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Voting in Old and New Democracies examines voting behavior and its determinants in 26 elections on five continents. This product of the Comparative National Elections Project (CNEP) presents analyses of the impact on voting of various factors, including both those that have been examined in other studies as well as those that were introduced or reintroduced by the CNEP. The results show that long-neglected factors have a significant political impact in many countries that previous studies have overlooked, such as the role of socio-political values and different forms of political intermediation—media exposure, personal discussion, and organizational intermediaries. Voting is also influenced by socioeconomic and technological modernization, by country-specific features, and by individual-level attitudes, evidence of which is clear in this cross-national comparative analysis. In contrast, “economic voting” is found to be insignificant in most elections once long-term partisan attitudes are taken into consideration.

The book examines a variety of political behaviors beyond the vote direction itself. It challenges conventional views on electoral turnout by reporting the effects of social voting and showing that the strongest predictor is participation by other family members, especially the spouse, another element of political intermediation. It also examines the nature and determinants of support for democracy and other attitudes relevant to citizen participation in democratic politics. In addition to its international scope, the volume offers a detailed longitudinal case study of Spain over 25 years, which illustrates how the idea and practice of democracy evolves and takes root among citizens over the long run.

Written in a clear and accessible style, Voting in Old and New Democracies significantly advances our understanding of citizen attitudes and behavior in election settings.
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The study of the political attitudes and behavior of citizens in an election setting has been a central focus for analysts of democratic politics. Great advances have been made in understanding the determinants of voter choices, especially in well-established democracies. With the wave of new democracies has also come an appreciation of the role elections and participation therein can play in public attitudes towards the political system. Yet, for all of this attention, there are substantial gaps in our understanding of voter attitudes and behavior. The building of knowledge from particular cases to systematic generalizations has been stymied by a concentration on single elections in a few, mostly Western, countries; by narrowly applied rival approaches; and by insufficient attention to the particular contexts in which voters are embedded in both single elections and election eras.

Drawing on 26 election surveys in 18 polities of the Comparative National Election Project, *Voting in Old and New Democracies* is designed to take the next step towards a broader understanding of voter attitudes and behavior in several important ways. First, it expands the comparative range of elections studied, by including countries that have democratized in recent decades and, in some cases, by focusing on more than a single election within a particular country. Second, it goes beyond the conventional demographic and attitudinal determinants privileged in contrasting paradigmatic approaches by looking at the social contexts in which individuals are embedded and the information to which they are exposed through these contexts. The role of these intermediaries in turn is included in explanations of voting choices that compare the various explanatory approaches. Third, it incorporates into multivariate analyses of voting a battery of previously neglected socio-political values that have served as the basis of partisan conflict in many democracies over more than a century. Some of these value cleavages lie at the core of political ideologies that date back to the late 18th century and yet
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have not been included in most empirical studies of electoral behavior. Finally, it looks beyond elections themselves to consider how their participants view electoral institutions and democracy itself.

Our approach to integrating social contexts into the study of voting behavior stems from the early contributions of Paul Lazarsfeld and his colleagues at Columbia University (Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet 1944; Berelson, Lazarsfeld and McPhee 1954), whom we consider to be the intellectual forefathers of the Comparative National Elections Project (CNEP) (Beck 2007; Hamilton 2007). Other efforts at comparative research on political behavior have not been oblivious to context in a broader sense. For example, when one thinks of members of political elites and mass publics as comprising different sides of particular social cleavages (Lipset and Rokkan 1967; Brooks, Nieuwbeerta and Manza 2006), voters are certainly being treated as embedded in a broader social and even organizational (e.g., churches, unions) context. Similarly, when political attitudes, participation and voting choices, measured at the individual level through surveys, are conceived as being potentially shaped by macro effects brought about by variations in the basic features of electoral or party systems (Klingemann 2009; Dalton and Anderson 2011), context is most certainly being brought to bear in explanations of political behavior.

However, CNEP’s distinctive contribution as a comparative research project is grounded in its ability to use survey research, which takes individuals as the fundamental unit of analysis, to focus on several under-studied features of what we might call the micro, meso and macro contexts of political attitudes and behavior in election campaigns. We have described those features, and what makes them consequential, by means of a unifying concept: political intermediation—the varying channels and processes through which voters receive information about partisan politics. Those channels and processes include the flow of campaign messages and the exertion of influence through face-to-face contacts with personal networks, what we might call the micro context; through membership and involvement in secondary associations, the meso context; and through party activity and the mass communications media, whose variations across different political settings form different macro contexts of intermediation. By calling our attention to the information and stimuli to which individuals are exposed as a result of their location in these contexts, CNEP’s approach, while generating data on individuals, has allowed us at the same time to show how social contextual variables contribute directly to the explanation (or serve as moderators or mediators in well-established empirical relationships) of political behavior. As Dalton and Klingemann note (2007a, 19), such a focus in other recent research has turned the study of the social context of voting and intermediation into one of the most productive areas for future research in the field.

