

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY

Batch 53

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION	A. PRIMARY	TEMPORARY	
	B. SECONDARY		
2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Values, leadership and development			
3. AUTHOR(S) Jacob, P.E.; Teune, Henry; Watts, Thomas			
4. DOCUMENT DATE 1967	5. NUMBER OF PAGES 44p.	6. ARC NUMBER ARC	
7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS PA.			
8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (<i>Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability</i>) (Presented at the American Political Science Assn. annual meeting, Chicago, 5-9 Sept. 1967)			
9. ABSTRACT (POLITICAL SCIENCE R & D) (DEVELOPMENT R & D)			
10. CONTROL NUMBER PN-AAD-262		11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT	
12. DESCRIPTORS		13. PROJECT NUMBER	
		14. CONTRACT NUMBER CSD-719 Res.	
		15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT	

VALUES, LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT

Philip E. Jacob, Henry Teune and Thomas Watts
University of Pennsylvania

File: U. of Pa.
CSD-719 Res.
PN-AAD-262

Prepared for delivery at the 1967 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, Sept. 5-9.
Copyright, 1967, The American Political Science Association.

This is the first, and very preliminary report on the International Studies of Values in Politics, a large-scale program of comparative research on political leadership and social mobilization in four countries - India, Poland, Yugoslavia and the United States.

The central theme of the project is the role of values in influencing political behavior. By "values" is meant the operational norms in terms of which choices are made among alternative courses of action, and conduct justified.

What this research has done is to identify, measure and compare the value commitments professed by leaders in local communities and to assess their impact on community activeness, that is, the social outputs of the local government and population.

The underlying hypotheses are (1) that social development is a function of political leadership, and (2) that effective leadership for development is in part determined and predictable by the values leaders hold. Concentration on the local level implies another hypothesis - that what happens at the base of the political pyramid has much to do with the tempo of social change, and may determine whether development occurs at all.

The design of this project provided, however, that the role of leaders' values would be challenged by alternative explanations, based on environmental variables - such as the level of affluence or resource base, the character of the political system (especially the amount of local autonomy prevailing) and certain features of the structure of influence in the community. Control for these factors was secured through the selection of countries with sharply divergent political, cultural and economic conditions, and the amassing of a substantial body of aggregative data, permitting differentiation within a sample of thirty localities chosen in each country.

The scope of the research involved four main lines of inquiry: (1) two to four-hour interviews with 3900 local leaders, virtually all the major political position-holders in the community sample. The instrument included sets of internationally identical, and also nation-specific questions, constituting ten scales of politically relevant values; and questions relating to value priorities - leadership traits, roles, influence and reference groups - perceptions of community problems, divisions and conflicts - attitudes towards areas of government responsibility - and aspirations for country.

(2) case studies of political decision-making, reconstructing the history and context of controversial issues in some of the communities.

(3) aggregative data yielding indices of the level and rate of local economic development and the degree of social mobilization of the community.

(4) value content analysis of national public policy communications to provide a basis of comparison with local values.

The project, sponsored by the International Social Science Council, has been conducted jointly by the University of Pennsylvania with the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Federal Institute of Social Sciences in Yugoslavia and the following institutions in India: University of Poona, Indian Institute of Technology at Kanpur, and the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, New Delhi.

VALUES, LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT:

A FOUR-NATION STUDY

Philip E. Jacob, Henry Teune and Thomas Watts
University of Pennsylvania

Prepared for delivery at the 1967 Annual Meeting of The American Political Association, Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, September 5-9, 1967.

Copyright, 1967, The American Political Science Association.

This is the first, and preliminary, report on the International Studies of Values in Politics, a large-scale program of comparative research on political leadership and social mobilization in four countries - India, Poland, Yugoslavia and the United States.

The central objective of the project has been to determine the influence of leaders' values upon community development and integration. By "values" is meant the operational norms in terms of which choices are made among alternative courses of action, and conduct justified.

Specifically, what this research has done is to identify, measure and compare the value commitments professed by leaders in local communities and to assess their impact on community activeness, that is, the social outputs of the local government and population.

The underlying hypotheses are (1) that social development is a function of political leadership, and (2) that effective leadership for development is in part determined and predictable by the values leaders hold.

The selection of local units of government as the level for investigation implies another assumption - that what happens at the base of the political pyramid has much to do with the tempo of social change, and may determine whether development occurs at all.

Design

The design of the studies called for the examination of two main sets of variables and their interrelationships, while controlling for certain other factors.

Leaders values, particularly those which had a strong bearing on political decision-making, were one set. Community "activeness" in the sense both of local government activity and of general public participation in the accomplishment of social goals, was the second. These have been interchanged as the dependent variable, community activeness being the object of explanation in the first phase of analysis, the value-profiles of local leaders in the second

In the preparation of this paper, Jacob was responsible for the sections on design and organization, and leadership values; Watts for the sections on perceptions of community and role, and local decision-making; and Teune for the analysis of the impact on community activeness. All three have been associated as the core American research staff in the International Studies of Values in Politics,

phase which is currently in progress. Major central variables have been the level of economic resources and rate of growth of the local community, the local political system (especially the degree of local autonomy), certain aspects of the community's social structure, and certain background characteristics and perceptions of the local leadership.

In summary, the design can be depicted as follows:

Phase One

<u>Explanatory Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>
Characteristics of the leadership	
(a) values	
(b) perceptions and other background characteristics	Community Activeness
Characteristics of the local unit	Dimension I -
(a) economic base	Resource mobilization
(b) social structure	(by the local government)
(c) political structure	Dimension II -
	Popular involvement

Phase Two

Community characteristics	Leaders values:
(a) economic base	(1) typology of profiles
(b) social structure	(2) deviant types
(c) political structure	
(d) community activeness	
Individual characteristics	
(a) leadership roles	
(b) background	

Fundamental to the whole project, of course, has been the comparison of these relationships across countries, on the assumption that "countri-ness" might make a crucial difference in determining the dynamics of community activeness on the one hand, or the values of leaders on the other. The selection of India, Poland, Yugoslavia and the U. S. as the participating countries was guided in part by the desire to provide for important differences in socio-economic conditions, cultural background and political ideology and system. At the same time in all four countries there was a common preoccupation with the problem of relating political system to economic development and social mobilization, as witnessed by variety and experimentation in the patterns of local-national relationships - panchayati raj in India, people's councils in Poland, the radical decentralization of powers in Yugoslavia to communes and workers' councils, and the shifting kaleidoscope of local-state-federal relations in the U. S. The ultimate stage of analysis envisages a direct comparison between the amount of intra-national variation and inter-national differences in the major variables, leading to conclusions as to the overall effect of distinctively national characteristics.

In India and Yugoslavia, it will be possible to examine regional differences as well, at least with regard to leadership characteristics, the sample of respondents having been chosen from three states and republics respectively. (It should be made clear that for India, findings cannot be generalized beyond the three states of Gujarat, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh in which most of the field work was concentrated. The selection of units in the other countries may have been sufficiently representative to warrant conclusions about the nation as a whole.)

Organization of the Project

Essential to the success of this work has been the support, in each instance, of the respective governments and responsible indigenous academic and research institutions. A distinctive pattern of international scholarly cooperation has evolved in which the design, execution and analysis of the research has been jointly planned and conducted by the participating teams, under the sponsorship of the International Social Science Council.

Costs have been shared, with support from both government and private sources.

As a result it has been possible to conduct an intensive interview survey of 3900 local leaders, virtually all the important position-holders in thirty governmental units in each country; to collect a massive volume of aggregative social, economic and political data from these localities, most of it on-the-spot in default of relevant, reliable data at central sources; to carry out a series of detailed case studies of decision-making on controversial issues in some of the communities; and to begin systematic content analysis of various kinds of communications by political leaders, especially at the national level. The design required completely parallel inquiry in all countries, in order to assure maximum comparability of the results. The pattern of collaboration in the International Studies of Values in Politics has brought about a degree of rigor in conceptualization, specificity in empirical referents for the variables and uniformity in analytical procedures which goes far to meet the comparability test.¹

1. The principal institutions cooperating in the I. S. V. I. P. have been: in India, the University of Poona, the Indian Institute of Technology at Kanpur and the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, New Delhi; in Poland, the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences; in Yugoslavia, the federal Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade. In Yugoslavia, major contributions have also been made by scholars associated with the Institutes of Sociology at Ljubljana and Sarajevo, and the University of Zagreb. The University of Pennsylvania initiated the project and has served as its administrative center, as well as carrying on the American side of the work, with the guidance of an inter-disciplinary advisory committee of social scientists from other American universities.

Leadership Values

Values, or value-orientations, have a solid position in descriptive anthropology as a basic cultural characteristic. Their significance for political behavior is more ambiguous. Often assumed to be synonymous with goals, they are treated as objects of acquisition or distribution, a kind of ultimate imperative of political systems.² The approach to values in this research by contrast is distinguished by a definition which is at once operational and normative, identifying values as one, but only one component or determinant of human action. They are the criteria in terms of which choices are made between alternative courses of action, the standards or norms actually applied by individuals (or groups of interacting individuals) in decision-making.³

Values, as we have explored them, include broadly-based concepts of legitimacy prevalent throughout a society; role-expectations of the general public or influence groups perceived by a decision-maker to be specifically applicable to his conduct; or personal convictions of what is right or wrong (which may conflict with the social norms to which the individual is exposed). It is quickly apparent that political decision-making will involve a process not only of applying particular values to the issue at hand, but of ordering priorities among inconsistent or conflicting values.

It is a thesis of this set of studies that values are so important a component of political motivation that empirical explanations of political behavior are seriously deficient if they do not seek to establish the value-profiles of the actors and the extent of their influence upon the decisional processes. This is especially the case with the study of development - economic or political - because the seeming independent forces of technological and institutional change, powerful as they are in shaping the environment and in turn the dispositions of men, are themselves molded, speeded or thwarted by the disposition of the human stuff through which they have to exert their social effect.

2 See the concepts set forth by Harold Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan in Power and Society; and by David Easton in The Political System.

3 The concepts used in this research are elaborated in Philip E. Jacob and James J. Flink, "Values and Their Function in Decision-Making", The American Behavioral Scientist Supplement, May, 1962. See also the chapter on values in Jacob and Toscano (eds.) The Integration of Political Communities. A clear critique of alternative concepts of values, from the standpoint of social research is presented by Allen Barton's monograph, Measuring the Values of Individuals. See also his working paper, "Value Measurement and the Analysis of Behavior", prepared for the First International Roundtable of the International Studies of Values in Politics (ISVIP Doc. USA/19).

