

Appendix 1: Alternative Measures of Government Support

The models in Table 3 focus on one specification of feeling represented in the incumbent: having voted for him or her. But there are other ways we could conceptualize this concept. As a robustness check, Tables A1–A3 below revisit each of the three dependent variables in Table 3 but with an additional four ways of measuring support for the incumbent.

1. *Self-identifying with the ruling party.* In the AmericasBarometer survey, respondents are asked two questions about their partisanship. They are first asked whether they currently sympathize with a political party and then, if they answer yes, they are asked to identify the political party with which they sympathize from a list of the parties in the country. Just as with previous vote choice, I code respondents into three groups: those who identify with the president’s party, those who identify with a different party, and those who do not have a partisanship. The focus is on the difference between those who identify with the president’s party and those who identify with another party, while we have fewer a priori expectations about how self-described independents will behave.
2. Not all people who voted for the president or who identify with the incumbent party are equally likely to agree with the president’s approach to governing, while individuals who did not support or identify with the ruling party may also differ in the depths of their disagreement with its approach. Thus various studies (Kim 2009; Curini, Jou, and Memoli 2012; Singh, Karakoç, and Blais, 2012; Ezrow and Xezonakis 2011) argue that satisfaction with democratic arrangements should increase with ideological *proximity to the government*. In the case of Latin America, it becomes more difficult to talk about ideologies, as some countries have party systems that are not structured around issues even at the elite level (Kitschelt et al. 2010) and individual-level answers to survey questions about where respondents would place themselves on the left-right scale often do not reflect issue concerns so much as they do partisan self-identification with how the term is used by elites in their country (Zechmeister and Corral 2013; Zechmeister 2015). Yet even if “left-right” represents a self-identification instead of an issue-based ideology, we might expect that individuals who place themselves on the same location on the scale as where the

president is commonly described to be will be more likely to support the democratic status quo while not opposing steps that would restrict challenges to the president than are individuals whose self-described position is different from that of the president. We follow Powell (2009) and others and measure the incumbent’s position using expert surveys. In particular, we use Wiesehomeier and Benoit’s expert survey to estimate the left-right position of each president. The survey was conducted between 2006 and 2007 and asks experts on party competition in the eighteen countries studied here to place the major parties in each country as well as the sitting president on the left-right scale. From this survey I generated a measure of the president’s ideology, using the average placement of the president in the cases where the president at the time of the AmericasBarometer survey was the same president covered in the Wiesehomeier and Benoit expert survey and using the average position of the ruling party when the president was different from the one at the time of the expert survey.¹

I measure respondent self-placement using answers to the question:

“On this card there is a 1–10 scale that goes from left to right. The number 1 means left and 10 means right. Nowadays, when we speak of political leanings, we talk of those on the left and those on the right. In other words, some people sympathize more with the left and others with the right. According to the meaning that the terms ‘left’ and ‘right’ have for you, and thinking of your own political leanings, where would you place yourself on this scale?”

I then compare respondents’ self-placements with my estimated presidents’ positions by calculating a measure of left-right proximity, measured as for respondent i in country-year j .

$$\text{Proximity}_{ij} = 10 - |\text{LRRespondent}_{ij} - \text{LRPresident}_j|$$

High values designate individuals who have very similar left-right placements to the president’s.

¹ One challenge was that the Wiesehomeier and Benoit expert survey uses a 1–20 scale while the left-right self-placement question in the AmericasBarometer is asked along a 1–10 scale. I thus rescaled the left-right scores from the expert survey by the following transformation $\text{LRPres}_{\text{rescaled}} = (\text{LRPres}_{\text{original}} - 1) * 9 / 19 + 1$.

