



**Departamento de Economía**  
Facultad de Ciencias Sociales  
Universidad de la República

**Documentos de Trabajo**

**Vigilante Justice and Police Protocols in the Latin  
American South Cone**

**Fernando Borraz, Cecilia Chouhy, Irene Mussio y Maximo Rossi**

**Documento No. 09/13**  
Agosto 2013

ISSN 0797-7484

# Vigilante justice and police protocols in the Latin American South Cone

Fernando Borraz<sup>\*</sup>, Cecilia Chouhy<sup>†</sup>, Irene Mussio<sup>‡</sup> and Maximo Rossi<sup>§</sup>

## Resumen

Amplio es el debate en el mundo, y particularmente en América Latina, respecto a la inseguridad ciudadana y la proliferación de reclamos más punitivos por parte de la sociedad. En este artículo se analiza la actitud de los ciudadanos de los países del Cono Sur hacia el mantenimiento de la ley en la persecución y el castigo de delincuentes. Puntualmente, se aborda la aprobación de la justicia por mano propia en algunas circunstancias y la justificación de la acción policial por fuera de la ley como forma de garantizar la captura de delincuentes. Para ello se utiliza la base de datos de LAPOP (Latin American Public Opinion Project, Vanderbilt University) realizada en el año 2008. Analizando los datos a partir de estimaciones probit, se observa que la aprobación de la justicia por mano propia está relacionada a la experiencia y la situación particular del encuestado. De esta forma, haber sido victimizado en los últimos meses y sentirse inseguro en el propio barrio aumenta la probabilidad de asumir tal posición respecto a la justicia por mano propia. Por otro lado, el apego a los procedimientos policiales se relaciona más fuertemente con creencias políticas generales y el nivel de preocupación por la inseguridad ciudadana del entrevistado. Estos hallazgos indican que la formación de estas creencias tiene una dinámica diferencial y que a la hora de justificar una acción fuera de la ley, se distingue en función del tipo de acción involucrada y del actor que la lleva adelante.

**Palabras clave:** justicia por mano propia, procedimientos policiales, ley, Cono Sur, justicia

## Abstract

There is a wide debate worldwide, and particularly in Latin America with respect to citizen insecurity and the proliferation of more punitive claims from the society itself. In this article we analyze the attitude of the citizens belonging to the countries of the Latin American South Cone towards maintaining the law regarding persecuting and punishing criminals. In particular, we tackle the approval of vigilante justice in some circumstances and the justification of police procedures outside the law as a form of guaranteeing the capture of criminals. For this, we use the LAPOP (Latin American Public Opinion Project, Vanderbilt University) database from the year 2008. Analyzing the data using probit estimations, we observe that the approval of vigilante justice is related to the experience and particular situation of the respondent. In this sense, having been victimized in the last months and feeling unsafe in his or her own neighborhood increase the probability of taking that position regarding vigilantism. On the other side, sticking to police procedures is more strongly related to the general political beliefs and the level of concern for the respondents' insecurity. These findings indicate that the formation of these beliefs has a differential dynamic and that when actions outside the law have to be justified, this is distinguished based on the type of involved action and the actor who carries it forward.

**Keywords:** vigilantism, police procedures, law, South Cone, justice

**JEL Classification:** K4, K14, P37

---

<sup>\*</sup> Departamento de Economía (dECON), Universidad de la República y Banco Central del Uruguay

<sup>†</sup> Departamento de Economía (dECON), Universidad de la República

<sup>‡</sup> Departamento de Economía (dECON), Universidad de la República

<sup>§</sup> Departamento de Economía (dECON), Universidad de la República and Center for Inter\_American Policy and Research, Tulane University

## **I. Introduction**

In recent years, debate on insecurity in the media and public opinion has been of increasing importance in both political and academic spheres. Even while explanations of the origin of this situation are varied and there is no consensus about its causes, the relevance of this issue has been broadly acknowledged and it has gained a preponderant place in the public agenda. However, the lack of reliable data on violence, crime and police procedures has been one of the most important hurdles related to the research on the subject, as government agencies have failed to produce valid statistics and statistics are usually under-reported (Beato, 1999). Given this, recent studies of crime and violence has focused on individual attitudes and not on crime figures. Individual's attitudes regarding crime and punishment in contemporary society has been approached from several perspectives and in different countries and regions (De la Torre and Alvarez, 2011). In particular, many papers analyze the link between punitive attitudes and the fact of individuals having been victim of a crime in the last year (Demombynes, 2009, Di Tella and Schargrotsky, 2009; Kuhn, 1989, Mayhew and Van Kesteren, 2002, Van Dijk, Manchin, Van Kesteren, Nevala, and Hideg, 2005). Findings are often contradictory and depend on the country of interest and the data source considered.