This poses immediately, of course, the problem of measurement. Much of the effort of the International Studies of Values in Politics has gone into devising reliable techniques of weighing the strength and impact of value-commitments which have particular political relevance. Four main methods have been tested:

- (1) development of multi-item scales for a number of values which are assumed to be conceptually and operationally discrete (the items consisting of various types of closed, structured questions);
- (2) factor analysis of a diverse set of value-laden questions;
- (3) coding of responses to open-ended questions designed to secure a broad and relatively unstructured view of the individual's standards for evaluating political conduct and aspirations;
- (4) content analysis of speeches and other documentary records of political intercourse, distinguishing value-laden expressions by substance and measuring their frequency of reference and intensity.

Before elaborating, we must admit that none of these techniques can by themselves establish that the values identified do actually influence political action, that is, have an operational effect. These are measures of professed values. Independent means must be used to measure carry-over into performance. We have experimented with four such:

- (1) outputs of political agencies and groups with which the respondents are associated, calculated in aggregative terms of commitments of the resources available to those bodies;
- (2) outputs of such groups, identified as decisions reached (or rejected);
- (3) actions of individuals, as described by themselves;
- (4) the behavior of individuals, as described by others.

In addition, the intensive interview survey of local political leaders conducted by the project included a large number of inter-related items, permitting a close check for internal consistency.

We are least satisfied with the assessment of individual performances. Systematic penetration into the actual processes of participant interaction in political decision-making proved beyond the capacity of the project, at least for the present.

However, relationships between group values and actions have been demonstrated (that is, on the one hand, the collective means and variances of values professed by the whole group of leaders interviewed in a community, and on the other, the output of decisions and resource commitments of the local government bodies). These relationships are discussed later in this paper by Henry Teune.

Further, the consistency of responses in the survey (as well as their discriminatory power) is remarkable. There was only one scale item in one country where respondents tended to reverse the direction originally conceived to be appropriate, while factor analysis produced conceptually coherent clusters accounting for 65% to 80% of the variance in each country.

Corroboration of the proposition that professed values do in fact have a determinable relationship to "real" or operational values, was also indicated in certain special probes. Notably, K. K. Singh, of the Indian Institute of Technology at Kanpur, found in a study of 87 village leaders that a greater discrepancy between their estimate of the honesty of others and their own professed commitment to honesty as a principle of conduct was a distinguishing characteristic of leaders who, by other observations, were identified as "traditional" and "inner-directed" in their behavioral disposition.⁴

The Value Scales

The construction of the value scales was designed to meet these criteria:

- (a) they should identify values which were relevant to the public decision-making functions of the respondents;
- (b) they should distinguish among such values;
- (c) they should have the power to discriminate degrees of commitment among respondents within countries;
- (d) they should be cross-nationally equivalent.

The following procedures were undertaken:

- (1) Empirical identification of the universe of political values as conceived by political leaders in each country. Several hundred officials of different types were asked to describe the qualities of leaders they admired or disliked, and to specify recent political actions they considered good or bad (and to state why they considered them such). They were also asked to outline their wishes and hopes for the future of themselves and their country. In addition, the values expressed in major policy pronouncements by national leaders were content-analyzed.
- (2) Selection and conceptual clarification of a set of presumably discrete values, widely stressed in the above data.
- (3) Preparation of two sets of questions - one identical for all countries, the other specific to each country - presumed to measure commitment to each value. Some of these were generously made available by the authors of other cross-cultural attitudinal and personality studies;

⁴ K. K. Singh, Ali Ashraf and Henry Teune, "Some Socio-Psychological Dimensions of Political Responsibility." (ISVIP document IND/31)

most were composed anew, usually based on the responses initially secured from the pilot groups of respondents.⁵

- (4) Purification. After each of several pretests and the final survey, items were inter-correlated and those having a low homogeneity ratio discarded.
- (5) Establishing cross-national equivalence. After choosing the best set of internationally identical questions, those nation-specific items which correlated best with the international set were added to compose the full scale.⁶
- (6) Scoring. Individuals were scored on a 4-point scale (strongly agree - 1; agree - 2; disagree - 3; strongly disagree - 4). Midpoint is obviously 2.5 though no option was provided for this position, or for "no opinion". The individual's score on a given value was computed by dividing his total score on all (purified) items by the number of items.

5 The ISVIP is especially indebted to Allen Barton, Director of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, to Samuel Eldersveld, Professor and Chairman of Political Science, University of Michigan, and to William A. Scott, Professor of Psychology, University of Colorado, for their major contributions as technical consultants to the methodology of value measurement used in the project. The approach generally follows that applied by Scott in his Organization and Values, a study of the values of American fraternity students.

Furthermore, the entire design of the project and its execution reflects the rigor, insight and innovativeness which these colleagues brought to it in their several months of devoted effort at various points in its evolution.

Lester Milbrath, Professor of Political Science, University of Buffalo, also participated at the initial stage, in development of the survey instrumentation

The opportunity to include in the final questionnaire certain items from instruments developed by Joseph Kahl, Washington University at St. Louis, and Milton Rokeach, Michigan State University, is appreciated.

6 The special approach devised to maximize cross-national comparability, while relating the survey as specifically as possible to the particular circumstances of each country, is explained by A. Przeworski and H. Teune in "Equivalence in Cross-National Research". The Public Opinion Quarterly, vol. 30, Winter 1966-67.

In the final survey of 3900 leaders in India, Poland, U.S. and Yugoslavia, ten value scales were designed, each including ten or more items:

1. concern for economic development
2. concern for conflict resolution or avoidance
3. commitment to public participation in decision-making
4. selflessness
5. localism, i. e. putting local interests above those of country c
people outside the immediate community
6. action propensity
7. honesty, in particular a concern for truthfulness in public conduct
8. change orientation
9. equality, in particular economic equality
10. political responsibility, or sense of public obligation in reference
to either country or community. (This scale was used in three
countries only, and analysis is in progress.)

The homogeneity of the purified scales for the four
n Table 1

Table 1
Homogeneity of the Value Scales

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Mean Coefficients of Inter-Item Correlation</u>			
	<u>India</u> <u>n=952</u>	<u>Poland</u> <u>n=888</u>	<u>U. S.</u> <u>n=905</u>	<u>Yugoslavia</u> <u>n=1179</u>
1. Economic development	.129	.181	.208	.224
2. Conflict resolution	.165	.132	.281	.096
3. Participation	.154	.142	.193	.203
4. Selflessness	.126	.200	.130	.164
5. Localism	.215	.163	.138	.212
6. Action propensity	.135	.128	.191	.111
7. Honesty	.137	.160	.250	.216
8. Change orientation	.136	.212	.148	.228
9. Equality	.133	.222	.294	.271

Cross-National Comparisons on the Value Scales

The following findings emerge from preliminary analysis of mean scores on nine value scales for the total group of leaders interviewed in each country (see Table 2).

1. There is substantial similarity across countries in the importance attached to honesty and selfless as standards of public conduct.
2. These local leaders, taken as composite national groups, are square in the middle when it comes to committing themselves as between national or local interests when the two are in conflict.

3. They are on the same side of the fence in being favorably disposed toward change, but American leaders as a whole are significantly less so than the others.
4. On the other hand, these leaders are not prone to act. That is, they want to calculate the risks before jumping. Indian leaders are particularly cautious (while being most eager for change). The Americans are just the reverse.
5. A marked difference appears in concern for public participation in political decision-making. Indian leadership is strongly opposed. In the other countries, the leadership ends up about evenly divided.
6. As might have been expected, American leaders are strongly opposed to economic egalitarianism. Indian leaders are as strongly committed in favor. Curiously, local leadership in the Communist countries is not overly enthusiastic about levelling off economic differences.
7. Finally, the national groups diverge on the issue of conflict resolution. The Indians are clearly concerned to avoid conflict; Poles and Americans tend not to be upset over the possibility of conflict. In Yugoslavia, this scale was not sufficiently reliable to warrant a conclusion.

It should be emphasized that these conclusions are based on mean scores for each country, and do not constitute a profile generally characteristic of individual leaders. Indeed variances are so large within nations that a full-scale analysis is being undertaken of the nature and sources of individual differences.

On the other hand, variation is not great among communities in any country, as reported below. While individual leaders differ markedly in the values they profess, they appear to cancel each other out so that as a group community leadership espouses much the same collective commitments, community to community, within each country.

This suggests that from the standpoint of development, it is not the collective profile of values of the community leadership that counts, but the impact of particular leaders holding particular values which may put them sharply at odds with the norms espoused by their fellows. That one gets is a picture of differences within community leadership but differences so evenly balanced throughout the local officialdom of these countries, that they present a deceptive appearance of universal homogeneity when compared as entities.

Table 2
Nine Values - Four Countries

<u>Value Scales</u>	<u>Mean Scores*</u>			
	<u>India</u>	<u>Poland</u>	<u>U. S.</u>	<u>Yugoslavia**</u>
1. Economic development	1.30	1.89	2.26	1.67
2. Conflict resolution	1.82	2.88	2.88	2.12
3. Participation	3.17	2.29	2.26	2.24
4. Selflessness	1.43	1.77	1.86	1.85
5. Localism	2.57	2.70	2.30	2.56
6. Action propensity	3.39	2.92	2.52	2.90
7. Honesty	1.69	1.86	1.72	1.59
8. Change orientation	1.53	1.67	2.47	2.01
9. Equality	1.51	2.26	3.28	2.02

*Note: The method of scoring results in a low score for those who say they agree with or accept the indicated value; a high score denotes rejection of the value. 1.00 is the maximum agreement score possible; 4.00 is the maximum score for rejection.

**Tentative, pending final computations of corrected data.

Value Factors

Responses to all the value questions were subjected to three and in some instances four orthogonal factor analyses for each country.⁷

- 7 (1) Ten factors were rotated for 69 items which were identical in all countries, separately for each country and pooled for all countries.
- (2) These items plus all nation-specific items (including a set of 10-16 questions which were asked in three countries to measure a sense of political responsibility) were analyzed by a factor iteration program which rotated sequentially all principal components with an eigenvalue greater than 1.00.
- (3) All items except those concerning political responsibility (that is, internationally identical plus nation-specific questions) were rotated for fifteen factors, regardless of eigenvalue.
- (4) For U. S. and Yugoslavia, the iteration program described in (2) above was also run on all items except those concerning political responsibility.

