The Civic Culture Transformed

From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens

This book reevaluates Almond, Verba, and Pye's original ideas about the shape of a civic culture that supports democracy. Marshaling a massive amount of cross-national, longitudinal public opinion data from the World Values Survey, the authors demonstrate multiple manifestations of a deep shift in the mass attitudes and behaviors that undergird democracy. The chapters in this book show that in dozens of countries around the world, citizens have turned away from allegiance toward a decidedly "assertive" posture to politics: they have become more distrustful of electoral politics, institutions, and representatives and are more ready to confront elites with demands from below. Most importantly, societies that have advanced the most in the transition from an allegiant to an assertive model of citizenship are better-performing democracies – in terms of both accountable and effective governance.

Russell J. Dalton is a professor of political science and the founding director of the Center for the Study of Democracy at the University of California, Irvine. His recent publications include *Citizen Politics*, sixth edition (2013); *The Apartisan American* (2012); *Political Parties and Democratic Linkage* (2011); and *The Good Citizen* (2009). Dalton has also edited or coedited more than a dozen volumes, including *Citizens*, *Context and Choice* (2011); *Party Politics in East Asia* (2008); and *Citizens*, *Democracy and Markets around the Pacific Rim* (2006).

Christian Welzel is a professor of political science and chair of political culture research at the Center for the Study of Democracy, Leuphana University. He is also a foreign consultant for the Laboratory of Comparative Social Research at the Higher School of Economics, St. Petersburg, Russia. He is a former president of the World Values Survey Association. Welzel's recent books include *Freedom Rising: Human Empowerment and the Quest for Emancipation* (Cambridge, 2013, winner of the Alexander L. George Award and the Stein Rokkan Prize); *Democratization* (with Ronald Inglehart, Christian Haerpfer, and Patrick Bernhagen, 2009); and *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy* (with Ronald Inglehart, Cambridge, 2005).

Other World Values Survey Books from Cambridge University Press

Christian Welzel, *Freedom Rising: Human Empowerment and the Quest for Emancipation*, 2013 (winner of the Alexander L. George Award and the Stein Rokkan Prize).

Doh Chull Shin, Confucianism and Democratization in East Asia, 2012.

Pippa Norris, Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited, 2011.

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, *Cosmopolitan Communications: Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World*, 2009.

Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, *Modernization*, *Cultural Change and Democracy*, 2005.

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, *Sacred and Secular: Politics and Religion* Worldwide, 2004.

Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris, *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change around the World*, 2003.

The Civic Culture Transformed

From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens

Edited by **RUSSELL J. DALTON** *University of California, Irvine*

CHRISTIAN WELZEL Leuphana University, Lüneburg



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

```
www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107682726
```

© Cambridge University Press 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

The civic culture transformed : from allegiant to assertive citizens / edited by Russell J. Dalton, Christian Welzel.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-03926-1 (hardback) – ISBN 978-1-107-68272-6 (paperback)

 Political culture. 2. Political participation. 3. Political psychology. 4. Democracy.
 Government accountability. I. Dalton, Russell J., editor of compilation. II. Welzel, Christian, 1964– editor of compilation.

JA75.7.C59 2014 306.2–dc23 2014018495

ISBN 978-1-107-03926-1 Hardback ISBN 978-1-107-68272-6 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

To Ronald Inglehart, for a career of giving voice to citizens and developing the research infrastructure so others could follow his lead

Contents

List of Figures	<i>page</i> ix
List of Tables	xiii
Contributors	xv
Foreword: Pushing the Envelope – Analyzing the Impact of Values Marita R. Inglehart	xix
Preface and Acknowledgments	xxvii
I Political Culture and Value Change Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel	I
PART A: CHANGING VALUES	
2 Value Change over a Third of a Century: The Evidence for Generational Replacement Paul R. Abramson	19
 The Decline of Deference Revisited: Evidence after Twenty-Five Years Neil Nevitte 	35
4 Enlightening People: The Spark of Emancipative Values Christian Welzel and Alejandro Moreno Alvarez	59
PART B: CHANGING IMAGES OF GOVERNMENT	
5 Reassessing the <i>Civic Culture</i> Model Russell J. Dalton and Doh Chull Shin	91
6 Dissatisfied Democrats: Democratic Maturation in Old and New Democracies Hans-Dieter Klingemann	116

vii

viii	Contents
 7 Support for Democracy in Postcommunist Europe and Post-Soviet Eurasia Christian W. Haerpfer and Kseniya Kizilova 	158
PART C: THE IMPACT OF CULTURAL CHANGE	
8 The Structure and Sources of Global Environmental Attitudes Robert Rohrschneider, Matthew Miles, and Mark Peffley	193
9 Social Change and the Politics of Protest Tor Georg Jakobsen and Ola Listhaug	213
10 Mecca or Oil? Why Arab States Lag in Gender Equality Pippa Norris	240
Allegiance Eroding: People's Dwindling Willingness toFight in WarsBi Puranen	261
12 From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens Christian Welzel and Russell J. Dalton	282
References	307
Index	325

