

Paper Forthcoming in Comparative Political Studies, 2013

**Attitude Variability among Latin American Publics: How Party System
Structuration Affects Left/Right Ideology**

Imke Harbers*, Catherine E. de Vries^a & Marco R. Steenbergen^o

* University of Amsterdam, ^a University of Geneva, ^o University of Zurich

Political scientists often describe party competition, political behavior or public preferences in left/right terms. Nevertheless, the usefulness of the concepts ‘left’ or ‘right’ is rarely explored. This is unfortunate as the use of left/right ideology as a means to describe public opinion or party behavior is contentious, especially in developing democracies. This study assesses whether the left/right continuum resonates with publics in developing Latin American democracies. Using data from the 2008 wave of the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) we measure variability in left/right self-placement in three Latin American countries, namely Ecuador, Mexico and Chile. Variability provides crucial insights into the strength of attitudes underlying survey responses. Building on the approach developed by Alvarez and Brehm (1995, 1998, 2002) for public opinion in the United States, we explore (1) the extent to which voters in Ecuador, Mexico and Chile possess predictable left/right positions and (2) whether predictability can be attributed to individual and country level characteristics. At the individual level, we show that variability decreases with political sophistication. At the country level, we find that a lower degree of programmatic party system structuration leads to higher levels of response variation. Mapping the variability in left/right preferences provides important insights into the structure of public opinion and contours of political behavior in Latin America and how it differs from other regions such as North America. In addition, this study brings to bear important new individual-level insights into recent political developments in the Latin American region, especially the so-called ‘left turn’ in Latin American politics.

Key Words: Latin America, Left/Right Ideology, Public Opinion, Response Variation, Party System Structuration

Attitude Variability among Latin American Publics: How Party System Structuration Affects Left/Right Ideology

Introduction

Political positions and preferences are often expressed in left/right terms. While left/right semantics have been found to provide significant leverage in the study of politics in Western Europe, the usefulness of these concepts in the developing democracies of Latin America remains highly contentious. Many observers have pointed out that one key characteristic of democracies in Latin America is the relative weakness of the left/right dimension as a functional homogenizing cleavage (e.g. Dix, 1989; Roberts, 2002), while other mechanisms—such as clientelism, patronage and personalized politics—play a much more important role in linking voters to parties (e.g. Levitsky, 2003). Yet, despite the widespread skepticism about the usefulness of left/right labels in the region, the terms continue to be used frequently not only by academics but also by commentators and political elites. This paradox has recently become evident in the debate about Latin America's 'left turn', which has brought to power a series of governments, whose policy preferences are considered to be leftist. The election of these governments has led to a discussion about the underlying causes of this region-wide trend. Have electorates shifted massively to the left? How stable and durable will this shift be? We aim to contribute to the discussion through an analysis of the strength of attitudes underlying left/right self-placement in the electorate.

Building on the approach developed by Alvarez and Brehm (1995, 1998, 2002) for public opinion in the United States (U.S.), this study seeks to make two contributions. First, we explore whether the left/right dimension resonates with Latin American citizens. More

specifically, we analyze the extent to which voters in Ecuador, Mexico and Chile possess predictable left/right positions. Discussions about shifts to the left of mass publics are useful only to the degree that survey responses reflect stable dispositions. This is captured by our notion of response variability. Second, we examine how personal predispositions and characteristics of the political environment influence variability in left/right self-placement. At the individual level, we focus on political sophistication, which we capture by four important components: attention to the news, political interest, political involvement, and political efficacy. We find that more sophisticated voters exhibit lower levels of response variation. In addition, we expect to find considerable between-country variation in terms of response variability. We show that a lower degree of programmatic party system structuration leads to higher levels of response variation.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we briefly review the literature on the left/right dimension in Latin America and introduce the concept of response variability employed in this study. Subsequently, we present our theoretical expectations regarding the factors both at the individual level and contextual level that influence the degree of response variability on left/right attitudes in Latin America. After outlining the data, method and operationalizations, we present the empirical results. We conclude by drawing several general lessons from our analysis and elaborate the important implications of our analysis for the recent political developments in the Latin American region.

Theoretical Framework: Attitude Formation and the Left/Right Dimension in Latin America

Studies of political competition in Latin America tend to emphasize mechanisms other than ideology, such as clientelism and personalism, as explanations for voter-party linkages. Therefore, most scholars exhibit a healthy skepticism towards the idea that the left/right dimension constitutes a homogenizing functional cleavage in the region. Yet, the policy orientations of politicians and parties are commonly described in left/right terms. This is most evident in the recent debate about the so-called ‘left turn’ in Latin American politics. The resurgence of the left has been attributed at least in part to changing attitudes in the electorate. Drawing on data from the 2004 and 2006 waves of the AmericasBarometer, Seligson (2007: 84) contends that public opinion across the region has shifted noticeably to the left. Cleary (2006: 37) also argues that the persistence of poverty and inequality after neoliberal reforms have created favorable conditions for “a socioeconomic cleavage in which the median voter supports the radical redistribution of wealth”. Moreover, as the memory of authoritarian regimes has faded, voters have become less prone to the kind of self-censorship associated with the transition period, where votes for left-wing candidates were perceived as a threat to democratic stability (Cleary 2006: 41). In light of these changes, the expectation is that the “leftward change will endure” (Cleary 2006: 36).

