

Latin

America

in

New Approaches
to Methods
and Analysis

Comparative

Perspective

edited by
Peter H. Smith



Latin America in
Global Perspective Series

**LATIN AMERICA
IN COMPARATIVE
PERSPECTIVE**





Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Latin America in Global Perspective

The fundamental purpose of this multivolume series is to broaden conceptual perspectives for the study of Latin America. This effort responds to a perception of need. Latin America cannot be understood in isolation from other parts of the world. This has always been so; it is especially true in the contemporary era.

Accordingly, the goal of this series is to demonstrate the desirability and the feasibility of analyzing Latin America in comparative perspective, in conjunction with other regions, and in global perspective, in the context of worldwide processes. A subsidiary purpose is to establish a bridge between Latin American "area studies" and mainstream social science disciplines, to the mutual benefit of both. Ultimately, the intent is to explore and emphasize intellectual challenges posed by dynamic changes within Latin America and in its relation to the international arena.

The present volume, *Latin America in Comparative Perspective: New Approaches to Methods and Analysis*, explores theoretical and methodological issues involved in the comparative analysis of Latin America. Other studies in this series will include:

EnGENDERing Wealth and Well-Being: Empowerment for Global Change, edited by Rae Lesser Blumberg, Cathy A. Rakowski, Irene Tinker, and Michael Monteón;

Cooperation or Rivalry? Regional Integration in the Americas and the Pacific Rim, edited by Shoji Nishijima and Peter H. Smith;

Latin American Environmental Policy in International Perspective, edited by Gordon MacDonald, Daniel Nielsen, and Marc Stern;

Civil-Military Relations After the Cold War, edited by David Mares;

Institutional Design in New Democracies, edited by Arend Lijphart and Carlos Waisman.

This series results from a multiyear research program organized by the Center for Iberian and Latin American Studies (CILAS) at the University of California, San Diego. Principal funding has come from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

LATIN AMERICA IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

**New Approaches to
Methods and Analysis**

edited by

Peter H. Smith

University of California, San Diego



Routledge

Taylor & Francis Group

New York London

Latin America in Global Perspective

First published 1995 by Westview Press

Published 2018 by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 1995 Taylor & Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 13: 978-0-8133-2105-9 (pbk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-8133-2104-2 (hbk)

Contents

<i>List of Tables and Figures</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>List of Acronyms</i>	xv
CHAPTER ONE	
The Changing Agenda for Social Science Research on Latin America	
<i>Peter H. Smith</i>	1
PART ONE	
ANALYTICAL STRATEGIES	31
CHAPTER TWO	
Contending Paradigms for Cross-Regional Comparison: Development Strategies and Commodity Chains in East Asia and Latin America	
<i>Gary Gereffi</i>	33
CHAPTER THREE	
Purposes and Methods of Intraregional Comparison	
<i>Amparo Menéndez-Carrión and Fernando Bustamante</i>	59

CHAPTER FOUR Uses and Limitations of Rational Choice <i>Barbara Geddes</i>	81
PART TWO CONCEPTUAL ISSUES	109
CHAPTER FIVE Rewriting the Scripts: Gender in the Comparative Study of Latin American Politics <i>Jane S. Jaquette</i>	111
CHAPTER SIX Trajectory of a Concept: "Corporatism" in the Study of Latin American Politics <i>David Collier</i>	135
CHAPTER SEVEN Assessments of State Strength <i>Evelyne Huber</i>	163
CHAPTER EIGHT Reassessing Political Culture <i>Frederick C. Turner</i>	195
PART THREE POLITICAL ROLES OF SOCIAL SCIENCE	225
CHAPTER NINE Polls, Political Discourse, and the Public Sphere: The Spin on Peru's Fuji-golpe <i>Catherine M. Conaghan</i>	227

CONTENTS

ix

CHAPTER TEN

Public Opinion Research in Mexico

Miguel Basáñez

257

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Public Opinion Research in Russia and Eastern Europe