List of Figures

2.1	Percentage of postmaterialists minus materialists over time	page 23
3.1	Stability and change in patterns of authority	42
3.2	Trends in authority orientations	43
3.3	Cross-national trends in responses to the	
	Independence-Obedience Index	44
3.4	General deference by cohort, 1981–2006	47
3.5	Changing levels of independence-obedience by cohort,	
	1981-2006	48
3.6	General deference and institutional performance	54
4.1	A stepwise qualification of people's liberal understanding	5.
	of democracy	64
4.2	Definitions of democracy by culture zone before and after	
	qualification	71
4.3	Desires for democracy by culture zone before and after	
	qualification	72
4.4	Ratings of democracy by culture zone before and after	
	qualification	73
4.5	The combined individual-level and societal-level effect of	, 2
	emancipative values on the strength of people's desires for	
	democracy	76
4.6	The combined individual-level and societal-level effect of	
	emancipative values on the liberalness of people's notions	
	of democracy	77
4.7	The combined individual-level and societal-level effects of	
	emancipative values on the criticalness of people's ratings	
	of democracy	78

ix

х		List of Figures
4.8	The combined individual-level and societal-level effects of emancipative values on people's critical-liberal desires for	
	democracy	79
4.9	Dissolving the coexistence paradox	83
5.1	Human development and political interest	97
5.2	Human development and confidence in government	100
5.3	Confidence in parliament over time in advanced industria	
	democracies	102
5.4	Confidence in parliament before and after democratic	
	transition	104
5.5	Confidence in parliament in postcommunist nations	105
5.6	The distribution of authoritarians and democrats	107
5.7	Democratic development and citizenship orientations	IIO
6.1	Proportion of democrats over time	124
6.2	Negative performance evaluations over time	125
6.3	Dissatisfied democrats over time	128
6.4	Civic attitudes over time	130
6.5	Levels of constraint over time	132
6.6	Confidence in parliament and the probability of being a	
	satisfied democrat	135
6.7	Representation of postmaterialists among dissatisfied and	
	satisfied democrats	137
7 . 1	Three processes of transformation on three levels	160
7.2	Distrusting democrats and actual levels of democracy	177
7.3	The pyramid of political support in postcommunist	0
	countries	181
7•4	Differences in the support pyramids between Central and	
0	Eastern Europe	182
8.1	The direct and conditional relationships explored in this	0
0	study	198
8.2	Average commitment to environmental protection by	
0	human development source: World Values Survey 2008	199
8.3a	Concerns about local pollution on environmentalism	
0.1	conditioned by actual pollution levels (EPI)	207
	Concerns about global pollution on environmentalism	0
	conditioned by actual levels of pollution (EPI)	208
8.4	Relationship between postmaterial values and	
	environmentalism conditioned by level of development	
	(HDI)	209
9.1	Protest participation by economic development and	
	survey wave	222
9.2	Protest participation by economic development	225
9.3	Effect of income in different societies on the likelihood of	
	protest	230

List of Figures

10.1	Structural and cultural models of women's representation	244
10.2	Sexual liberalization and gender equality values by type of	
	society	252
10.3	Cultural attitudes, oil, and the proportion of women in	
	parliament, 2005	256
11.1	Percentage of national publics willing to fight for their	
	countries	264
11.2	Relationship between technological advancement and	
	choice orientations	269
11.3	Proportional drop in willingness to fight by global region	274
12.1	Allegiant and assertive cultures (societies)	295
12.2	Allegiant and assertive cultures (culture zones)	296
12.3	Allegiant and assertive cultures (culture zone cohort	
	trajectories)	297
12.4	Visualization of model 1.1 of Table 12.2	302
12.5	Visualization of model 2.1 of Table 12.2	303

xi

List of Tables

1.1	Aspects of Allegiant and Assertive Citizenship	page 11
1.2	The Five Waves of the World Values Survey	12
3.1	The Political Correlates of General Deference	45
3.2	Determinants of General Deference (Retrospective), 1981	50
3.3	Detecting Statistical Imprints (Prospective) on General	-
	Deference, 2006	52
4.1	Empirical Dimensions in Popular Definitions of	-
-	Democracy	65
4.2	Testing Individual-Level and Societal-Level Effects of	-
-	Emancipative Values on Popular Views of Democracy:	
	MLMs	80
5.1	The Correlates of Cultural Traits	98
5.2	A Typology of Political Orientations	109
6.1	Democrats as Defined by the Democracy-Autocracy Index	123
6.2	Citizens with a Negative Performance Evaluation of	
	Democracy	125
6.3	Dissatisfied Democrats	127
6.4	Rank Order of Levels of Civic Attitudes	129
6.5	Association of Levels of Civic Attitudes and the	
	Democracy-Autocracy Index	131
6.6	Predicting Satisfied and Dissatisfied Democrats	134
6.7	Dissatisfied Democrats and Postmaterialist Value	
	Orientations	137
6.8	Correlations between Dissatisfied Democrats and the	
	Materialism-Postmaterialism Index	138
7.1	Support for the Political Community	164
7.2	Support for the Democratic System	168
7•3	Confidence in National Government	172
		xiii

