The Nature of Attitudes Towards Artificial Intelligence Among Mass Publics

Ignacio Urbina¹ April 23. 2024

¹State University of New York at Stony Brook

This material is based upon work supported by NSF under Grant NRT-HDR 2125295. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.



1. Introduction

- 2. Theoretical Framework
- 3. Hypothesis
- 4. Research Design
- 5. Results
- 6. Discussion

Introduction

Rage Against the Machine

The Echoes of the Luddites' 19th Century Revolt Against Automation.



Does job automation risks moderate the relationship between ideology and attitudes toward welfare and redistribution?

- Automation looms as a major threat to employment, with estimates suggesting up to 40% of jobs face a high replacement risk.
- Political Scientists have long sought to understand what drives attitudes toward welfare and redistribution.
- Research Question: Does exposure to automation risks <u>moderate</u> the relationship between individuals' ideology and support for welfare and redistribution policies?

Theoretical Framework

Preferences and Support for Welfare and Redistribution

- Ideology is one of the most important predictors of support for welfare and redistribution. (Armingeon & Weisstanner, 2022)
- A growing literature suggests occupational exposure to job automation risk increases support for redistribution. (Thewissen & Rueda, 2019; Busemeyer & Tober, 2023)
- Yet, some mixed findings exist for welfare support, e.g., UBI. (Dermont & Weisstanner 2020)
- In this paper, building on the theory of psychological needs, I explore the role of job automation in moderating the effect of ideology on welfare and redistribution preferences. (Jost et al. 2009; Feldman 2003)



Ideology (0:left, 10:right w.)

Hypothesis

- Increase perceptions of economic threat.
- Increase support for redistribution, improve perceptions of welfare policies and increase support for UBI (unconditionally).
- Attenuate the effect of ideology on support for redistribution, attitudes toward welfare, and support for UBI.

Research Design

- 7th Wave of the European Social Survey (Fielded 2016).
- Frey and Osborne's 2017 Estimation of Job Automation for SOC-coded occupations.
- Selected Items for Analysis.
 - Unemployment Worry: Likely or very likely will be unemployed and looking for work in the next 12 months.
 - Income Loss Worry: Likely or very likely will face income shortages, so they won't be able to meet their needs in the next 12 months.
 - Welfare 1: Social benefits/services prevent widespread poverty (agree/disagree, Likert, 5p).
 - Welfare 2: Social benefits/services lead to a more equal society (agree/disagree, Likert, 5p).
 - Redistribution: Government should reduce differences in income levels (agree/disagree, Likert, 5p).
 - UBI item: Against or In favor of a basic income scheme (against/in favor, Likert, 4p)

Distribution of Job Automation Risks

Figure 1: Distribution of Job Automation Risks in the ESS Sample



- We use linear regression, including an extensive set of controls and country-fixed effects. We *interact* automation risks with ideology.
- To explore multilevel heterogeneity, using OLS, we decompose automation risks into three orthogonal levels: country, economic industry, and individual. We *interact* these measures with ideology.

Results

	Unemployment Worry (dummy)						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
Autom. Risk	0.14***	0.03 [†]	0.02 [†]	0.02 [†]	-0.01		
	(6.57)	(1.86)	(1.78)	(1.78)	(-0.64)		
Num.Obs.	35 227	24 062	23 988	23 988	23 909		
Especif.	As Is + Country FE	+ Sociodemogr. Controls	+ Unempl. & Unionized	+ Welfare Beneficiary	+ Social Class FE		
R2 Adj.	0.056	0.191	0.231	0.231	0.254		

Significance labels: $^{\dagger} p < 0.10$, $^* p < 0.05$, $^{**} p < 0.01$, $^{***} p < 0.001$. t-statistics in parenthesis. Country-clustered robust standard errors. Sociodemographics: Total income deciles, household size, household with a partner (dummy), education, gender, age. Unempl. & Unionized: current/former union membership (dummy), unemployment status (dummy). Welfare Beneficiary: source of main income is either pensions, unemployment status (dummy). Social class dummies: Small Business Owners, Technical Professionals, Production Workers, Associate Managers, Clerks, Socio-cultural Professionals, and Service Workers.

	Unemployment Worry (dummy)					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Idiosync. AR	0.13***	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.02	
	(5.70)	(0.79)	(0.71)	(0.71)	(-1.00)	
Industry AR	0.18***	0.10**	0.08**	0.08**	0.05 [†]	
	(8.48)	(3.58)	(3.24)	(3.24)	(2.02)	
Especif.	As Is + Country FE	+ Sociodemogr. Controls	+ Unempl. & Unionized	+ Welfare Beneficiary	+ Social Class FE	
Num.Obs.	34 763	23 801	23 727	23 727	23 650	
R2 Adj.	0.057	0.193	0.234	0.234	0.256	

Significance labels: $^{\dagger} p < 0.10$, $^* p < 0.05$, $^{**} p < 0.01$, $^{***} p < 0.001$. t-statistics in parenthesis. Country-clustered robust standard errors. Sociodemographics: Total income deciles, household size, household with a partner (dummy), education, gender, age. Uenmpl. & Unionized: current/former union membership (dummy), unemployment status (dummy). Welfare Beneficiary: source of main income is either pensions, unemployment benefits, or other welfare benefits (dummies). Social class dummies: Small Business Owners, Technical Professionals, Production Workers, Associate Managers, Clerks, Socio-cultural Professionals, and Service Workers.

	Redistr.		Welfare		UBI	
	(1a)	(1b)	(2a)	(2b)	(3a)	(3b)
ldiosync. AR	0.05 (1.13)	0.04 (1.06)	-0.03 (-0.68)	-0.03 (-0.72)	0.03 (0.90)	0.03 (0.86)
Industry AR	-0.07	-0.06	0.01 (0.07)	0.01 (0.12)	-0.02	-0.02 (-0.24)
Ideology	-0.10*** (-6.62)	-0.25*** (-5.14)	-0.02 [†] (-1.94)	-0.05 (-0.94)	-0.03*	-0.23*** (-5.75)
Idiosy. AR × Ideology	(,	0.08*** (4.82)	(0.03*	(=:,	0.04 [†] (1.85)
Industry AR × Ideology		0.13** (3.68)		0.06		0.02
Country AR × Ideology		0.30** (3.38)		0.06 (0.55)		0.38*** (4.35)
Full Model Num.Obs. R2 Adj.	Yes 23 585 0.148	Yes 23 585 0.154	Yes 23 576 0.082	Yes 23 576 0.082	Yes 22 781 0.062	Yes 22 781 0.066

Significance labels: $^{\dagger}p < 0.10$, $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{***}p < 0.001$. t-statistics in parenthesis. Country-clustered robust standard errors. Controls for Country Fixed Effects, Sociodemographics, Unempl. & Unionized, Welfare Beneficiary, Social class dummies.

Automation as Moderator of the Ideology's Mfx on Redistr. Pref.



95% Confidence Intervals.

Automation as Moderator of the Ideology's Mfx on Welfare Att.



95% Confidence Intervals.

Discussion

- Exposure to industry-level job automation risks increases economic anxiety.
- In contrast to previous work, there is no evidence of a direct effect of automation risk on support for redistribution.
- We find that automation risks **attenuate** the relationship between ideology and support for redistribution and positive attitudes toward welfare.
- Psychological needs, motivations, individual differences, and economic threat
 - We must consider the effect of economic threats and individual differences simultaneously.