Whether the shift to the left is likely to endure, however, arguably depends on voters’ attitudes underlying this shift. So far, left/right attitudes in the electorate have received scant attention and how stable ideological preferences are remains unclear. Much of the empirical literature on left/right attitudes focuses on the way in which elites make use of these concepts (e.g. Alcántara Sáez 2008; Kitschelt et al 2010). At the elite level, there is considerable evidence that programmatic and partisan differences in a number of Latin American countries

coincide with common notions of left/right (e.g. Martí i Puig & Santiuste Cué 2008). In an expert survey of party positions in 18 Latin American democracies, Wiesehomeier and Benoit (2009) also find support for the notion of an underlying left/right dimension of political competition.

Studies of left/right attitudes in the electorate are relatively rare. One notable exception is the work by Zechmeister (2006) on Mexico and Argentina. Drawing on Q-sort methods, she explores the meaning citizens attribute to left/right labels and shows how the interpretations of these labels vary across individuals and contexts. At the individual level, political sophistication influences the understanding of left/right. More sophisticated individuals understand ideological labels in ways closely related to dominant academic conceptions. At the contextual level, elite packaging shapes the degree to which partisan identities are conceived in left/right terms. Mexican elites make more use of left/right semantics than Argentine elites and voters in Mexico have a clearer understanding of ideological labels than Argentine voters. The time consuming nature of Q-sort methodology makes this technique unsuitable for the analysis of large groups and Zechmeister's study is limited to a relatively small sample of university students (109 students in Mexico City and 117 students in Buenos Aires). Yet, Zechmeister and Corral's (2010) analysis of data from the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) echoes the importance of individual and contextual characteristics for the substantive meaning citizens attribute to left/right semantics. Thus, extant studies of left/right attitudes in Latin American suggest that the degree to which ideological labels resonate with voters may vary across individuals and contexts. This expectation can be substantiated by the theoretical literature on response variability, which is what we turn to next.

The Concept of Response Variability¹

This section defines the concept of response variability used in this study and provides an overview of ongoing work on this topic. For nearly eight decades now, sample surveys have been the empirical backbone of public opinion research. Posing questions to a randomly selected subset of citizens is the essential tool that allows researchers a glimpse of the collective preferences of the mass public. But what exactly drives the survey response? For years, the answer to this question has been that survey responses are driven by a fixed, albeit unobservable, attitude plus random measurement error that is due to the imprecision of survey items (e.g., Achen, 1975). The key assumption here is that the attitude is a fixed point on a continuum. Thus, any and all response variation is a case of measurement error.

Recently, however, many public opinion scholars have moved away from the notion that attitudes are fixed points. At least three strands of theory lead one to conceptualize attitudes as inherently variable qualities. First, the evaluative space model of Cacioppo et al. (1997) calls attention to the possibility that individuals are ambivalent, i.e., simultaneously like and dislike an attitude object. In this theory, the complete attitude is not defined as a single point but as a pair of points that characterize the intensity of liking and disliking, respectively. This introduces an element of variability into the attitude.

Second, Feldman and Zaller have conceptualized attitudes as distributions of considerations (Feldman, 1995; Zaller and Feldman, 1992). To the extent that considerations vary in their evaluative implications, this automatically introduces variability into the attitude concept. In the extreme case, the attitude may be characterized by considerations with opposing evaluative implications, in which case the attitude is again characterized by ambivalence. Feldman and Zaller explicitly link their characterization of attitudes to the survey response by introducing the idea of sampling. When an individual answers a survey question, they argue, that a person will engage in “top-of-the-head” responding. This means

that he or she samples at best a few considerations. Since the individual may draw different samples at different times, the expressed opinion will not always come out identical. Thus, response variation is a direct consequence of the nature of attitudes.

Third, in a similar vein, Alvarez and Brehm (2002) argue that citizens possess multiple predispositions, which may either be conflicting (ambivalence) or reconciled (equivocation). In the case of ambivalence, response variability should be greater, whereas it should be smaller in the case of equivocation. In addition, Alvarez and Brehm see a key role for information. A lack of attitudinally relevant information induces uncertainty, which in turn increases response variation (see also Alvarez and Brehm, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2002).

The three theoretical approaches outlined here share as a common element that response variation does not merely reflect measurement error but, importantly, also reflects qualities of the underlying attitudes themselves. We adopt this perspective here as well. Indeed, it is precisely because of its attitudinal sources that response variability is of theoretical interest instead of a phenomenon that is merely of methodological interest.