The loadings reported below are derived from the first analysis (1) for India and Poland and the fourth analysis (4) for U. S. and Yugoslavia.

The sharpest and most consistent factor structure seems to emerge from ten or fewer rotations. To increase the comparability and precision of the factors to be used in this investigation, the iteration program will be applied to the data from all countries and a final decision on the best comparable set of factor rotations and factors will then be made.

It is clear from the analyses already completed however that there is a very large congruence and stability in the five selected factors for all four countries.

The results demonstrate sufficient parallelism of factor structure across countries to justify a wide range of comparison. The factor analyses also tend to sustain the validity of most of the scales for most countries.

- (1) Six to ten factors emerged for each country, with components having an eigen value of 1.00 or more, and accounting for 65%-80% of the variance.
- (2) Several of these factors were congruent with particular value scales, notably -
 - local-national orientation
 - change orientation
 - honesty
 - equality
 - participation
 - conflict avoidance (in India)
- (3) Five factors were sufficiently parallel in all four countries (with a common core of identical items loading heavily on the corresponding factors) to conclude that on these dimensions, comparisons would be valid. (See Table 3.)

One of these is a general factor which may be interpreted as a concern for "principled" conduct in public affairs, as against a pragmatic or opportunistic approach which would compromise truthfulness, the public interest and ideological considerations to achieve personal or group interests.

The others are the specific concerns for local over national interests, disposition to accept change, respect for expertise and corresponding distrust of public participation in decision-making, and concern for economic equality.

Leaders have been individually scored on the factors which emerged in their respective countries, and community means and variances calculated. (Procedure: standard scores were computed for responses to all items, and multiplied by the loading of each item on a given factor.) Cross-national and intra-national analyses of the results are in process.

Table 3
Value Factors - International

<u>Questions (with relatively high loadings)</u>	<u>Loadings</u>			
	<u>India</u>	<u>Poland</u>	<u>U. S.</u>	<u>Yugoslavia</u>
<u>FACTOR I: Principled Conduct vs. Pragmatism in Public Life</u>				
#71. If leaders can get things done the people need not bother whether or not they are selfish.	.398	.445	.494	.134
#146. If a person is requested by his superiors to present a false impression of certain matters he should be willing to comply.	.250	.439	.443	.389
#147. If a leader knows that the truth will harm someone he should conceal certain facts.	.427	.347	.348	.475
#148. Local officials should cover up situations which may embarrass their superiors.	.307	.433	.524	.495
#149. In order to achieve community goals, it is permissible for leaders to present facts in a one-sided way.	.286	.466	.482	.333
#150. It is not necessary for a leader to be strictly honest in public dealings if he knows this will interfere with getting his work done.	.516	.461	.567	.392
#151. If a leader in local government is highly skilled one should overlook minor instances of dishonesty.	.525	.424	.612	.449

(see note 1)

Note 1: Several additional questions relating to honesty and selflessness loaded .300 or more for Yugoslavia, including some which were asked only in this country.

Note 2: Beyond the common core, this factor includes for some of the countries a set of items which appear to represent a particular ideological commitment, or concept of general principles held to characterize a "good" leader in that particular country. For instance in Yugoslavia, the factor includes items concerned with economic development, acceptability of social change and commitment to public participation in decision-making. In the U. S., Poland, and Yugoslavia propensity toward action in decision-making is an element in the factor - but this is of practically no consequence in the case of India.

(Table 3 - cont'd)

<u>Questions</u> (with relatively high loadings)	<u>Loadings</u>			
	<u>India</u>	<u>Poland</u>	<u>U. S.</u>	<u>Yugoslavia</u>
<u>FACTOR II: Concern for Local vs. National Interests</u>				
#87. National goals should not be obtained at great costs to local communities.	-.389	-.402	-.349	-.251
#88. Although national affairs are important, people here should first worry about their own community problems.	-.543	-.359	-.475	-.280
#89. Community progress is not possible if national goals always have priority.	-.575	-.459	-.415	-.525
#90. We should not worry so much about national problems when we have so many in our own community.	-.581	-.319	-.378	-.271
#92. Local leaders should always be prepared to adjust their programs to national goals and policies even if this is disadvantageous for the community.	.324	.291	.117	.600
#93. It is necessary to forego development of one's own community to help the development of the rest of the country.	.347	.482	-.161	.443

Note 1: Additional nation-specific items relating to the concern for national as against local interests load above .300 on this factor as follows:
US 1, Yugoslavia 3.

FACTOR III: Orientation Toward Change

#159. If society is to progress, newer solutions to problems are essential.	-.301	-.533	-.428	-.392
#162. The people in this community must continually look for new solutions to problems rather than be satisfied with things as they are.	-.241	-.469	-.433	-.372
#163. Even if the newer ways conflict with the way things were done in the past, they are absolutely necessary and desirable.	-.519	-.514	-.362	-.391
#164. Changes are desirable even if they do not seem to contribute as much as one might expect.	-.467	-.327	-.248	-.295

Note 1: In most of the countries, this factor also includes selected items referring to concern for economic development and action in decision-making.

(Table 3 - cont'd)

Questions (with relatively high loadings)

Loadings

	<u>India</u>	<u>Poland</u>	<u>U. S.</u>	<u>Yugoslav</u>
<u>FACTOR IV: Expertise vs. Public Participation in Decision-Making</u>				
#46. Most decisions should be left to the judgment of experts	415	351	455	515
#47. Only those who are fully informed on the issues should vote	494	262	448	473
#48. Only those who are competent on an issue should speak about it.	448	415	462	343
#50. To have decisions made by people who are experts on the matter under consideration (is important to achieve when making political decisions).	.469	.451	.377	.491

Note 1: Additional items related to this theme load .300 or above on this factor for U.S. and Yugoslavia, as follows: U.S. 2, Yugoslavia 5. Most of the additional items included in the Yugoslav factor appear as a separate factor in the other countries, representing a general attitude toward public participation without specific reference on the issue of competence or expertise. In Yugoslavia, virtually all items relating to citizen participation inter-correlate and form a homogeneous set - which also comprises some items relating to the avoidance of social conflict.

FACTOR V: Concern for Equality (Economic)

#167. There should be an upper limit on income so that no one earns very much more than others.	.432	.589	213	522
#168. The government has the responsibility to see that nobody lives well when others are poor.	.416	.520	280	390
#170. In every situation poor people should be given more opportunities than rich people.	.400	.304	307	479
#171. Avoiding spending on luxuries is necessary to minimize distance between social groups.	.133	.434	323	285
#172. Discrepancies in salaries should be continually reduced.	.341	.497	370	461

Priorities

The most difficult problem in this part of the research has been to ascertain which values would prevail when leaders could not avoid a choice among the various "goods" to which they felt committed.

In designing the interview schedule, many questions were deliberately couched so as to require respondents to choose between adherence to one value or another.

- Q. 4. Economic development should not be pursued if it means hardships for the people.
- Q. 28 A good leader should refrain from making proposals that divide the people even if these are important for the community.
- Q. 45 Widespread participation in decision-making often leads to undesirable conflicts.
- Q. 71. If leaders can get things done, the people need not bother whether or not they are selfish.
- Q. 93 It is necessary to forego development of one's own community to help the development of the rest of the country.
- Q. 147 If a leader knows that the truth will harm someone, he should conceal certain facts.
- Q. 150 It is not necessary for a leader to be strictly honest in public dealings if he knows this will interfere with getting his work done.

Many of these proved to have strong discriminating power.

On the other hand, an attempt to devise a battery of situation-specific questions, where the respondent was asked to decide what he would do in concrete and presumably realistic political controversies turned out to be mostly futile. We could get few reliable correlations.

Scale scores of course provide a useful overall assessment of the relative strength of commitment among values, but do not necessarily indicate which values will prevail in forced choice situations, even where the issues are sharp and clearly pit one value against another.

To get at least some understanding of a respondent's hierarchy, among the values we were attempting to scale, one question was asked, posing a forced choice among a set of verbal statements representing the different values. The results were sufficiently different from the hierarchy one might have inferred from the scale scores to warrant including them in the total value-profile. (See Table 4).

Table 4
Value Priorities

Values	Means* and				Rankings for			
	India	R	Poland	R	U.S.	R	Yugo.	R
1. Economic development	.947	1	1.053	1	.997	1	.737	3
2. Conflict avoidance	.504	3	.477	4	.388	5	.234	5
3. Selflessness	.468	4	.167	8	.172	7	.153	7
4. National vs. local interests	.435	5	.337	6	.088	8	.029	8
5. Honesty	.795	2	.505	3	.807	2	.967	1
6. Participation	.193	8	.314	7	.380	6	.735	4
7. Equality (social and economic)	.398	6	.356	5	.611	3	.187	6
8. Change	.254	7	.834	2	.572	4	.883	2

*This table reports means of the means secured for the leaders in each community (rather than for the leaders pooled nationally).

The Open-End Questions

Of the several questions designed to round out the leader's value-profile by eliciting a freer and more general response than was possible with the structured questions, two proved especially sensitive on pretest and were asked in the general survey:

What are your wishes and hopes for the future of our country?
If you picture the future of (name of country) in the best possible light, how would things look, let us say, ten years from now?
Obligatory probe (after respondent's initial answer): Anything else?⁸

What kinds of people would you like to see as political leaders?
That is, what do you think are the most important qualities for a good leader to have? Obligatory probe (after respondent's initial answer): Anything else?

Coding has not yet been completed in all countries, but it is obvious from the preliminary frequency classification reported in Tables 5 and 6 that, first, the pattern of response on aspirations for country is radically different (at least between India and the U.S.), while second, with regard to qualities of leadership, the models are also distinctive in crucial respects.