This volume aims at providing further contributions to this research agenda. Where do voters get political information in election campaigns in contemporary democracies? What kind of political information is it, and what are its sources?
How are voters’ attitudes and behavior affected by their exposure to the stimuli and norms conveyed by that information? Several of the chapters in this volume develop, refine and test hypotheses that, in prior studies (using either the CNEP surveys or other sources of data), had only been tested in (or suggested by) single-country case studies or, at best, in a smaller set of countries and elections than the ones we have available now. Moreover, the volume addresses these research questions by comparing countries across five continents and at various stages of democratic development.

The addition of new election surveys has expanded the original CNEP research agenda by taking advantage of new issues raised about voting and elections, especially in the new democracies. CNEP I (as we refer to the first stage of this project, from 1990 through 1992) was founded as a four-country study aimed at bringing the “Columbia” approach back into explanations of voting behavior. In studies focusing on established post–World War II democracies in highly advanced post-industrial economies (the US, Japan, Germany and Great Britain), several basic aspects of the polities under examination could be taken for granted as a stable background for any analysis of the patterns and consequences of intermediation. Those aspects include high levels of mass support for democratic rule; free and fair elections; highly developed communications-media systems; well-educated electorates; and, perhaps with the partial exception of Japan, dynamics of political competition and voting behavior structured both by traditional left–right and by “new politics” or materialism/post-materialism conflicts.

However, throughout the 1990s, new countries joined the CNEP that had experienced less democratic trajectories in the post-war period, including Spain, Chile, Uruguay, Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Hungary, Indonesia and even Hong Kong. The last survey included in this second wave of expansion of the project, CNEP II, was a second Chilean survey, conducted in 2000. The third phase of this study—CNEP III—includes election surveys in a new set of countries with checkered post-war democratic experiences—South Africa, Portugal, Mexico, Argentina, Taiwan, Mozambique and the People's Republic of China—as well as new surveys conducted in countries that were already covered in the previous stages (the US, Greece, Spain, Uruguay, Indonesia, Hungary and Italy). Table 1.1 shows the diversity of the countries in which the CNEP surveys used in this book have been conducted from the point of view of both their social and political development. From the largest country on Earth (in terms of population) to a small nation like Uruguay, from several countries that rank among the richest and most developed in the world to one of the poorest (Mozambique) and from old and established democratic regimes like the US and Britain to new democracies with important problems in terms of guarantees of civil and political rights (or even nations where elections at most levels of government fall totally short of rendering them democracies), the diversity is indeed staggering, setting CNEP apart from most other comparative studies of electoral behavior, which most commonly restrict their samples of countries to one world region, usually on Western Europe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Population (millions)</th>
<th>GDP per capita (2005 PPP $)</th>
<th>HDI Freedom House</th>
<th>Age of democracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>39,331</td>
<td>11,001</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,699</td>
<td>9,503</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>13,958</td>
<td>6,897</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15,454</td>
<td>9,338</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,324,655</td>
<td>6,013</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>57,580</td>
<td>22,774</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>10,709</td>
<td>18,329</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11,061</td>
<td>24,993</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>25,936</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10,266</td>
<td>12,263</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10,071</td>
<td>17,134</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>205,946</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>221,293</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>56,860</td>
<td>26,442</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>58,941</td>
<td>30,173</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>112,116</td>
<td>12,105</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20,438</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10,549</td>
<td>19,949</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>46,664</td>
<td>6,503</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>38,189</td>
<td>20,442</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>42,691</td>
<td>27,848</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>22,749</td>
<td>25,610</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>256,514</td>
<td>31,548</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>292,805</td>
<td>41,540</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>8,091</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Population (millions): World Bank Development Indicators (The World Bank 2012); GDP (gross domestic product) per capita: Penn World Table (Heston, Summers and Aten 2011), Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) converted GDP per capita at 2005 constant prices; HDI: United Nations Human Development Index (United Nations Development Program 2014) for each country in the closest year available; Freedom House: average score of political and civil liberties for each country (1 most free, 7 least free); Age of democracy: number of years of continuous Polity IV Democ score of 6 or above at time of election (Marshall, Jaggers and Gurr 2011).
As CNEP has added new countries, its focus has evolved to capture prominent features of the electoral setting in the new cases while preserving the emphases of previous studies. To respond to changing conditions—such as the emergence of the Internet—these emphases also have evolved in some of the original countries. The resulting incorporation of new questionnaire items was, of course, restricted to new surveys going forward. This is reflected in subsequent chapters by the varying numbers of countries with relevant variables available for analysis. In particular, two of the earliest CNEP surveys, of Germany in 1990 and Japan in 1993, did not contain enough of the variables analyzed in this volume to be retained as country cases. Rather than restrict our analysis to those variables included in all surveys, at the price of failing to address these new themes, this volume capitalizes on the richness of the CNEP as the project has evolved.¹