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03926-1 - The Civic Culture Transformed: From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens
Edited by Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel
Frontmatter
More information

xiv		List of Tables
	Confidence in National Parliament	174
, ,	Confidence in Political Parties	175
	Correlates of Support for Political Institutions	178
7.7	Correlates of Support for Democracy as a System of	
	Government	179
7.8	Correlates of Support for the National Community	180
8.1	A Two-Factor Model of Environmentalism and Economic	
	Ideology	201
8.2	A Three-Factor Model of Environmentalism and Local	
	and Global Pollution Perceptions	202
8.3	Models Predicting Commitment to Environmental	
2	Protection	205
9.1	Three-Level Models of Protest Activity, 1981–2007	228
10.1	Multilevel Model Predicting Cultural Values	254
	Regression Model Predicting Women's Representation in	51
	Elected Office	257
11.1	Explaining Willingness to Fight for One's Country	57
	(National-Level Regression Analyses)	272
TT.2	Multilevel Model of Willingness to Fight for One's	_/_
	Country	277
тэт	Measuring Allegiant Culture and Assertive Culture with	-//
12.1	WVS Data	293
та а	Country-Level Regressions Examining the Effects of	295
12,2	Allegiant Culture and Assertive Culture on Accountable	
	8	
	Governance and Effective Governance	300

Contributors

Paul R. Abramson is professor of political science at Michigan State University. He is the author of *Generational Change in American Politics* (1975), *The Political Socialization of Black Americans* (1977), *Political Attitudes in America* (1983), and *Politics in the Bible* (2012). He is coauthor of *Value Change in Global Perspective* (with Ronald Inglehart, 1995) and coauthor of a series of seventeen books on presidential and congressional elections with John H. Aldrich and David W. Rohde, the most recent of which is *Change and Continuity in the 2012 Elections* (2014). He is also author or coauthor of more than seventy journal articles, including thirteen in the *American Political Science Review*.

Russell J. Dalton is professor of political science at the University of California, Irvine. His research focuses on public opinion, attitudinal change, electoral and political behavior, and party politics in contemporary democracies. He recently authored *Citizen Politics*, sixth edition (2013), *The Apartisan American* (2012), *Political Parties and Democratic Linkage* (2011), *The Good Citizen* (2009), and *Democratic Challenges – Democratic Choices* (2004). Dalton has also edited or coedited more than a dozen volumes, including *Citizens*, *Context and Choice* (2011); *Party Politics in East Asia* (2008); *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior* (2007); *Citizens, Democracy and Markets around the Pacific Rim* (2006); *Democracy Transformed* (2003); and *Parties with Partisans* (2001).

Christian W. Haerpfer is professor of political science and holds the Established First Chair of Politics at the University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom. He is also head of the Department of Politics and International Relations and director of the European Centre for Survey Research at the University of Aberdeen and of the Eurasia Barometer, and President of the World Values Survey Association. His research focuses on democratization, comparative public opinion, and

xv

xvi

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-03926-1 - The Civic Culture Transformed: From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens Edited by Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel Frontmatter More information

Contributors

electoral and political behavior in postcommunist Europe and post-Soviet Eurasia. His most recent books include *Living Conditions*, *Lifestyles and Health in Post-Soviet Eurasia* (with Claire Wallace and Martin McKee, 2013); Democratization (with Ronald Inglehart, Chris Welzel, and Patrick Bernhagen, 2009); and Democracy and Enlargement in Post-Communist Europe (2002).

Tor Georg Jakobsen is a postdoctoral researcher in political science at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology and an associate professor at Trondheim Business School. His dissertation is "Macro Factors and Public Opinion: An Investigation of Economic Left-Right Attitudes in Advanced Industrialized Democracies." Jakobsen's fields of interest include political behavior, quantitative methods, and conflict and peace studies. Jakobsen has authored and coauthored articles in, among other journals, *European Sociological Review*; Work, Employment and Society; and Social Indicators Research.

Kseniya Kizilova is a Research Fellow at the European Centre for Survey Research, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom. She is the manager of the project "ArabTrans: Political and Social Transformations in the Arab World." Kizilova is also vice director of the Eurasia Barometer. Her research interests focus on identities, population health and life quality, political support, and trust. She has more than thirty scientific publications.

Hans-Dieter Klingemann is Professor Emeritus of political science at the Freie Universitaet Berlin, Director Emeritus of the Research Unit "Institutions and Social Change" at the Social Science Research Center Berlin, and Global Professor of Political Science at New York University in Abu Dhabi. His research focuses on the comparative study of political behavior, political parties, and democratic political culture. In 2011, he received the Lifetime Achievement Award of the European Consortium of Political Research. Klingemann's edited and coedited books include Parties, Policies and Democracy (1994); Citizens and the State (1995); A New Handbook of Political Science (1996); Mapping Policy Preferences (2001); Democracy and Political Culture in Eastern Europe (2006); Mapping Policy Preferences II (2006); The State of Political Science in Western Europe (2007); The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior (2007); The Comparative Study of Electoral Behavior (2009); and Cultural Diversity, European Identity, and the Legitimacy of the EU (2011).

