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PREFACE

This book is based on the analysis of data from the Cross-National Program in Political and Social Change. The Cross-National Program was a collaborative program of survey studies in seven nations. The studies dealt with a wide range of questions but focused primarily on citizen involvement in political life. Other works – some dealing with one or a few of the nations studied, others more generally comparative – have appeared. (See the List of Publications of the Cross-National Program in Participation.) This work attempts to deal comprehensively with one aspect of our study across all seven nations: the ways citizens participate and the processes that lead them to do so.

The study began over a decade ago as a follow-up to Almond and Verba’s *The Civic Culture*. The original goal was to replicate that study in some other nations. Over the years the present study has evolved in a somewhat different direction for several reasons. For one thing, we decided to build on rather than replicate the earlier study. In this way, we could take advantage of lessons learned from the earlier work. This choice involves some loss, since replications are valuable ways of achieving continuity in research. But the loss is balanced by our ability to move beyond the previous work. Another source of change in the focus of the study is its organizational structure. From the beginning, it was decided that the study ought to be a cooperative one in which research groups from each of the participating nations would join in research planning and design. The cooperation would go beyond the design of the specific instruments to the choice of a general theoretical orientation. The collaborating groups did join in this process, and the study design developed in new directions in response to their interest.

The resulting study, nevertheless, deals with many of the themes of the earlier work: the citizen as participant, the social sources of that participation, and the values associated with the role of citizen. There are, however, several new emphases. We are more concerned with participatory behaviors – in the wide range of ways in which individuals can participate in politics – than in participatory attitudes. We believe that participatory behaviors have a more immediate impact on politics and that they are somewhat easier to measure in a valid and reliable way.
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across nations. Furthermore, we seek to explain patterns of political participation in terms of the contemporaneous social and psychological characteristics of individuals, not in terms of earlier socialization. Lastly, unlike the approach used in *The Civic Culture*, our concern here is with the problems of social and political equality within nations.

The study began as an attempt to use survey techniques in a number of nations different from the five studied in *The Civic Culture*, particularly some Asian and African nations. The original participating nations were: India, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, and the United States. Two nations had been in the earlier study, three were new. Over time the set changed somewhat. The Mexican group withdrew during the planning phase. (The withdrawal was largely in response to the Project Camelot affair. Project Camelot was a large-scale planned study of insurgency and social stability sponsored by the Pentagon. The revelation of this base of Camelot's support in Chile had repercussions across many Latin American nations and on many research enterprises having no connection with it.) In the later stages of the research three additional nations joined in: Austria, Yugoslavia, and the Netherlands. The result is a quite heterogeneous set of nations – something that (as we shall try to explain in Chapter 2) is an important asset to our work.

We remain within the tradition of *The Civic Culture* in that we use survey studies to deal with macropolitical problems. We are not primarily interested in explaining the behavior of the individual citizen but in understanding the political system and the way in which individual behavior shapes that system. But despite that macroconcern, our explanatory sights have been set somewhat lower than those of the earlier work. We do not try to explain why some democracies are stable and effective whereas others are less so. To answer such a question as that raised in *The Civic Culture* required quite a leap from the data on citizen attitudes and behavior to conclusions about the political system. We want to explain why the participant population in a society takes the shape it does – why some groups are overrepresented and others underrepresented – and what the consequences are of the particular composition of the participant population. Our substantive concern is with the equality of political access and influence within each of the political systems we study, not with the overall survival of the political system. As we shall see, the equality of political access and influence within a political system is a political phenomenon quite closely tied to the data we have, and our manipulation of those data allows us to explain differences among the nations.

