

The Legitimacy Puzzle in Latin America Political Support and Democracy in Eight Nations

Political scientists for more than two decades have worried about declining levels of citizens' support for their regimes (legitimacy) but have failed to empirically link this decline to the survival or breakdown of democracy. This apparent paradox is the "legitimacy puzzle," which this book addresses by examining political legitimacy's structure, sources, and effects. With exhaustive empirical analysis of high-quality survey data from eight Latin American nations, it confirms that legitimacy exists as multiple, distinct dimensions. It finds that one's position in society, education, knowledge, information, and experiences shape legitimacy norms. Contrary to expectations, however, citizens who are unhappy with their government's performance do not drop out of politics or resort mainly to destabilizing protest. Rather, the disaffected citizens of these Latin American democracies participate at high rates in conventional politics and in such alternative arenas as communal improvement and civil society. And despite regime performance problems, citizen support for democracy remains high. These findings resolve the puzzle – citizen actions and values, even among the disaffected, likely strengthen rather than weaken democratic governments.

John A. Booth is Regents Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas. In addition to his four coedited volumes and fourteen articles and chapters with this study's coauthor, Mitchell A. Seligson, he is the author of *Understanding Central America: Global Forces, Rebellion, and Change* (fourth edition 2006, coauthored with Christine J. Wade and Thomas W. Walker); *Costa Rica: Quest for Democracy* (1998); and *The End and the Beginning: The Nicaraguan Revolution* (second edition 1985). He has published articles in a wide array of scholarly journals in the United States and Latin America, was an associate editor of *International Studies Quarterly* (2003–2008), and serves on the editorial board of *Latin American Politics and Society*.

Mitchell A. Seligson is the Centennial Professor of Political Science at Vanderbilt University and a Fellow of the Vanderbilt Center for Nashville Studies. He founded and directs the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP), which conducts the AmericasBarometer surveys that currently cover 23 countries in the Americas. He has been a Fulbright Fellow and been awarded grants from the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and others and has published more than 140 articles, 14 books, and dozens of monographs. His most recent book is *Development and Underdevelopment: The Politics of Global Inequality* (fourth edition 2008, with John Passé Smith). He serves on the editorial board of the *European Political Science Review*.



For our grandchildren,
Andrew Cruz Lara
and
Maya Rahel, Dalia Ella, and Tamar Marta Levanon
May they grow up in a world of peace and democracy



The Legitimacy Puzzle in Latin America

Political Support and Democracy in Eight Nations

JOHN A. BOOTH

University of North Texas

MITCHELL A. SELIGSON

Vanderbilt University





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521734202

© John A. Booth and Mitchell A. Seligson 2009

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2009

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Booth, John A.

The legitimacy puzzle in Latin America : political support and democracy in eight nations / John A. Booth, Mitchell A. Seligson

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-521-51589-4 (hardback) – ISBN 978-0-521-73420-2 (pbk.)

Legitimacy of governments – Latin America.
 Legitimacy of governments – Latin America – Case studies.
 Democracy – Latin America – Case studies.
 Public opinion – Latin America – Case studies.
 Seligson, Mitchell A. II. Title.

JC497.B66 2009 320.9801'1-dc22 2008042305

ISBN 978-0-521-51589-4 hardback ISBN 978-0-521-73420-2 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate. Information regarding prices, travel timetables, and other factual information given in this work are correct at the time of first printing, but Cambridge University Press does not guarantee the accuracy of such information thereafter.



Contents

List of Figures	page ix
List of Tables	xi
Preface	xv
The Latin American Public Opinion Project	xvi
Background to the 2004 Survey	xvii
Acknowledgments	xix
1. The Legitimacy Puzzles	I
Prior Research on Legitimacy	6
Legitimacy's Structure	8
Legitimacy's Sources	14
Legitimacy's Effects	19
Legitimacy in Costa Rica	24
A Pilot Research Project: The 2002 Survey	28
Discussion and Plan of This Book	34
2. The Structure of Legitimacy	38
The Data: The 2004 Eight-Nation Survey	43
Variable Selection	47
Findings: The Structure of Legitimacy	49
Dimensional Structure	56
Relationships among Dimensions	58
Relative Levels of Support	59
National Patterns of Legitimacy	62