This article analyzes the attitudes of South Cone inhabitants regarding the maintenance of law in the prosecution and punishment of offenders. Specifically, it addresses respondents' approval of people taking justice into their own hands in some circumstances and the justification of police action outside the law when capturing criminals. Particular attention is given to the link between individual victimization and such attitudes towards justice along with the importance of beliefs in an ideological and philosophical sense. Data from the survey LAPOP (Latin American Public Opinion Project, Vanderbilt University) conducted in 2008 is used for this purpose.

The paper goes as follows: section 2 discusses prior literature of justice, punitivism and the use of vigilante justice. Section 3 details the data used and methodology applied to analyze the issue. Section 4 discusses the results and section 5 concludes.

## II. PREVIOUS STUDIES

Establishing whether there has been an actual punitive turn in contemporary societies has been a frequent point of debate in the specialized literature. The “get tough” policy consolidated in the 70’, when many governments adopted measures of this sort that, among other things, ended up largely increasing prison population while failing in combating crime (Petersilia, 1992). Garland illustrates this punitive turn toward hardening criminal justice as follows: “*Harsher sentencing and increased use of imprisonment, ‘three strikes’ and mandatory minimum sentencing laws; ‘truth in sentencing’ and parole release restrictions; ‘no frills’ prison laws and ‘austere prisons’; retribution in juveniles court and the imprisonment of children; the revival of chain gangs and corporal punishment; boot camps and supermax prisons; the multiplication of capital offences and executions; community notification laws and pedophile registers; zero tolerance policies and Anti-Social Behavior Orders. There is now a long list of measures that appear to signify a punitive turn in contemporary penalty.*” (Garland, 2001 in Matthews, 2005).

Authors such as Garland, Pratt and Wacquant, emphasize the character of such an ostensible punishment, not only expected to serve as an example for the rest of society but also associated with the dismantling of the welfare state and a consolidation of right-wing governments in the developed world. In this kind of analysis, the role of public opinion is oftentimes emphasized and increasing punitive attitudes from public, in support of such policies, are commonly assumed (Matthews, 2005).

However, these categorical assertions about public opinion are questionable at least in two ways. First, there is no consensus regarding the construction of measures of public opinion. Piquero and Steinberg (2011), Nagin et al. (2006), Hough and Roberts (1999) and Hutton (2005), through different kind of studies, discuss the robustness and validity of measures from public opinion polls and despite the differences of their studies, the findings coincide in the fact that opinion polls are conditioned to the way questions are constructed and that changes in the stimuli may lead to differing conclusions.

Hough and Roberts (1999) critique the traditional public opinion polls addressing the fact that measurements, being too focused on attitudes, tend to ignore basic issues such as public visibility of both alternative sanctions and actual judicial behavior. Analyzing both elements altogether, they conclude that public attitudes read as punitive are mainly

associated with not only the respondent's ignorance concerning alternative measures but also with to his or her overestimating of judicial indulgence.

Nagin et. al. (2006) discuss the common assumption of the public opinion supporting certain political expenditures in punitive “getting tough” measures. For this purpose, they conduct a population survey focused on measuring the public willingness to pay for alternative policies such as detention or rehabilitation. With this data, they conclude that, given two policies –one punitive and one rehabilitative oriented- with similar outcomes, public preferences are at least indifferent. Also, in low-age population, the public declares a high willingness to pay for preventive policies. Piquero and Steinberg when replicating this study by extending the cities covered conclude that: *“when informed that rehabilitation was as effective as incarceration, the public was willing to pay nearly 20 percent more in additional taxes annually for programs that offered rehabilitative services to serious juvenile offenders than to pay for longer periods of incarceration (...) The added value of the present study was that this general trend was found using a WTP methodology that was thought to more accurately gauge public support for various policy alternatives than conventional polling, and the results were replicated across several different locales, each with unique crime/political pressures.”*(2010:5)

Adding to the discussion, Hutton (2005) contrasts the attitudes measured by opinion polls with focus groups analysis. Findings show that even though the punitive view emerges in the first speeches, opinions on the implementation of punitive measures become more lenient and contradictions and nuances appear in the previous generated consensus as the groups develop.

On the other hand, and beyond methodological criticism, empirical studies conducted using traditional approaches to public opinion are not conclusive on whether there has been a punitive turn in public attitudes. Study conclusions vary depending on the type of information used and the region of reference.

In this regard, several studies analyze international survey data, particularly the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS), Latin American Population Survey (LAPOP), etc. Other studies, use data from own elaborated surveys (Briceño-León, Ávila, and Camardiel, 2009; Di Tella and Schargrotsky, 2009)

Kuhn (1989) analyzes the determinants of public punitive attitudes using data from the EU ICS. He finds that while traditional demographic variables are important factors in explaining punitive attitudes, they are less relevant than cross-cultural differences between countries. Van Dijk et al. (2005) analyze cross-country differences and conclude that it is in UK where the more prevalent positions in favor of punitive policies are encountered. When contrasting these findings with imprisonment rates, the association between these two elements becomes less conclusive.