Elena Bashkirova

275

About the Book

293

About the Editor and Contributors

295

Index

299



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Tables and Figures

Tables

1.1	Methods of agreement and difference	5
1.2	Most-Similar-Systems (MSS) and Most-Different-Systems (MDS) designs	5
1.3	Analytical strategies and methodological approaches	7
2.1	Comparative methods, generalizations, and variables	40
6.1	Subtypes and dimensions: Differentiating in terms of the locus of power	145
8.1	What people in different countries find to be very important, 1990–1991	199
8.2	Practices and attitudes relating to the transition toward democracy by social class: Mexico, 1990	202
8.3	The assignment of responsibility for political, economic, and social change by social class: Urban residents in Mexico, 1961	203
8.4	Practices relating to the transition toward democracy: Mexico, Argentina, and Chile, 1981–1991	213
8.5	Views of whether change should come through reform or through revolutionary action: Mexico, Argentina, and Chile, 1981–1991	214
8.6	Attitudes toward citizen participation, interpersonal trust, confidence in the legal system, and patriotism: Mexico, Argentina, and Chile, 1984–1991	215

9.1	Confidence in national institutions: Peru, 1990–1992	233
9.2	Approval rating of Alberto Fujimori as president, 1990–1993	235
9.3	Conditions of continued approval/disapproval of Fujimori presidency, 1992	243

Figures

6.1	Effort to accommodate discussion of “concertation” leads to differentiation of overarching concept into two components	143
6.2	Classical versus radial subtypes	148
10.1	Party preferences in Mexico 1982–1993	265
10.2	Do you approve or disapprove of the way the president is handling his job? Mexico 1982–1983	266
10.3	Would you say your personal situation is better today, the same, or worse than it was a year ago? Mexico, 1987–1993	267
10.4	Do you think elections will be respected? Mexico, 1988–1991	268
11.1	Perception of improvement in household finances: East European countries, 1992–1993	283
11.2	Perception of outlook for general economic situation: East European countries, 1993	284
11.3	Is the creation of a market economy right or wrong? East European countries, 1993	286
11.4	Are economic reforms proceeding too fast or too slowly? East European countries, 1993	287

Preface

This book results from extensive collaboration among numerous individuals and institutions over the past several years. Activities began in 1992 when the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) launched an initiative on Latin America in conjunction with its renowned Summer Program in Quantitative Methods held in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Colleagues from ICPSR and the University of Michigan and I then developed an intensive workshop on "Quantitative Research on Latin America," which is now offered on a regular basis. Select groups of students from Latin America, Europe, and the United States attend. In July 1992 we also held an exploratory two-day conference on "Prospects for Quantitative Research on Latin America." The following year we set out to organize a full-fledged conference and to convene an informal seminar where our ICPSR students could report on their research-in-progress. These efforts led to a meeting on "Latin America in Comparative Perspective: Issues and Methods" held in Quito, Ecuador, July 29–31, 1993.

This volume has emerged from all of these activities and addresses a broad range of analytical questions. After an introductory assessment of the state of the field, in Part One the authors explore methodological approaches to the study of Latin America: cross-regional comparison, intraregional comparison, and the application of rational choice. In Part Two contributors examine conceptual and substantive issues: women's movements, corporatism, state capacity, and political culture. And in Part Three the authors evaluate the status and usage of public opinion research in Latin America, Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union, thus providing insight on the roles of social science under conditions of political change.

As director of the Center for Iberian and Latin American Studies (CILAS) at the University of California, San Diego, I want to acknowledge

the contributions of cosponsoring institutions: the Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO), the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales Sede Ecuador (FLACSO/Ecuador), the ICPSR, and the Program in Latin American and Caribbean Studies at the University of Michigan. Financial support came from all these institutions and from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

As project co-organizer I express gratitude to Claudia Leite, Amparo Menéndez-Carrión, Marcia Rivera, Richard J. Rockwell, and Rebecca J. Scott.

As volume editor I offer special thanks to Patricia Rosas, editorial assistant at CILAS, and to Barbara Ellington, our editor at Westview Press.