Data

The data reported in this volume come from large-scale sample surveys conducted in each of the participating nations. The surveys took
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place at various times between 1966 and 1971, with the sample size ranging from 1,775 in Austria to 2,600 in the United States. The samples were designed to produce a representative cross section of the citizenry in each nation. Exceptions to national coverage exist in three of the nations. In India the sample is limited to four states: Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. In Yugoslavia, it is limited to four republics: Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia, and Slovenia. In each case considerations of cost as well as cultural and linguistic diversity determined the limitation. In Nigeria, our original plan had been for a study in each of the four major regions into which Nigeria was then (1966) divided: the East, Midwest, West, and North. During our field work, violence broke out in a number of northern cities. This had little effect on our sample elsewhere, but made it impossible to complete the northern field work. We have, therefore, limited our analysis to the data from the three nonnorthern regions.

The samples in each nation were designed with multiple purposes in mind, given the varied interests of the researchers. Though the goal was national representativeness (or representativeness within the areas studied), we oversampled in certain target communities and interviewed local political leaders in these communities. This volume is based largely on the cross-section data. A more complete description of the samples is found in Appendix C.

History

The first initiatives for the research project took place during a trip by Gabriel A. Almond to a variety of countries in 1963 during which he had conversations with scholars about the possibility of collaborative research following up that done for The Civic Culture. In the spring of 1964 invitations were sent out to scholars from India, Japan, Nigeria, and Mexico for a meeting to last six weeks at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. The meeting there was a rather open forum for the discussion of a variety of research approaches and topics. Gradually the group converged on the subject of the interrelationship between social and economic change and political participation.

The group worked out an overall sketch of a research design, but no precise delineation of what was to be done. One important product of the meeting was a rather long and cumbersome interview form. Each group promised to test it on a few dozen respondents in each country as a means of determining whether the information we were interested in was, in fact, obtainable. The interview was not a very useful research instrument, and very little of it survived into the final field work. On the other hand, it was organizationally useful. It meant that all of the
research groups spent a large part of the next academic year worrying about the same set of problems and refining their ideas on the subject.

In the summer of 1965, the same research groups met again at the University of Ibadan. The meeting lasted a little over a month and was the most crucial meeting for the development of the project. During this meeting, we agreed on a dual-level survey design (interviewing a cross-section sample as well as local leaders) and upon the overall focus of the interviews. On the basis of this meeting a fairly precise set of interview schedules was worked out. We planned pretest activities for the coming year that would involve the simulation of the entire research task in several communities in each of the countries. During the academic year 1965, pilot studies were conducted in each of the individual countries. The interviews were coded, punched, and sent to Stanford University for preliminary analysis.

In the summer of 1966 there was a briefer meeting of the research groups at Uppsala, Sweden. This meeting led to the drafting of our final questionnaires, which were then sent to each of the participating nations. The field work began in the summer of 1966 and lasted until the spring of 1967. Much of the calendar year of 1967 was spent on coding the data and preparing the data for analysis. In the fall of 1967 the senior researchers from each of the countries came to Palo Alto. Some of them were fellows of the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences for 1968, and others were at the Institute of Political Studies at Stanford. This gave us an extended period together planning and carrying out the preliminary analysis. Our original goal had been to accomplish a great deal of the data analysis jointly during the period when the various researchers were all together, but we were somewhat overambitious in our timing. The coding and cleaning of the data took longer than anticipated. This, coupled with the transition from the IBM 7090 to the IBM 360 delayed the availability of the data, so that only preliminary analysis could be done at that time.

However, much planning of the analysis was possible and some analysis was carried out. In addition, several members of the research teams from the other countries spent an additional six months at the University of Chicago when the American locale of the project moved there at the beginning of 1969.

In the summer of 1969, we held a meeting in Bled, Yugoslavia, to plan possible extensions of the study to several other countries. The initiative for this extension had come, in each case, from the scholars of the respective countries (or, in the case of Austria, from two American scholars who specialized in Austrian politics). The meeting in Yugoslavia focused on two main problems: (1) how to design a study that would

---

1 The field work in any single nation took less time.
Preface

xv

take advantage of what had been learned in the first wave of our research but that would remain comparable to the early research, and (2) how to adjust a study of political participation for application in a socialist society where the institutional structures were somewhat different.

