

Jana Morgan and Nathan J. Kelly – Memo detailing responses to reviewers for “Inequality, Exclusion, and Tolerance for Political Dissent in Latin America.” Published in *Comparative Political Studies*.

## **Response Memo**

We are grateful to the reviewers and editors for their careful engagement with our work. The revised manuscript endeavors to respond to all the comments offered, and we believe the paper is stronger as a result. This memo provides an overview of the changes we have made.

### **Editor-emphasized comments**

#### Reviewer 1:

- The editors asked that we respond to the questions from this reviewer.

We have endeavored to address all the suggestions from reviewer 1 as we elaborate in detail below.

#### Reviewer 2:

- Requested more detailed analysis to explore differences between Afro-descendant and indigenous respondents

In the revised paper, we place much more emphasis on comparing Afro-descendant and indigenous respondents. We now include interaction terms for both Afro-descendant and indigenous throughout the analysis, which allows us to chart how tolerance in each of these groups responds to changes in economic and political exclusion. The revised analysis provides the opportunity to better understand the similarities and differences between these subgroups, and these results are now much more central to our discussion. In expanding the comparison between indigenous and Afro-descendants, we have also followed the reviewer’s helpful suggestion that we integrate insights from the group consciousness literature. Ideas from this work inform our discussion of the different patterns we observe between the two groups, and we have conducted some additional analysis drawing on a group consciousness measure asked across all Latin American countries in the 2012 AmericasBarometer, which offers some preliminary support to the theoretical insights suggested by the group consciousness literature.

- Asked about the possibility of different patterns in countries with predominantly Afro-descendant or indigenous minorities

We conducted analysis examining subsets of countries where Afro-descendant or indigenous minorities are relevant. We find that our core results are similar across these country subgroups, but unsurprisingly some results for country-level variables are no longer statistically significant due to the much smaller number of countries and overall sample sizes included in these subsets of the data. These results are referenced in the text and presented in the appendix.

#### Reviewer 3:

- Suggested that we implement the reframing suggestions from this reviewer

Reviewer 3 offered some helpful comments about ways that the paper might be strengthened by emphasizing our focus on tolerance of dissent, as opposed to democratic values more generally. We have made changes to the introduction and theoretical discussion to emphasize the importance of understanding tolerance for dissent specifically, and we have revised to incorporate the reviewer’s detailed comments concerning the ways a focus on tolerance for dissent can provide more clarity about

the causal mechanisms linking the social structure to intolerance. We believe the paper's argument and framing are much stronger as a result.

Editor-specific comments:

- The editors asked that we spell out what we already know from the existing tolerance literature and clarify the ways that this paper moves beyond previous work.

In reframing the paper along the lines that reviewer 3 suggested, we have focused more attention on the tolerance literature specifically. Also in the introduction, we have detailed how our argument and findings go beyond previous work in this vein, which has largely focused on individual-level explanations or occasionally considered the contextual effects that formal political institutions exert on tolerance. By focusing on the effects racialized systems of exclusion have on tolerance, our paper builds on this previous work emphasizing the importance of contextual effects, but we contemplate the influence of less formal systems of economic and political power and specifically emphasize the role of racialized exclusion which previous literature on political tolerance has not considered. Our theoretical discussion further elaborates on the ways our argument builds on but goes beyond previous studies of tolerance.

- The editors also suggested that we flesh out the portion of our theoretical argument concerning the effects racialized inequalities may have on tolerance across society as a whole.

These comments, along with related comments from reviewers 1 and 3, have pushed us to further develop this component of our argument, which we see as one of the most original and important elements of the paper. To do so, we have expanded our discussion of the relationship between racialized social hierarchies and citizens' willingness to eschew tolerance for dissent. This section of our theoretical discussion now spells out how this portion of our argument draws insights from the social dominance theory of intergroup relations and how it extends the logic of previous work on the ways ethnoracial inequality undermines public support for more equitable distribution of resources to understand how racialized hierarchies might also weaken support for equitable distribution of rights, which is what our tolerance measure essentially captures. We hope that this portion of our argument comes through more clearly now.