In the present context, response variability is of interest for understanding left/right self-placement in Latin America. While political preferences in modern democracies are often expressed in left/right terms, the usefulness of these concepts in the developing democracies of Latin America remains highly debatable. Consequently, our analysis of whether the left/right continuum shapes public opinion in three Latin American countries, i.e. Ecuador, Mexico, and Chile, is crucial for understanding the extent to which left/right actually really structures attitudes and behavior of Latin American publics and how this may vary across countries. Expectations in this regard are what we turn to now.

Explaining Response Variability: The Role of Political Sophistication and System Structuration

To understand the sources of response variability, we conceptualize public opinion regarding left/right ideology as a cueing process. More specifically, we expect left/right ideology to be a sufficiently complex topic that citizens require clear attitudinal cues from the political environment and/or personal knowledge to determine their own ideological stance. Thus, the degree of response variability is influenced by factors at the individual and at the country level. The general expectation is that the clearer the cues are and/or the more sophisticated a person is, the better able he or she will be to form a coherent attitude and the less variable her expressed opinions will be. The availability of cues as well as the consistency between cues plays a central role in predicting response variation. We should elaborate on these points, as they form the crux of our theory of response variation. We believe opinions to be most variable when there is not enough information to form a coherent attitude. Thus, a lack of cues or sophistication will make survey responses less predictable.

In terms of personal predispositions, we expect the degree of political sophistication of respondents to be crucial. We understand political sophistication as the store of political information available to an individual to be called upon when making judgments or decisions. In most political systems there is considerable variation in this respect among the public (Converse, 1962, 1964; Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Luskin, 1987), and these differences affect the ways in which people take up and make use of information (see also Zaller 1992). When studying the moderating influence of political sophistication, scholars often distinguish between several types of political sophistication, such as political attentiveness, interest or knowledge (see for example Luskin, 1987). Due to the fact that not much research into the role of political sophistication exists in Latin America (but see Zechmeister 2006), we aim for a broad conceptualization of the concept. Specifically, we look at four sources of political

sophistication: attention to the news, political interest, political involvement, and political efficacy. We expect that more sophisticated voters, i.e. respondents who pay more attention to, are more interested and active in political life, or feel more politically self-confident, exhibit lower levels of response variation. All these expectations are derived from the idea that when a person is more politically sophisticated, she has a higher aptitude to form a more well-defined (crystallized) attitude about politics (McGraw and Pinney, 1990). Even if media or political elites provide political information, the availability of cues alone is not enough to reduce response variation, as cue integration also matters (Rosenberg, 1988). It is likely that politically informed and active citizens are in a better position to integrate various elite cues, which as a result reduces response variability.ⁱⁱ Thus, our first hypothesis relates to the effect of personal predispositions on the extent of response variability:

Political Sophistication Hypothesis (H1): *Higher degrees of political sophistication are negatively related to response variation in left/right self-placements.*

In order to form political attitudes citizens draw on cues from their political environment. The extent to which political elites communicate political choices in terms of left/right terminology and whether they use these terms consistently therefore plays a key role in the process of attitude formation. Among Latin American countries, there is considerable variation in the degree to which party systems are programmatically structured. Kitschelt et al (2010) distinguish between the substantive and symbolic components of left/right semantics among political elites. The symbolic component reflects whether political groups, such as political parties, share a common left/right identity, whereas the substantive component indicates whether left/right semantics are congruent with policy stances. Where neither

component is strong, left/right semantics do not help citizens to distinguish between political choices. The political environment does therefore not provide sufficient cues to citizens to formulate predictable left/right attitudes.

Drawing on legislators' self-placement on a 10-point ideological scale Kitschelt et al (2010: Ch. 3) analyze the strength of substantive and symbolic components of left/right semantics among parliamentary elites in twelve Latin American countries. The analysis reveals considerable cross-country variation in the degree to which Latin American elites make consistent use of left/right labels. We draw our cases from the extremes and middle of Kitschelt et al's (2010) country ordering of the substantive component and compare response variability in a country with high elite structuration (Chile), medium elite structuration (Mexico) and low elite structuration (Ecuador).ⁱⁱⁱ Our second hypothesis relates to the effect of the political environment on response variability:

System Structuration Hypothesis (H2): *Higher degrees of system structuration are negatively related to response variation in left/right self-placements. More specifically, we expect response variability to be lower in Chile than in Ecuador and Mexico.*

Data, Methods and Operationalizations

Data

The data used in this study are derived from the 2008 wave of the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP).^{iv} The LAPOP project consists of a collection of public opinion data from over 20 countries in the Americas. These opinion surveys include measures on political attitudes and behavior of Latin American publics based on national probability samples of voting age adults. In this study, we include the data from Ecuador, Mexico and Chile from the

2008 round of the surveys. The Ecuadorian survey includes 3000 respondents, the Mexican 1576, while the Chilean one consists of 1527 in total.