This also means that, with the successive waves of expansion of CNEP, many of the previous working assumptions about basic commonalities between societies and polities became problematic. Of course, the project is still about the core business of studying elections. But how do voters in all these different countries, some with long-standing democratic traditions but others with new or broken democratic practices, experience those elections? Considering the variation in the extent to which those elections seem to take place, especially in terms of conditions of actual freedom and fairness, do citizens see them as a consequential way of expressing political preferences? Is the perception that democracy is “the only game in town,” or is there even a shared understanding of what democracy means, something that can be taken for granted when analyzing how voters make sense of the electoral process and the political information they receive? If not, what may be behind variations in the understanding of democracy, support for democracy, views about the electoral process and overall levels of political efficacy and engagement, and how are they related to the overall process of political intermediation?

Furthermore, we know that there is something akin to a historical “Western template” of ideological struggles, revolving around conservatism versus liberalism, state versus market and, more recently, materialism versus post-materialism value conflicts (Gunther and Kuan 2007). However, it is an open question whether the historical trajectories in many of the new countries included in CNEP—non-Western, new or struggling democracies, late developers—have fostered these same sorts of political cleavages. For example, arguments about the importance

¹ Appendix 1. A provides details on each of the 26 surveys included in this book. To prevent countries whose survey sample sizes were very large (e.g., China and the United Kingdom) from exerting a disproportionate influence on these findings, “equalizing” weights were applied to all countries in the pooled analyses that follow, in addition to whatever weights were used in the country studies themselves. These weights equalized each country study’s contribution to the merged 26-country-study file (at 1,200 cases each), for a total number of weighted cases for the 26 country surveys of 31,200.
of values favoring communitarianism, paternalistic views of state power, conflict avoidance, isolationism and cultural assimilation have been advanced about several countries and cultures (Shi and Lu 2010). As we expand our scope of analysis beyond well-established Western or Westernized democracies, do any of these values constitute the basis of political conflicts such as had appeared at some point in more developed and established democracies? Or, to put it differently, what kinds of ideas, proposals and issues do parties in these very different countries communicate about in electoral campaigns, and under what kind of prior schemes of political competition are these messages framed?

In a broader sense, these older and newer CNEP themes—informational intermediation, citizens’ views about the democratic process and the expression of value cleavages in society and politics—evoke some of the major debates in the study of political culture and political behavior of the last decades. Societal modernization is expected to impact these processes in relatively predictable ways. Socioeconomic development is thought to increase individuals’ exposure to political information and their cognitive abilities to process it, expand political communication infrastructures and increase the organizational capabilities of parties to reach out to voters (Lerner 1958; Deutsch 1961; Plasser and Plasser 2002). Societies undergoing modernization are thought to experience important cultural changes, which increase citizens’ demands for rights, freedom and self-expression and render them more politically competent and engaged, even if such engagement is not necessarily directed towards conventional electoral politics (Inglehart and Welzel 2005). Finally, the advanced stages of societal modernization and/or political democratization bring the promise of the dissolution or resolution of “old” class- and religion-based political divisions, a decline in the influence of social cleavages in political choices and the rise of short-term factors as explanations of the vote (Franklin et al. 1992; Dalton 2002).

The CNEP research program provides unparalleled opportunities to paint a somewhat more complex picture, incorporating historical contingency, different paths of political development and the role of political agency. To be sure, it would be unreasonable to ignore the ways in which processes of societal change and economic development affect the context in which political interactions take place, and we have enough evidence to suggest that, at least in the long term, there are consequences of such processes that are similar and characterized by a general “developmental universalism” (Inglehart and Welzel 2005, 289). However, we know politics also matters, and the long term is not the only time frame we should care about in political analysis. In almost all aspects of mass politics one would care to focus on, questions about bottom-up forces and constraints need to coexist with questions about the top-down role of political elites in designing institutions, defining agendas, filtering demands and articulating alternatives. Are voters’ levels of political engagement and views about the democratic process mostly determined by increasing levels of education, societal wealth, welfare and cognitive capacities? Contrastingly, how much are they shaped by the country-specific
actions of political parties and leaders, particularly around the crucial moments when electoral winners and losers are determined? Are differences between countries in terms of the prevalent ideological and value conflicts mainly dictated by their level of socioeconomic development and experience with democracy? Or do these cleavages reflect particular political legacies, electoral experiences and actual choices by partisan actors? Are electoral choices in democracies increasingly reflecting the prevalence of a “reasoning voter,” unencumbered by social and cultural allegiances and moved by short-term, election-specific political cues and economic evaluations? Or is this picture complicated by historical trajectories and the ability of political actors to (re)activate socio-political cleavages, even in contexts that would lead us to expect such cleavages to have long disappeared? These are some of the central issues addressed by the chapters in this volume. In the next sections, we will focus in greater detail on what CNEP has accomplished so far and on the ways in which this volume expands existing knowledge.