- The editors asked that we tighten up the paper's key focus ("What's the key DV? Is it support for democracy, or tolerance?")

We have clarified throughout the paper that our dependent variable is tolerance. Some of the reviewer comments about framing the argument around tolerance for dissent specifically were helpful along these lines. As a result of these changes, we believe the paper's focus is tighter and its contribution clearer.

- The editors requested that we add discussion of substantive effects, suggesting we may underplay effect sizes for economic exclusion and over-play significance of political exclusion

In the revised version we expand our discussion of substantive significance. Of particular note, we have implemented what we believe is a better indicator of political exclusion that varies both over time and across country (see response to R1 below). The political exclusion effect is clearer using this measure, though we also make an effort not to overstate the strength of these effects.

- The editors asked us to include the dependent variable measurement in the main text, streamline footnotes, and be sure to cite work by people from under-represented groups

The revised paper responds to all these suggestions.

### **Reviewer 1**

- Asked for clarification about how social structures exert a causal effect independent from past undemocratic political values/culture

We have made significant revisions to our discussion of the way social structures work to undermine tolerance from dissent. Our theoretical argument now clarifies how we build on social dominance theory from political psychology and discusses how hierarchical systems legitimize the inegalitarian status quo, thereby fostering intolerance for extending equal political rights to dissidents. We have also endeavored to eliminate the confusion created by our previous discussion of the way social hierarchies weaken tolerance commitments in the mass public – we did not mean to convey that existing tolerance commitments are simply the result of (previous) mass political culture, but rather that long-run social hierarchies in which people are embedded shape their tolerance attitudes. We appreciate the chance to clarify and hope the argument is improved.

- Asked us to spell out the precise empirical implications of our hypotheses and the level of the analysis where we expect to see the anticipated patterns play out

For the most part, our empirical analysis focuses on the ways cross-national differences in the context of political exclusion and BGI explain tolerance commitments. Because these patterns of exclusion tend to be deeply entrenched, the cross-national variation is generally much larger than any temporal variation within countries. So our theoretical discussion and empirical analysis emphasizes the cross-national dimension of variation, and we have revised the discussion of our hypotheses and the empirical strategy to clarify the precise empirical implications of our argument at that level. The within-country analysis of temporal changes toward greater inclusion in Bolivia is the one exception to this cross-national focus, and we have revised our discussion of that portion of the analysis as well in effort to clarify our empirical expectations in this unusual instance of significant temporal change within a country.

- Identified a disconnect between our discussion of “tolerance” and democratic values at the beginning of the manuscript as opposed to the empirical analysis and asked for clarification as well as more specific theoretical discussion concerning the link between ethnoracial exclusion and tolerance for dissent.

In response to these comments and related suggestions from the third reviewer, we have focused our discussion at the beginning of the manuscript on tolerance for dissent specifically and our theoretical argument now speaks directly to the relationship between ethnoracial marginalization and *tolerance of dissent*. We also provide a clear definition of political tolerance in the “Empirical Strategy” section.

- Asked for clarification about the empirical patterns anticipated by our group-specific hypotheses

We have tried to be more precise about the patterns we expect to observe with regard to each of the two, competing group-specific hypotheses that we consider. We spell out our expectations at the end of the section “Consequences of Exclusion for the Marginalized.” And in the discussion of the results, we

have endeavored to make more direct connections between the observed empirical patterns and the specific expectations articulated in the theoretical discussion.

- Raised doubts about the validity of a measure of political exclusion focusing on the presence of a pro-minority party

We reassessed our measurement of political exclusion and have shifted to V-DEM's *social group power distribution index*. This measure is specifically designed to tap the extent to which political power is concentrated or distributed across different ethnoracial groups in a society. It does not rely on categorization decisions about individual parties, and it also has the benefit of being regularly updated and providing both cross-national and temporal variation, which our previous measure lacked. We also believe this measure is a better match with the concept we are seeking to measure. We discuss the measure in the "Empirical Strategy" section and provide descriptive statistics in the appendix.