Ola Listhaug is professor of political science at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim. His research focuses on public opinion, political trust, and political behavior. Recent books include *Losers' Consent* (with Christopher J. Anderson, André Blais, Shaun Bowler, and Todd Donovan, 2005), *Civic and Uncivic Values – Serbia in the Post-Milosevic Era* (edited with Sabrina Ramet and Dragana Dulic, 2011), *Civic and Uncivic Values in Macedonia* (edited with Sabrina Ramet and Albert Simkus; 2013), and *Bosnia-Herzegovina since Dayton* (edited with Sabrina Ramet, 2013).

Contributors

xvii

Matthew Miles received his PhD from the University of Kansas and now teaches at Brigham Young University in Idaho. His research interests include American politics, comparative politics, and quantitative and experimental research methods. His PhD research examined the interaction between partisanship, policy polarization, and the impact of institutions on electoral campaigns.

Alejandro Moreno Alvarez is professor of political science at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México and director of the Department of Public Opinion Research at the *Reforma* newspaper, both in Mexico City. He is president (2013–14) of the World Association for Public Opinion Research. He has served as principal investigator in Mexico for the World Values Survey and for the Comparative National Election Project and as managing director for the 2010 and 2011 Latinobarometro surveys. Among his books are *Political Cleavages* (1999), *El votante mexicano* (2003), *Nuestros valores* (2005), *La decisión electoral* (2009), and *Consolidating Mexico's Democracy* (edited with Jorge I. Domínguez and Chappell Lawson, 2009).

Neil Nevitte is professor of political science and public policy and governance at the University of Toronto. He is a coinvestigator of the Canadian Election Study and the principal investigator of the Canadian World Values Survey and has published a number of books, including, most recently, *A Question* of Ethics: Canadians Speak Out (2006), The Democratic Audit of Canada: Citizens (2004), Anatomy of a Liberal Victory (2002), Value Change and Governance (2002), Unsteady State (2000), The Challenge of Direct Democracy (1996), and Decline of Deference (1996). He has contributed to a variety of academic journals. His research interests are in public opinion, voting, value change, and the problems associated with transitional elections.

Pippa Norris is the McGuire Lecturer in Comparative Politics at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, and ARC Laureate Fellow and professor of government and international relations at the University of Sydney. Norris has published more than forty books, including *A Virtuous Circle* (2000), *Digital Divide* (2001), *Democratic Phoenix* (2002), *Rising Tide* (with Ronald Inglehart, 2003), *Electoral Engineering* (2004), *Sacred and Secular* (with Ronald Inglehart, 2004, 2010), *Radical Right* (2005), *Driving Democracy* (2008), *Cosmopolitan Communications* (with Ronald Inglehart, 2009), *Democratic Deficit* (2011), and *Making Democratic Governance Work* (2012).

Mark Peffley is professor of political science at the University of Kentucky. His research focuses on public opinion, political psychology, racial attitudes, and political tolerance. He is director of the Quantitative Initiative for Policy and Social Research and former coeditor of the journal *Political Behavior*. He is coauthor of *Justice in America: The Separate Realities of Blacks and Whites* (with Jon Hurwitz, 2011), the 2011 winner of the Robert E. Lane Award for Best Book in Political Psychology.

xviii

Contributors

Bi Puranen is associate professor in the history of economics at the University of Stockholm. She is also secretary general of the World Values Survey Association and senior research Fellow at the Institute for Future Studies in Sweden. Her research focuses on health, human security, tolerance, and changing values. Puranen coedited *Religion, Democratic Values and Political Conflict* (2009). Her most recent publications include *Willingness to Fight for One's Country and the Importance of Democracy* (2008), *European Values on Security and Defense: An Exploration of the Correlates of Willingness to Fight for One's Country* (2009), *The Transformation of Europe's Armed Forces* (2010), and *How Values Transform Military Culture* (in Swedish, 2012).

Robert Rohrschneider is the Sir Robert Worcester Distinguished Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Kansas. His research interests focus on comparative public opinion and parties in advanced industrial democracies. He is the coauthor of *The Strain of Representation* (2012) and authored *Learning Democracy* (1999), which won the 1998 Stein Rokkan Prize for Comparative Social Science Research. His research has also been published in such journals as the *American Journal of Political Science*, *American Political Science Review*, the *European Journal of Political Research*, *Comparative Political Studies*, and the *Journal of Politics*.

Doh Chull Shin is the Jack Peltason Scholar in Residence at the Center for the Study of Democracy at the University of California, Irvine, and Professor Emeritus, Korea Foundation Chair, and Middlebush Chair at the University of Missouri, Columbia. He is the founder of the Korea Democracy Barometer and cofounder of the Asia Barometer. His recent books include Confucianism and Democratization in East Asia (2011); The Quality of Life in Confucian Asia (2010); How East Asians View Democracy (2008); Citizens, Democracy and Markets around the Pacific Rim (2006); and Mass Politics and Culture in Democratizing Korea (2000).