3. The last two measures of government support that I use are contemporaneous measures of *approval of the incumbent president*. Even if individuals did not vote for the president, identify with the ruling party, or see themselves in similar terms on the left-right scale, they might come to approve of the job the president is doing (and, of course, individuals who have supported the president and the ruling party in the past may stop doing so). Thus, government approval might also be associated with feelings of representation and a desire for the status quo to be preserved. One way to measure government approval is using the question

“Speaking in general of the current administration, how would you rate the job performance of President [NAME OF CURRENT PRESIDENT]? (4) Very good (3) Good (2) Neither good nor bad (fair) (1) Bad (0) Very bad,”

where high scores represent positive evaluations. Again, there is substantial variation across countries, with the highest average scores going to presidents in Brazil (2010), Colombia (2008 and 2010), Ecuador (2010), and Uruguay (2010), while the least popular presidents were in Ecuador (2006), Nicaragua (2006), and Paraguay (2008). The latter three presidents saw their party lose control of the executive in the next election.

4. An alternative measure tracks *government success* in achieving certain policy outcomes. Specifically respondents were asked:
 - “To what extent would you say the current administration fights poverty?”
 - “To what extent would you say the current administration promotes and protects democratic principles?”
 - “To what extent would you say the current administration combats government corruption?”
 - “To what extent would you say the current administration improves citizen safety?”

Answers to each question range from 1 (not at all) to 7 (a lot). Answers to the four questions are highly correlated (the weakest bivariate correlation is $r=0.645$ and the Chronbach’s alpha for the four questions= 0.897), and so I created an additive scale of approval of the government’s policy efforts. This variable is strongly correlated with the basic measure of government approval at the individual ($r=0.552$) and country-year level ($r=0.817$). Whether this is because these policy areas

are the driving factors that explain government support or because answers to these questions reflect the respondent's underlying feelings about the incumbent is impossible to tell, but the important factor is that both the general approval question and the battery of questions asking about government management of policies measure current evaluations of how the government is doing and, if these performance issues have spillover effects for democracy more broadly, should be correlated with support for the democratic status quo.

If we count the original measure of voting for a winner, there are fifteen correlations measured between the five measures of incumbent support and the three measures of support for civil liberties and electoral contestation. Fourteen of those correlations are negative and statistically significant, as the principal-agent theory advanced in the paper predicts.

Table A1: Allow Regime Critics to Exercise Civil Rights

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Voted for the Winner	-1.077*** (0.213)				
Abstained Last Election	-0.776*** (0.187)				
Government Partisan		-1.417*** (0.350)			
Independent		-1.336*** (0.254)			
Close to President on Left-Right Scale			-0.074 (0.067)		
Government Approval				-0.869*** (0.110)	
Government Policy Performance					-0.054** (0.020)
National Economy Is Getting Better	-0.370*** (0.107)	-0.455*** (0.104)	-0.443*** (0.102)	-0.119 (0.090)	-0.359*** (0.097)
Feels Secure in Neighborhood	-0.025 (0.071)	-0.015 (0.073)	0.035 (0.072)	0.061 (0.069)	0.025 (0.072)
No Corruption in Government	-0.396*** (0.090)	-0.365*** (0.090)	-0.385*** (0.100)	-0.299*** (0.088)	-0.329*** (0.091)
Interpersonal Trust	0.370*** (0.054)	0.380*** (0.056)	0.377*** (0.062)	0.424*** (0.053)	0.396*** (0.055)
Education	0.210***	0.205***	0.223***	0.208***	0.206***