Sources and Contents of Political Information

The first question that CNEP research has tried to answer since the project’s inception can be simply stated: where do voters get political information in election campaigns, and how supportive or dissonant is that information in relation to voters’ own predispositions? To be sure, on the basis of extant studies, the answer is clearly not the same for all countries or elections. However, a few consistent patterns have been detected in earlier CNEP studies, in terms of both the level of exposure to different intermediaries and the perceived partisan content of the information they convey.

First, although television has clearly been one of the major sources of political news for voters during campaigns across many different types of political systems, it is also seen uniformly as a low-bias source, that is, one in which voters tend not to perceive major partisan biases (Richardson and Beck 2007). Even where there may appear to be an exception in Americans’ increased propensity to acknowledge and detect such biases in the TV news content to which they are exposed, almost two-thirds of Americans did not perceive television as a biased news source. This also does not mean that such biases are indeed objectively absent in the TV news content itself: it may simply mean that, given the well-known “hostile media effect” (Vallone, Ross and Lepper 1985) and the prevalence of partisan-motivated reasoning, citizens with particular partisan predispositions may fail to detect partisan biases in TV news if those happen to be consistent with their own and if they choose only supportive programs. However, it is also the case that there are many countries outside the US where the role of regulatory agencies and the presence of highly scrutinized public-owned television channels foster strong standards of impartiality, or, at least, balance, in television news contents (Gunther and Mughan 2000).

Another consistent pattern that previous CNEP studies have identified has to do with the clear contrast between television and other sources of political
information. The contrast with newspapers, for example, takes place mostly in terms of overall levels of exposure, which seem, in the case of the press, to be much more variable across countries and, as a rule, much lower. Secondary organizations are relevant sources of political stimuli in few countries, mostly in Japan and the US among our early CNEP sample of countries, but are of much less relevance in countries where associational membership is low or where the electoral system and/or the low resources of parties give them few incentives and capabilities to extend relevant mobilization efforts (Bellucci, Maraffi and Segatti 2007; Magalhães 2007).

A final contrast that previous CNEP studies have detected is between, on the one hand, the media and, on the other hand, the people with whom voters regularly interact, that is, personal contacts, as sources of political information. This contrast can be most clearly seen in terms of the perception of partisan bias: in our regular interactions and discussions with others, political communication occurs under conditions where perceptions of the partisanship of interlocutors tend to be rather clear and prevalent (Richardson and Beck 2007). Furthermore, whenever we are able to measure the actual political predispositions of those in a respondent’s social network, the perceptions formed by the respondent about that network’s political inclinations seem to be remarkably accurate, quite unlike what happens with the media.  

In Chapter 2 of the current volume, Beck and Gunther revisit these issues using more recent studies and a much broader array of countries. They look at the extent to which voters tend to obtain political information through the media; through discussions with family, friends, neighbors or co-workers; from the organizations and associations to which they belong; from direct contacts with political parties; and, for a limited set of more recent cases, via the Internet. In some countries, those where more than one wave of CNEP surveys has been conducted, it is possible to determine whether patterns of exposure to these different sources of political information have changed over time. But more generally, using data on the new countries, it is possible to determine whether previous generalizations about exposure to and consumption of political information hold, especially in less advanced and more recent democracies.

Thus, from a more descriptive point of view, what sets this chapter apart from most research on exposure to political information is, as the authors note, its dual comparative focus. First, instead of focusing on a single country or a small set of advanced post-industrial democracies, the chapter uses data from a wide range of countries with very different levels of economic development, historical experiences with democracy, media markets and communication structures. Second,
instead of focusing on a single communication channel, it encompasses, in the CNEP tradition, a variety of information sources. Chapter 2 ends up with a classification of countries by their citizens' reliance on these different intermediaries.

What also sets this chapter apart from previous CNEP work along these lines is the possibility, given the larger sample of countries and elections included, of testing generic hypothesis about macro- and micro-level determinants of the patterns of exposure to political information. On the one hand, Beck and Gunther are interested in testing a generic “modernization hypothesis,” the notion that cross-national patterns are explained by differences in affluence, education and technological change. On the other hand, they examine how a variety of political motivations (political engagement and partisanship) affect, at the individual level, citizens’ choices of information sources and their actual level of consumption of such information. They also examine deviations by individual countries from these general patterns and interpret them with reference to country-specific factors.