On aspirations for the national future, it is U.S. leaders who are more preoccupied with the conduct of government, and overwhelmingly concerned with achieving world peace. Aside from the expected commitment to economic and social improvement, a substantial number of the Indian local leaders strongly express an interest in the development of the nation as nation, with particular stress on national self-sufficiency and solidarity. This finding supports a conclusion from other parts of the survey that Indian local leadership is actually

⁸ This was one of the questions asked by Hadley Cantril and Lloyd Free in their major cross-national studies of "Hopes and Fears for Self and Country". See Cantril, The Pattern of Human Concerns. The authors are grateful for permission to use this question and for the original and continuing guidance and encouragement of Professor Cantril throughout the ISVIP.

more nationally oriented than is often assumed, certainly much more so than U. S. leaders if one can believe what the Americans say.

On leadership, the Indians place more emphasis on moral qualities and sociability, the U. S. on professional competence and organizational ability - though both pay homage to the saintly virtues of honesty and selfless dedication to the public.

Table 5
Wishes and Hopes for Country

<u>Category (collapsed)</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	<u>India (n=954)</u> <u>Per Cent</u>	<u>U. S. (n=905)</u> <u>Per Cent</u>
Improved welfare and standard of living	49.58	47.73
Industrial development; employment	31.76	11.49
More and better social services (education, health, family and welfare services, culture and recreation)	35.84	27.95
Aspirations concerning form and operation of government (democracy, socialism, freedom, etc.; more effective, honest government)	15.51	33.25
National unity, strength, self-sufficiency, independence, prestige	38.05	20.00
World peace; better, cooperative international relations	2.93	60.00

Table 6
The Good Leader

<u>Qualities</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
Honesty	52.41	55.80
Selflessness, dedication and public service	52.93	34.36
Intelligence, education, professional knowledge	19.39	55.46
Impartiality	14.67	12.59
Good relationship with people (sociability, etc.)	36.47	25.19
General leadership abilities (energy, organizational ability, decisiveness)	16.66	29.39

Note: The tables report the percentage of respondents whose comments were classified in a given category. A respondent was classified only once in a category, regardless of the length of his response or the number of different subjects mentioned relative to that category.

The complete code, and classification of responses by frequency of mention (rather than on the basis above) is available in ISVIP document no. RT/V/6 rev. 1).

Content Analysis - Values of National Leadership

Content analytic techniques, especially developed to identify, classify and measure the emphasis placed on values, were applied to limited selections of major policy statements by national leaders.⁹

Briefly, the approach involved clear specification of substantive (rather than syntactical) elements which distinguish value-laden themes as the units for analysis. The components of a value theme or thought-unit include some or all of the following: a standard of evaluation, an object being evaluated, a referent or beneficiary of the value asserted, and certain terms denoting an evaluative act. Various formats in which an evaluative communication might be conveyed by political leadership were empirically derived from the material and set forth as guidelines for coding. These procedures permitted identification of some values conveyed by inference, or reference to the common-knowledge context in which the statement was delivered, thus widening the value content beyond explicit expressions of approval, justification and the like, and coming closer to the intentions of the author.

Classification categories were also empirically derived directly from the material analyzed: value references were clustered into conceptually distinct groups, defined quite precisely, usually in the author's own terms. On examination, many categories appear cross-nationally comparable, but some are unique for particular countries, at least on the basis of statements so far analyzed.

Several methods of measurement have been tried: frequency of reference, amount of time or space devoted to a value, strength of language used in the author's evaluative statement, and degree of specificity in the reference. Evidence from the pilot study indicates that combining the strength and specificity scores gives the best overall index of the author's stress on various values.

The tentative stage of this phase of the project must be made clear. The body of material so far analyzed is limited. The reliability of the techniques, while tested at various points during the evolution of the coding directives has not been systematically established cross-nationally. Nevertheless, the preliminary results suggest some of the dominant concerns which the national leadership chose to present to their countries in the year prior to the survey of local leaders conducted by ISVIP.

⁹ See K. Krippendorff, "A Preliminary Inquiry Into the Expression of Values in Political Documents", ISVIP doc. no. USA/68 for elaboration of the technique. Coding instructions are available in ISVIP doc. no. USA/72. See also, P. E. Jacob, Progress Report on Value-Content Analysis of National Leadership: U.S. and India, ISVIP doc. no. USA/71. This report is based on analysis of ten major speeches on "Great Society" issues by President Johnson 1965-66, and ten speeches on domestic issues by Prime Ministers Shastri and Gandhi during approximately the same period.

In terms of aspirations, the Indian local and national leaders seem more at one than is the case in the U. S. , especially in their preoccupation with meeting basic economic needs. However, in regard to social needs, Indian local leaders seem to demonstrate greater concern than their prime ministers (at least as evidenced in the speeches studied) - a circumstance which may have important implications for the strategy of development programming, calling for close attention to the balancing of social against economic initiatives.

On the American side, there is a gulf between the basically political orientation of the locals and the socio-economic commitments of the President. It is apparent that as of the fall of 1966, the bulk of the local leadership recognized little need for action on their part, or anyone's, to improve the social and especially the economic lot of their communities and country. Jobs did not figure as an aspiration - nor, as will be seen in the report later on of responses, as a serious community problem. Nor was there widespread concern over resolving social conflicts in community or country. Greater equality, at least in economic terms, was, as we have seen, rejected out of hand as a legitimate aspiration, or politically relevant value.

In terms of operational values, i. e. the day-to-day considerations influencing political decisions, the Indian local leaders appear earthier and more pragmatic in their survey responses, than the prime ministers in their public pronouncements. Ideology, except for pockets of personal asceticism and the broad commitment to "change" is discounted. Keeping the boat from rocking - in the community and in the political family - is for most a more vital imperative than principle.

For American politicians, the pragmatic appeal is stock-in-trade at both national and local levels, to judge from the different lines of inquiry carried out in this project. Cost and pay-off, usually in material terms, forms a major part of the rationale of convincement.

In general, comparing the results of this pilot content analytic study with those of the survey indicates large areas of mutual relevance. There is sufficient parallel between the issues addressed to warrant hypotheses, if not conclusions, concerning the vital question of whether the local leadership accepts the values held or pressed by the top. ¹⁰

10. As would be expected, in view of the completely different methods of inquiry, there is a considerable range of issues on which even rough comparisons are not possible. Values emerged from the content analysis which had no counterpart in the survey (given the fact that the national leaders were not prompted by the same, directed stimuli). And some of the values pointed up in the survey were not echoed in the particular set of national statements which were analyzed. It is hoped that in further research, value content analysis may be undertaken of local leaders' speeches and other communications corresponding to the kind of material used from national leaders.

Leadership Perceptions

The choices local leaders make among the various political values they hold may well be determined by the broader situational context within which they make decisions and within which their values become operational. This context would be in part formed by their own perceptions of their community environment; of their place in the community power structure and their own effectiveness as leaders; or of their own proper role as responsible officials. Such perceptions may also be related to community activeness independently of leader values.

In this section, several of these perceptual variables are reported in terms of means or percentages for the entire leadership group of each country. They are representative, but not exhaustive, of the perceptual data gathered in the survey. Because of the tentativeness of some of the data and the preliminary nature of this report, interpretive comments are kept to a minimum and no attempt is made to statistically interrelate variables.¹¹

Community Environment

Of several perceptual dimensions of community environment three will be examined here: (1) Community Problems; (2) Community Conflicts and Cleavages; and (3) Local Autonomy.

(1) Community Problems:

The kinds of actions taken by leaders in any community will most likely be defined largely by the sorts of problems which they feel are existent at a particular time. These problems will vary from community to community and from nation to nation. For one place, they may involve poor schools; for another lack of hospital facilities. For the fullest expression of this, an open-end question was used to initiate the interview in all countries: "What do you think are the most important problems facing this community now?" The responses were coded according to problem areas mentioned and permit identification of high to low problem perceivers. National comparisons and rankings appear in

¹¹ A central problem still undergoing analysis is whether differences among leaders within countries are so great on these perceptions as to make national generalizations untenable. This presentation, while not presuming a final answer, assumes that inter-country differences of the magnitude demonstrated on some items will prove to be significant.

Preliminary evidence concerning the contribution of these variables to the explanation of community activeness is reported in the final section of this paper.

For a discussion of the problems of making cross-national comparisons, see Adam Przeworski and Jerzy J. Wiatr, "Methodological Problems in Cross-National Study on Local Politics: Order of Explanations in Comparative Research," unpublished paper prepared for VIth World Congress of Sociology, Evian, September 4-11, 1966.

Table 7. For the U.S., two of the categories are not comparable with India and Yugoslavia since they are largely an artifact of the way communities were sampled. In the U.S. only cities were studied, while in India and Yugoslavia the local units were largely rural in character. Hence, American leaders do not perceive agricultural development as a problem while one third of the Indian responses involved such concerns as irrigation, food, mechanization, and improved agricultural practices. On the other hand, urbanization was the problem most often mentioned by American local leaders (19.74%), while it comprised less than 2% of Indian responses.

Table 7
Perceived Community Problems¹³
Percent of Total Problems Mentioned

	India (n=954)		U. S. (n=905)		Yugoslavia (n=1124)	
	%	R	%	R	%	R
Total problems mentioned	3091		2462		4191	
1. General principles of social and economic organization	00.62	14	00.12	13	01.36	9
2. Concern for general welfare, betterment of life, economic development	01.07	13	00.79	10	00.97	11
3. Basic living standards and productivity; poverty	03.56	6	00.28	12	01.38	10
4. Need for economic stability	01.86	11	00.83	9	00.50	13
5. Lack of resources; tax problems; inequitable allocation of resources	03.39	7	14.01	4	04.89	6
6. Problems of agricultural development	33.02	1	00.04	14	07.99	4
7. Industrialization and related problems	10.94	3	08.00	7	26.67	1
8. Problems of urbanization	01.53	12	19.74	1	06.84	5
9. Utilities	17.28	2	15.47	2	16.72	3
10. Social services	12.21	4	13.64	5	24.50	2
11. Social and cultural problems	02.38	8	01.34	8	00.62	12
12. Inter-group conflicts	02.02	10	10.56	6	02.81	8
13. Political problems	07.87	5	14.66	3	04.53	7
14. Miscellaneous	02.18	9	00.52	11	00.16	14
	99.93%		100.00%		99.94%	

12. The table reports the percentage of the total number of references by all respondents coded in a given category. One or more references may have been coded for each respondent.