Mayhew and Van Kesteren, (2002) focus on the analysis of the different punitive attitudes of each region's population and its relationship with the type of policies developed in these regions. Latin America falls in the global average, being the developed world inhabitants those who have fewer punitive demands and Africans the ones claiming for stronger average sanctions. From these findings they conclude that economic development has much to do with these types of claims and that it is in countries with lower levels of development where prisons have higher levels of support. The consolidated punitive tradition of Anglophone countries makes them the only exception, where support for prison sentences is higher than in the rest of the developed world.

Kuhn's (1989) study draws other important conclusions when relating these attitudes to victimization and insecurity experienced at an individual level. In this sense, he concludes that it is not possible to address a clear link between victimization and punitive attitudes. Following the author: "*the attitude towards punishment essentially depends on an individual's 'Weltanschauung' (philosophy of life) and certain variables that influence it, such as the standard of education, but remains largely insensitive to demonstrations of the object of suppression, i.e. crime*" (Kuhn 1989: 291).

Kühnrich and Kania (2005) assess the problem only for the German sample. The results of such analysis are similar to those found for Europe in general except for the significance of victimization and neighborhood insecurity parameters. While these group variables have less weight than sex and educational level parameters, they are still significant for this sample, contrary to what was found by other studies.

Mayhew and van Kesteren (2002) conclude, using the ICVS survey data, that parameters such as sex, age and educational level, correlate strongly with punitive attitudes of the population. Perception of insecurity and having been a victim of theft presents a small

correlation in some cases, but do not have a significant effect in all regions, so that it is not possible to conclude that the fact of having been a victim of crime increases people's punitive claims.

Findings are also inconclusive when analyzing Latin America's specific situation. Di Tella and Schargrodsky (2009) studied the link between punitive demands from population and victimization in Argentina, analyzing the same sample at two different moments of time. Through this kind of methodology, they were able to isolate the changes in the parameters provoked by experiencing victimization. Their results are conflicting with most worldwide findings, as they find that being victimized reduces the chances of adopting more punitive attitudes. This issue is explained, in the words of the authors, as a sort of victims "Stockholm Syndrome", as they tend to sympathize more with social inequities and thus claim for solutions such as higher employment and better educational opportunities. Also, they found an association between victimization and not punitive attitudes related to having leftist beliefs. Also, being a victim of crime is correlated with thinking that the effort does not pay.

Demombynes' (2009) work provides a direct background to the current study. The conclusions drawn from this paper differ greatly from those made by Di Tella and Schargrodsky (2009) analyzing the situation of Latin America using LAPOP 2008 survey. Other than punitivism, in this case, the study focuses on people's attitudes toward several crime related items such as the justice system -particularly attitudes towards institutions-, approval of people taking justice into their own hands (vigilantism) and the belief that police authorities may act within the law under certain circumstances.

In terms of the relation between such attitudes and demographic variables, the author observes that trusting the justice system is more frequent among nonwhites, the more educated and the poorer, while decreases with age at a decreasing rate. With regard to authorities abiding the law, support for this statement is higher among men, whites, married and richer, while also diminishes with age at a decreasing rate.

Dembombynes' paper focuses on the relationship between having experienced a situation of victimization and the adoption of the attitudes described above, particularly important in societies with rising crime rates. Analyzing the changes in attitudes and victimization, the conclusion drawn is that suffering such an event reduces confidence in justice, increases

the adoption of vigilantism and decreases the belief that the authorities always have to respect the law. The results differ between the countries concerned and not all parameters are significant.

Both from Demombynes (2009) and Di Tella and Schargrotsky (2009) findings, such attitudes impacting on actions taken by the state is directly assumed. However, a direct relationship between population demands and punitive policy implemented by governments is an issue yet to be addressed. The relationship between individuals' attitudes with regard to punishment and the actual implementation of punitive policies in this regard is unclear, and has also been debated in the academy.

Di Tella and Dubra (2011) studied the increase in punitiveness comparing prison rates in different countries and conclude that "tough hand" policies are associated with people believing in individual opportunity and the rewards of working hard. Thus, they associate punitivism with ideologies and beliefs, addressing the differences between the United States and Europe. On the contrary, Van Dijk et al (2005) when analyzing European samples with specific questions about punishment, conclude that no significant relationship between imprisonment rates and punitive attitudes from public can be established. Similar conclusions are drawn by Mayhew and van Kesteren (2002) who, when analyzing the link between public approval and use of punitive measures by the justice system, found no significant effect in the different regions considered.