	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Household Wealth	0.132**	0.158***	0.150***	0.134***	0.150***
	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.045)	(0.039)	(0.040)
Female	-0.956***	-0.870***	-0.949***	-0.887***	-0.884***
	(0.105)	(0.102)	(0.104)	(0.099)	(0.099)
Age 26–35	-0.306**	-0.212°	-0.216°	-0.195°	-0.195°
	(0.112)	(0.112)	(0.126)	(0.111)	(0.112)
Age 36–45	-0.287°	-0.228	-0.107	-0.163	-0.182
	(0.158)	(0.160)	(0.162)	(0.154)	(0.156)
Age 46–55	-0.246	-0.178	-0.081	-0.120	-0.110
	(0.180)	(0.183)	(0.192)	(0.177)	(0.183)
Age 56–65	-0.324	-0.347°	-0.248	-0.204	-0.266
	(0.201)	(0.203)	(0.233)	(0.202)	(0.210)
Age 66+	-0.689**	-0.730***	-0.489*	-0.524*	-0.588**
	(0.215)	(0.220)	(0.224)	(0.220)	(0.216)
Mestizo	0.154	0.205	0.129	0.209	0.187
	(0.162)	(0.170)	(0.178)	(0.160)	(0.163)
Indigenous	-0.003	0.043	-0.036	0.076	0.063
	(0.295)	(0.311)	(0.316)	(0.279)	(0.298)
Black	0.269	0.277	0.082	0.295	0.337
	(0.251)	(0.268)	(0.298)	(0.253)	(0.274)
Mulatto	0.282	0.274	0.235	0.313	0.311
	(0.267)	(0.258)	(0.261)	(0.256)	(0.252)
Moreno	-1.555	-1.448	-1.464	-1.504	-1.573
	(1.003)	(0.970)	(0.935)	(1.016)	(0.978)
Other Ethnic	0.545	0.433	0.069	0.474	0.340
	(0.545)	(0.526)	(0.505)	(0.517)	(0.545)
Rural	-0.287*	-0.387**	-0.316*	-0.331*	-0.335*
	(0.138)	(0.142)	(0.142)	(0.135)	(0.137)
Constant	21.669	22.077	21.273	22.418	21.583
	(0.786)	(0.754)	(0.887)	(0.780)	(0.789)
N Respondents	84551	86612	76665	91605	89110
N Country-Years	67	66	67	68	68
F	26.58***	29.18***	27.55***	35.83***	28.88***
R ²	0.061	0.062	0.063	0.064	0.060
<p>OLS Regression with Standard Errors Adjusted for Country-Years in Parentheses; ° p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001 (two-tailed).</p>					

Table A2: Disapprove of Attempts to Restrict Free Speech

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Voted for the Winner	-1.567*** (0.191)				
Abstained Last Election	-1.003*** (0.210)				
Government Partisan		-1.051*** (0.258)			
Independent		-0.924*** (0.203)			
Close to President on Left-Right Scale			-0.311*** (0.041)		
Government Approval				-1.143*** (0.087)	
Government Policy Performance					-0.353*** (0.013)
National Economy Is Getting Better	-0.509*** (0.115)	-0.573*** (0.116)	-0.474*** (0.116)	-0.161 (0.114)	0.095 (0.112)
Feels Secure in Neighborhood	0.122 (0.085)	0.048 (0.085)	0.108 (0.087)	0.184* (0.081)	0.274*** (0.082)
No Corruption in Government	-0.819*** (0.093)	-0.836*** (0.093)	-0.771*** (0.095)	-0.709*** (0.090)	-0.505*** (0.090)
Interpersonal Trust	0.032 (0.088)	0.093 (0.088)	0.083 (0.090)	0.114 (0.084)	0.169* (0.085)
Education	0.254*** (0.022)	0.270*** (0.021)	0.292*** (0.022)	0.264*** (0.020)	0.249*** (0.020)
Household Wealth	0.202*** (0.060)	0.193*** (0.060)	0.263*** (0.061)	0.219*** (0.057)	0.213*** (0.057)
Female	-0.974*** (0.154)	-1.002 (0.154)	-1.231*** (0.157)	-0.988*** (0.147)	-0.971*** (0.147)
Age 26–35	0.144 (0.218)	0.313 (0.216)	0.319 (0.219)	0.279 (0.206)	0.222 (0.205)
Age 36–45	0.225 (0.234)	0.312 (0.228)	0.514* (0.231)	0.335 (0.218)	0.215 (0.218)
Age 46–55	0.322 (0.265)	0.447° (0.258)	0.436° (0.264)	0.351 (0.247)	0.419° (0.247)
Age 56–65	0.499 (0.320)	0.419 (0.312)	0.585° (0.322)	0.602* (0.299)	0.444 (0.298)
Age 66+	0.290 (0.364)	0.295 (0.355)	0.663° (0.365)	0.607° (0.341)	0.472 (0.344)
Mestizo	1.136***	1.103***	1.165***	1.084***	1.086***