On the basis of this meeting, a parallel study was conducted in Austria in the winter of 1969. In addition, the year 1969–70 was used for some preliminary studies in Yugoslavia and the Netherlands. During that time, one member of the Yugoslavian group spent six months in Chicago working on the research design. During the academic year 1970–1, field work was carried on in Yugoslavia and the Netherlands.

Data analysis has taken place at a variety of sites. The group that prepared the present volume has analyzed these data at computer centers at Stanford, the University of Chicago, the University of Alberta, the University of Leiden, the Max Planck Institute at Garsching, in West Germany, and the University of Iowa. (If surfers travel the world to find that perfect wave, and mountain climbers do the same to climb the unclimbable, cross-national survey researchers, burdened with the immense data files, travel anywhere to find the cheaper computer.) At these places, data were also analyzed at the request of other national groups – members of which often joined us at one or another place.

Funding

The first part of the study was funded by the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The former supported the field research outside of the United States; the latter supported the research within the United States. In addition, there were funds supplied in each of the countries through the local research centers. Though the major funding for the first wave of studies came from the United States, the use of the funds in each of the countries was under the control of the local research team. The data analysis in the United States has been supported by the National Science Foundation. The Japanese group and the Indian group have both received funds within their own nations for data analysis. The director of the Nigerian study – formerly chairman of the Sociology Department at the University of Ibadan – now occupies the Chair of Sociology at Uppsala, where the data analysis is being supported by Swedish funds.

The studies in Yugoslavia and the Netherlands are supported by funds raised in those two countries. The Austrian study was jointly supported by funds from the Institute of International Studies of the University of California at Berkeley and the Institute for Empirical Social Research in Vienna. Thus, over time, the program has moved toward a more dispersed structure of funding.
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Organization

The program was, from the beginning, organized around the principle of maximum possible egalitarian cooperation. Our hope was to have fully cooperative participation in the research design, research administration, and research analysis phases. The major intellectual problems of the study and the major design of the research instruments were determined at the series of conferences among the senior researchers from each of the countries. Within each of the countries, the local team was fully responsible for the conduct of the research.2

Comparative survey research is a slow and complex business. Cooperative research designed and conducted by an international group is slower and more complex by a factor probably equal to the number of collaborating groups (in our case seven). Such a research approach is often defended in terms of the sociology and politics of international social science: Intrusive research by foreigners into another country (particularly by researchers from the United States) is a form of intellectual imperialism; a more equitable approach is one in which multinational groups collaborate. The argument has much validity, and “safari research” where the foreign scholar enters to gather some data with the help of local assistants and carries it off home is and should be largely a thing of the past.

But the main justification for a cooperative style of research is intellectual. One major problem in comparative research is how can one do systematic comparisons across nations (which involves simplification and abstraction from the specific setting of any particular nation) and at the same time do justice to the significant special features of each of the nations being considered (which involves sensitivity to complex contextual factors within each nation). Too much research falls at one extreme or the other: either abstracting a few variables from each country, which may lead to superficial results, or returning to the tradition of the configurative case study, which leads to noncomparable results.

An organizational structure for research that forces scholars who have worked intensively on their own countries to consider their country within a comparative framework is one way of attempting to achieve the two somewhat incompatible goals of comparative research. The specialized knowledge that they bring of their own societies (knowledge that is necessary for meaningful understanding), coupled with the need to compare that society with others, leads to a fairly reasonable compromise between the two polar extremes of research.

Our group discussions constantly moved up and down the ladder of

2 The only exception was the Austrian study that was conducted under the supervision of two American researchers who had worked in Austria.