A direct antecedent of the current study is the one conducted by Borraz et. al. (2012), in which the focus was to further analyze the determinants of both support to vigilantism and police disregard for legal procedures when dealing with criminals in Uruguay. The study found that support for each issue had a different set of determinants, being vigilantism related to experience (e.g. victimization) and support for police acting outside legal margins related to general philosophical and ideological orientations. The purpose of the present study is to extend this previous research to the situation in the South Cone and to establish whether these conclusions hold for the whole region.

In short, it is important to study specifically this kind of attitude in the case of the South Cone and seek to deepen the understanding of the factors that best explain the adoption of such beliefs by the public. In particular, it is crucial to take into account the effect of

victimization on them, simultaneously addressing the factors that explain it. Once those issues are addressed, it will be possible to discuss the potential impact of such findings when thinking about changes in the action of the justice system and the political system. Nevertheless, caution shall be needed when discussing possible relationships between attitudes and policies and debating potential future scenarios.

### **III. Methodology and data**

#### **i) Data**

Data on crime and victimization cause controversy across the world. There is a great discussion about which sources are best to estimate the level of crime in a given society and how accurate official records are in this regard. Victimization surveys, as well as the self-report data sources are broadly used in the developed world, where periodic measurements are made from these instruments. These measurements also include questions that reveal interviewee's considerations regarding their opinion on optimal punishments. Beyond entering into the controversy over which data are most valid for estimating the crime, it is important to highlight the poor development of these instruments in Latin America.

Measurements of victimization have been incorporated in international surveys, which are carried out in mostly all Latin America (LAPOP, Gallup, Latinobarometer).

These surveys differ in the way they formulate victimization questions, each of which requires a different analysis. Specifically, Latinobarometer questionnaire asks about the victimization either of the respondent or of a relative, while the Gallup Poll focuses on the household' victimization and the LAPOP only on the individual's. These differences affect victimization estimates, by involving different units of analysis.

In this article, we seek to understand the effect of victimization in people's attitudes. For this reason, we decided to use the database LAPOP, which explores personal victimization. While it is possible to think that the victimization of any household member may also generate a second-hand experience likely to influence the attitude of respondents about the rule of law when it comes to punishing offenders, it is most convenient to analyze the isolated effect of personal victimization, which is also be the most reliable data (Gottfredson and Hindelang, 2010). The survey also includes variables measured at the

individual level that will allow a better understanding of the importance of other attitudes on punitiveness and enrich the explanatory power of the model.

## **ii) Methodology**

We focused on the explanation of two different attitudes. Individual's approval of people taking justice into their own hands (vigilantism) and of police violating lawful procedures in order to capture and question offenders. Different probit models are estimated in order to predict the probability of individuals approving such things. Both dependent variables are taken as binary type 0 = Disapprove 1 = Approve. Separate models were constructed to predict each dependent variable.

Table 1 shows the definition of the variables that are incorporated into the model. As shown, in addition to the variables that refer directly to attitudes and experiences related to crime and insecurity, the direct object of the present work, other variables are also included.

### ***Insert Table 1***

On the one hand, traditional demographic variables such as gender, age, socioeconomic status, are included as control variables. Their inclusion also allows to visualize differences between sub-populations. Moreover, we include variables relating to general attitudes, which account for a certain philosophy of life (ideological self-identification, tolerance towards homosexuality, religion, etc.). Those attitudes are deemed to be also related to specific attitudes toward crime (Kuhn, 1989). Finally, we include measures of individual's self-evaluations of their conditions, specifically economic situation and economic improvement and fear of crime. Those variables are oftentimes considered as determinants of the attitudes of respondents to variables working interest (Di Tella and Schargrotsky, 2009).

## **IV. Results**

First, it is important to analyze the overall figures of approval of the elements considered in each of the countries considered. Looking at Table 2 it can be observed that the position of the countries in terms of their approval percentage differs depending on the question considered. The average approval of both issues among the South Cone Countries is lower

than the total Latin America's average. Still, there is a great different within this group in regards with approval of police acting in the margins of the law. Uruguay, Paraguay and Chile show percentages of approval highly above the average while Brazil and Argentina's approval is smaller than average.

This situation is striking, as Uruguay, for example, usually shows high levels of respect to law and confidence in justice institutions. Further research in order to address the relationship between individual approval of such issues and actual outcomes regarding police and justice actions must be conducted. Surveys are often influenced by what people perceive is occurring in the country. People may perceive that lawful procedures are being taken too seriously and thus claim for a change, in the belief that procedures against the law are being sub-utilized. Hough and Roberts' (1999) findings about punitive claims are in line with this kind of reasoning. According to them punitive claims emerged when people had misleading –and underestimating- perceptions of how judges were acting. In order to assess the impact of global country level determinants such as those previously exposed, further research shall be developed.

### ***Insert Table 2***

We estimate three different models for each of the dependent variables, which arise from the progressive incorporation of the different groups of independent variables we considered (Table 3). We control for country fixed effects (Uruguay being the omitted variable) and aim for robust errors using country-based clusters.