13. At the time tabulations for open-end questions were prepared, the Polish data were not yet ready.

The most salient problem for Yugoslav leaders appears to be industrial development (26.67%) but this is a problem of concern to American and Indian leaders as well (8.44% and 11.08% respectively). American leaders more often mention lack of resources and provision of utilities, intergroup conflicts, and political problems, while Indian and Yugoslav leaders both mention social services and utilities.

That intergroup conflicts appear to be of more concern to Americans than to either Indians or Yugoslavs is due largely to perceptions of current racial problems in American cities. Included among the political type problems perceived as important by the Americans were such things as inefficiency, bureaucracy, and lack of competent personnel.

That leaders in different countries necessarily operate within a somewhat different environment of problems calls for caution in interpreting other perceptual differences.

(2) Community Cleavages:

The amount of harmony in a community and the degree to which a leader perceives conflicts and divisions may well influence his view as to what can be accomplished, the way he confronts community problems, and consequently community outputs. To provide data for a measure of cleavage, leaders were presented a list of eight community "differences" or "cleavages" and asked, "To what extent do differences such as the following tend to divide people in your community?" The list contained such items as "differences in education" and "differences in social origins", items which represent basic social and institutional divisions. Response categories of "very much", "somewhat", and "not at all" were provided. Mean scores are presented in Table 8.

Table 8¹⁴
Perceived Community Cleavages

Cleavages	Mean Scores Across Communities							
	India (n=955)		Poland (n=888)		U.S. (n=905)		Yugoslavia (n=1176)	
	Mean score	R	Mean score	R	Mean score	R	Mean score	R
1. Education	.786	5	.993	2	.902	3	.881	2
2. Income	1.175	2	1.178	1	.955	2	1.158	1
3. Religious belief	.758	7	.920	4	.474	7	.508	6
4. Political views	1.212	1	.832	5	1.015	1	.496	7
5. Urban-rural	.783	6	.709	7	.364	8	.639	4
6. Managers-employees	.736	8	.829	6	.643	6	.763	3
7. Racial and social origin	.979	3	.327	8	.823	4	.315	8
8. Desiring change-opposing change	.947	4	.969	3	.772	5	.568	5
Mean sum of areas of community cleavage	7.377		6.728		5.948		5.330	

14 This table reports means of means secured for the leaders in each community rather than pooled nationally. This is also true for other similar tables in this section.

(1) For India and the U.S., differences in political views are perceived as dividing people the most, while in Poland such differences rank fifth and in Yugoslavia seventh. More surprising perhaps is the perception in both of these countries of the significance of differences in income. This social cleavage shows up as only slightly less dominant for India and the U.S., ranking second in each. As expected, differences in racial and social origin are fairly strong for India and the U.S. but are least relevant for Poland and Yugoslavia. And only leaders in Yugoslavia see major divisions resulting from manager-employee relations.

Summing scores across all areas permits comparison of overall community cleavage. Indian leaders see the most, then Polish leaders, followed by U.S., while Yugoslav leaders perceive the least. Thus, the two least economically developed countries in the study perceive both the most and the least community divisions.

(3) Autonomy:

Autonomy, as used here, means the extent to which the local governmental unit is free to make the ultimate decisions on actions to be carried out. It might be hypothesized that the degree of local autonomy in a community will be related to the effectiveness of local government in major areas of community concern. More specifically, it could be related to the range of decisions with which local leaders are interested or involved, and thereby the scope of activity possible for the local government. Although autonomy could be assessed in several ways (for example, by examining and rating sets of decisions in each community or by examining formal rules and laws), a specific perceptual question was included for this purpose in the survey.

Given a list of specific examples of more general areas of governmental responsibility, leaders were asked to specify, "In which of these areas does the local government here lack enough power and autonomy to act effectively?" Mean autonomy scores were computed for each community. In this case, the lower the score, the more autonomy perceived. These scores suggest that local leaders in Yugoslavia perceive the greatest amount of autonomy, while Indian leaders see the least. Polish leaders also perceive very little autonomy, but U.S. leaders report relatively more.

That Yugoslav leaders do perceive much local autonomy is perhaps understandable in light of the program of decentralization underway over the past ten years and especially since 1963. The competence of local authorities no longer rests upon what the state explicitly transfers - the citizens of local government deal as a matter of official policy with all questions which can practically be settled locally and there has been increasingly smaller participation by governmental units outside of the commune.¹⁵ This new policy is apparently quite clearly understood by local officialdom.

15 See the statement by Anton Vratusa at the closing session of the First International Roundtable, International Studies of Values in Politics, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, June 23 to July 2, 1965. ISVIP Report. Mimeo.

Looking at the specific areas in which autonomy may be perceived (Table 9) it is apparent that in all four countries employment problems are not seen as being relatively very solvable by the local units while supporting cultural activities does come within the relative competence of all. One of the more striking contrasts revealed in this table appears in the field of education - specifically that of building schools. U. S. leaders saw greatest local competence in this area while for local Polish leaders, this was the area of least felt autonomy.

Table 9
Perceived Lack of Local Autonomy

Local Autonomy	Mean Scores Across Communities							
	India		Poland		U. S.		Yugoslavia	
	Mean score	R	Mean score	R	Mean score	R	Mean score	R
1. Solving housing problems	0.701	3	0.593	2	0.390	2	0.160	4
2. Every man who wants a job gets it	0.751	1	0.499	4	0.506	1	0.247	1
3. Building schools	0.309	7	0.649	1	0.168	7	0.150	6
4. Providing clinics	0.455	5	0.446	5	0.227	5	0.246	2
5. Supporting art and culture	0.376	6	0.294	6	0.200	6	0.164	3
6. Provide electricity	0.748	2	0.547	3	0.261	3	0.153	5
7. Solving problems of youth	0.531	4	0.147	7	0.237	4	0.124	7
Sum of Areas of Autonomy	3.876		3.178		1.989		1.243	

Note: For this table, the lower the score, the more autonomy perceived.

Leadership Effectiveness

A leader's capacity to work effectively depends not only upon his personal abilities and skills but upon his perception of the system of interpersonal relationships which define the specific situation within which he has to work, particularly his place in the power structure of his community. Several questions furnished data designed to permit assessment of this effectiveness. Three will be examined here:

- (1) his perception of the degree and nature of his activity in specific functional areas of community activeness;
- (2) his perception of the degree and nature of his influence in functional areas in the community; and
- (3) what he perceives to be obstacles to his effectiveness.

(1) Activity:

Evaluation of the important problems perceived by leaders only indirectly leads to deductions about the extent to which these problems are related to the fields of activity of the leaders themselves - or about what problems are important for a local leader to be actively working on and what problems for which he feels responsible (in the sense of moral duty as well as accountability). The fewer the areas of perceived activity of a group of community leaders, the less activity we might expect to find in that community. Or, if scope of perceived activity does not predict, the kinds of activity in which leaders engage may. To assess such perceptions, a list of ten functional areas of activity was developed from inventories emerging from pretests in each country. Each appears to have particular significance with respect to community development and each is a customary subject of local governmental and political decision-making.

Table 10 contains the national mean scores across communities for each country and reveals some interesting cross-national differences. Indian local leaders apparently perceive themselves as being most active in their most important problem area, agriculture, followed by education, public improvements and health - and they are least active with respect to housing and industrial development. Leaders in the U.S. also put their efforts on public improvements, but on social improvements and welfare and on cultural and recreational activities as well. They are least active in the area of health (in addition, of course, to agriculture). Poland and Yugoslavia appear to be somewhat similar in the scope of their activity in that local leaders in each are most active in political organization work but rate themselves low for health and revenue activities.

Table 10
Perceived Activity of Local Leaders

Activity Area	Mean Scores Across Communities							
	India		Poland		U.S.		Yugoslavia	
	Mean score	R	Mean score	R	Mean score	R	Mean score	R
1. Industrial and econ. development	.433	9	.346	5	.515	6	.337	6
2. Agriculture	.839	1	.463	2	.061	10	.324	7
3. Housing	.429	10	.327	6	.561	4	.235	10
4. Public improvements utilities	.674	3	.294	8	.641	1	.417	3
5. Health	.660	4	.240	9	.422	9	.254	9
6. Culture, recreation, sport	.512	8	.403	3	.587	3	.365	5
8. Social improvements, welfare	.546	6.5	.305	7	.595	2	.372	4
9. Political organization	.605	5	.531	1	.540	5	.785	1
10. Collection and distr. of public revenue	.546	6.5	.228	10	.432	8	.275	8
7. Education	.782	2	.396	4	.509	7	.464	2
Mean Sum of Areas of Activity	6.028		3.506		4.863		3.829	

By summing the activities mentioned for each individual, it was possible to derive a total "activity" score for each leader. Again, by comparing country means, computed by community, the Indian leaders appear most activist, averaging six areas. U.S. leaders are active in five and Polish and Yugoslav leaders in fewer than four. Certainly this data does not support hypotheses relating scope of perceived activity at the community level to development on a national scale:

(2) Influence:

There is evidence in community power literature to suggest that the activity of a leader does not necessarily predict the influence he has in that area. Pretest material from this study also suggested that there might be differences between what a leader perceives to be his areas of activity and his influence on what gets accomplished in these areas. Yet the way a local leader perceives his position within the power structure of the community (quite apart from his areas of activity) might be an important element in accounting for differences in the activeness of groups with similar values.

To provide a check, a measure was derived based upon the same activity areas presented in Table 10 above. Leaders were asked to "... indicate those in which you feel you have a great deal of influence, only some, or none at all." Scores were computed on the basis of 2, 1, or 0. According to rankings in Table 11, Indian leaders perceive themselves most influential in the same areas in which they are active - agricultural development, education, and general public improvements and utilities. Polish leaders are also most influential in their area of greatest activity, political organizations. They do perceive themselves to be somewhat more influential than they are active in education, but influence and activity rank the same for culture, recreation, and sports. American leaders feel they are most influential in the areas of public improvements and utilities although they were most active in social improvements and welfare, but perceived their influence in housing about the same as activity. The Yugoslavs, like the Polish leaders, see themselves as most influential as well as active with political organizations followed by public improvements and education.

Comparison of Tables 10 and 11 suggests that self assessed activity does fairly well predict self assessed influence,¹⁶ although more objective measures might well produce different results.

¹⁶ Rank order correlations on Activeness and Influence: India, $Rho = .963$, $P < .01$; Poland, $Rho = .707$, $P < .02$; U.S., $Rho = .957$, $P < .01$; Yugoslavia, $Rho = .920$, $P < .01$.