Model

We estimate Harvey's (1976) heteroskedastic regression model to test our expectations regarding variability on respondents' left/right attitudes in Ecuador, Mexico and Chile. This model informed the model of response variation discussed by Alvarez and Brehm (1995, 1997, 1998, 2002) and has recently used to explore the predictability of political attitudes in East and West Europe (see Steenbergen and De Vries, 2011). Let y_i denote individual i 's response on a question concerning their left/right self-placement. Further, let x_i be vector of covariates that drive the individual's average response tendency on the question. Furthermore, let ϵ_i denote deviations from the average response. Finally, let z_i denote a vector of covariates that drive the size of the deviations. Then, the heteroskedastic regression model may be formulated in the following way:

$$y_i = x_i' \beta + \epsilon_i$$

$$\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_i^2)$$

$$\sigma_i^2 = \exp(z_i' \gamma)$$

Here β and γ are vectors of regression coefficients. Note that γ includes a constant. If all other elements of this vector are simultaneously zero, then the variance model reduces to $\exp(\gamma_0)$ and we obtain the classical linear regression model with homoskedastic errors.

In our analysis, we include the following elements in x_i : income, ethnic identity, rural (versus urban) residence, religious denomination, church attendance, gender, union membership, age (linear and squared), education (linear and squared) and satisfaction with

democracy. The vector β includes attention to news-reporting, political interest, political involvement, political efficacy as well as dummy variable for Ecuador and Mexico since we expect an overall higher response variability for Ecuadorian and Mexican respondents in terms of their left/right self-placement.

Operationalizations

The dependent variable employed in this study is a respondent's self-placement on a scale that runs from 1 'left' to 10 'right'. Thus, higher values imply that a respondent views herself as more rightwing. It is worth pointing out that the survey question explicitly leaves the interpretation of the concepts up to the respondent. Our emphasis in this study is on the variability of survey responses, rather than on the meaning citizens attribute to left/right semantics. In order to derive a measure of response variability of these left/right placements, we first have to estimate a mean model with individual characteristics, which may influence the left/right orientation of respondents. So far, the determinants of left/right self-placement have received scant attention in the cross-national literature on Latin America. To identify relevant individual level characteristics, we therefore draw on two related bodies of literature. First, we make use of extant work on left/right self-placement in other parts of the world. Second, we draw on the Latin American literature about the demographic determinants of related political attitudes, such as support for privatization and for specific political parties.

We include a range of individual-level predictors in this model. The first explanation of left/right self-placements in Ecuador, Mexico and Chile is a respondent's income level. In advanced industrial democracies, higher incomes tend to be associated with right-wing attitudes (see Rush, 1967). Recent work on left-wing parties in Latin America has shown that such parties tend to favor social justice and economic policies that benefit the poor (e.g. Panizza 2005). We expect respondents with higher household incomes to be more reluctant

towards redistributive policies and thus to hold more rightwing attitudes. The income variable taps into the household income, divides the sample into income deciles and ranges from 0 'no income' to 10 'highest income category'.

The rise of ethnic political parties has highlighted the importance of ethnicity for electoral politics in Latin America. Ethnicity has been shown to influence a variety of political attitudes. Even though parties like the Movement towards Socialism (MAS) in Bolivia and Pachakutik in Ecuador draw support from different ethnic groups, citizens that self-identify as indigenous or mestizo are significantly more likely to support these parties than those that self-identify as white (Madrid 2008). This is relevant for our purposes, because these parties are generally considered instances of leftwing parties and their supporters tend to view themselves as leftists. Conversely, white respondents are more likely to view themselves as rightwing than citizens from other ethnic groups (Basáñez and Parás 2001). The survey item included in our analysis asks respondents with which ethnic group they identify most. Six ethnic identities were separated: (1) white, (2) mestizo, (3) indigenous, (4) black, (5) mulatto and (6) other ethnic identity.

Third, we take into account religious beliefs, because research on Chile in the early 1990s suggests that Protestants hold more rightwing political views than Catholics (Steigenga and Coleman 1995). We include dummies in our model for Catholics and Evangelicals. Non-believers and respondents belonging to other religious groups are coded 0. In addition to denomination, we also include church attendance, i.e. the frequency with which respondents go to religious services.

The fifth variable included in our mean model reflects membership in trade unions and union membership is expected to be associated with more leftist attitudes. We measure union membership through a dummy variable, where a positive score indicates that the respondent has attended union meetings.^v The sixth predictor in our mean model is support for

democracy. We expect respondents that agree with the statement ‘democracy is better than all other forms of government’ to hold more leftwing attitudes. This expectation is based on the idea developed mostly with the context of industrial democracies that authoritarian attitudes are mostly associated with the political right, whereas attitudes supportive of democratic rule or deepening of democratic values are favorable for the development of more leftwing attitudes (see for example Inglehart, 1977; Dalton, 1996). Support for democracy is measured through a dummy variable where (1) indicates agreement.