Indigenous	(0.187) 0.095	(0.189) 0.057	(0.190) 0.213	(0.179) 0.171	(0.179) 0.087
Black	(0.378) 1.130**	(0.378) 1.286**	(0.392) 1.138**	(0.364) 1.225**	(0.362) 1.105**
Mulatto	(0.422) -0.184	(0.440) -0.125	(0.434) -0.207	(0.406) -0.161	(0.405) -0.154
Other Ethnic	(0.495) -0.229	(0.475) 0.216	(0.504) 0.000	(0.469) 0.209	(0.472) 0.346
Rural	(0.645) -1.152***	(0.609) -1.165***	(0.668) -0.908***	(0.605) -1.077***	(0.604) -1.025***
Constant	(0.190) 31.438	(0.189) 31.034	(0.196) 31.921	(0.182) 32.183	(0.182) 34.306
N Respondents	(0.493)	(0.484)	(0.541)	(0.464)	(0.468)
N Country-Years	15390	15220	14503	16587	16089
F	13	13	13	13	13
R ²	44.58***	42.48***	45.88***	51.89***	71.39***
	0.09	0.080	0.090	0.089	0.121
OLS Regression with Standard Errors in Parentheses; ° p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001 (two-tailed).					

Table A3: Support for Opposition Party Rights, 2008–2010

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Voted for the Winner	-0.416*** (0.035)				
Abstained Last Election	-0.208*** (0.036)				
Government Partisan		-0.454*** (0.069)			
Independent		-0.186*** (0.053)			
Close to President on Left-Right Scale			-0.044** (0.014)		
Government Approval				-0.358*** (0.024)	
Government Policy Performance					-0.082*** (0.005)
National Economy Is Getting Better	-0.189*** (0.024)	-0.197*** (0.024)	-0.223*** (0.026)	-0.088*** (0.016)	-0.050** (0.019)
Feels Secure in Neighborhood	0.015 (0.013)	0.014 (0.012)	0.015 (0.013)	0.035** (0.012)	0.043** (0.011)