The Consequences of Political Intermediation

How are voters’ political attitudes and behavior affected by the quantity and quality of political information to which they are exposed? Previous studies using CNEP data have so far approached this in different ways and with emphasis on the impact of different sources of information. One line of research has focused on the consequences of exposure to media news content for voters’ levels of political engagement, knowledge, social trust, attitudes towards political institutions and regimes, and participation. Two main results have stood out in this regard. First, effects seem to be more than minimal. To be sure, the phenomena of selective exposure and perception are prevalent, but such media effects remain present even with models specified in such a way as to get the most conservative estimates possible on the basis of the available data. Second, the medium, its informational content and the cross-national variations in media markets definitely matter: exposure to political information through high-quality newspapers and public television channels is not the same as exposure to tabloids or commercial television, or simply generic media consumption. Whereas the former typically produces positive effects (if by positive we mean higher levels of trust, satisfaction with democracy or political engagement), the latter tends to produce negative ones (Schmitt-Beck and Voltmer 2007; Schmitt-Beck 2008; Schmitt-Beck and Wolsing 2010). The same conclusion has emerged from analysis of the impact of media consumption on actual turnout: exposure to media messages can mobilize or demobilize, depending on sources and contents (Schmitt-Beck and Mackenrodt 2010). In short, “mediamalaise” hypotheses are refuted, or at least seriously qualified, by showing how the effects of media consumption and their direction are contingent.

The consequences of intermediation processes on political attitudes and behavior have also been studied for sources other than the media. It seems, for example,
that active membership in associations, of either a political or non-political nature, is weakly related to attitudes of regime support, levels of discontent or dissatisfaction with governments, or levels of political disaffection (Gunther, Montero and Torcal 2006, 2007). Effects on actual political participation do exist, especially when we distinguish between types of associations and isolate those situations where voters seem to be the recipients of political messages transmitted by the associations to which they belong (Bellucci, Maraffi and Segatti 2007). Those effects, although significant, are nevertheless modest.

The same is not the case, however, when we shift our attention to political discussions within personal networks. First, frequent discussion among friends, family, co-workers and neighbors is consistently related to political efficacy (Gunther, Montero and Torcal 2007). Second, the content of those conversations, and the political stimuli conveyed by them, seems to be of great importance for vote choices themselves. Starting with research using the American component of the CNEP data (Beck 2002; Beck et al. 2002; Elder and Greene 2003), and then generalizing to other contexts (Schmitt-Beck 2003; Magalhães 2007), several studies have found rather large effects of the dominant partisan bias within voters’ discussion networks on their own electoral choices, above and beyond what one might expect on the basis of a large number of factors that might account for homophily within social groups.

The consequences of other aspects of information flows within personal networks remain much less clear. For example, studies in the US have found that high frequency of political discussion may work, in and of itself, as a way for citizens to acquire informational resources and thus overcome personal constraints (McClurg 2003). At the same time, other studies have pointed out that discussion of politics is not always virtuous in this regard: whenever it tends to highlight political disagreement, although it may increase acceptance of other views, political discussion also depresses participation, efficacy and overall civic engagement.3 Expansion of this line of research to other settings suggests an even greater variability of effects. The amount of disagreement in discussion networks and in the messages transmitted by those discussants seems, again, to be able to either mobilize or demobilize voters depending on the actual relationship between discussants and voters, the specific content of the norms and cues the former transmit, and the type of context in which the elections themselves take place, not to mention the way these concepts are measured on the basis of survey data (Faas and Schmitt-Beck 2010; Schmitt-Beck and Mackenrodt 2010). In sum, regarding the attitudinal and behavioral consequences of intermediation, many solid findings about the relative importance of the various intermediation channels in a wide variety of countries coexist with the suggestive but often contradictory findings originating from country- or election-specific studies.

---

3 Mutz 2002a, 2002b and 2006; McClurg 2006; Torcal and Maldonado 2014; but see also Nir 2005.
Several chapters in this volume focus on these issues. Although the importance of informational intermediaries in voting choices seems clear, their role in fostering or depressing political participation and the mechanisms through which such effects might take place have remained, as we saw before, inconclusive. Magalhães, with Segatti and Shi, focuses on electoral turnout in Chapter 3. What stimuli from what sources of political information—discussants, secondary associations, parties or the media—are more consequential for turnout? Does the intensity of political discussion, in and of itself, increase voters’ propensity to show up at the polls? Is turnout a social act, conditioned by what one’s spouse or other intimates do (Stoker and Jennings 1995; Rolfe 2012)? Or do effects depend on the particular stimuli—mobilizing or demobilizing—that they receive from discussants? And if the latter, what is the mechanism? An informational one, through which voters—particularly those with low levels of political sophistication—rely on cues from the people they regularly interact with in order to determine the benefits of voting? Or a normative one, through which voters tend to adjust to the behavior of those who can monitor their adherence to particular norms for or against political participation? The picture that emerges is one that confirms the contingent effects of social networks on turnout and their importance in conveying and enforcing social norms of participation (Schmitt-Beck and Mackenrodt 2010), but where the comparative data also allow the formulation of hypotheses about the role of macro-contextual variables—such as compulsory voting rules and the competitiveness of elections—in moderating such effects.