vi Contents

	Conclusions and Measurement Decisions: Our Key Variables	64
3.	Countries in the Study	66
,	The Eight Nations – Common Features	69
	Key Differences among the Eight Countries	73
	The Eight Nations – Variations on a Theme	78
	Mexico	78
	Guatemala	80
	El Salvador	84
	Honduras	87
	Nicaragua	89
	Costa Rica	92
	Panama	95
	Colombia	99
	The Central Research Question	102
4.	The Sources of Political Legitimacy	105
	Macrosocial Sources of Legitimacy	108
	Microsocial Sources of Legitimacy	113
	Demographic Variables	113
	Personal Experiences and Attitudes	116
	Results	118
	Political Community	119
	Support for Regime Principles	121
	Support for Regime Institutions	125
	Evaluation of Regime Performance	129
	Support for Political Actors	133
	Support for Local Government	135
	Discussion and Conclusions	138
5.	Legitimacy and Political Participation	144
	Theories about Legitimacy and Political Participation	146
	The Measures of Participation	151
	Analysis and Results: Legitimacy's Effects on	
	Participation	153
	Voting and Registration	158
	Partisan and Campaign Activism	158



	Contents	vii
	Contacting Public Officials	162
	Communal Activism	165
	Civil Society Activism	166
	Protest Participation	167
	Discussion and Conclusions	170
6.	Legitimacy and Negative Political Capital	177
	Measuring Negative Political Capital	178
	Analysis and Results	182
	Willingness to Accept the Violent Overthrow of an Elected Government	182
	Support for a Coup d'Etat	185
	Approval of Confrontational Political Tactics	189
	Vigilantism	190
	Discussion and Conclusions	195
7.	Legitimacy and Democratic Values	201
	Legitimacy and Opposition to Authoritarian Rule	203
	The Perceived Supply of Democracy and Legitimacy	207
	The Democracy Demand-Supply Gap	213
	Huntington's Question: Legitimacy, Participation, and Democracy	215
	Conclusions	218
8.	The Sky Is Not Falling: The Puzzle Solved	221
	Summary of Findings	225
	The Structure of Legitimacy	225
	Comparative Levels of Legitimacy	227
	Sources of Legitimacy	231
	Consequences of Legitimacy: Its Impact on Political Participation	_
	Consequences of Legitimacy: Its Impact on Negative Political Capital	234 236
	Consequences of Legitimacy: Its Impact on Support	-5-
	for Democracy	239
	Implications for the Eight Countries	240
	What Proportion of Citizens Is Triply Dissatisfied?	245
	How Do the Triply Dissatisfied Behave and What Are Their Attitudes?	249



257
260
265
291
299
301
305
309
331
333



List of Figures

1.1	Costa Rican system support trends	page 2/
1.2	Voting and system support in Costa Rica, 1999	28
1.3	Confirmatory factor analysis of legitimacy items,	
	Costa Rica, 2002	31
2.1	Sample countries	45
2.2	Structure of legitimacy, 8 nations	5 5
2.3	Comparison of levels of dimensions of legitimacy	60
4.I	Survey respondents' self-reported victimization	
	by crime	129
4.2	Survey respondents' self-reported victimization	
	by corruption	130
5.1	Support for regime principles and partisan	
	and campaign activism	159
5.2	Support for regime performance and partisan	
	and campaign activism	160
5.3	Support for political actors and partisan and	
	campaign activism	160
5.4	Support for local government and partisan and	
	campaign activism	161
5.5	Support for local government and contacting public	- (-
	officials	162
5.6	Support for regime institutions and contacting public officials	163
	public officials	103

ix



X	List of Figures	
5.7	Support for local government and	
	communal activism	166
5.8	Support for regime principles and protest	
	participation	169
5.9	Support for regime performance and protest participation	169
6.1	Approve of participation in a group using arms	169
0.1	to overthrow the government	182
6.2	Circumstances in which a coup d'etat might	102
o	be justified	186
6.3	Percent who could ever justify a coup d'etat	187
6.4	Support for confrontational political tactics	190
6.5	Approval of vigilantism	192
7.1	Preference for electoral democracy over	
,	unelected strongman	204
7.2	Impact of legitimacy on satisfaction with	
	democracy	208
7.3	Impact of legitimacy on level of democracy	
	in the country	209
7.4	Impact of legitimacy on direction in which	
	democracy is heading	210
7.5	Supply of democracy	211
7.6	Gap between the demand for and supply	
	of democracy	214
8.1	Variation in legitimacy scores across six	0
0 -	dimensions	228
8.2	Support for the political system	229
8.3	Political participation and attitudes by combined legitimacy norms	250
8.4	Civil society activism among triply	250
0.4	dissatisfied and triply satisfied	252
8.5	Partisan and campaign activism among triply	-,-
٠٠,	dissatisfied and triply satisfied	253
8.6	Protest activism among triply dissatisfied	33
	and triply satisfied	254