(See the Acknowledgments for a list of collaborators.)
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specificity: We would discuss some general dimension of interest to us and how we might tap it; one participant would comment, “But that makes no sense in my country”; we would discuss the situation in that country and then attempt to climb up again to our general dimension armed with some understanding that would allow it to make more sense in that country. We tried to avoid forcing the individual nations into categories that had no relevance to their specific situations, but at the same time we tried to avoid the “in our country it is different” kind of parochialism.

Our ability to accomplish this was enhanced by our dedication to a rather flexible research strategy. No attempt was made to have identical research instruments in each nation; we were interested in functional not formal equivalence (see Chapter 2). Our goal was to deal with the same set of theoretical issues and to measure the same set of theoretically relevant dimensions but, if need be, to measure them somewhat differently in each case. Furthermore, the research instruments were not limited to the core of common concerns. In the various nations, additional sections of the questionnaires were devoted to more specific topics of interest of the local research team.

Was the enterprise worth it? In particular, has the collaboration paid off? The answer must be yes and no. In some respects our dream of a fully cooperative research venture across national boundaries worked out as we had hoped. The design of the study bears the imprint of the multiple collaborators. The design was not as neat as one created by a smaller group would have been, and, at times, the variety of concerns we carried almost drowned us. But most likely it is a better design than any that could have been created by one or the other of the national groups. The comparativist may find that we adjusted too much to national differences; the specialist on one or the other nations will certainly find that we have paid insufficient attention to national peculiarities. But one must set the balance between universalism and particularism somewhere, and we are not unhappy about our choice.

Our cooperative dream, however, has been less completely fulfilled at the analysis stage. The project involved a quite explicit agreement on data access. The main principle was that the data from all of the countries would be fully available to the senior participants in each of the countries, who would be free to do as they wished with them – with the requirement that they keep collaborators elsewhere informed. Thus each of the senior researchers in each of the countries has had, in principle, full rights to conduct any kind of analysis he wishes of the data. In fact, however, things do not work out in quite so egalitarian a manner.

It is easier to express the general principle of equality of access to the data and equal opportunities for analysis than to put these into actual
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practice. The members of the national groups differ in terms of the amount of time they have available to them for such activities and in terms of the computer and other facilities available to them. It is a rather empty gesture to provide raw data to collaborators who do not have access to the computer facilities needed for the analysis of those data.

Our research project made provisions for these problems. Members of the research teams spent extended periods in the United States working on the data; the U.S. group provided assistance in organizing data analyses in the various nations; and we carried out numerous data analysis requests for the various national groups. The result has been, we believe, an impressive cross-national research product. Large-scale works on each of the nations have been produced or are in progress by the national teams, and a number of collaborative works have been produced by scholars from the different countries. (A full list is provided in the list of publications of the Cross-National Program in Participation; see page 384.) Further national and comparative studies are in progress in several of the nations.

But the project never achieved the full cross-national cooperative result for which we had hoped. In part this was due to problems beyond our control. National groups differ in the kinds of resources available to them – computer facilities, time, technical assistance. Attempts to balance things by international transfers help. But, as most cross-national researchers know, everything always takes more time and costs more money. The result is that the imbalance is never fully corrected.

Perhaps we have achieved all that one could realistically have hoped to achieve. The works produced by our project are large in volume and, we hope, high in quality as well. And as a glance at the List of Publications will make clear, the product is cross-national. Yet we would be less than honest if we did not share our lingering concern that, though international cooperation may be easier in the social sciences than in politics, it is not all that easy.

Though our data come from seven nations, this is not a book about these nations so much as it is a book about some general social processes for which each nation is the setting. This is not to say that we ignore context. As we shall try to demonstrate, certain general social processes lead to different results within different contexts. The seven nations provide us with the appropriate variation in context. We do not, however, attempt to deal with the nations per se. The result is that no nation receives adequate coverage in this volume, even from the point of view of our main concerns with participation and stratification. The choice to focus on the general problem was deliberate. Fuller considerations of the individual nations on the basis of these data can be found in some of the publications listed toward the end of the book.
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