- Asked for clarification of our measure of household well-being, which forms part of our measure of BGI and is included as an individual-level independent variable

We follow Córdova 2009 in using an index of household goods to measure well-being. We have clarified the measurement in the revised manuscript.

- Identified some confusing elements in our discussion of the marginal effects figures

In response to this comment and other reviewer feedback, we have revamped how we present and discuss the results pertaining to the interaction terms. The new Figure 2 graphs predicted tolerance for each ethnoracial group, rather than marginal effects. This version of the figure is more suited to evaluating the specific empirical implications of our group-specific hypotheses, and we have revised this portion of the analysis discussion and endeavored to clarify that our theoretical argument is especially interested in how marginalized groups' tolerance changes under different contextual conditions.

- Suggested strengthening the Bolivia analysis and giving more attention to subgroup patterns there

We have revised the Bolivia analysis to make it more rigorous. We now estimate an individual-level regression model that mirrors the cross-national analysis. We estimate the effect of a dummy variable dividing the period before and after MAS gained power, and we interact this variable with indigenous identity to evaluate how changes in political inclusion affected those at both the top and the bottom of the ethnoracial hierarchy. In multivariate analysis with controls for individual-level characteristics and clustering standard errors by year, we find that tolerance increased among both white and indigenous Bolivians after MAS came to power. We note that the results are also similar with a time trend and control for BGI included.

- Suggested moving or eliminating the discussion of the interview data

We removed the interview data from the empirical section and incorporated a few key quotes to illuminate our argument in the introduction and conclusion.

## **Reviewer 2**

Some ideas from this reviewer were highlighted by the editors. The relevant revisions related to these points are highlighted above. One of the most important changes is that we have expanded our analysis

and discussion of differences and similarities across Afro-descendant, indigenous, and white respondents as suggested, and in doing so we incorporated insights from the literature on group consciousness. We are extremely appreciative of the reviewer's prodding in this direction as we see the paper as stronger for having wrestled with these ideas. The reviewer also offered some excellent suggestions about how to further strengthen our argument about the ways structural racism has consequences across society at large, which we found quite helpful in revising the manuscript.

- The reviewer also suggested we consider additional dependent variables in our analysis

Given feedback from the other reviewers and the editors, who recommended that we sharpen the paper's focus on tolerance for dissent specifically, we have elected not to expand the set of dependent variables considered in this paper. This suggestion is one we hope to implement in future work.

- Proposed moving the interview evidence earlier in the paper where we develop our argument

We removed the interview data from the empirical section and incorporated a few key quotes to illuminate our argument in the introduction and conclusion.

In response to "Smaller Comments":

- We now show variation in our political exclusion measure in the Appendix.
- We followed the suggestion to move the table of regression results to the appendix and inserted figures charting the results for all ethnoracial groups into the paper, which enabled us to strengthen and clarify the discussion of these findings in the text.

### **Reviewer 3**

As noted in our discussion of the editor-emphasized comments, we have drawn on the excellent suggestions from this reviewer about how we might sharpen our argument by focusing more specifically on tolerance of dissent. We have implemented these suggestions as outlined above and are grateful for the resulting improvements to the manuscript.

- Suggested delving more deeply into explaining the ethnoracial subgroup findings

These suggestions from reviewer 3 resonated with related comments from reviewer 2 – both pushed us to further examine the findings about indigenous and black attitudes in different contexts of exclusion. We have expanded our discussion of these findings and their meaning in the revised manuscript.

- Wondered about the statistical significance of the interaction effects

In response to this question as well as related queries about subgroup effects from other reviewers, we have revamped how we present and discuss the findings for different ethnoracial groups. In doing so, we have endeavored to be clearer about the significance of different interaction effects and about what this means for our understanding of the tolerance commitments of different ethnoracial groups in different contexts of exclusion. Interpreting interaction effects can be challenging, and we appreciate the reviewer pushing us to (hopefully) do a better job on this front.