List of Tables

2.1	Unweighted sample size, by nation	page 45
2.2	Variables and expected dimensions of political	
	legitimacy	50
3.1	Population characteristics	74
3.2	Economic performance	74
3.3	Social development performance	75
3.4	Political performance	77
3.5	Mean legitimacy score (and rank)	81
4.I	System-level performance measures	110
4.2	Sources of a perception of the existence of a	
	political community	120
4.3	Sources of support for regime principles	122
4.4	Sources of support for regime institutions	126
4.5	Sources of support for regime performance	
	legitimacy	131
4.6	Sources of support for political actors	134
4.7	Sources of support for local government	136
4.8	Summary of sources of legitimacy	139
5.1	Summary of legitimacy effects on political	
	participation	155
6.1	Predictors of willingness to accept armed	
	overthrow	183
6.2	Predictors of approval of coups d'etat	188

xi



xii	List of Tables	
6.3	Predictors of approval of confrontational political	
	tactics	191
6.4	Predictors of vigilantism	192
6.5	Summary of effects on negative political capital	196
7 . I	Predictors of preference for elected leaders	205
7.2	Predictors of supply of democracy	212
7.3	Participation, legitimacy, and supply of democracy	216
8.1	Summary of legitimacy's effects	235
8.2	Triply dissatisfied and triply satisfied and regime principles, regime performance, and institutional	
	support	247
A.1	Variables and dimensions of political legitimacy, Costa Rica, 2002	265
A.2	Varimax rotated principle components solution for legitimacy variables, pooled eight-nation sample	268
A.3A	Oblimin rotated principle components solution for legitimacy variables, pooled eight-nation sample structure matrix, with factor correlation matrix	271
A.3B	Factor correlation matrix, eight-nation pooled sample oblimin rotation (for solution in	2 71
	Table A.3A)	274
A.4A	Oblimin rotated principle components solution for legitimacy variables, Guatemala (structure matrix),	
A . D	with factor correlation matrix	275
A.4D	Component correlation matrix, Guatemala oblimin rotation (for solution in Table A.4A)	278
A.5A	Oblimin rotated principle components solution for legitimacy variables, Colombia (structure matrix),	
	with factor correlation matrix	279
A.5B	Component correlation matrix, Colombia oblimin rotation (for solution in Table A.5A)	282
A.6	Mean legitimacy scores by dimension and country,	
	2004	283
A.7	Legitimacy effects on voting and	
	registration – ordinary least squares model	282
A.8	Legitimacy effects on partisan and campaign activism – OLS model	285



	List of Tables	xiii
A.9	Legitimacy effects on contacting public	
	officials – OLS model	286
A.10	Legitimacy effects on communal activism – OLS	
	model	287
А.11	Legitimacy effects on civil society activism - OLS model	289
A.12	Legitimacy effects on protest participation - OLS model	290
В.1	Political participation indexes	291
B.2	Exploratory factor analysis of participation	
	variables with multiple indicators, excluding	
	protest and civil society (pooled eight-nation	
	sample); rotated component matrix	292
B.3	Additional variables and indices used in the	
	analysis	293
C.1	System-level performance measures, eight Latin	
	American nations	300
D.1	Design effects for demographic and legitimacy indicators	304



Preface

In democracies, public opinion matters. Political scientists have for several decades pored over the results of public opinion surveys attempting to determine which attitudes and behaviors may be critical for the emergence and maintenance of stable democracy. In the 1970s, however, almost all of Latin America was caught in the grip of dictatorial rule, and carrying out public opinion surveys was dangerous for interviewers and respondents alike. At that time, one of the few places in the region where surveys of public opinion could be carried out openly and safely was Costa Rica, a country that had been democratic since the early 1950s and that had enjoyed a democratic tradition for most of the twentieth century.

It was in Costa Rica that the authors of this volume first began their collaboration, a relationship that has continued and prospered for more than thirty-five years. As graduate students studying at different universities, we had been drawn independently to Costa Rica to write our dissertations. Mitchell Seligson had served there in the Peace Corps and returned to conduct a survey of the political attitudes and behaviors of the peasantry funded by the Social Science Research Council. John Booth went to Costa Rica under the auspices of the Latin American Teaching Fellowship program to conduct a survey for Costa Rica's community development agency (Dirección Nacional de Desarrollo Comunal). During our shared time in Costa Rica, we developed the foundation of a lasting personal and intellectual friendship. We talked shop at length about the challenges of carrying out surveys in a developing country, one that at the time had a poorly developed road system and a telephone system largely limited to urban areas. We shared ideas about the science and art of measuring attitudes and behaviors, sampling, questionnaire wording



xvi Preface

and design, verification, survey team management, coding, and data management. The learning curve was steep, but this "baptism by fire" has served the two of us ever since, giving us the self-confidence to undertake survey research under challenging conditions. It also set us on a path of sharing our ideas and our datasets, resulting in fourteen coauthored articles and chapters and four coedited volumes. This work is our first book-length collaboration. It is an attempt to solve for us (and hopefully for our readership) what we call "the legitimacy puzzle."