As additional demographic variables, we include urban/rural residence, gender, age and education, all of which have been shown to affect political attitudes in a large number of studies in Latin America and beyond. Urban/rural residence is measured by a dummy variable, where 1 stands for rural and 0 for urban. On the gender variable, women are coded as 1 and men as 0. With regard to age, we include both a linear and a curvilinear effect. One could argue that older population strata are likely to hold more conservative political attitudes, while at the same time it may be the case that the younger and the older generations are more left-leaning in terms of their political views as they are more dependent on the state for obtaining public goods like education or health care (which would point at a curvilinear effect). Education, the final predictor, is operationalized as the years a respondent spent in school and ranges between a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 18 years. We expect more leftwing political orientations among the more highly educated parts of the population. We also estimate a curvilinear effect of education on left/right self-placement, since we could also expect respondents with no or low levels of formal education to be more leftwing due to their precarious socioeconomic status. In order to account for this possibility we added education as a squared term as well.

The variance model includes measures of political sophistication at the individual as well as a two dummy variables indicating if respondents reside in Ecuador or Mexico. We

operationalize a respondent's degree of political sophistication using four different measures. The first taps into how often a respondent listens to news on the radio and varies between 1 'every day' and 4 'never'. As a second measure of political sophistication, we include a respondent's level of political interest, which ranges between 1 'no interest in politics' to 4 'a lot of interest'. Third, we include an item measuring the degree to which a respondent is involved in politics by means of asking if she ever attends political rallies (1 'once a week' – 4 'never'). Fourth, we include a measure of voters' political efficacy, which is based on responses to the following statement: 'I have a good understanding of the most important political issues facing my country'. Respondents characterized with a high level of political efficacy are those indicating that they fully agree with this statement.

Empirical Analysis

Mean Model

Our emphasis in this paper is on the variability of left/right opinions. Before exploring this topic, however, we should spend a brief moment discussing the results from the mean model. Here, several individual differences manifest themselves, as can be seen in Table 1. Overall, we find mixed evidence for our expectations. We fail to find any effects of income, gender, urban residency, church attendance, age or support for democracy on left/right self-placement of Chilean, Ecuadorian and Mexican respondents. The coefficients for each of these variables are in the expected directions, for example respondents earning higher household incomes hold more rightwing attitudes, but they fail to pass conventional significance levels. Which factors do impact left/right ideology? In the case of ethnic identity, we find more empirical support for our expectations. Throughout Latin America ethnicity has proven to be important understanding political attitudes. Our results support this view. We find that citizens that self-

identify as indigenous, mestizo or mulatto are significantly more likely to hold leftwing views than the reference category, which are respondents that self-identify as white. This is in line with the idea that these ethnic groups are supporters of more leftwing parties and will thus identify more with leftwing views.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Another individual factor that influences respondents' left/right self-placement is the degree of formal education. We find more leftwing political orientations among the more highly educated parts of the population, which is in line with our expectations. This being said, we find no evidence of education having a curvilinear effect. We formulated the expectation that respondents with no or low levels of formal education are more leftwing due to their precarious socioeconomic status. This expectation is not supported by the Chilean, Mexican, and Ecuadorian data. Religion matters for left/right self-placement as well. Both Catholics as well as Evangelicals are more rightwing compared to respondents holding no religious beliefs or who do not identify with any religion, but only the effect for Catholics reaches statistical significance. Finally, we find that respondents who attend union meetings to hold more leftwing political attitudes. This finding is in line with our theoretical expectations.

Table 1 provides the estimates based on a pooled analysis, which combines the Chilean, Ecuadorian and Mexican data. It is of course possible that some of the explanations for left/right self-placements vary across country contexts. In order to check for possible causal heterogeneity, we also ran both the mean and individual level variance model for each of the three countries separately. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 2 below.

When we compare the mean model results for these three countries, it becomes clear that our findings are robust across the different country contexts. We only find two real differences between the mean models, namely that Mexican respondents who are in the 61%-70% income decile or female hold more rightwing attitudes whereas we find an opposite pattern for Ecuadorians and Chileans. This being said, however, none of the effects for the 61%-70% income decile or gender reach statistical significance in neither of the three countries under investigation.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Variance Model

Most important for our purposes is the variance model. The results of the variance model pooled across the country contexts are reported in Table 1 while Table 2 provides these findings broken down by country. We find evidence for the political sophistication hypothesis, but not uniformly. The effect of attending political rallies is neither statistically significant nor sizable. The remaining predictors are statistically significant and reveal interesting patterns. First, consider the effect of media attention. Here, we observe a negative effect, meaning that response variation tends to be lower for respondents that pay attention to news on the radio. For one-unit increase in media attention we find that response variation decreases by a factor of almost -.041, but this effect is barely statistically significant ($p < .093$, two-tailed). More sizable is the effect of political interest. We find that respondents that have a higher degree of political interest have better crystallized attitudes when it comes to left/right ideology. The coefficient for political efficacy is also in the expected negative direction indicating that higher levels of political self-confidence lead to less response

variability. The direction of these effects is robust when we inspect the results for each country separately provided in Table 2. We do find differences in the statistical significance, but these are likely due to differences in sample sizes.