No Corruption in Government	-0.130*** (0.023)	-0.133*** (0.022)	-0.139*** (0.024)	-0.114*** (0.021)	-0.076*** (0.020)
Interpersonal Trust	0.033* (0.013)	0.034** (0.012)	0.029* (0.014)	0.051*** (0.013)	0.064*** (0.012)
Education	0.051*** (0.005)	0.053*** (0.005)	0.057*** (0.005)	0.052*** (0.005)	0.049*** (0.005)
Household Wealth	0.048*** (0.008)	0.045*** (0.008)	0.057*** (0.009)	0.042*** (0.008)	0.040*** (0.008)
Female	-0.029° (0.015)	-0.029* (0.015)	-0.052*** (0.016)	-0.024 (0.015)	-0.027° (0.016)
Age 26–35	0.074** (0.026)	0.070** (0.023)	0.075*** (0.026)	0.080*** (0.022)	0.071** (0.022)
Age 36–45	0.201*** (0.028)	0.201*** (0.025)	0.196*** (0.029)	0.203*** (0.024)	0.197*** (0.025)
Age 46–55	0.287*** (0.039)	0.276*** (0.035)	0.283*** (0.040)	0.281*** (0.035)	0.288*** (0.035)
Age 56–65	0.341*** (0.041)	0.337*** (0.039)	0.341*** (0.049)	0.344*** (0.039)	0.340*** (0.040)
Age 66+	0.368*** (0.051)	0.361*** (0.045)	0.394*** (0.053)	0.379*** (0.045)	0.377*** (0.046)
Mestizo	0.021 (0.034)	0.017 (0.035)	0.039 (0.035)	0.034 (0.031)	0.019 (0.032)
Indigenous	-0.035 (0.063)	-0.047 (0.063)	-0.034 (0.071)	-0.026 (0.060)	-0.020 (0.056)
Black	-0.051 (0.053)	-0.037 (0.051)	-0.033 (0.057)	-0.027 (0.051)	-0.047 (0.047)
Mulatto	0.011 (0.087)	-0.003 (0.084)	0.017 (0.083)	0.020 (0.081)	-0.015 (0.078)
Moreno	0.047 (0.051)	0.039 (0.017)	0.020 (0.037)	0.033 (0.035)	0.007 (0.016)
Other Ethnic	-0.007 (0.101)	-0.053 (0.098)	-0.073 (0.080)	-0.003 (0.088)	0.012 (0.095)
Rural	0.015 (0.030)	0.013 (0.030)	0.018 (0.033)	0.021 (0.029)	0.048° (0.029)
Cut 1	-2.035 (0.148)	-2.035 (0.145)	-2.084 (0.177)	-2.534 (0.166)	-3.004 (0.177)
Cut 2	-1.302 (0.135)	-1.294 (0.131)	-1.340 (0.165)	-1.789 (0.150)	-2.245 (0.161)
Cut 3	-0.459 (0.124)	-0.446 (0.120)	-0.484 (0.153)	-0.931 (0.136)	-1.357 (0.147)
Cut 4	0.317 (0.120)	0.333 (0.117)	0.300 (0.145)	-0.140 (0.129)	-0.538 (0.135)
Cut 5	0.939	0.958	0.926	0.496	0.116

Cut 6	(0.119) 1.505 (0.120)	(0.116) 1.532 (0.117)	(0.140) 1.491 (0.139)	(0.124) 1.079 (0.121)	(0.126) 0.711 (0.121)
N Respondents	66759	71523	60712	72559	70710
N Country-Years	53	54	53	54	54
F	1640.4***	2168.69***	1534.81***	2593.10***	3230.41***
R ²	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.024	0.033
Ordered Logit with Standard Errors Adjusted for Country-Years in Parentheses; ^o p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001 (two-tailed).					

Appendix 2: Measuring Government Performance in the Aggregate

As discussed in note 17, some scholars may worry about the measures of government performance being endogenous to government support. While the controls for government support in Table 3 and in Tables A1-A3 attempt to control for this, we can also use aggregate data that gets around this issue. Specifically, within each country the survey data are measured with regional representativeness, and so we can generate for each respondent the average view of the economy, crime, and corruption in his or her region, with the assumption being that those local sources serve as a heuristic for national-level outcomes (see Zechmeister and Zizumbo-Colunga 2013 for a discussion). The models below are hierarchical models (treating the dependent variables as linear for ease of estimation) that acknowledge that countries are cross-nested with years and then embed individuals within survey regions within those country-years.

The results regarding the effect of performance in Table A4 are slightly less consistent than are the individual-level results in Table 3. Part of this may reflect controlling for endogeneity, but the divergence also potentially reflects the smaller number of degrees of freedom in the data that make it harder to avoid correlations with other omitted country-level variables that are likely to correlate with the cross-section of perceptions from a cross-section of countries. The models in Table 3 used country-fixed effects to control for those omitted differences, focusing on variation within countries. Yet these results also suggest that the main driver of attitudes might be political affiliation and identification, not performance.