### ***Insert Table 3***

In the estimation of both dependent variables, the age parameter is significant and reports negative marginal effects in the different specifications of the model. This means that, in general, the older the person is, the less probable he will approve of actions outside the legal parameters, specifically regarding police procedures and vigilante justice.

In the case of education, the coefficient is significant and negative only in the case of vigilantism.

Contrary to what happens to age and educational levels, we highlight the lack of significance of variables which are traditionally used to evaluate attitudinal differences, such as gender and the income percentile the household of surveyed individual is ranked.

In addition, the estimated models incorporate a set of variables related to the specific situation of the individual, his attitudes towards crime and life philosophy. The results for these variables are different depending on the dependent variable considered in each model.

In the first place, we analyze the estimation for *vigilantism*. In this case, the significant variables are related to the perception of the individual's own situation, whether it is insecurity or economic uncertainty.

The victimization parameter is significant and positive, which means that having been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months increases the probability (5.8 pp based on the means of the other variables in the second model and 4.7 pp in the third model) that the individual approves vigilante justice. The individual's declaration that he or she feels insecure in the neighborhood he lives in works in the same direction that approval of vigilantism. In this case, the reported marginal effect is higher, taking a value of around 4.2 pp. The significance and direction of these two parameters highlights the relationship between the agreement with vigilante justice and the individual's own experiences with crime. Not only when individuals have a direct experience with crime but also when they feel particularly vulnerable and insecure, it is more likely for them to legitimize vigilante justice or empathize with those who exercise it. Negative experiences are basing more punitive beliefs\*\*.

In this aspect, results are then similar to those of Borraz et. at. (2012) and also contradict the observation made by Di Tella and Schargrodsky (2009), who concluded about the existence of a "Stockholm syndrome" effect, determining that the victimized individual held less punitive beliefs. It should be noted that in this case, the authors are not analyzing punitivism in global terms based on synthetic measures, but they estimate explicative

---

\*\* This relationship will have to be studied with more depth in further studies, with the aim of establishing controls which consider the potential endogeneity of the involved variables and allowing to estimate causal relationships.

models of particular aspects which compose punitivism and that should not necessarily have the same determinants as a synthetic measure.

However, results are different than those obtained in Borraz et. al. (2012) in two aspects. First, in this model, the variables related to the economic situation of the individual are not significant.

Second, it is important to highlight the impact of religion and religiosity in the approval of vigilante justice in this model. Individuals who are more religious (attend religious services frequently) are less likely to approve the use of vigilante justice. The associated parameter is significant and the marginal effect is quite similar between specifications (around 3.5 pp). Among religions, Catholicism does not have a significant impact but Evangelism does. The associated coefficient for this last variable is significant and has a negative impact (around 5 pp).

Similar to what was found analyzing the case of Uruguay (Borraz et. al, 2012), results are quite different when we estimate a model with *police protocols* as the dependent variable. In this case, the variables which are significant are not indicative of the individual's experience but his or her general beliefs and philosophical and ideological postures. Specifically, the ideological auto positioning scale is significant. The reported marginal effect establishes that positioning another point towards right derives in a 1.3 pp increase in the probability of approving these types of procedures. In addition, insecurity operates in the same sense, increasing the probability of agreeing with police procedures outside the law in 8.9 pp.

The probability differential is also affected by the married dummy, which has a positive effect. A negative probability stems from the individual approving that homosexuals can hold public jobs.

In this sense, Borraz et. al. (2012) findings seem to hold in this broaden scenario. Despite some changes in regards to which variables are significant, both the specific model estimated for Uruguay and the South Cone one, show that the classification proposed by Inglehart et. al. (2002) regarding cultural orientations could be influencing this aspect. Inglehart et. al (2002) propose an alternative way to understand cultural differences beyond the traditional ideological axis. In this sense, the type of cultural orientation – towards

survival or self-expression – appears to be relevant when trying to explain several punitive attitudes.

In the post-industrial societies, the overcoming of certain economic uncertainties derived in a change of values, product of a new series of preoccupations no longer related to economic security but to the subjective well-being, the quality of life and self-expression (Inglehart 1997 in Adamczyk and Pitt, 2009), where some non-traditional lifestyles seem to be more tolerant, such as homosexuality. In the countries where these economic goals have not been reached, cultural orientations centered in survival prevail, where traditional values associated with family are preponderant and where there is more intolerance towards alternative organizations. The hybrid character that these processes have acquired in Latin America has been strongly pointed out. This is a region where these new cultural orientations coexist with traditional orientations, in a scenario where economic uncertainties persist (Garretón, 2002; Lechner, 1988). This is the framework where our findings seem to be suggestive, as they mark a differentiation no longer based in the traditional-sense ideology but on a different axis. Being married increases the probability of being in favor of not respecting police procedures while tolerance to homosexuality has the opposite effect could seem as two independent facts, but they are accounting for the fact that this axis seems to be classifying lifestyles which derive in different attitudes towards crime.