Table 11
Perceived Influence of Local Leaders

<u>Activity Area</u>	<u>Mean Scores Across Communities</u>							
	<u>India</u>		<u>Poland</u>		<u>U.S.</u>		<u>Yugoslavia</u>	
	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>
1. Industrial and econ. development	.617	9	.767	7	.829	6.5	.634	8
2. Agriculture	1.349	1	.883	5	.110	10	.683	7
3. Housing	.576	10	.752	9	.931	3	.611	9
4. Public improvements, utilities	1.096	3	.821	6	1.104	1	.918	2
5. Health	.948	5	.643	10	.692	9	.566	10
6. Culture, recreation, sport	.789	7	.953	3	.882	5	.723	5
7. Education	1.264	2	.970	2	.829	6.5	.911	3
8. Social improvements, welfare	.845	6	.888	4	.958	2	.753	4
9. Political organization	.967	4	1.193	1	.929	4	1.302	1
10. Public revenue	.783	8	.764	8	.821	8	.719	6
Mean Sum of Areas of Influence	9.236		8.587		8.085		7.870	

In terms of total influence scores (based upon sums of areas of influence mentioned), the Indian leaders as a group perceive themselves as the most influential, then the Polish leaders, followed by the Americans and the Yugoslavs. But the differences are not great.

(3) Obstacles:

A fuller appreciation of leader influence can be obtained by examination of results from a question designed to get at the sorts of things that leaders feel limit their effectiveness. The question was posed in the open-end format and the most appropriate coding categories turned out to be quite similar to those on the lists for activity and influence questions. Responses for broad categories of obstacles are reported in Table 12. In all the three countries for which coding and tabulation is completed, and particularly in the U.S., it is political-type obstacles which are most frequently seen as limiting what the leaders individually can do. Political-type obstacles include, in various distributions across countries, such mentions as inefficiency, interference by politicians, inadequate time at disposal of the leader, attitudes of the people and conflicts between political groups and interests. Lack of material resources is also a particularly significant obstacle for Yugoslavian leaders while social and cultural problems rank high for Indians.

Concentration of responses in two or three coding categories suggests need for more detailed analysis within these categories.

*with
well un-
precise*

Table 12
Perceived Obstacles to Leader Effectiveness
Percent of Total Obstacles Mentioned

	India (n=954)		U.S. (n=905)		Yugoslavia (n=1124) A	
	Percent	R	Percent	R	Percent	R
Total Obstacles Mentioned	1693		1124		1558	
1. Principles of social and economic organization	0.11	9	1.33	5	0.83	5
2. General welfare development	0	10	0	9	0.12	7.5
3. Need for economic development	0.17	8	0	9	0.06	9.5
4. Basic living standards	4.01	5	0	9	0.06	9.5
5. Need for economic stability	0.47	7	0.08	6.5	0.12	7.5
6. Lack of material resources	12.69	3	3.20	3	21.05	2
7. Problems of agricultural development	1.77	6	0.08	6.5	0.64	6
8. Problems of industrialization	6.20	4	2.93	4	13.09	3
9. Social and cultural problems	16.06	2	8.00	2	6.22	4
10. Political	58.47	1	84.34	1	57.76	1
	99.94%		99.96%		99.95%	

Leader Role

The concept of role is used here to focus on the norms of behavior thought to apply to the local leader as they concern his sense of responsibility and the demands made upon him. This presumes that the leader has some awareness of these norms and that he can provide information about (1) where his loyalties lie and whose interests he seeks to advance, as well as (2) whose support he relies upon and what groups and persons are therefore in the best position to help him structure the alternative courses of action open to him.

(1) Loyalties:

Knowledge about the groups to which a leader feels committed could help explain values held by leaders, and provide insights as to how they become operational. Sense of responsibility to region and nation could, for example, be hypothesized to be positively related to the number and importance of local decisions to promote social and economic development, as well as to perceived local autonomy.

As one source of data, respondents were presented a short list and asked, "Of the following groups, whose interests and welfare do you as a community leader feel the most strongly committed to advance?" They were permitted a first and second choice and scores were computed. Mean scores and derived rankings are presented in Table 13.

Table 13
Reference Groups of Local Leaders

<u>Reference Groups</u>	<u>Mean Scores Across Communities</u>							
	<u>India</u>		<u>Poland</u>		<u>U.S.</u>		<u>Yugoslavia</u>	
	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Mean score</u>	<u>R</u>
1. Political party	.514	3	.972	2	.160	4	1.001	2
2. Friends & supporters	.080	4	.042	4	.297	3	.022	4
3. People in the community	.714	2	.512	3	1.312	1	.552	3
4. Nation as a whole	1.345	1	1.395	1	1.037	2	1.367	1

Leaders in all countries except the U. S. strongly supported the "nation as a whole" as their focus of primary commitment. The Americans showed a slight preference for the people in their own community. And, as might be expected, both Polish and Yugoslav leaders scored "the party" second, but the Americans apparently felt almost no relative commitment to their party - even placing personal friends and supporters ahead of it, an almost non-existent political reference group for leaders in the other three countries. As interpreted from this table, the sense of responsibility of American local leaders indeed differs very considerably from that of other local leaders in this study.

(2) Support Groups:

Data was also gathered on the range of groups perceived necessary from which to have support, backing and perhaps assistance in acting on problems and in reaching decisions affecting the development of the community. For this measure of support sought, leaders were asked to indicate from a list of 16 roughly similar groups for each country those to whom they usually turn when they, in their positions as leaders, are in situations in which support from others is necessary. These groups represented functional types (such as party, administrative colleagues, interest groups, and the wider public), but included a level dimension as well - thus local party leaders and higher party leaders were separate choices.

A score of extensiveness or range of support was computed on the basis of the total number of groups checked by each leader (Table 14). These scores suggest that Indian leaders feel it necessary to mobilize far more support before they can act effectively than do leaders in the other three countries.

Table 14
Support Sought

	<u>Mean Score Across Communities</u>			
	<u>India</u>	<u>Poland</u>	<u>U. S.</u>	<u>Yugoslavia</u>
Total No. of Groups Checked	9.546	6.146	4.533	4.853

Space does not here permit display of the entire list of support groups for each country. We can report, however, that in India, Poland and Yugoslavia it is the local party organization that is most frequently mentioned, while in the U. S. party is tenth. The local party organization may be the backbone of the American political party system, but it certainly does not appear to be thought very necessary for programmatic accomplishment by the entire leadership groups in cities under 250,000. The U. S. local leaders instead seem to feel great sensitivity for the impact of public opinion for, not only do they profess their greatest loyalty to the people at large in the community, but they mention the general public most frequently as necessary for their own support.

In this section a number of perceptual variables have been presented and briefly described. They were formulated to assess local leaders' views of their own community, their individual positions within the community power structure, and the roles of the leaders with respect of their loyalties and support.

Some of these variables appear to relate to one another in rather expected ways while others do not. Further descriptive examination of this sort along with exploration of the interrelationships should permit construction of general profiles of local leaders for each country.

Decisional Case Studies

The major objective of the study has been to assess the relative influence of values upon decision-making as they affect the development of integrated community activity. Originally, a major category of variables concerned the actual decisions made by political leaders and those "intervening" variables which mediate in the decisional process between leader values on the one hand and community outputs on the other. Some of these have been measured in the survey instrument but practical limitations made it impossible to adequately ascertain at what point and in what manner they become operative in the process itself.

To bridge this data gap, a program of comparative case studies was undertaken. The focus of these studies is on actions and decisions of leaders rather than on the total activeness of the whole community. They provide a systematic penetration into the actual processes of participant interaction and behavior in political decision-making. Decision here refers to a choice between alternative courses of action on a given issue which would ultimately involve action by a local government body having authoritative responsibility, were it to be consummated. This conceptualization permitted selection of recent, or contemporary events, where decisions have not yet reached the point of local government action, or where the effect of the decision has been to forestall or block action by a local government body.

The basic program called for four cases to be undertaken in each country (two in more active communities, two in less active communities). The range of decisions selected was restricted to a very few functional areas concerning primarily questions of community output and facilities. While differences in the

kinds of problems important in each country led to variation in the kinds of decisions selected; the most important criterion was that the decisions concern issues considered vital in the particular community and consequently to have excited wide interest and probably controversy. The functional areas from which cases were selected were related to construction of schools, improvement of agriculture, local roads, dispensaries, small factories and to providing drinking water - all areas with which local leaders in Poland, Yugoslavia and India were concerned. For the U. S. such functional areas as urban renewal and air pollution could be substituted.

A total of 25 cases have now been completed in the four countries of which 14 are final studies and the others pretests. Data for the final reports were derived from records, interviews with informants, and interviews with participants. Similar questions were asked in each study. At least one researcher invested two weeks or more of field study time in the locality of each case.

In each country, at least one of the cases finally selected concerned school problems while the others tended to be somewhat more nation specific:

<u>Country</u>	<u>Decisional Area</u>
India	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building of a fish nursery pond 2. Building of a technical school 3. Location and building of dispensaries
Poland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location and building of a school 2. Location and building of a warehouse 3. Location and building of a milk collection center 4. Priorities and construction of roads
U. S.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban renewal 2. Racial integration of school districts 3. Urban renewal 4. Location and construction of a school
Yugoslavia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Closing of a hospital 2. Building of a recreation center and school 3. Setting up a budget in a commune

Standard criteria were adopted for developing the case reports in each country: (1) that the decision-making process be examined as a link between leadership values and outputs; (2) that specific elements included be relevant by either enabling or restricting leader actions; and (3) that the priority in selection of reference points be given to those explanatory variables in the survey design which may not have been adequately operationalized. This led to the selection of the following general variables: (1) Power and Influence Structure and how elements of the informal structure bear on decisions made by the formal political structure; (2) Mobilization and Organization of Support, both with respect to particular individuals and groups and with respect to the public;

(3) Exercise of Roles, how the participants perform according to self-expectations and expectations of others as well as clear identification of the place of the participant in the decisional process (initiator, promoter, opponent, supporter, decision-maker); (4) Communication, Information and Cognition, how communication channels among levels affect decisions and how leaders acquire information about the decision; (5) Local Autonomy and the ways in which real and perceived autonomy are influential - what are the formal-legal restrictions and how do leaders deal with them? Finally, an overall attempt was to be made to relate particular values identified in a case to specific output actions, particularly whether leaders felt it necessary to modify or compromise their values and if so, how and with what justifications.