Table A4: Protection of Civil Liberties with Regional Performance Measures

	Tolerance Civil Rights	Protect Free Speech	President Should Not Limit the Opposition
	[1]	[2]	[3]
Voted for the Winner	-1.195*** (0.079)	-1.633*** (0.185)	-0.455*** (0.017)
Abstained Last Time	-0.839*** (0.089)	-1.169*** (0.204)	-0.221*** (0.020)
Average Perception of the National Economy	-0.618** (0.227)	3.036 (1.696)	-0.484*** (0.054)
	1.455***	-2.914*	0.045

Average Perception of Feeling Secure	(0.257)	(1.244)	(0.057)
Average Perception of No Corruption	0.544* (0.273)	-0.731 (1.794)	-0.906*** (0.063)
Interpersonal Trust	0.374*** (0.036)	0.091 (0.082)	0.023** (0.008)
Education	0.215*** (0.009)	0.253*** (0.021)	0.050*** (0.002)
Household Wealth	0.132*** (0.026)	0.136* (0.059)	0.047*** (0.006)
Female	-0.934*** (0.064)	-0.945*** (0.148)	-0.023 (0.014)
Age 26–35	-0.229* (0.093)	0.206 (0.212)	0.086*** (0.021)
Age 36–45	-0.181 (0.099)	0.416 (0.227)	0.215*** (0.022)
Age 46–55	-0.118 (0.110)	0.517 (0.256)	0.286*** (0.024)
Age 56–65	-0.159 (0.128)	0.608 (0.309)	0.340*** (0.028)
Age 66+	-0.464** (0.147)	0.297 (0.348)	0.345*** (0.033)
Mestizo	0.211* (0.083)	1.055*** (0.183)	0.041* (0.019)
Indigenous	0.253 (0.161)	0.559 (0.371)	0.003 (0.036)
Black	0.314 (0.177)	0.785 (0.418)	-0.046 (0.039)
Mulatto	0.422* (0.202)	-0.204 (0.485)	-0.009 (0.045)
Moreno	-0.774* (0.305)		0.039 (0.065)
Other Ethnic	0.460 (0.280)	-0.605 (0.631)	-0.020 (0.062)
Rural	-0.169 (0.089)	-0.402* (0.204)	-0.020 (0.020)
Constant	18.890*** (0.835)	33.492*** (2.572)	4.186*** (0.156)
Variance Component			
Country	4.101 (1.505)	2.864 (1.572)	0.088 (0.034)
Year	0.739 (0.550)		0.014 (0.012)

Region	1.866 (0.311)	2.950 (0.805)	0.048 (0.009)
Individual-Level	90.121 (0.426)	88.708 (0.984)	3.529 (0.019)
N Respondents	89,590	16,331	70,749
N Regions	115	68	112
N Country-Years	67	13	53
N Countries	18	13	13
Wald χ^2	1799.97***	460.66***	2452.04***
<p>Hierarchical logit model standard errors in parentheses; * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001 (two tailed).</p>			

Appendix 3: Regional Measure of Economic Performance Interacted with Time in Office

In Table 4 I show that the negative effect of the economy on support for civil liberties and opposition rights becomes stronger the longer the president is in office. In the table below I show that the same is true if we replace the individual-level perception of economic performance with the regional aggregate of that measure similar to Appendix 2 above. In these models, a crisis early in the term is significantly associated with support for delegative democracy, but again this sign flips as the president is in office longer.

Table A5: The Effect of the Economy over Time on Attitudes about Protection of Civil Liberties

	Tolerance Civil Rights [1]	Protect Free Speech [2]	President Should Not Limit the Opposition [3]
Voted for the Winner	-1.197*** (0.079)	-1.626*** (0.185)	-0.457*** (0.017)
Regional Average Perception of the National Economy	1.953*** (0.334)	7.573** (2.398)	-0.107 (0.086)
Time in Office	1.067*** (0.093)	2.069* (0.824)	0.157*** (0.022)
Time*National Economy	-1.063*** (0.105)	-2.367* (0.961)	-0.126*** (0.024)
Regional Average of Feeling Secure in Neighborhood	1.380*** (0.257)	-3.129* (1.228)	0.066 (0.057)
Regional Average of No Corruption in Government	0.322 (0.287)	-0.132 (1.730)	-0.974*** (0.065)
Interpersonal Trust	0.373*** (0.036)	0.091 (0.082)	0.023** (0.008)
Education	0.214*** (0.009)	0.253*** (0.021)	0.050*** (0.002)
Household Wealth	0.132*** (0.026)	0.134* (0.059)	0.047*** (0.006)
Female	-0.929*** (0.064)	-0.946*** (0.148)	-0.023 (0.014)
Abstained Last Election	-0.861***	-1.169***	-0.226***