Lastly, we find that religiosity has a negative and significant impact in police protocols (approximately 3 pp).

## **V. Conclusion**

Based on the prior analysis, it is possible to state several conclusions. On one side, it is important to highlight the high percentage of the population in the Southern Cone who agrees with statements that validate the not-strictly-sticking to the established legal frames when it comes to fighting crime.

In accordance with previous findings, we observed that the justification behind vigilante justice in the Latin American Southern Cone is strongly linked to the respondent's personal experience. This means that it is based on the individuals' vulnerability towards crime, both objective (victimization) and subjective (sensation of insecurity).

On the contrary, the considerations regarding police action and their respect towards legal procedures when it comes to chasing criminals seem to have other reasons behind it. In this case, it depends more of the respondent's philosophy of life and his ideological beliefs. This philosophy of life transcends ideological considerations in more traditional terms (left-right affiliation) and involves cultural orientations, located in a self-expression-survival axis (Inglehart et. al, 2002).

This fact contributes as evidence to be accounted for when evaluation the respondent's attitudes in global terms. Many of the highlighted studies use synthetic indicators of the concept of punitivism as dependent variable, and these indicators are used in different models. This research therefore warns future investigations, as it contributes with evidence that under apparently similar attitudes, different elements could be operating. This means that the concept to be evaluated should be treated with caution.

Finally, the concept of punitivism itself involves a wide variety of aspects of the society, one of them related to public opinion. While when determining punitive attitudes of individuals is important to incorporate several points of view of the subject, it is also key to account for the different aspects which involve it. This article has analyzed two specific opinions which relate to a partial view of the topic in a specific region, so future studies should consider all the elements which make up the punitiveness of the public opinion in a more inclusive way.

## References

- Adamczyk, A., and Pitt, C. (2009). Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context. *Social Science Research*, 38(2), 338-351. Elsevier Inc. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.01.002
- Beato, C. (1999). Social theory and the violence questions: Explanations and analysis of rising crime rates in Latin America. Paper presented at the Research Workshop held at the University of Texas at Austin, "Rising Violence and the Criminal Justice Response in Latin America: Towards an Agenda for Collaborative Research in the 21st Century"
- Borraz, F., Chouhy, C. and Rossi, M. (2012). Victimization y justicia por mano propia en Uruguay. *Documentos de Trabajo DECON*. N°07/12.
- Briceño-León, R., Ávila, O., and Camardiel, A. (2009). *Inseguridad y violencia en Venezuela*. (Alfa, Ed.) (1<sup>o</sup> ed.). Venezuela.

- De la Torre, V., and Álvarez, A. M. (2011). Violencia, Estado de derecho y políticas punitivas en América Central. *Perfiles Latinoamericanos, Enero-juni*.
- Demombynes, G. (2009). The effect of crime victimization on attitudes. *World Bank*, (May).
- Di Tella, R., and Dubra, J. (2011). Free to Punish? The American Dream and the Harsh Treatment of Prisoners. *NBER Working Paper No. 17309*.
- Di Tella, R., and Schargrodsky, E. (2009). Happiness , Ideology and Crime in Argentine Cities. *Inter-American Development Bank, No. IDB-WP*(November).
- Garretón, A. (2002) Política, cultura y sociedad en la transición democrática. *Nueva sociedad* 180-181.
- Gottfredson, M. R., and Hindelang, M. J. (2010). Sociological aspects of criminal victimization. *Review Literature And Arts Of The Americas*, 7(1981), 107-128.
- Hough, M., and Roberts, J. V. (1999). Sentencing trends in Britain Public knowledge and public opinion. *Secretary*, 1(1), 11-26.
- Hutton, N. (2005). Beyond populist punitiveness? *Punishment and Society*, 7(3), 243-258. doi:10.1177/1462474505053828
- Inglehart, R. (1990) *Culture Shift*. Chicago, United States: University of Chicago Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1997) *Modernization and Postmodernization*, Princeton U J, Princeton University Press
- Inglehart, R., Norris, P., Welzel, C., (2002) Gender equality and democracy. *Comparative Sociology* 1, 321–345.
- Kuhn, A. (1989). Attitudes towards punishment. In A. A. del Frate, U. Zvekic, and J. J. M. van Dijk (Eds.), *Understanding Crime. Experiences of Crime and Crime Control* (pp. 271-292). Rome: UNICR.
- Kühnrich, B., and Kania, H. (2005). Attitudes Towards Punishment in the European Union Results from the 2005 European Crime Survey ( ECSS ) with Focus on Germany. *Focus*, 1-71.
- Lechner, N. (1988). *Los patios interiores de la democracia. Subjetividad y política*. Santiago: FLACSO.
- Matthews, R. (2005). The myth of punitiveness. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(2), 175-201. doi:10.1177/1362480605051639
- Mayhew, P., and Van Kesteren, J. (2002). Cross-National Attitudes to Punishment. Findings from the 2000 ICVS. In M. Roberts, J.V. and Hough (Ed.), *Changing*

*Attitudes to Punishment , Public opinion, Crime and Justice.* Devon: Willan Publishing.