A systematic coding and analysis of these cases is now underway (as well as completion of one more case in India and one in Yugoslavia). While it is apparent that extensive quantitative treatment will be quite difficult with such a small number of cases, preliminary efforts suggest that the format being followed will permit some meaningful comparisons.¹⁷ For example, it seems quite possible to identify the decisional role positions of the key participants and to reasonably assess the predominant values operative in each case. In Poland, the value of preserving the economic plan as articulated from above consistently seems to take precedence over the value of avoiding conflict within the poviats irrespective of the general activity or development level of the poviats, while in the U.S., the values of localism and equality do appear to be related to such factors. But equally as important as the possibility of making variable-by-variable comparisons is the prospect of constructing out of this data one or more models or common patterns for reaching decisions at the local level within each country which will then be compared cross-nationally and perhaps within nations as well.

17 The problem of numbers may eventually be reduced by an expanded program of case studies to be undertaken in all countries where eventually all 30 survey communities may be included.

Impact on Development:
Structuring the Explanation of Community Activeness

The question is what impact political leaders have on the development of their countries. The context is local political units and local political leaders. Impact is conceived of as the activeness of local communities. In empirical terms the question is how much of the variance in activeness of local political units can be explained in terms of leader characteristics, particularly leader values. The theoretical question is, of course, more complex. It is why certain specific leader characteristics made differences.

This section is a report on the empirical question. The first task is to present the concept and measures of activeness. This poses the problem of assessing an equivalent concept in four countries - a problem which is intensified by the fact that manifestations of activeness are conditioned by the peculiarities of the political system, such as degree of local autonomy and the economic base of the country.

The second task will be to present the best set or combination of variables related to a single and general measure of activeness. Here, the strategy will be an examination of a large number of variables for Indian and American local communities and then to estimate which set of them is most likely to account for the observed variance in their level of activeness. The units are a sample of 30 U. S. cities having populations between 25,000 and 250,000, and a two stage sample (first of districts and then of blocks) of 30 Indian blocks, 10 each in Gujarat, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh.¹⁸ The leaders were approximately the total universe of people occupying official positions in these units, about 30 leaders per community.

The Concept of Activeness

The notion of activeness is commonsensically conceived as the total activity of a local political unit or taking place within that unit over a number of years. It is sharply distinguished from economic level, although this must be taken as a conceptual distinction and not as an assertion that measures of economic level and of activeness are unrelated.

After several definitions of activeness were attempted and indicators were examined, a final definition was determined: "Activeness is the aggregate of individual and collective behavior directed to or having consequences for an increase in community facilities and the extent of individual involvement in solving problems at a collective or community level." There are two kinds of behavior in the general concept: "collective behavior which refers to actions of community institutions, particularly the local government, in generating community facilities and in increasing the opportunities for individual involvement; and individual

18 Analysis of Yugoslav and Polish data is in process.

behavior which is the involvement of individuals in broader community relations through participation in socio-political institutions and responding to community programs. "19

Two dimensions or components constitute the definition of activeness: resource mobilization which refers to the actual performance of local institutions in providing facilities and services where the acceptance or involvement of individuals is not necessarily required; and popular involvement which is the sum total of individual behavior in articulating preferences or demands and responding to collective initiatives with no necessary direct impact on the level of community facilities and services. "19

Assessing Activeness

Two goals dominated the strategy for assessing activeness. On the one hand, it was important to have comparable measures across nations, something which could be achieved if identical data were available and indicated identical things; on the other, it was essential that the measures validly reflect the phenomena in each country, which perhaps could not be achieved by using identical indicators even if they were available. The first goal would be attained but at a cost for the other, just as a common intelligence test facilitates comparisons between negroes and whites, but at the cost of getting a valid measure of intelligence for one or the other group.

The strategy of assessment was to use those indicators that best reflect the phenomenon in the particular country. Within as contrasted to between country standards were used. The basis for determining scores for a particular unit was where that unit fell in comparisons to other units within the same political system, not where it fell in comparison to all units in the study regardless of country. The goal was to have parallel measures so that a high score in India could be treated as equivalent to a high score in the U.S. The parallel measure was to be achieved by using a common procedure and by adjusting the scores to within country standards. 20

Abandoning common criteria for cross-national comparability in the assessment of local political unit activeness was mandated by several facts and arguments: (1) data on local political units, almost without exception, are not identical in any two countries; (2) multiple observations were being made anyway in each country, providing a basis of differentiation around national tendencies; (3) no cross-national standard, such as a dollar, was available for resource mobilization or participation, and even if there were some, problems of transformation would be immense; and (4) the behavior of political units or of people holding political roles needs to be understood or interpreted in context, that context being the particular political system.

19. See Document RT/V/7, pp. 2, 3

20 Whether the scores which are standardized for each of the four countries will be put into a four-country pool is a possibility for future analysis. If this is done, it would be desirable to have some "criterion" variables for cross-national validation.

Assessment is, therefore, of a general, comparable concept, measured by manifestations peculiar to specific political systems. The concept is homogeneous, although the indicators - the ways in which the concept is manifested, are heterogeneous. The meaning of specific indicators, it is assumed, is best interpreted in the context of the particular political system in which it is observed. Governmental expenditures are governmental expenditures. But in one country they are mandatory and reflect little choice; in another they are discretionary and perhaps reflect, better than anything else, the decisions of local governments.

The first step in the procedures is to postulate relationships between the two dimensions of activeness on the one hand and a number of accessible indicators on the other. As examples, high popular involvement would be related to high voting turnout and an indicator of high resource mobilization would be a large number of schools built. The task is to select only those indicators which indeed reflect the defined phenomena and not something else, or at least better reflect the phenomena than anything else (contain more "true" than "error"). But what is the standard by which the indicators can be evaluated? One step in this procedure is to pick enough indicators (have enough hypotheses) so that the probability of having true indicators is increased. The standard for each indicator is how it relates to the total set of indicators - all items being taken as the first best estimate of the phenomena or at least as a better estimate than any single item. The effect of this evaluation is to obtain a set of inter-related items so that the "true" contained in the several indicators overwhelms the "error" that could be contained in any one indicator. The final task is to devise an approximate weight for each indicator according to how probable it is that it indicates the "true" rather than "error". Thus the standard for the validity of the measures taken together is the degree to which individual indicators are related to all other indicators - all of the indicators being the standard.²¹ The relationships are observed within the specific political system, not across some or all systems.

The specific procedures are: (1) to postulate a set of relationships of specific indicators to activeness, the selection process being somewhat disciplined by availability of data and the likelihood of getting similar data in other countries; (2) to collect the data for a number of political units; (3) to inter-correlate the indicators; (4) to exclude indicators which correlated poorly on the whole with the other indicators; (5) to exclude indicators which behave peculiarly, such as being high in only one state in India; and (6) to factor analyze the final set of indicators to obtain clusters of indicators and weights reflecting how well an indicator fits with a general cluster of indicators.

In operational terms, the goal was to obtain several weighted indicators which could be used for measuring three phenomena - resource mobilization, popular involvement, and a combination of the two; and which should be reasonably well correlated within a particular country.

²¹ For further discussion on this, see Teune, "Measuring Characteristics of Complex Social Aggregates", Document USA/82. For an example with Yugoslav data, see Mlinar and Teune, "Community Integration: Aggregate Data Assessment", Document YU/20.

A major assumption used for India but not for the U. S. or other countries was that of "infinite need". Present levels, area, population, and cultivable land, were not used for standardization. Even though this assumption could be justified by the fact that most of these units have similar size dimensions, the more important justification was that no block would be in a position to reduce its efforts in building schools, distributing fertilizers, or inoculating the population. In every block, in short, there was equal opportunity for effort, if not equality of need. A secondary assumption for the Indian indicators was that popular involvement should be viewed as individual response to developmental or community wide programs, such as vaccinations, use of contraceptives. This behavior is believed to be more reflective of individual involvement in community affairs than conventional western measures of involvement, such as voting or joining organizations.

American indicators are of three types - local governmental revenues and expenditures, voting, and activity of some organizations. Several of the indicators are of an incremental nature - increase or decrease in voting, or expenditure. Several of them reflect present levels. Many of them were gathered in the field.

The tables below (15 and 16) present the selected indicators, the factor loadings for each indicator, and the dimension that the indicator was hypothesized to indicate - resource mobilization or popular involvement. The factor loadings presented are from the factor interpreted as "mixed". For India it is the first four factors rotated, and for the U. S. the second of four factors rotated. Two of the remaining three factors tend to be "pure" resource mobilization or "pure" popular involvement and the remaining factor an additional "mixed type", but less readily interpretable.

Communities were scored on the basis of the factor loadings. Standard scores were computed for each community on each indicator; this score was multiplied by the factor loading; these weighted scores were then summated; and the summated score in turn was divided by the number of loadings, producing an average score on the several items and the score for activeness.

Table 15

Indian Activeness Measures (in order of importance)

<u>Hypothesized Dimension</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Factor loading*</u>
RM=resource mobilization		
PI =popular involvement		
RM	(1) Average supply of chemical fertilizer per year - 1962-65	+ .940
PI	(2) Average number of adults made literate per year	+ .909
PI	(3) Average number of inoculations of cattle " " " "	+ .843
PI	(4) Average number of sterilizations (male and female) per year - 1962-65	+ .744
RM	(5) Average increment of village radios per year 1962-65 (base year 1961-62)	+ .708
PI	(6) Average number of smallpox vaccinations per year 1962-65	+ .605
RM	(7) Average increment of motor-run pumping sets per year 1962-65 (base year 1961-62)	+ .540
PI	(8) Average number of artificial inseminations per year 1962-65	+ .439
PI	(9) Average number of drinking wells constructed per year 1962-65	- .178
RM	(10) Average increment of area irrigated per year, 1962-65 (base year 1961-62)	- .157
RM	(11) Average number of improved ploughs distributed per year, 1962-65	- .150
PI	(12) Average increment in the proportion of paid-up share capital of cooperative societies, 1962-63 - 1965-66, (base year 1961-62)	- .120
RM	(13) Average increment in proportion of the supply of improved seeds, 1962-63 - 1965-66 (base year 1961-62)	- .104
RM	(14) Average number of new schools opened per year, 1962-65	- .077
PI	(15) Average increment in school enrollment 1962-65 (base year 1961-62)	+ .053
PI	(16) Average increase in the proportion of members of cooperative societies, 1962-63 - 1965-66 (base year 1961-62)	- .042
PI	(17) Average number of latrines built per year, 1962-65	+ .019
PI	(18) Average number of manure pits dug per year, 1962-65	+ .012
PI	(19) Number of loops inserted, 1965-66	.004

*This is the largest factor of four factors rotated, accounting for 23.4% of the variance.