Chapter 7 in this volume also provides a deeper perspective on the issues of intermediation and their consequences for political behavior. It is somewhat different from all remaining chapters, as it focuses exclusively on one country—Spain. However, it uses a very rich array of data, including five national surveys spanning the period from 1979 through 2004, a panel survey and a large number of in-depth interviews. In the extensive ground covered by the analysis of this Spanish micro study by Gunther, Montero and Puhle, the consequences of intermediation are a central concern. They cover trends in media exposure and media bias, associational membership, party mobilization and face-to-face flows of information across several decades. They describe Spaniards’ dependence on television for political news and low consumption of printed media, and how these are connected with political disengagement. They show how the very rapid social modernization in Spain reduced the impact of social class on voting and contributed to the weakening of links between individuals, on the one hand, and their residential communities and secondary associations, on the other, thus reducing their role as sources of political information. Finally, they show how the deeply polarizing issues of the past (the Second Republic and the Civil War) and more recent social changes have led to a profound reluctance to discuss politics with those who are likely to hold conflicting opinions, something that socioeconomic development and a successful democratization trajectory do not seem to have been able to erase.
Attitudes, Values and Political Competition

As explained early on, the expansion of CNEP as a cross-national project meant that what had started out early on as a project focusing mostly on intermediation moved to include a broader set of research questions. This had several consequences. First, the core CNEP questionnaire was expanded. New batteries of questions focused on voters’ perception of the integrity of the electoral process itself and on citizens’ understandings of what democracy means, including not only procedural but also substantive aspects. Other added items go beyond the “Western template” explored by Gunther and Kuan (2007) by incorporating measures from the Afrobarometer and East Asian Barometer surveys dealing with the tension between individual interests and the well-being of communities, government paternalism and neopatrimonialism, the need to avoid political conflict, nationalism and social integration. The inclusion of these questions in subsequent CNEP surveys has made possible comparisons between new and more established democracies with regard to understandings of democracy, evaluations of the electoral process and values.

With the help of these new variables and the incorporation of new surveys into CNEP III, the remaining chapters in this volume attempt to answer a third question: what fundamental values and attitudes underlie political competition in the increasingly diverse set of countries for which data has become available? Previous CNEP studies had already shown that, in relatively new democracies, support for democracy, satisfaction with democratic performance and disaffection with politics evolved in such a way as to form three autonomous attitudinal domains with identifiable behavioral correlates (Torcal 2002; Gunther, Montero and Torcal 2006 and 2007). Support for democracy is stable over time once the new regime has been consolidated, and Gunther, Montero and Torcal (2007) argue that “the strategies and behavior of prominent political elites and organizations during particularly salient stages in the democratization process” (53) played important roles in the adult political socialization of their respective sets of followers. They contrast new democracies where the former authoritarian elite had played a constructive role in the democratic transition (such as Spain and Hungary), or where outgoing military rulers were completely marginalized from the political transition process (e.g., Uruguay and Greece), with Chile and Bulgaria, where the former dictators had actively opposed democratic political change. They demonstrate that in the former set of countries, support for democracy is widespread, and partisan competition is not polarized by the presence of anti-system parties, whereas in the latter, former supporters of the authoritarian regime tend to hold undemocratic or anti-democratic attitudes and support anti-system or “semi-loyal” parties. Political discontent, in contrast, fluctuates widely and is not only independent from regime support but also linked with a very different behavior—voting against incumbent parties. Finally, political disaffection is remarkably durable, is conceptually and empirically distinct from both democratic support and political dissatisfaction and is linked with low levels of political involvement and political information.
Chapter 6, by Mattes with Mujani, Liddle, Shi and Chu, extends this line of inquiry to aspects of citizens’ attitudes that include evaluations of the freeness and fairness of elections and even their very understanding of what democracy is supposed to mean: procedures, such as freedom of speech and free and fair elections, or substantive outcomes, such as full employment or a smaller income gap between richer and poorer. Mattes and his co-authors explore individual- and macro-level determinants of both evaluations of elections and understandings of democracy, including various measures of cognitive competence and resources and, at the macro level, age of democracy and communication infrastructures. However, their main goal is to examine the role of political parties and elites themselves in shaping the way people think about democracy in general and their own democracy in particular. Are parties—through their messages, their behavior around elections and the bonds of identification they build with voters—able to shape their followers’ views about democracy and elections? Or are such views instead determined by people’s cognitive resources or their country’s economic and political development? And how do views about elections and the meanings assigned to democracy affect, in turn, people’s support for and satisfaction with democratic rule?