Nagin, D. S., Piquero, A. R., Scott, E. S., and Steinberg, L. (2006). Public Preferences for Rehabilitation Versus Incarceration of Juvenile Offenders: Evidence From a Contingent Valuation Survey. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5(4), 627-651. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2006.00406.x

Petersilia, J. (1992). California's Prison Policy: Causes, Costs, and Consequences. *The Prison Journal*, 72(1-2), 8-36. doi:10.1177/0032885592072001002

Piquero, A. R., and Steinberg, L. (2010). Public preferences for rehabilitation versus incarceration of juvenile offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 1-6. Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.11.001

Van Dijk, J., Manchin, R., Van Kesteren, J., Nevala, S., and Hideg, G. (2005). *The Burden of Crime in the EU, A Comparative Analysis of the European Survey of Crime and Safety (EU ICS) 2005. EUICS report* (pp. 1-118). Brussels.

## ANNEX

**Table 1: Description of variables**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Label</b>
<b>Police_protocols</b>	In order to apprehend criminals do you think that the authorities should always respect the law or that occasionally they can skate close to the limits of the law? (1 if can act on the margins occasionally)
<b>Vigilantism</b>	Of people taking the law into their own hands when the government does not punish criminals. How much do you approve or disapprove? (1 if approves)
<b>Victim</b>	Have you been a victim of any type of crime in the past 12 months? ((1 if yes)
<b>Insecurity</b>	Speaking of the neighborhood where you live, and thinking of the possibility of being assaulted or robbed, do you feel very safe, somewhat safe, somewhat unsafe or very unsafe?(1 if somewhat unsafe/very unsafe)
<b>Homo</b>	And now, changing the topic and thinking of homosexuals, how strongly do you approve or disapprove of such people being permitted to run for public office? (1 if disapprove)
<b>Left</b>	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? Indicate the box that comes closest to your own position. (1 if left, 10 right)
<b>Es_good</b>	How would you describe your overall economic situation? Would you say that it is very good or good? (Ordinal variable: good, neutral or bad)
<b>Es_neutral</b>	How would you describe your overall economic situation? Would you say that it is neither good nor bad (Ordinal variable: good, neutral or bad)
<b>Es_improve</b>	Is your economic situation better than in the last twelve months?
<b>Female</b>	1 if female
<b>Age</b>	Age in age brackets (16-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56-65, 65+)

---

<b>Education</b>	Years of education
<b>Married</b>	1 if married
<b>Divorced</b>	1 if divorced
<b>Widow</b>	1 if widow
<b>Wealths</b>	Wealth index according to LAPOP methodology[1]
<b>Biggercity</b>	1 if lives in a big city
<b>Catholic</b>	1 if catholic
<b>Evangelist</b>	1 if evangelic
<b>Attend</b>	1 if attends religious services at least once a week

---

**Table 2: Percentage of approval of procedures outside the law, by country**

<i>Country</i>	<i>Vigilantism</i>		<i>Police Protocols</i>	
	% approval	Position	% approval	Position
<b>Argentina</b>	25.81	11	37.32	12
<b>Brasil</b>	12.95	20	28.90	18
<b>Chile</b>	27.20	8	48.62	5
<b>Paraguay</b>	16.62	19	48.66	4
<b>Uruguay</b>	22.43	12	49.83	3
<b>Average Latin American countries</b>	24.82		39.37	
<b>South Cone average</b>	21.00		35.56	
<b>Total</b>	24.99		38.85	