Peter H. Smith
La Jolla, California

Acronyms

AAPOR	American Association for Public Opinion Research
ACLS	American Council of Learned Societies
ADEX	Asociación de Exportadores (Association of Exporters, Peru)
AMAI	Asociación Mexicana de Agencias de Investigación (Mexican Association of Research Agencies)
APEIM	Asociación Peruana de Empresas de Investigación de Mercados (Peruvian Association of Market Research Companies)
APRA	Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana (Latin American Popular Revolutionary Alliance, Peru)
CARICOM	Caribbean Community and Common Market
CCD	Congreso Constituyente Democrático (Democratic Constituent Congress)
CEDYS	Centro de Estudios de la Democracia y la Sociedad (Center for the Study of Democracy and Society)
CEO	Centro de Estudios de Opinión (Center for Public Opinion Studies, University of Colima)
CEO	Centro de Estudios de Opinión (Center for Public Opinion Studies, University of Guadalajara)
CEOP	Centro de Estudios de Opinión Pública (Center for the Study of Public Opinion)
CIEPLAN	Centro de Investigación y Estudios para la Planificación (Center for Planning Research and Study, Chile)
CILAS	Center for Iberian and Latin American Studies
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CLACSO	Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (Latin American Council for Social Science)

CNN	Cable News Network
CONACYT	Consejo Nacional para Ciencias y Tecnología (National Council on Science and Technology, Mexico)
CPI	Compañía Peruana de Investigación (Peruvian Research Company)
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
DESCO	Centro de Estudios y Promoción del Desarrollo (Center for the Study and Promotion of Development)
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EIU	Economist Intelligence Unit
EOI	export-oriented industrialization
EPZ	export-processing zone
ESOMAR	European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research
FLACSO	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (Latin American Faculty for Social Science)
FONDECYT	Fondo Nacional de Ciencias y Tecnología (National Fund for Science and Technology, Chile)
GCC	global commodity chain
GDP	gross domestic product
GEO	Gabinete de Estudios de Opinión (Survey Research Cabinet)
GNP	gross national product
ICPSR	Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IDESP	Instituto de Estudos Economicos, Sociais e Politicos de São Paulo (The Institute of Economic, Social and Political Research of São Paulo)
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISI	import-substituting industrialization
ISOP	Investigaciones Sobre Opinión (Public Opinion Research)
LASA	Latin American Studies Association
LASDB	Latin American Survey Data Bank
MDS	most-different-system
MERCOSUR	Mercado Común del Sur (Common Market of the South)
MSS	most-similar-system
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NIC	newly industrializing countries
OAS	Organization of American States
OBM	original brandname manufacturing

OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OEM	original equipment manufacturing
OP	Opinión Profesional (Professional Opinion)
PAN	Partido Acción Nacional (National Action Party, Mexico)
PCC	Partido Comunista de Cuba (Cuban Communist Party)
PEAC	Prospectiva Estratégica (Strategic Outlook)
PHARE	Aid for the Economic Reconstruction of Poland and Hungary
PM	Pulso Mercadológico (Market Pulse)
POP	Peruana de Opinión Pública (Peruvian Public Opinion)
PPS	probability proportional to size
PRD	Partido Revolucionario Democrático (Democratic Revolutionary Party, Mexico)
PRI	Partido Revolucionario Institucional (Institutional Revolutionary Party)
PSU	primary sampling unit
ROMIR	Russian Public Opinion and Market Research
SMEOP	Sociedad Mexicana de Estudios de Opinión Pública (Mexican Society for Public Opinion Research)
SSRC	Social Science Research Council
TACIS	Technical Assistance for Community of Independent States
TNC	transnational corporation
UNCTC	United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations
USIA	United States Information Agency
USITC	United States International Trade Commission
VCiom	All-Russian Center for Public Opinion
VLSI	very-large-scale integrated circuits
WAPOR	World Association for Public Opinion Research
WID	women in development



