. Role of Civil Society

What is the role of the civil society?	# of Respondents
Mediator/intermediary between citizens and the government	14
To preserve and value the citizens interests	19
Advisor or reference on issues	7
Mediate the politicians	2
Educate the population	19
Supervise and critique the government	9
Monitor democracy/elections	5
Help government	6
Contribute to development	9
I do not know	5
Other	24
Total	119

Table 5. Role of Each Citizen

What is the role of each citizen?	# of Respondents
Participate in elections	37
Express their opinions/give advice	17
Participate in political life/activities	16
Work and contribute to development	17
Know and exercise their rights and responsibilities	22
Respect the rights of others	6
Respect the laws and the constitution	29
Respect the government	1
To be knowledgeable or aware of events in the country	13
Other	12
Total	170

Table 6. Role of the International Community

What should the role of the international community be in Malagasy government?	# of respondents
To advise and to mediate	48
Nothing	2
To help and support the government	20
To help with the development of the country (inc. financial)	20
To oversee the implementation of intl agreements/funds	16
To respect Madagascar's sovereignty	6
To pressure the government	1
Intervene during a crisis or bad governance/giving a solution	8
Other	10
Total	131

Table 7. Voter Turnout

Did you participate in the last elections?							Total
Presidential:	Yes	70	52.20%	No	64	47.80%	134
Legislative:	Yes	41	31.30%	No	90	68.70%	131
Mayoral:	Yes	56	45.50%	No	67	54.50%	123

Table 8. Reasons to Vote and Not to Vote

Why or why not?	# of Respondents
Yes, it is my right/duty	43
Yes, I wanted to express my opinion	7
Yes, I am contributing to my country	21
Yes, I supported a candidate	2
Yes, other reasons	2
Total	75
No, I didn't have an electoral card	12
No, I was not of age	25
No, the elections/candidates are corrupted	15
No, I was fed up with politics	2
No, the elections were not interesting	5
No, I was busy that day	7
No, other reasons	10
Total	76

Table 9. Importance of the Constitution

What is the importance of the constitution in the government?	# of Respondents
Defines and limits the role of the government	42
Fundamental law and basis of the country	26
Keeps the government from abusing power	15
Avoid anarchy	5
Defines the aspirations and ideas of the people	1
It is a balance	2
It is a reference/guide for the government actions	26
Proves sovereignty and/or protects individual rights	12
To have good governance	6
I do not know	2
Other	7
Total	144

Table 10. Principles of Democracy

In your opinion, how important are: (1=not important, 5=very important)						Total Score
Freedom of the press	1 4	2 5	3 24	4 43	5 42	468
	3.40%	4.20%	20.30%	36.40%	35.60%	
Freedom of speech and expression	1 2	2 6	3 15	4 26	5 70	513
	1.70%	5.00%	12.60%	21.80%	58.80%	
Protections of minority rights	1 9	2 11	3 13	4 28	5 59	477
	7.50%	9.20%	10.80%	23.30%	49.20%	
Separation of powers	1 14	2 8	3 13	4 22	5 68	497
	11.20%	6.40%	10.40%	17.60%	54.40%	

Table 11. Methods of Influencing Government

How can citizens influence public officials?	# of Respondents
Participating in elections/referendums	24
Through citizen responsibilities (taxes)	5
Through the civil society/organized events/meetings	12
Bringing concerns directly to the government	7
Media	30
Demonstrations	30
Joining a political party/organization	8
I do not know	2
Other	11
Total	129

Table 12. Definitions of Democracy

In your opinion, how do you define democracy?	# of Respondents
Freedom expression (speech/press)	67
Government of, for, and by the people/power of people	31
Equality of citizens	8
Power of the majority	14
Respect for minority groups	4
Individual rights and freedoms	10
Elections	18
Other	7
Total	159

Table 13. Problems with Democracy in Madagascar

What are the problems with democracy in Madagascar?	# of Respondents
Citizens are not free to express themselves	26
The majority does not have power	2
The government does not respect democratic rules	34
Misunderstanding of or differing definitions of "democracy"	37
Too many political parties	2
No separation of powers	3
Democracy does not exist in Madagascar	14
Malagasy culture is contradictory to democracy	2
Disregard for human rights	1
Lack of civic education	7
Citizens do not respect democracy	4
Other	13
Total	145

Bibliography

- Afrobarometer. "Points de vue de la population sur la situation économique, la gouvernance et la démocratie : premiers résultats de l'enquête « Afrobaromètre 2008 » à Madagascar." 2008.
- ALIMA, Felixa. Survey Response. Alliance Francias. 19 April 2010.
- ANDAIAMBOLOLOMANANA, Vola Finontsoa. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 16 April 2010.
- ANDRIANJAFITSARA, Raissa. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- BRANDRUP, Sylvie Rasendra. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- Freedom House. "Country Report 2009: Madagascar." Accessed on 23 April 2010 at <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=22&year=2009&country=7652>
- HERIMAMATRATRA, Tanjona. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- RABOANARISON RAMANAMISATA T.N. Holiniaina. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 16 April 2010.
- RAHARISOA, Hanitra. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- RAKAKANDRAINANA, Hary. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- RAKOTOARISON, Hoja H. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 16 April 2010.
- RAKOTOVAO, Fara. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- RAKOTOZAFY, Lala Fanta Nirina. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- RALANTOAVIELO, Henintova. Survey Response. Jesosy Mamonjy. 22 April 2010.
- RAMANANKASINA, Annick. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.
- RAMIARINARIVO, Tiana Lalaina Nandrianina. Survey Response. University of Antananarivo. 13 April 2010.
- RANDRIAMASY, Matthieu Tahina. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April

2010.

RANDRIAMIARISOA, Haingo Lalaina. Survey Response. University of Antananarivo. 13 April

2010.

RANDRIANANDRAINA, Fanja Harivelo. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 16

April 2010.

RANDRIANARINONY, Brunel. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April 2010.

RANDRIANARISOA, Voahangy. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 16 April 2010.

RANDRIANJA, Solofo and Stephen Ellis. "Madagascar: A Short History." University of

Chicago Press: Chicago, 2009.

RASOLO, Andre. Class Lecture. 18 February 2010.

RATOVOHERY, Nisirtoa. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 16 April 2010.

RAZAFIMANANTENA, Ny Tando. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 15 April

2010.

RAZAFINATOANDRO, Harivelomananjara Evelyne. Survey Response. Alliance Francis. 19

April 2010.

RAZAFINJATOVO, Taualy. Survey Response. American Cultural Center. 16 April 2010.

SAMSON, Liliane Judith. Survey Response. University of Antananari