Moving next to system structuration effect, the results presented in Table 1 are in line with our System Structuration Hypothesis. Both the dummy variables for Ecuador and Mexico are positive and statistically significant indicating that in a political system characterized by low or medium structuration, response variation in left/right self-placements is higher compared to Chile characterized by a high level of party structuration. In addition, we find that the effect of the Ecuador dummy is more sizable than the one for Mexico albeit only slightly so. This indicates that Ecuadorian respondents residing in the context with least party system structuration display most response variation on left/right self-placements. This result is also supported when we inspect the constants of the variance models for each of the three countries separately which are displayed in Table 2. The constant of the variance model in Ecuador is highest followed by Mexico, and is the lowest for Chile. This is in line with our expectation that attitude variability in terms of left/right ideology is higher when the degree of party system structuration is low. It is important to note that these effects of party structuration are the most sizable of all predictors replicating the findings from the European context that show that characteristics of the political environment are important for understanding response variability (see Steenbergen and De Vries, 2011).

Concluding Remarks

Just like in Europe and North America, politics within the Latin American continent is often discussed in terms of left/right ideology. Notwithstanding the important contribution much of the extant work on public opinion and behavior within the Latin America, we

currently fail to understand how the labels left and right resonate among the public within the region. This study addresses this lacuna by examining public left/right attitudes and the degree of attitude variability in left/right self-placements among the Ecuadorian, Mexican and Chilean citizenry. Our analysis shows that individuals as well as country level characteristics influence response variability. At the individual level, political sophistication is negatively associated with response variability in left/right self-placement. More specifically, we find support for the notion that attention to the news, political interest and efficacy are associated with more predictable left/right attitudes. At the country level, our focus has been the programmatic structuration of party systems. Where elites consistently package political choices in left/right terms, voters will be able to draw on these cues to develop stable attitudes. This expectation is borne out by our comparison of Chile, Mexico and Ecuador. Response variability is greater among Ecuadorian and Mexican than among Chilean voters. This coincides with the lower degree of party system structuration in terms of left/right ideology in Ecuador and Mexico compared to Chile.

Mapping the variability in left/right preferences provides important insights into the structure of public opinion and contours of political behavior in Latin America and how it differs from other regions such as North America. This study expands the current state-of-the-art on attitude ambivalence from the United States and European context (see Alvarez and Brehm, 1995, 2002 or Steenbergen and De Vries, 2011) by exploring response variation in political attitudes in developing democracies in Latin America. In doing so, we cross-validate a large body of work originating from industrialized democratic countries which highlights the importance of response variability when studying citizens' political attitudes and the importance of elite cueing (see for example Cacioppo et al., 1997, Zaller and Feldman, 1992;

Alvarez and Brehm, 1995, 2002; Steenbergen and De Vries, 2011). These important concepts also have bearing on the study of public opinion in Latin American countries.

Finally, this study brings to bear important new individual-level insights into recent political developments in the Latin American region, especially the so-called ‘left turn’ in Latin American politics. The idea that Latin America is currently experiencing an unprecedented shift to the left is a prominent theme in the study of the region. Yet, the underlying causes of this shift remain poorly understood. Given that all leaders that have come to power during the ‘left turn’ have won democratic elections, a closer look at ideological attitudes in the electorate seems warranted. The results of our analysis point towards the need for a more nuanced analysis of the so-called leftward shift in the electorate. Our findings lend credence to the idea that Latin American publics – depending on individual level attributes as well as characteristics of the political context in which they reside – may demonstrate highly variable left/right preferences.

References

- Achen, C.H. (1975). Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response. *American Political Science Review* 69(4): 1218-1231.
- Alcántara Sáez, M. (2008) *Politicians and Politics in Latin America*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner.
- Alvarez, R.M., and J. Brehm. (1995). American Ambivalence towards Abortion Policy: Development of a Heteroskedastic Probit Model of Competing Values. *American Journal of Political Science* 39(4): 1055-1082.
- Alvarez, R.M., and J. Brehm. (1997). Are Americans Ambivalent towards Racial Policies? *American Journal of Political Science* 41(2): 345-374.
- Alvarez, R.M, and J. Brehm. (1998). Speaking in Two Voices: American Equivocation about the Internal Revenue Service. *American Journal of Political Science* 42(2): 418-452.
- Alvarez, R.M., and J. Brehm. (2002). *Hard Choices, Easy Answers: Values, Information, and American Public Opinion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Basáñez, M. & Parás, P. (2001) Color and Democracy in Latin America. In Camp, R.A. (Ed.) *Citizen Views of Democracy in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 139-153.
- Brewer, M.B. (2001). The Many Faces of Social Identity: Implications for Political Psychology. *Political Psychology* 22(1): 115-125.
- Cacioppo, J.T., W.L. Gardner, and G.G. Berntson. (1997). Beyond Bipolar Conceptualizations and Measures: The Case of Attitudes and Evaluative Space. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 1(1): 3-25.
- Cappella, J.N., and K.H. Jamieson. (1997). *Spiral of Cynicism: The Press and the Public Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cleary, M.R. (2006). Explaining the Left's Resurgence, *Journal of Democracy*, 17, 35-49.