Chapter 4, by Moreno, moves beyond views about democracy to take on another central aspect of mass attitudes: the value structures that underlie partisan competition. We knew from Gunther and Kuan (2007) that in countries such as the US and several new democracies in Southern Europe and South America, voters’ use of the basic left–right scheme seems to relate reasonably well with traditional value conflicts, such as those opposing individual freedoms versus traditionalist conservatism, or preferences for social equality and state intervention in the economy (social democracy) versus free-market capitalism. However, in other countries there were important departures from what one might call this “Western template” of the value conflicts that undergirded Western democracies in the classic Lipset and Rokkan (1967) formulation. Survey items measuring socio-political values and originally conceived as capturing voters’ positions along scales of traditional conservatism, socialism/social democracy or postmaterialism seemed not to cluster as predicted in some CNEP countries, nor to have any relevance for the vote. Where political histories and trajectories did not involve the articulation by parties of these political ideologies or the explicit mobilization of voters on that basis, the Western template of value conflicts did not emerge. Instead, in those cases, voters responding to value-based political statements about “privatization,” “competition,” “abortion,” “law and order,” “equality” or “taxes” do not organize their views in a manner that fits with traditional political categories of the left or the right in predictable ways.

Moreno reexamines and expands these conclusions, looking at how different societies and different party constituencies make use of the “left–right” heuristic, the extent to which positions on basic issues and values are related to that heuristic, what dimensions and value clusters emerge in different countries, how they are
related to partisanship, and, finally, how political sophistication among electorates moderates the latter relationship. Is the “Western template” a main feature of all or most advanced industrial democracies? Has it been extended to countries in Latin America, Eastern Europe, Africa and Asia? Where it has not, do we find the signs of other sorts of prevalent value conflicts, or are party systems and political competition in those cases organized along mostly “value-free” lines, with party or ideological attachments giving way to short-term issues and leadership evaluations?

In Chapter 5, Gunther, Costa Lobo, Bellucci and Lisi return to the CNEP’s original focus on elections in their examination of a number of propositions that have commonly been set forth in the literature on electoral behavior. To what extent has social change (e.g., socioeconomic development and secularization) weakened the cleavage anchoring of partisan preferences? Has modernization (especially education and “cognitive mobilization”) led to the weakening of long-term partisan loyalties and contributed to increased electoral volatility by increasing voters’ concerns with short-term campaign factors such as their assessments of the qualities of the leading candidates and the condition of the economy? More broadly, is there a systematic difference between models of voting behavior in old versus new democracies, or in affluent, post-industrialized societies versus less developed countries? The chapter addresses these and other questions by undertaking multivariate analyses of the determinants of the vote, employing theoretically guided stepwise regression in which the effects of temporally prior factors (in what is commonly called the “funnel of causality”) are taken into account before entering subsequent factors. The breadth and heterodoxy of this analysis transcends the limitations (criticized by Franklin [2010]) that derive from conducting research entirely within a particular paradigm or school of voting analysis. Instead, it enables us to assess and compare the relative explanatory power of each of these approaches—sociologically grounded cleavage research, the more psychologically oriented Michigan school, economic voting, the political communication or intermediation approach introduced by Lazarsfeld et al., and more recent value-based cleavage research (Kriesi 2010). In doing so, it provides a powerful demonstration of the value added to research on electoral behavior by the CNEP’s introduction of socio-political values and its reintroduction of political intermediation into the repertory of research instruments available for use in voting studies.

The Spanish micro study presented in Chapter 7 also provides important lessons from this point of view. Spain would seem to be, at first sight, a textbook case as to how social modernization changes the anchors of partisanship and voting behavior, leading to a withering of social-structural factors as explanations of the vote. Using a longitudinal research design, Gunther, Montero and Puhle examine how the roles of social-structural variables, religiosity and left-right self-placement have changed over time, initially confirming a story of cleavage decline. However, they also reveal how the impact of religiosity seems to have experienced
a revival in later years and link it to the political developments that followed the return of the center-right to power and the elite-led reactivation of a religious cleavage that seemed dead but was, in fact, only dormant. In other words, although the signs of long-term trends dictated by social change are clearly visible, social attitudes and behaviors seem also to have been shaped by the deliberate political strategies and messages conveyed by parties and leaders and designed to obtain electoral advantage.

More broadly, this chapter takes advantage of rich quantitative and qualitative in-depth interview data sources amassed over almost four decades of research in Spain by these authors, from the early years of its current democratic era into the 2000s, to allow a more intensive “look under the hood” in considering the topics examined in several previous chapters, paying particular attention to the processes of intermediation, political socialization and electoral mobilization. It examines the determinants of particular patterns of intermediation, corroborating findings set forth in Chapter 2. This includes insights into the extent to which urbanization discourages the frequency of face-to-face discussion of politics with neighbors and co-workers by creating a more heterogeneous environment. The chapter also analyzes the extent to which media bias can influence the voting choice.

Using in-depth interviews about childhood and young adult political socialization and cohort analyses of surveys conducted between 1979 and 1993, the chapter is also able to examine the development over time of fundamental attitudes towards democracy and active citizen engagement, as well as the development of partisan attitudes and identification. Basic attitudes regarding support for democracy in Spain are found to be primarily the product of adult political learning, with party leaders playing crucial roles during the transition from authoritarian rule in leading their followers to support democracy and acknowledge the legitimacy of the current democratic regime. Attitudes regarding active citizen engagement, in contrast, are deeply rooted in childhood socialization experiences, with formal education playing a crucial role in reducing levels of political disaffection and marginalization. But early socialization through frequent political discussion under the authoritarian Franco regime is shown to be the strongest predictor of a high level of political engagement in the new democracy.

