Table 5.3 shows the items, factor loadings and reliabilities of the process perceptions scale. These results clearly support the validity of the scale. The calculated fit indices for the group comparison are: with CFI = .96, RMSEA =.04 (90% CI = .01, .06), Chi-Square = 78.24; df = 52. Cronbach's Alpha in the first sample was .45, in the second sample .44. In general, then, the findings support H1b.

5.3.3. Discriminant Validity of Preferences and Perceptions Scales

In order to compare citizens' process preferences and related process perceptions, the two scales to measure preferences and perceptions need to be discriminant, that is they need to measure different concepts. The discriminant validity of the process preferences and process perceptions scales was tested using the joint sample including participants group 1 and group 2 (n = 523).The discriminant validity of the process preferences and process perceptions scales was tested for the three dimensions, consensus, efficiency and competition, separately. The specification of a model in which each of the indicators loads on only one factor provides a precise test of convergent and discriminant validity (Kline, 2005, p. 181). A one-factor model tests whether the items are measuring one overall factor rather than two individual factors. Support for this model would suggest that individuals do not differentiate among different process preferences and process perceptions and both concepts would best be represented by a unidimensional construct (cf. Noar, 2003, p. 633f.). The results of selected fit indices clearly indicate poor fit for the one factor model for all three dimensions, consensus, efficiency and competition (see Table 5.4). The fit is significantly worse than the fit for the uncorrelated factors model, as the Chi-Square difference test shows.[52] An uncorrelated factors model tests the idea that the two factors are independent. Support for this model suggests that the process preferences and process perceptions scales are independent constructs and thus not related to one another (Noar, 2003, p. 634). Comparing the uncorrelated factor model with a correlated factor model, the correlated factors model did result in a significant reduction of Chi-Square for the efficiency and competition dimensions, but not for the consensus dimensions.[53] The correlation between efficiency preferences and efficiency perceptions was -.398 (p < .005); the correlation between competition preferences and competition perceptions was .515 (p < .005). In general, the findings support H1c and indicate that the process preferences and process perception factors show discriminant validity and the scales allow measuring process preferences and related perceptions separately, although preferences and perceptions that concern the

---

52 Given a difference in Degrees of Freedom (df) of 1, the difference in Chi-Square is significant at the level of 5 % if it is 3.841 or larger. The Chi-Square difference here is larger than that value.

53 Given a difference in Degrees of Freedom (df) of 1, the difference in Chi-Square is significant at the level of 5 % if it is 3.841 or larger. The Chi-Square differences for the efficiency dimension and the competition dimension are larger than that value.

efficiency of political processes and preferences and perceptions that concern the competition of political processes were found to be correlated.

Models	Fit Indexes				
	Chi^2	df	Chi^2/df	CFI	RMSEA
Consensus Dimension					
One-factor model	272.718	10	27.27	.469	.236
Uncorrelated factors model	9.887	9	1.1	.999	.011
Correlated factors model	8.595	8	1.07	.999	.008
Efficiency Dimension					
One-factor model	465.045	10	46.5	.291	.296
Uncorrelated factors model	86.659	9	9.63	.883	.127
Correlated factors model	53.088	8	6.64	.934	.101
Competition Dimension					
One-factor model	63.844	6	10.64	.738	.129
Uncorrelated factors model	46.534	5	9.31	.805	.122
Correlated factors model	22.521	4	5.63	.916	.090

Table 5.4. Process Preferences and Process Perceptions as Distinct Concepts

5.3.4. Test of Cultural Invariance of Process Preferences Scale

Cultural invariance indicates that a construct has the same meaning in different cultures. The measurement invariance is a precondition for interpreting differences in scores in different cultures (cf. Bensaou, et al., 1999; Little, 1997). "Inadequate testing for the invariance of data across national groups weakens the interpretations that may be derived from cross-national empirical research" (Bensaou, et al., 1999, p. 672). In order to test the cultural invariance of the scale which is assumed in H2, data from the first pilot study was used. This study was conducted with college students in Germany (n = 163) and Switzerland (n = 150). Switzerland constitutes a typical consensus democracy, whereas Germany is a rather competitive democracy. The test of the cultural invariance is based on a restricted data set; for each of the