- Converse, P. E. (1962.) Information Flow and the Stability of Partisan Attitudes. *Political Research Quarterly* 263, 578-599.
- Converse, P. E. (1964). The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics, in D. A. Apter (ed.) *Ideology and Discontent*. pp. 206-261. London: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Dalton, R. (1996) *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Chatham: Chatham House.
- Delli Carpini, M.X., and S. Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Feldman, S. (1995). Answering Survey Questions: The Measurement and Meaning of Public Opinion. In *Political Judgment: Structure and Process*, ed. M. Lodge and K. M. McGraw. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Harvey, A.C. (1976). Estimating Regression Models with Multiplicative Heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica* 44(3): 461-465.
- Inglehart, R. (1977) *The Silent Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kitschelt, H., Hawkins, K.A., Luna, J.P., Rosas, G. & Zechmeister, E.J. (2010). *Latin American Party Systems*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Luskin, R.L., (1987). Measuring Political Sophistication. *American Journal of Political Science* 314, 856-899.
- Madrid, R.L. (2008) The Rise of Ethnopolitism in Latin America. *World Politics*, 60, 475–508.
- Martí i Puig, S. & Santiuste Cué, S. (2008) *The Parliamentary Left*. In Alcántara Sáez, M. (Ed.) *Politicians and Politics in Latin America*. Boulder, Lynne Rienner, 195-217.
- McGraw, K.M., and N. Pinney. 1990. The Effects of General and Domain-Specific Expertise on Political Memory and Judgment. *Social Cognition* 8(1): 9-30.

- Panizza, F. (2005) Unarmed Utopia Revisited: The Resurgence of Left-of-Centre Politics in Latin America. *Political Studies*, 53: 716-734.
- Rosenberg, S.W. (1988). *Reason, Ideology, and Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rush, G. B. (1967) Status Consistency and Right-Wing Extremism. *American Sociological Review*, 32: 86-92.
- Seligson, M.A. (2007) The Rise of Populism and the Left in Latin America. *Journal of Democracy*, 18, 81-95.
- Steenbergen, M. & C. E. De Vries (2011) Variable Opinions: The Predictability of Support for Unification in Mass European Publics. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Political Marketing*.
- Steigenga, T.J. & Coleman, K.M. (1995) Protestant Political Orientations and the Structure of Political Opportunity: Chile, 1972-1991. *Polity*, 27, 465-482.
- Wiesehomeier, N. & Benoit, K. (2009) Presidents, Parties, and Policy Competition. *Journal of Politics*, 71, 1435-1447.
- Zaller, J., (1992). *The Nature and Origin of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaller, J. and S. Feldman. (1992). A Simple Theory of the Survey Response; Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences. *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 579-616.
- Zechmeister, E. (2006). What's Left and Who's Right? A Q-Method Study of Individual and Contextual Influences on the Meaning of Ideological Labels. *Political Behavior* 28(2): 151-173.
- Zechmeister, E.J. & Corral, M. (2010) The Varying Economic Meaning of "Left" and "Right" in Latin America. *AmericasBarometer Insights*, 38.

Tables & Figures

Table 1: Heteroskedastic Regression Model for Left/Right Self-Placements

	B	SE	Prob> z
<u>Mean Model:</u>			
Bottom Income Decile 1%-10 %	0.595	0.517	0.250
11%-20%	0.227	0.505	0.653
21%-30%	0.342	0.505	0.497
31%-40%	0.259	0.506	0.609
41%-50%	0.465	0.506	0.358
51%-60%	0.359	0.513	0.484
61%-70%	0.551	0.525	0.294
71%-80%	-0.656	0.536	0.221
81%-90%	-0.630	0.540	0.243
Top Income Decile 91%-100%	-0.784	0.551	0.155
Mestizo	-0.257	0.091	0.005
Indigenous	-0.536	0.173	0.002
Black	0.015	0.337	0.964
Mulatto	0.834	0.354	0.019
Other Ethnic Identity	-0.457	0.442	0.302
Catholic	0.313	0.113	0.005
Evangelical	0.223	0.166	0.181
Church Attendance	0.093	0.078	0.236
Union Membership	-0.231	0.141	0.101
Support for Democracy	-0.014	0.023	0.553
Rural	0.002	0.087	0.980
Gender	-0.049	0.076	0.517
Age	0.001	0.013	0.924
Age Squared	0.000	0.000	0.720
Education	-0.075	0.038	0.049
Education Squared	0.001	0.002	0.572
Constant (at baseline)	5.786	0.619	0.000
<u>Variance Model:</u>			
Attention to News	-0.041	0.024	0.093
Political Interest	-0.085	0.030	0.005
Attend Political Rallies	-0.040	0.051	0.433
Political Efficacy	-0.037	0.016	0.022
Ecuador	0.218	0.067	0.002
Mexico	0.198	0.074	0.008
Constant	1.897	0.237	0.000
<u>N</u>	3830		
<u>Loglikelihood</u>	-8640.258		

Notes: Table entries are maximum likelihood heteroskedastic regression estimates and their standard errors. Respondents with no income are the reference category for the income variable. White respondents are the reference category for ethnic identity.