Christian Welzel is chair in political culture research at the Centre for the Study of Democracy at Leuphana University, Lueneburg, Germany, and foreign consultant at the Laboratory for Comparative Social Research at the Higher School of Economics, St. Petersburg, Russia. He is also past president of the World Values Survey Association. His research focuses on human empowerment, emancipative values, cultural change, and democratization. Author of some hundred scholarly publications, his most recent books include *Freedom Rising: Human Empowerment and the Quest for Emancipation* (2013) – winner of the 2014 Alexander L. George Award and the Stein Rokkan Prize; *Democratization* (with Christian Haerpfer, Ronald Inglehart, and Patrick Bernhagen, 2009); and *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy* (with Ronald Inglehart, 2005).

Foreword

Pushing the Envelope – Analyzing the Impact of Values

Marita R. Inglehart

In a sense, this book began when Ronald Inglehart went to Paris in May 1968 to investigate the causes of a student uprising that had just paralyzed France. He mounted a representative national survey of the French public that probed into the motivations underlying the greatest mass uprising since World War II and why the Gaullist government that had opposed it was returned to power by a majority of French voters in subsequent national elections.

When he began to analyze the results, Inglehart was surprised: the data contradicted his expectations. Like most observers – including the strikers and demonstrators themselves – he assumed that the May 1968 uprising was a manifestation of class conflict. Paris was covered with posters attacking capitalist exploitation; French intellectuals interpreted the events in Marxist terms, and the participants used standard Marxist slogans about class struggle. Accordingly, Inglehart initially struggled to make the findings fit Marxist expectations. New elections were held a month after the strikes and demonstrations. His data showed that instead of heightened class polarization, with the proletariat supporting the parties of the Left and the bourgeoisie rallying behind General de Gaulle, a large share of the working-class voters had shifted to support the Gaullist ruling party, contributing to its victory. It was mainly middle-class voters who moved in the opposite direction.

Seeking to understand why this happened, Inglehart analyzed the responses to an open-ended question that asked about the goals of those who had taken part in the strikes and demonstrations. The motivations varied sharply by age and social class. Working-class respondents, especially the older ones, overwhelmingly mentioned higher salaries. Middle-class respondents, especially the younger ones, said they wanted a freer, less impersonal society. Inglehart hypothesized that these age and class differences reflected a process of intergenerational value change linked with the economic miracles of the postwar era.

xix

xх

Foreword

He reasoned that, throughout history, most people have grown up experiencing economic and physical insecurity. Germany was a particularly striking example that quickly caught Inglehart's attention right after his visits to France. In Germany, the older generations had experienced deprivation and loss of life during World War I, followed by the Great Depression of the 1930s, and then defeat, occupation, and liberation during World War II. The postwar era, by contrast, brought historically unprecedented levels of economic and physical security. During the two decades before 1968, Germany experienced the highest economic growth rates in its history. This economic development, combined with the emergence of the modern welfare state, meant that for the first time in history, a large part of the population had grown up in a society where starvation was virtually unknown. A large part of the postwar generation no longer gave top priority to economic security, instead placing growing emphasis on autonomy and freedom of expression.

A society's basic values, of course, do not change overnight, and older generations continued to emphasize the materialistic goals that had shaped them during their formative years. But the more secure strata of the postwar generation gave higher priority to "postmaterialist" goals, as Inglehart called them.

The student protesters in France, Germany, and elsewhere in the Western world indicated the political emergence of the postwar generation. Although their formative conditions had been present for years, this generation did not become old enough to have an impact on politics until the 1960s, when they were university students. Eventually they would occupy the leading positions in society, but initially they saw themselves as having values that were sharply different from those of their elders. "Don't trust anyone over thirty!" was a widespread slogan. When postmaterialists first emerged as a political force, they tended to express themselves in Marxist slogans, which were then the standard rhetoric of protest in Western Europe. To a large extent, the term "Left" *meant* the Marxist parties, and it was natural for the postmaterialists to assume that they were Marxists. But in fact there were profound differences between the goals of the postmaterialists and those of the Marxist Left, as the postmaterialists gradually discovered.

In 1970, Inglehart tested his postmaterialist value change theory in a sixnation survey of European attitudes with a battery of questions he had explicitly designed to measure materialist versus postmaterialist values. In all six countries (Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands), there were massive differences between the values of young and old respondents. Among those older than sixty-five, materialists outnumbered postmaterialists by a margin of fourteen to one; but among the postwar generation, postmaterialists were more numerous than materialists. Moreover, within each birth cohort, postmaterialists were much more heavily represented among the economically secure strata than among the less-educated and lower-income groups. The article reporting these findings was published in 1971 in the

Foreword

xxi

American Political Science Review, and the concept of postmaterialism entered the vocabulary of modern political science.¹

Several critics argued that the dramatic value differences between age groups reflected life-cycle effects rather than generational change. Data from a long time series would be needed to answer this question. The four-item materialistpostmaterialist values battery was included in the Eurobarometer surveys beginning in 1973 and was continued for decades. This made it possible to carry out cohort analyses based on data covering a long time series. The results confirmed that a process of intergenerational value change was taking place: given birth cohorts did not become more materialist as they grew older, and as younger cohorts gradually replaced older ones in the adult population, the society as a whole became increasingly postmaterialist. In addition, the wealth of the data in the Eurobarometer studies enabled survey researchers to examine the range of attitudes and behaviors linked to postmaterialist value change, stimulating a growing body of research on this topic.