**Table 3: Marginal effects of probit estimations**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	<b>Vigilantism</b>				<b>Police Protocols</b>			
<b>Victim</b>		0.199***	0.163***	0.201***		0.077	0.026	-0.118**
		[0.039]	[0.028]	[0.025]		[0.069]	[0.054]	[0.045]
<b>Insecurity</b>			0.151*	0.149*			0.228***	0.229***
			[0.061]	[0.062]			[0.058]	[0.057]
<b>Female</b>	0.007	-0.002	-0.006	-0.007	0.001	0.004	0.007	0.007
	[0.057]	[0.054]	[0.060]	[0.060]	[0.044]	[0.041]	[0.038]	[0.038]
<b>Age</b>	-0.009**	-0.009**	-0.009**	-0.009**	-0.008***	-0.007***	-0.008***	-0.008***
	[0.003]	[0.003]	[0.003]	[0.003]	[0.002]	[0.002]	[0.002]	[0.002]
<b>Education</b>	-0.026**	-0.028**	-0.028***	-0.028***	-0.014	-0.014	-0.01	-0.01
	[0.009]	[0.009]	[0.008]	[0.008]	[0.009]	[0.009]	[0.008]	[0.008]
<b>Married</b>	-0.065	-0.07	-0.074	-0.076	0.097*	0.098*	0.095	0.091
	[0.055]	[0.058]	[0.068]	[0.068]	[0.048]	[0.048]	[0.050]	[0.051]
<b>Divorced</b>	0.078	0.064	0.056	0.055	0.04	0.049	0.059	0.055
	[0.083]	[0.084]	[0.073]	[0.073]	[0.076]	[0.075]	[0.078]	[0.079]
<b>Widow</b>	-0.064	-0.057	-0.052	-0.051	0.104	0.098	0.105	0.101
	[0.094]	[0.092]	[0.105]	[0.106]	[0.112]	[0.112]	[0.116]	[0.116]
<b>Wealths</b>	-0.018	-0.018	-0.003	-0.002	0.009	0.01	0.018	0.018
	[0.011]	[0.012]	[0.020]	[0.020]	[0.024]	[0.024]	[0.023]	[0.023]
<b>Biggercity</b>	0.13	0.118	0.091	0.089	-0.044	-0.049	-0.089	-0.083
	[0.083]	[0.088]	[0.092]	[0.092]	[0.050]	[0.050]	[0.046]	[0.044]
<b>Catholic</b>	-0.129	-0.132	-0.121	-0.122	0.005	0.007	0.003	0.005
	[0.084]	[0.083]	[0.085]	[0.085]	[0.071]	[0.070]	[0.070]	[0.069]
<b>Evangelist</b>	-0.213***	-0.206***	-0.186***	-0.186***	-0.051	-0.04	-0.052	-0.054
	[0.047]	[0.041]	[0.041]	[0.043]	[0.092]	[0.087]	[0.087]	[0.087]
<b>Attend</b>	-0.129***	-0.128***	-0.119**	-0.120**	-0.069	-0.075	-0.088*	-0.091*
	[0.036]	[0.039]	[0.040]	[0.039]	[0.041]	[0.042]	[0.038]	[0.039]
<b>Left</b>	0.015	0.014	0.016	0.017	0.034*	0.033*	0.030*	0.030*
	[0.010]	[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.016]	[0.016]	[0.015]	[0.015]
<b>Argentina</b>	0.057	0.046	0.006	-0.002	-0.405***	-0.415***	-0.450***	-0.523***
	[0.044]	[0.042]	[0.030]	[0.033]	[0.014]	[0.015]	[0.032]	[0.036]
<b>Brasil</b>	-0.346***	-0.328***	-0.306***	-0.269***	-0.636***	-0.642***	-0.640***	-0.662***
	[0.031]	[0.034]	[0.041]	[0.039]	[0.050]	[0.051]	[0.055]	[0.050]
<b>Chile</b>	0.229***	0.234***	0.235***	0.256***	-0.035***	-0.036***	-0.078***	-0.141***
	[0.020]	[0.020]	[0.017]	[0.011]	[0.009]	[0.010]	[0.020]	[0.022]
<b>Paraguay</b>	-0.193**	-0.186**	-0.153	-0.154	-0.041	-0.036	-0.078	-0.079
	[0.067]	[0.070]	[0.086]	[0.082]	[0.072]	[0.073]	[0.093]	[0.088]
<b>Es_good</b>			-0.148	-0.148			-0.058	-0.057
			[0.119]	[0.120]			[0.072]	[0.071]
<b>Es_neutral</b>			-0.107	-0.105			-0.027	-0.027
			[0.091]	[0.092]			[0.051]	[0.051]
<b>Es_improve</b>			0.03	0.032			0.049*	0.047*
			[0.050]	[0.050]			[0.020]	[0.019]
<b>Homo</b>			0.052	0.052			-0.141	-0.139
			[0.133]	[0.133]			[0.075]	[0.074]
<b>VictimAR</b>				0.02				0.274***
				[0.030]				[0.037]
<b>VictimBR</b>				-0.195***				0.095***
				[0.018]				[0.020]
<b>VictimCH</b>				-0.091**				0.281***
				[0.034]				[0.030]
<b>VictimPY</b>				0.017				-0.01
				[0.030]				[0.016]
<b>Observations</b>	5,721	5,690	5,614	5,614	5,678	5,651	5,574	5,574
<b>pseudo R-sq</b>	0.033	0.036	0.040	0.040	0.033	0.034	0.042	0.043

Note: Uruguay is the excluded country control variable. Country-cluster errors are considered.