Table 2: Heteroskedastic Regression Model for Left/Right Self-Placements for Ecuador, Mexico & Chile Separately

	Ecuador			Mexico			Chile		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Prob> z </i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Prob> z </i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Prob> z </i>
<u>Mean Model:</u>									
Bottom Income Decile									
1%-10 %	-2.116	0.719	0.003	-0.412	1.303	0.752	-0.774	0.708	0.275
11%-20%	-1.120	0.676	0.076	-0.648	1.294	0.617	-0.929	0.708	0.189
21%-30%	-1.412	0.659	0.032	-0.569	1.295	0.660	-0.897	0.714	0.209
31%-40%	-1.077	0.659	0.102	-0.389	1.298	0.765	-0.661	0.730	0.365
41%-50%	-0.175	0.662	0.076	-0.086	1.299	0.947	-0.360	0.727	0.621
51%-60%	-1.264	0.677	0.062	-0.642	1.302	0.662	-0.706	0.752	0.348
61%-70%	-0.803	0.719	0.264	0.187	1.305	0.886	-0.524	0.814	0.519
71%-80%	0.425	0.771	0.581	0.279	1.319	0.832	0.718	0.775	0.355
81%-90%	1.845	0.849	0.030	0.012	1.380	0.993	0.805	0.744	0.279
Top Income Decile 91%-100%	0.278	1.396	0.842	0.719	1.360	0.597	0.785	0.748	0.294
Mestizo	-0.263	0.226	0.244	-0.071	0.164	0.664	-0.298	0.142	0.036
Indigenous	-0.719	0.367	0.050	-0.449	0.329	0.173	-0.314	0.237	0.185
Black	0.037	0.436	0.933	1.246	0.979	0.203	0.423	0.378	0.263
Mulatto	1.290	0.506	0.011	0.417	0.488	0.392	0.039	0.453	0.931
Other Ethnic Identity	-3.190	0.323	0.000	0.340	0.126	0.007	-1.406	0.675	0.037
Catholic	0.071	0.202	0.726	-0.222	0.526	0.672	0.541	0.165	0.001
Evangelical	0.073	0.288	0.801	0.105	0.215	0.624	0.329	0.231	0.155
Church Attendance	0.047	0.119	0.691	0.105	0.148	0.480	0.267	0.158	0.091
Union Membership	-0.258	0.210	0.218	-0.340	0.165	0.370	-0.066	0.268	0.807
Support for Democracy	-0.087	0.035	0.014	-0.186	0.042	0.000	-0.110	0.042	0.009
Rural	0.219	0.120	0.068	0.305	0.167	0.067	0.327	0.196	0.094
Gender	-0.048	0.114	0.676	-0.130	0.145	0.370	-0.296	0.142	0.037
Age	0.020	0.021	0.360	0.011	0.024	0.642	0.015	0.022	0.485
Age Squared	0.000	0.000	0.461	0.000	0.000	0.801	0.000	0.000	0.375
Education	-0.090	0.068	0.188	-0.017	0.064	0.787	-0.152	0.070	0.031
Education Squared	0.001	0.003	0.636	0.001	0.003	0.702	0.006	0.004	0.069
Constant (at baseline)	6.218	0.930	0.000	4.326	1.430	0.002	6.803	0.941	0.000
<u>Variance Model:</u>									
Attention to News	-0.075	0.036	0.039	-0.036	0.045	0.424	-0.076	0.048	0.112
Political Interest	-0.105	0.044	0.016	-0.020	0.060	0.736	-0.122	0.063	0.049
Attend Political Rallies	-0.023	0.073	0.753	-0.019	0.091	0.836	-0.230	0.125	0.067
Political Efficacy	-0.006	0.025	0.823	-0.027	0.029	0.334	-0.066	0.032	0.042
Constant	2.325	0.540	0.000	1.919	0.311	0.000	1.505	0.393	0.000
<u>N</u>	1753			1067			1010		
<u>Loglikelihood</u>	-3978.109			-2401.244			-2175.089		

Notes: Table entries are maximum likelihood heteroskedastic regression estimates and their standard errors. Respondents with no income are the reference category for the income variable. White respondents are the reference category for ethnic identity.

ⁱ This section is based in part on Steenbergen and De Vries (2011).

ⁱⁱ On the link between sophistication and integration see, for example, Rosenberg (1988).

ⁱⁱⁱ In Kitschelt et al's (2010: 110) country ordering left/right semantics are closely tied to issue bundles in Uruguay and Chile. Costa Rica and Mexico are intermediate cases, while in the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Argentina and Ecuador ideological and partisan divides explain little of the variance found in left/right self-placement of parliamentary elites.

^{iv} We thank the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) and its major supporters (the United States Agency for International Development, the United Nations Development Program, the Inter-American Development Bank, and Vanderbilt University) for making the data available.

^v The Chilean survey includes a direct question about union membership. Unfortunately, this question was not asked in Ecuador and Mexico. We therefore use 'attendance at union meetings' as a proxy.