Age 26–35	(0.088) -0.225*	(0.204) 0.204	(0.020) 0.085***
Age 36–45	(0.093) -0.177	(0.211) 0.419	(0.021) 0.212***
Age 46–55	(0.099) -0.114	(0.227) 0.518*	(0.022) 0.286***
Age 56–65	(0.110) -0.152	(0.256) 0.606*	(0.024) 0.337***
Age 66+	(0.127) -0.452**	(0.309) 0.294	(0.028) 0.343***
Mestizo	(0.147) 0.216**	(0.348) 1.050***	(0.033) 0.038*
Indigenous	(0.083) 0.286	(0.183) 0.559	(0.019) 0.009
Black	(0.161) 0.338	(0.371) 0.792	(0.036) -0.040
Mulatto	(0.177) 0.393	(0.418) -0.189	(0.039) 0.014
Moreno	(0.204) -0.888**	(0.485)	(0.045) 0.034
Other Ethnic	(0.305) 0.558	-0.593	(0.065) -0.005
Rural	(0.280) -0.163	(0.631) -0.402	(0.062) -0.018
Constant	(0.089) 16.708	(0.204) 29.523*	(0.020) 3.781
	(0.885)	(2.854)	(0.166)
Variance Component			
Country	3.662 (1.372)	1.914 (1.148)	0.091 (0.035)
Year	0.984 (0.722)		0.009 (0.008)
Region	2.051 (0.339)	2.985 (0.788)	0.048 (0.009)
Level 1	89.974 (0.425)	88.695 (0.984)	3.525 (0.019)
Number of Observations	89,590	16,331	70,749
Number of Country Years	67	13	53
χ^2	1942.27***	467.50***	2542.72***
Hierarchical Linear Model, Standard Errors in Parentheses; * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001.			

Works Cited

- Curini, Luigi, Willy Jou and Vincenzo Memoli. 2012. Satisfaction with Democracy and the Winner/Loser Debate: The Role of Policy Preferences and Past Experience. *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (2): 241-261.
- Ezrow, Lawrence, Georgios Xezonakis. 2011. Citizen Satisfaction With Democracy and Parties' Policy Offerings. *Comparative Political Studies* 44 (9): 1152–1178.
- Herbert Kitschelt, Kirk A. Hawkins, Juan Pablo Luna, Guillermo Rosas, Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2010. *Latin American Party Systems*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Myunghee. 2009. Cross-National Analyses of Satisfaction with Democracy and Ideological Congruence. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion, and Parties* 19 (1): 49-72.
- Powell, G Bingham. 2009. The Ideological Congruence Controversy: The Impact of Alternative Measures, Data, and Time Periods on the Effects of Election Rules. *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (12), 1475-1497.
- Singh, Shane, Ekrem Karakoç, Andre Blais. 2012. Differentiating winners: How elections affect satisfaction with democracy. *Electoral Studies* 31 (1): 201-11.
- Wiesehomeier, Nina and Kenneth Benoit. 2009. Presidents, Parties and Policy Competition. *Journal of Politics* 71(4): 1435-1447.
- Zechmeister, Elizabeth J. and Margarita Corral. 2013. Individual and Contextual Constraints on Ideological Labels in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies* 46 (6): 675-701.
- Zechmeister, Elizabeth J. 2015. Left-Right Identifications and the Latin American Voter. In *The Latin American Voter: Pursuing Representation and Accountability in Challenging Contexts*, Ryan Carlin, Matthew Singer, and Elizabeth Zechmeister, eds. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press. 195-225.