In conclusion, a rich array of research questions motivate the chapters that follow. Many of them have previously been addressed in the research literature, including earlier CNEP studies. Yet all too many of these have been answered incompletely because previous research was narrowly based on only a few, often “most similar system” (Przeworski and Teune 1970) countries, and from one theoretical perspective in isolation from others. As we will see, the 18 countries and 26 surveys of the CNEP through 2008 provide opportunities to address these questions more comprehensively, in particular from the perspectives of both established and nascent democracies and both modern and modernizing societies. These data also enable us to address relatively new questions about how democratic citizens
view elections and democracy. Finally, by expanding the number of countries for analysis, we can begin to differentiate between the generic or nomothetic patterns and the unique, idiographic characteristics of particular countries. Although the country base for these analyses could (and, in subsequent CNEP efforts, will) be expanded, the broad perspective these country cases provide promises to significantly advance our understanding of citizen attitudes and behavior in election settings.
## APPENDIX 1.A Characteristics of the Elections and Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and year</th>
<th>Election type and date</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Country Weights</th>
<th>Timing of interviews</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mode of interview</th>
<th>Timing relative to election</th>
<th>Population covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria 1996 (BU96)</td>
<td>Presidential, Oct. 27 &amp; Nov. 3, 1996</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nov. 1996</td>
<td>Institute for Political and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile 1993 (CL93)</td>
<td>Presidential, Dec. 11, 1993</td>
<td>1,305 pre; 900 post</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nov.–Dec. 1993 and Jan.–Feb. 1994</td>
<td>Department of Sociological Studies, Catholic University</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Pre and post</td>
<td>Registered voters of greater Santiago and Valparaiso areas&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and year</th>
<th>Election type and date</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Country Weights</th>
<th>Timing of interviews</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mode of interview</th>
<th>Timing relative to election</th>
<th>Population covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong 1998 (HK98)</td>
<td>Legislative, May 24, 1998</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>May–Aug. 1998</td>
<td>Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Representative sample of Hong Kong Chinese adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary 2006 (HU06)</td>
<td>Legislative, Apr. 9 and 23, 2006</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Apr.–May 2006</td>
<td>Tarki</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of voting-age citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia 1999 (IN99)</td>
<td>Legislative, Apr. 5, 1999</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Apr. 1999</td>
<td>Indonesian Survey Institute</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia 2004 (IN04)</td>
<td>Legislative, Apr. 5, 2004</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Apr. 2004</td>
<td>Indonesian Survey Institute</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy 1996 (IT96)</td>
<td>Legislative, Apr. 21, 1996</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>May 2–20, 1996</td>
<td>SWG for Italian National Election Studies</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy 2006 (IT06)</td>
<td>Legislative, Apr. 9–10, 2006</td>
<td>2,005 pre; 1,377 post</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Feb.–Mar. and Apr.–July 2006</td>
<td>Doxa for Italian National Election Studies</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Pre and post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of electors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico 2006 (MX06)</td>
<td>Presidential, July 2, 2006</td>
<td>2,102 pre and post; 2,620 post</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mar.–June and July–Aug. 2006</td>
<td>Olivares Plata and Associates</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Pre and post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of electors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Legislative, Feb. 20, 2005</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mar.–May 2005</td>
<td>Center for Public Opinion Polls and Surveys, Portuguese Catholic University</td>
<td>Face-to-face Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Legislative, Apr. 14, 2004</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sept.–Oct. 2004</td>
<td>Citizen Surveys</td>
<td>Face-to-face Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain 1993</td>
<td>Legislative, June 6, 1993</td>
<td>1,448 pre and post</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>May–July 1993</td>
<td>DATA, S.A.</td>
<td>Face-to-face Pre and post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan 2004</td>
<td>Legislative, Dec. 11, 2004</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jan.–Apr. 2005</td>
<td>National Science Council</td>
<td>Face-to-face Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2004</td>
<td>Presidential, Nov. 2, 1992</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nov. 2004</td>
<td>Knowledge Networks</td>
<td>Internet from telephone-selected panel Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay 1994</td>
<td>Legislative, Nov. 27, 1994</td>
<td>1,005 pre; 712 post</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Oct.–Dec. 1994</td>
<td>Equipos-Mori</td>
<td>Face-to-face Pre and post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay 2004</td>
<td>Legislative, Oct. 31, 2004</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Institutol Factum</td>
<td>Face-to-face Post</td>
<td>Nationally representative sample of adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Although this region contains only slightly more than half of the Chilean electorate, its vote results in both elections closely approximate national totals.
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