The research agenda on value change in contemporary societies continued to expand. In 1973, Inglehart developed a broader-based twelve-item battery. With Samuel Barnes, Max Kaase, Warren Miller, Hans-Dieter Klingemann, and Alan Marsh, he helped design the Political Action study, which demonstrated the link between value change and new forms of political action such as protests, petitions, sit-ins, and various other manifestations of contentious action.²

The concept of postmaterialist values has become a standard term in social science (in 2014, a Google Scholar search on "postmaterialist values" produced more than 15,000 citations). But in subsequent research, Inglehart found that the value shift he first measured in 1970 was part of a much broader process of intergenerational cultural change linked with modernization.³ Materialist-postmaterialist values were just one component of a broader dimension of cross-cultural variation, which he called survival–self-expression values. Self-expression values give high priority to environmental protection, tolerance of out-groups, gender equality, and emphasis on participation in decision making in economic and political life. These values reflect mass polarization over gender equality and individual freedoms, which are part of a broader syndrome of tolerance of out-groups, including foreigners and gays and lesbians. The shift

¹ R. Inglehart, "The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies," *American Political Science Review* 65 (1971): 991–1017; R. Inglehart, *The Silent Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977).

² S. H. Barnes, M. Kaase, K. Allerbeck, F. Heunks, R. Inglehart, M. K. Jennings, et al., *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979).

³ R. Inglehart, *Culture Shift* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990); R. Inglehart, *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977); P. Abramson and R. Inglehart, *Value Change in Global Perspective* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995); R. Inglehart and W. Baker, "Modernization, Cultural Change and the Persistence of Traditional Values," *American Sociological Review* 65 (2000): 19–51.

xxii

Foreword

from survival values to self-expression values also includes a shift in childrearing values, from an emphasis on hard work and conformity to social norms toward emphasis on imagination and tolerance as important values to teach a child. Plus it goes with a rising sense of subjective well-being that is conducive to tolerance, trust, political moderation, and expressive political action – all of which are conducive to democracy.

Building on this revised view of modernization, Inglehart, in collaboration with various colleagues, particularly Christian Welzel and Pippa Norris, developed the evolutionary modernization theory. Departing from earlier versions of modernization theory, it abandons simplistic assumptions of linearity.⁴ Instead, it emphasizes that modernization is reversible and can change direction. Thus, the transition from agrarian to industrial society was linked with a cultural shift from "traditional" to "secular-rational values," which made the emergence of "electoral democracy" possible, although by no means inevitable. Then, the transition from industrial to postindustrial society brought a shift in a very different direction: from "survival" to "self-expression values," which makes "liberal democracy" increasingly likely. This theory also moves from a narrow focus on changes in objective socioeconomic conditions to examine changes in people's subjective beliefs and the impact of these beliefs on regime institutions and public policies. Finally, this theory recognizes the enduring impact of a society's historic heritage, as is manifest in the robust global cultural zones based on religious and colonial experiences: economic development tends to change a society's culture in roughly predictable ways. But the process is path dependent: the fact that a society was historically Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, Muslim, or Confucian continues to shape its people's values today.

Nevertheless, it seems clear that rising economic and physical security tends to erode the rigid cultural norms that characterized agrarian societies, leading to norms that allow greater individual autonomy and free choice. Strikingly similar findings have been reported by researchers in other disciplines from anthropology to biology. Thus, Gelfand and colleagues find that nations that encountered severe ecological and historical threats have stronger norms and lower tolerance of deviant behavior than do other nations, arguing that existential pressures determine whether a culture is tolerant of deviance.⁵ Similarly, Thornhill and colleagues find that historic vulnerability to infectious disease is linked with collectivist attitudes, xenophobia, and low support for gender equality – all of which hinder the emergence of democracy.⁶

⁴ R. Inglehart and P. Norris, *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change around the World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); P. Norris and R. Inglehart, *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*, expanded 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); R. Inglehart and C. Welzel, *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁵ M. J. Gelfand, J. L. Raver, L. Nishii, L. M. Leslie, J. Lun, B. C. Lim, et al., "Differences between Tight and Loose Cultures: A 33-Nation Study," *Science* 27 (2011): 1100–4.

⁶ R. Thornhill, C. Fincher, and D. R. Murray, "Zoonotic and Non-zoonotic Diseases in Relation to Human Personality and Societal Values," *Evolutionary Psychology* 8 (2010): 151–55.

Foreword

xxiii

Inglehart's theory of postmaterialism and the revised theory of modernization that developed from it continue to be the basis of evolving theories. Recent extensions include Welzel's *general theory of emancipation*⁷ as well as Dalton and Welzel's *allegiance-assertion theory*, pursued in this volume, which postulates a shift from allegiant to assertive types of citizens. The underlying logic connecting this lineage of theories is that increasing existential security, cognitive mobilization, and other opportunity-widening aspects of modernization tend to make people more self-directed and to shift their emphasis on freedom of choice and equality of opportunities. These values fuel various social movement activities that advocate gender equality, tolerance of gays and lesbians, and participatory democracy throughout societal life.