Table 16
U. S. Activeness Measures (in order of importance)

<u>Hypothesized Dimension</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Factor loading</u>
RM=resource mobilization		
PI =popular involvement		
RM	(1) Change in intergovernmental revenue, 1959-64, per capita	+ .715
PI	(2) Boy Scout adult volunteers, 1965, pop. over 21	.701
PI	(3) Mean turnout of voters in local elections, 1959-66, pop. 21 and over	+ .636
RM	(4) Change in revenue from property taxes, 1959-64, per capita	+ .619
PI	(5) % change in Boy Scout members, 1960-65	-.521
PI	(6) Mean turnout of voters on referenda, 1960-66, pop. 21 and over	+ .514
RM	(7) Expenditure: law and order, 1965, per capita	-.473
PI	(8) Mean turnout of voters in presidential elections, 1960-64, pop. 21 and over	+ .452
PI	(9) Change in turnout of voters in presidential elections, 1960-64, pop. 21 and over	-.393
RM	(10) Non-patient hospital revenue, 1965, per capita	+ .385
RM	(11) Value poverty program, 1965, per capita	+ .384
PI	(12) United Fund contributions raised, 1965, per capita	-.285
RM	(13) Change in expenditure: public health and hospitals, 1960-65, per capita	+ .256
PI	(14) YMCA - total number of board and committee members, 1965, total pop.	+ .237
RM	(15) Change in expenditure: law and order, 1960-65, per capita	-.193
RM	(16) Expenditure: parks & recreation, 1965, per capita	-.189
RM	(17) Total general expenditure, 1964, per capita	-.136
RM	(18) Change in expenditure: parks and recreation, 1960-64 per capita	+ .121
RM	(19) Increase in per pupil expenditure, 1960-65	+ .113
PI	(20) Change in United Fund contributions raised, 1960-65, per capita	+ .103
RM	(21) Expenditure; public health & hospitals, 1965, per capita	+ .079
RM	(22) Change in expenditure: libraries, 1960-65, per capita	+ .061
RM	(23) Expenditure: libraries, 1965, per capita	+ .048
PI	(24) Members League of Women Voters, 1965, pop. over 21	-.044
PI	(25) % change in the number of YMCA volunteer group leaders, 1960-65	-.025
RM	(26) Per pupil expenditure, 1965	+ .006
PI	(27) YWCA contributions, 1965, per capita	+ .004
PI	(28) YMCA contributions, 1965	+ .001

*This is the second largest of four factors rotated, accounting for 12.7% of the variance.

The Explanatory Structure of Activeness

Several variables were hypothesized as partial explanations of activeness. To repeat the opening question, the problem is to determine how much of the variance in activeness can be explained by leader characteristics, particularly leader values. A strong alternative general hypothesis is that the activeness of local communities is a consequence of their economic base and the socio-political structure.

Approximately 165 variables were inter-correlated and their relationship to the general, mixed activeness measure examined.²³ A set of the best correlated variables was selected for each country (39) as those most likely to provide a coherent pattern of explanation.

A step-wise regression was run on activeness with these selected variables. This analysis picks the best correlated variable, presents how much of the total variance it explains, produces partial order correlations holding this variable constant, looks at the partial order correlations, picks the variable with the highest partial correlation, holds constant for this variable as well as for the preceding one, and continues this process until 99% of the total variance in the dependent variable is explained. The result is a multi-variate, hierarchical structuring of variables predicting a single variable. If one wanted to know the one variable that best predicted a phenomenon, what would it be? If one wanted to know the only two variables, or three variables, what would they be? The single best predictor of a legislator's vote would be his party. The two best things would be his party and the nature of his constituency, etc.

What are the best predictors (and prediction rather than explanation is technically correct) of activeness in India and the U.S.? Are the patterns of variables similar or do they sharply contrast? The fact of similarity or difference, of course, itself requires explanation.

The following table presents 10 variables accounting for about 90% of the variance in the general measure of activeness for 30 U.S. and Indian communities. The variables are presented in order of their contribution to the prediction. The percentage of variance given for each variable is the amount of variance predicted by that variable and all preceding ones. Two other regression analyses were made for each country. In the U.S. the score on the equality factor was the first variable in one of these analyses. It was omitted from the regression and analysis presented and is replaced by the score on the equality side. In India several highly correlated variables derived from open-ended questions were added, but the first five variables are the same as those presented here. These other analyses provide a basis for inferring that this structure is somewhat stable.

23 Actually 190 relationships with activeness were examined in the U.S. and 182 in India. The U.S. community file contains formal political structure variables and both contain variables derived from the open-ended questions. These are excluded from this discussion.

Table 17
Multiple Regressions: Variables Predicting Activeness in the U. S. and India

U. S.			I N D I A		
Variable	Direction	%of variance (multiple R squared)	Variable	Direction	%of varianc (multiple R squared)
1. Mean score on equality	positive	. 367	1. Mean score of factor ^(b) of economic radicalism	positive	. 496
2. Mean importance of ^(a) economic development	negative	. 489	2. Mean leader influence in agriculture	positive	. 656
3. Score on selflessness factor	positive	. 569	3. Mean leader activity in industrial & economic development	negative	. 727
4. Mean divisions perceived on ethnic and racial origins	negative	. 647	4. Variance on perceived divisions between superiors & subordinates	positive	. 794
5. Homogeneity of leaders' education	positive	. 719	5. Mean score on support sought from higher party officials	negative	. 846
6. Mean score on local-nationalism scale	positive (national)	. 760	6. Mean leader influence in social services	positive	. 886
7. Mean leader activity in finance	negative	. 792	7. Homogeneity of leaders' education	positive	. 908
8. Mean perceived-lack of autonomy in cultural affairs	negative	. 821	8. Mean score on honesty scale	negative	. 932
9. Mean score on honesty scale	negative	. 849	9. Mean importance on political participation scale	positive	. 949
10. Mean importance of national objectives	negative	. 857	10. Variance on perceived divisions on income	positive	. 955

(a) See section on value priorities.

(b) The following are illustrative of items loading high on this factor (1) "Even if newer ways conflict with the ways things were done in the past, they are absolutely necessary and desirable"; (2) "Quick decisions should be taken in important matters even at the risk of bad decisions!"; and (3) "Only economic development will provide the things required for the welfare and happiness of the people".

The language of this analysis can be reversed or put in descriptive terms. American cities which score high on activeness are characterized by leaders who state economic equality is important, who feel there are other values more important than economic development, honesty, or achieving national objectives, who are selfless in orientation, similarly educated, not active in financial affairs, see no lack of local autonomy in cultural affairs and do not see the community divided along racial or ethnic lines. The self-perception of inactivity in finance and perception of autonomy in culture do not seem interesting and perhaps should be excluded from a further analysis.

The pattern in India, with a few exceptions, seems to make sense in terms of the measures of activeness. Indian leaders in communities which score high on activeness feel that economic change and popular participation is desirable, but are not as interested in honesty, see themselves as influential in agriculture and social services but not in the general area described as "economic development", are of a similar educational background but disagree among themselves about the amount of cleavage in the community on superior-subordinate relationships and on income, and do not seek support from higher party officials. The picture is a leader who wants to change things and does so in the areas of direct payoff to the population - agriculture and social services.

These relationships, of course, cannot justify inferences that leader characteristics "cause" activeness in a local community. The data do not permit a determination of sequence, what follows what. Also there are theoretical links between leader values and perceptions and what happens in a community, particularly the decisions for which the leaders are responsible. But what is clear is that values have an important place in the hierarchy of variables related to community activeness. The problem, as in most social science research, remains of discovering the multi-variate pattern of explanation. The evidence from this study is that leader values will have a critical part in this pattern of variables explaining the level of resource mobilization and popular involvement in local governmental units.

Addenda

I. Conceptual specification of the value scales:

The conceptual history of the values for which scales were developed (see pages 6 to 10) is described in the Report of the Third International Roundtable of ISVIP, Warsaw, 1966 (document RT/III/3). In summary, the final interpretations are as follows:

1. Concern for economic development, combining a general interest in material progress and well-being with a readiness to place future economic growth ahead of immediate consumption.
2. Conflict resolution-avoidance, emphasizing particularly the extent to which a desire for consensus, and the avoidance of conflict limit the willingness of leaders to proceed with programs in the community.
3. Participation. This scale includes two elements - a general concern for citizen involvement in public policy formation and decision-making; and a specific readiness to subordinate expertise and professional competence to the value of public participation in the decisional process.
4. Selflessness: willingness to sacrifice for others.
5. Localism: orientation to local, as against national interests and goals, indicating readiness to give precedence to the former when there is conflict between them.
6. Action propensity: disposition to act, despite risks, uncertainties or lack of knowledge about consequences.
7. Honesty: truthfulness and the value of disclosure in public conduct.
8. Change orientation: disposition to accept and support "new things", especially in the solution of community problems.
9. Equality: specifically limited to concern for economic equality, i. e. reducing differences between rich and poor.
10. Political responsibility: this value includes three elements, (a) the referent object of responsibility felt by a leader (nation, local community, party, special interests, etc.), (b) the degree of commitment or sense of felt obligation, (c) conception of political role of the leader.

II. Data on perception of community conflicts:

Space limitations have prevented even a summary report on a substantial body of survey responses which indicate the leaders' assessment of the extent and nature of social and political conflict in their communities. Their perception of conflict as a community problem or obstacle to leadership is noted (pages 21 and 27) but there was a tendency not to fully confront the issue of conflict until it was specifically probed in the interview.

III. Specification of the "activeness" concept:

The dimension of popular involvement was conceptualized as programmatic involvement of the population in governmentally initiated development policies; social-cultural participation and political participation. There are no political participation indicators for India and no programmatic involvement indicators for the U. S.