THE LATIN AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION PROJECT

This book was a long time in the making and involved considerable collaborative enterprise along the way. Beginning in 1976, from a base in the Political Science Department at the University of Arizona, Mitchell Seligson, often in collaboration with Edward N. Muller of the Arizona department and always in collaboration with Miguel Gómez Barrantes of the Universidad de Costa Rica, began a systematic program of carrying out surveys of democratic values in Costa Rica. That program produced a series of surveys, but because dictators governed most of the other countries in Latin America at that time, the environment for extending the democracy survey program to other countries did not exist. By the early 1990s, however, democracy had spread in the Latin American region, and Mitchell Seligson had moved to the University of Pittsburgh. With grants from the Mellon Foundation, Tinker Foundation, North-South Center, Heinz Foundation, University of North Texas, and University of Pittsburgh, and in collaboration with several highly regarded research organizations in Central America and with John Booth, surveys were carried out in the capitals of all six Spanish-speaking Central American countries. Seligson's graduate students at the University of Pittsburgh collaborated on survey design and led the fieldwork. Several of the students involved produced articles and dissertations based on that dataset, and many of them have built successful professional careers based in part on their experiences with this early effort. From this collaborative initiative, the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) began to take shape.

A new phase in LAPOP's development began in 1993, when the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Guatemala commissioned a larger study of that country, allowing LAPOP for the first time to work in languages other than Spanish – in that case five major Mayan



Preface xvii

languages. The 1993 study was followed by surveys in 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2006, and 2008. In the late 1990s other countries began to tap into LAPOP's expertise. As a result, studies were carried out in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Ecuador. The studies in Bolivia and Ecuador also involved working in indigenous languages as well as Spanish. In addition, the project began rendering assistance to some African studies, especially Mozambique, and later Madagascar. Studies began to include corruption victimization and its impact, with projects in Nicaragua, Honduras, and Albania. Important additional funding came from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Bank, and USAID.

LAPOP's scope broadened further with surveys on war-induced migration (supported by the RAND Corporation) and research on crime victimization and its impact on the economy and the development of democracy. In 2004 the project again expanded with significant new funding from USAID for LAPOP to carry out studies in eight countries simultaneously: Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, and Colombia. A network of collaborating universities and research centers was established covering each of those countries. In 2004 Mitchell Seligson moved to Vanderbilt as the Centennial Professor of Political Science where his research for this book began and where the LAPOP project is now housed. At Vanderbilt, the project received major new support from the Center for the Americas and the Department of Political Science, as well as a substantial boost in funding from USAID, with additional support coming from the UNDP and the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB). The establishment of periodic surveys in a wider range of countries made it appropriate for the data series to take on a formal name, and from 2004 on, the series became the AmericasBarometer (in Spanish, El Barómetro de las Américas). This book is based on the 2004 AmericasBarometer survey of the LAPOP project.

BACKGROUND TO THE 2004 SURVEY

Public opinion surveys have become very popular in the democratizing world in general and in Latin America in particular in recent years. Unfortunately, far too few of those surveys follow the rigorous scientific procedures that have become accepted as the norm in academic public opinion research in the United States and Europe. Such studies often suffer from poorly designed questionnaires, unrepresentative and nonrandom samples, poor fieldwork supervision, careless data entry, and data analysis



xviii Preface

that rarely goes beyond univariate presentation of percentages. As a result, such studies can provide grossly misleading results.

The LAPOP project has attempted, we would argue with considerable success, to produce quality survey data that match the highest standards of academic research in the United States and Europe. Because they were envisioned from the outset to allow for reliable cross-national comparisons, the surveys upon which the present study relies were carried out with special rigor and attention to methodological detail, as described in this preface and in the chapters and appendixes that follow. Rather than wrongly assuming that surveys are all "scientific" and would easily provide the "correct" answers, LAPOP researchers recognized from the outset that all survey research, by its very nature, is prone to error (derived from many sources, including sampling, interviewer and respondent inattention, coding mistakes, and data entry failures). The goal was to reduce to the absolute minimum each of those sources of errors. We outline here the steps that we followed to develop the data used in this book.