In 1973, Jacques-René Rabier launched the Eurobarometer surveys and had the foresight to include the materialist-postmaterialist values in a long-term program of monitoring the attitudinal component of social change. This made it possible to test these ideas empirically and to modify and build on them to improve our understanding of how people's beliefs and goals are changing. Rabier is one of the unsung heroes of cross-national survey research. He not only launched the Eurobarometer surveys but also inspired and supported other cross-national survey research programs such as the Latino Barometer, the Afro Barometer, and the East Asia Barometer. He also helped design the European Values Study, launched in 1981 by Jan Kerkhofs and Ruud de Moore, which was carried out by the same survey institutes that did the Eurobarometer and included many of its key indicators, such as materialist-postmaterialist values and unconventional political action measures from the Political Action Surveys. Later, de Moor and Kerkhofs invited Inglehart to help expand the European Values Study (EVS) into a global survey project that in 1990 became the World Values Survey (WVS). In 1995, Inglehart launched a new wave of the WVS on his own, and in 1999, the EVS and WVS were established as two separate groups, which continue to cooperate, sharing key batteries of items to build up an unprecedented time series for the analysis of value change. Kerkhof's and de Moor's work has been carried on with great success by Paul de Graaf, Loek Halman, Jaak Billiet, Jacques Hagenaars, and their colleagues, covering virtually every country in Europe.

The WVS is the most important research project of Inglehart's career. In discussing the WVS, he is clearly expressing his appreciation and gratitude for having been able to work with such colleagues as Miguel Basanez, Russell Dalton, Jaime Díez-Nicolás, Juan Díez-Nicolás, Yilmaz Esmer, Christian Haerpfer, Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Marta Lagos, Shen Mingming, Alejandro Moreno Alvarez, Neil Nevitte, Pippa Norris, Thorleif Pettersson, Bi Puranen, Catalina Romero, Sandeep Shastri, Christian Welzel, Seiko Yamazaki, and many other colleagues in the WVS network. These people, from countries

⁷ C. Welzel, *Freedom Rising: Human Empowerment and the Quest for Emancipation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

xxiv

Foreword

around the world, have played key roles in carrying out the WVS, analyzing the data, and presenting the findings in publications and conferences around the world. A project of this scope requires people with diverse talents to design, organize, fund, analyze, archive, interpret, and publish findings from this study of social change in more than 100 countries, extending over 30 years. The WVS is diverse not only in talented people but also geographically. The WVS secretariat is based in Stockholm, the archiving is carried out in Madrid, and analysis and interpretation of the data are pursued by thousands of researchers in scores of countries around the world.

In codesigning the WVS, Inglehart emphasized a strategy of diversity, trying to cover the widest possible range of societies. This was a deliberate strategic choice. He was aware that a more cautious approach would have been to limit the data collection to countries with well-developed survey infrastructures, ensuring that fieldwork was carried out by experienced survey institutions. But this would have meant limiting the survey's coverage mainly to prosperous democracies. He was convinced that it was a better overall strategy to push the envelope, maximizing the economic, political, and cultural diversity of the countries covered. This approach greatly increases the analytic leverage that is available for analyzing the role of culture, economic development, and democratic versus authoritarian institutions. But it also tends to increase the possible error in measurement. This is a difficult balancing act, and it is an empirical question whether the gains offset the potential costs.

Extending survey research into developing countries means doing it in places where the infrastructure is less developed and the margin of error is likely to be higher. This raises the question: Is it possible to obtain accurate measures of mass beliefs and values in low-income countries and authoritarian states where survey research is rare? Or is the error margin so large as to render the data useless for comparative analysis? There is no a priori answer to this question; it requires empirical testing. Inglehart and Welzel conducted some relevant tests.8 They theorized that self-expression values should be strongly correlated with indicators of economic development. Thus, they compared the strength of the correlations obtained from high-income societies with the strength of those obtained from all available societies. Here two effects work against each other: (1) the presumed loss of data quality that comes from including lower-income societies, which would tend to weaken the correlations; and (2) the increased analytical leverage that comes from including the full range of societies, which should strengthen the correlations. Which effect is stronger? They found that among high-income societies, the average correlation between self-expression values and ten widely used economic development indicators was 0.57, whereas across all available societies, the average correlation is 0.77. The data from all

⁸ R. Inglehart and C. Welzel, "Changing Mass Priorities: The Link between Modernization and Democracy," *Perspectives on Politics* 8 (2010): 551–67.

Foreword

xxv

available societies explain almost twice as much variance as the data from high-income societies alone.

Their theory also implies that one should find strong linkages between self-expression values, the emergence of civil society, and the flourishing of democratic institutions. As data from scores of countries demonstrate, societallevel self-expression values are indeed closely correlated with a wide range of such indicators, including the "global civil society index" and World Bank indices of "government effectiveness," "rule of law," and "corruption control." They are also strongly correlated with the United Nations Development Programme's "gender empowerment measure" and an "index of effective democracy." Again, the gains obtained by increasing the range of variation more than compensate for any loss of data quality.