Our study began with a pilot project carried out in collaboration with Miguel Gómez Barrantes of the University of Costa Rica. As we explain in Chapter 1, even though we had carried out many prior surveys in which one or more dimensions of legitimacy were included, we had not previously taken a comprehensive look at the problem. We therefore embarked on that single-country study in 2002 in hopes of "getting the bugs out" of our instrument and enabling us to see which of our initial hypotheses had empirical support. With that work behind us, we embarked on the multicountry effort that provided the dataset that is the foundation for much of the research presented here.

Teams of scholars from each of the eight countries in which surveys were to be carried out were selected. In order to develop a common sample and questionnaire, the researchers met in Panama City in January 2004, hosted by our Panamanian colleague Marco Gandásegui, Jr., of the University of Panama. To help ensure comparability, a common sample design was crucial for the success of the effort. Each team worked from guidelines for the construction of a multistage, stratified area probability sample with a target N of 1,500 respondents. In Panama, each team met with Dr. Polibio Córdova, president of CEDATOS/Gallup, Ecuador, a region-wide expert in sample design who trained under the University of Michigan's

¹ A detailed recounting of the problems encountered in those surveys can be found in Seligson (2005c).



Preface xix

Leslie Kish, the father of modern survey sampling. Refinements in the sample designs were made at that meeting and later reviewed by Dr. Córdova. Detailed descriptions of the sample are found in Chapter 2.

At the conclusion of that meeting, the teams fanned out to their respective countries and engaged in extensive pretests. Problems that were detected in the pretests produced refinements in the instrument (a total of twenty-three distinct drafts were tested before the common instrument was finalized). At that point, translations were made into the major indigenous languages of Guatemala and into English (for the residents of the Bay Islands in Honduras) and the fieldwork was carried out. A sample of questionnaires from each country was drawn and audited and in some cases datasets needed to be corrected or reverified. The country datasets then were merged into a single file, and we began our analysis. This book is a product of that effort.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The 2004 opinion surveys upon which this study is based were made possible by the generous support of USAID. Margaret Sarles, Bruce Kay, and Eric Kite in the Office of Democracy and Governance of USAID, supported by María Barrón in the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, secured the funding and made possible the entire project thanks to their unceasing support. Todd Amani, USAID/Guatemala, assumed the role of coordinating the project at the USAID end. The University of North Texas College of Arts and Sciences and the UNT Development Leave Program freed coauthor John Booth from teaching responsibilities to allow him to dedicate time to the completion of this study.

Critical to the project's success was the cooperation of the many individuals and institutions that worked tirelessly to meet deadlines that at times seemed impossible. These include, for Mexico, Jorge Buendía and Alejandro Moreno, Departamento de Ciencia Política, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM); for Guatemala, Dinorah Azpuru and Juan Pablo Pira, Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales (ASIES); for El Salvador and Honduras, Ricardo Córdova, Fundación Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo (FUNDAUNGO), José Miguel Cruz, Instituto Universitario de Opinión Pública (IUDOP) de la Universidad Centroamericana (UCA), and Siddhartha Baviskar, University of Pittsburgh; for Nicaragua, Luís Serra and Pedro López Ruíz, Universidad Centroamericana (UCA); for Costa Rica, Luís Rosero-Bixby, Universidad



xx Preface

de Costa Rica, and Jorge Vargas, Programa Estado de la Nación; for Panamá, Marco A. Gandásegui hijo, Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos (CELA), and Orlando J. Pérez, Central Michigan University; for Colombia, Carlos Lemoine, Centro Nacional de Consultoría (CNC), and Juan Carlos Rodríguez-Raga, Universidad de los Andes. Polibio Córdova of Ecuador supervised sample design throughout. A team of graduate assistants worked arduously in numerous aspects of the study: Miguel García (Colombia), Daniel Moreno (Bolivia), Sawa Omori (Japan), and Rosario Queirolo (Uruguay). Miguel Gómez Barrantes, of the Universidad de Costa Rica, provided excellent advice on the questionnaire design. We are profoundly grateful to all of these fine people for their excellent work on this study. Most importantly, we sincerely thank the 12,401 individuals in the eight study countries who took time from their busy lives to answer our questions. Without their cooperation, this study would not have been possible.

Finally, we wish to recognize the roles of our spouses. John Booth thanks his wife and frequent coauthor, Patricia Bayer Richard, for her invaluable support, patience, and excellent counsel throughout this project's gestation. Mitchell Seligson thanks his wife, Susan Berk-Seligson, for making the writing of this book, and all other things, worth doing.

Portions of Chapter I and Chapter 5 draw from articles we have published in the *Latin American Research Review* (Seligson 2002a), in *Opinião Pública* (Seligson, Booth, and Gómez Barrantes 2006), and in *Political Research Quarterly* (Booth and Seligson 2005).