Another important reason for covering the whole spectrum of economic and democratic development is that bringing survey research into these societies helps them develop their research capabilities. Survey research can provide valuable feedback for policy makers, and the WVS network is based on the belief that it is the responsibility of social scientists in developed societies to help disseminate survey research techniques. Accordingly, the WVS has produced many publications based on collaboration between social scientists in developing countries and colleagues from countries with a long experience in using survey research. Inglehart was convinced that, over time, the quality of fieldwork in developing countries would be improved, and he considered the effort to do so worth a substantial investment.

For academics, life regenerates itself through students and colleagues. Inglehart takes tremendous pride in the students and colleagues with whom he has worked – some of whom have contributed to this volume. This volume is a tribute to Inglehart's achievements as a modernization theorist and an analyst of sociocultural change and also as a visionary who persistently worked to develop a key data resource, the WVS. I express my deep gratitude to all the authors for producing this volume. It is a testament both to Ronald Inglehart's scholarship and to the continuing importance of studying how changing values are reshaping the societies and political systems in which we live.

Preface and Acknowledgments

Sometime in the 1960–70s, the paradigm of comparative politics began to change in the established democracies. Until this point, one of the field's major concerns was to explain the collapse of democracy in interwar Europe and the rise of fascist governments in their place. The landmark study, *The Civic Culture*, thus looked at postwar Europe and before to assess what type of political culture sustained democracy. Political culture research argued that people's deference and allegiance to democratic institutions, combined with limited, elite-mandating mass involvement, were the foundation of stable democracy.

But societies and their people change. Mass prosperity, education, information, and other forces of social modernization were transforming citizens and the democratic process. New issue demands entered the political agenda, new citizen groups challenged the status quo, and a "participatory revolution" extended popular demands on governments. Usually, scholars and pundits depicted these developments as threats to democracy, often hearkening back to the model of citizenry proposed in the political culture studies of the early postwar era.

One of the first scholars to recognize the erosion of the allegiant model of democratic citizenship was Ronald Inglehart. He has been one of the strongest voices in the political culture field to object to the stereotypical interpretation of "elite-challenging mass action" as antidemocratic. In his landmark work, *The Silent Revolution*, Ronald Inglehart theorized and demonstrated the motivation driving the rise of elite-challenging action – a growing emancipatory spirit visible in increasing postmaterialist values. He further identified the generational increase of existential security and cognitive mobilization as the social forces fueling the rise of these new values. In his revised theory of modernization, Inglehart extended the notion of postmaterialist values into the broader concept of "self-expression values." While a first phase of

xxvii

xxviii

Preface and Acknowledgments

modernization – the transition from agrarian to industrial society – tends to strengthen "secular-rational values," self-expression values emerge in the second phase of modernization: the transition from industrial to postindustrial society. With this theory, Inglehart enriched the political culture field with a set of ideas and concepts that greatly enhanced our understanding of cultural change.

In addition to his intellectual impact, Inglehart's second crucial contribution was to provide an evidence base for the study of cultural differences and cultural change. At the beginning of his career, the field of comparative political culture research had systematic data for no more than a handful of countries. Inspired by the ambition to improve this situation, Inglehart helped develop the Eurobarometer surveys, contributed to the European Values Study, and founded the World Values Survey – the most encompassing, most widely cited and used, and most widely recognized database for studying political culture and cultural change. Hence Inglehart invented not only some of the most influential concepts but he also created the infrastructure for a major field of comparative politics. The development of these surveys has enabled a generation of scholars to do research in areas where no one had gone before. Both his intellectual and data collection contributions are so exceptional and outstanding that we dedicate this book as a tribute to the lifetime achievements of Ronald Inglehart.

In developing this project, we received essential support from the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung. The foundation provided a Transcoop grant for collaboration between Welzel and Dalton and their respective universities. In February and March 2011, the Centers for the Study of Democracy at Leuphana University in Germany and at the University of California, Irvine, in the United States held conferences to assemble the contributors to this volume. We appreciate the financial and administrative support from both centers, especially the center directors Ferdinand Muller-Rommel and William Schonfold.

Along the way, many people have assisted in developing this book. Bjoern Buss produced the index. Lewis Bateman, the chief social science editor at Cambridge University Press, and his assistant, Shaun Vigil, provided helpful guidance in getting this book ready for publication. We also appreciate the assistance of Amy Alexander, Natalie Cook, Yilmaz Esmer, Yuliya Tverdova, and Carole Uhlaner in developing this project and the final manuscript. The seed for this project was probably sown in previous collaborations with Almond and Verba that shaped our thinking about political culture, culture change, and the value of individual citizens. We stand on their shoulders, and we hope they would view this positively.

Almond and Verba's *The Civic Culture* gave voice to citizens in five nations and their views of politics and their political role. It created the foundation for political culture research on which we build. One of the major accomplishments of the World Values Survey used in this book is to give voice to people around the world, with surveys spanning nearly half of the nations on the globe, Preface and Acknowledgments

xxix

representing roughly 90 percent of the world population. Our argument is that the tenor of this voice has changed in the past half-century, with significant consequences for contemporary politics. We owe a debt to Almond and Verba for launching a research program with the enduring importance that led to the themes we study here.

Russell J. Dalton and Christian Welzel