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

CHAPTER ONE

The Changing Agenda for Social Science Research on Latin America

Peter H. Smith

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH on Latin America stands at a crossroads. Sweeping transformations throughout the region and the world have brought new issues to the forefront. In the aftermath of brutal authoritarianism, the onset of “democratization” has sparked controversy over dynamics of political transition and regime consolidation. In the wake of the “lost decade” of the 1980s, the quest for economic development has prompted emulation of export-led strategies pioneered in the Pacific Rim and has led to widespread acceptance of the so-called Washington consensus. In the post–Cold War international arena, these concurrent trends in Latin America—political and economic liberalization—are commonly hailed as integral expressions of universal, worldwide trends that represent and celebrate the triumph of a new “neoliberal” orthodoxy. In the meantime, nations of Latin America are striving mightily to find appropriate niches amid rapidly shifting global arrangements.

These developments require rigorous investigation and analysis, instead of self-congratulation. And as such changes shape the substantive research agenda, they demand the application of two related methodologies. The first of these is comparative analysis, especially cross-regional analysis that can identify similarities and differences between changes in Latin America and other parts of the world. In order to assess the utility for Latin America of “Asian” development models, for instance, it is essential to comprehend the social and political conditions that led to their formulation and permitted their implementation—and to

acquire a precise understanding of their practical ingredients. In order to analyze the global impulse toward democratization, it is important to detect the specific properties of political transition and to evaluate differential prospects for institutional consolidation in such distant areas as Eastern Europe and Latin America.

The second methodology is quantitative research, especially statistical analysis that can provide the means for measuring the *extent* of political, economic, and societal change. In most instances, it is not just a question of *whether* a given phenomenon might be taking place, it is a question of *degree*. Besides, many specific items on the newly evolving agenda lead directly to matters of measurement. The study of political phenomena associated with "democratization"—elections, public opinion polls, and legislative coalitions—opens new possibilities for quantitative work. So does the examination of such contemporary social issues as income distribution, class structure, and gender inequality.

How to meet the demands of this agenda? What analytical strategies are most appropriate? Is it suitable to compare development policies in Chile with those of South Korea or Taiwan? What can be learned by comparing political transitions in Argentina with Poland or Hungary, or is it more fruitful to concentrate on comparisons within Latin America? To what extent can (or should) Latin Americanists make use of game theory and rational choice models? What are the intellectual benefits of quantitative research? How can statistical analysis be appropriately employed in the cultural and social contexts of Latin America? And how can statistical findings be usefully compared from one region to another? Such questions form the framework of this book.

In this chapter I explore relationships between substantive issues and analytical strategies. I begin with commentary on comparative and quantitative methodologies, offer an overview of recent trends in Latin American studies, assess resources in the field, and conclude with observations about current and future research challenges. I concentrate mainly on political questions and political science, but this focus should be relevant to other disciplines as well.¹ □

COMPARATIVE AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Comparative and quantitative methodologies can go hand in hand. As Arend Lijphart pointed out some time ago, the two approaches are logically and practically linked to one another: "The comparative method resembles the statistical method in all respects except one. The crucial difference is that the number of cases it deals with is too small to permit systematic control by means of partial correlations. ... There is, consequently, no clear dividing line between the statistical and comparative

methods; the difference depends entirely on the number of cases."² Moreover, quantitative analysis itself requires some form of comparative perspective: Only then is it possible to determine whether an empirical finding represents a high or low number—that is, in relation to some kind of standard—and to interpret the results accordingly.

Lijphart has made an important point, but it can be taken only so far. The distinction between comparative and statistical analysis does not depend merely on the magnitude of the *N* (the number of cases), nor is statistical analysis inherently superior or preferable to qualitative comparison. As Charles Ragin has forcefully demonstrated, qualitative approaches can have distinct advantages. Because they focus on "cases" rather than on "variables" qualitative comparisons deal with configurations of attributes; they respect particularity and apparent idiosyncrasy; they seek multiple, contingent, and complex forms of causality. Such work typically examines a small number of cases to establish meaningful generalizations about theoretically definable phenomena (the *opus classicus* of the genre is Barrington Moore's *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*).³ In contrast, statistical analysis usually employs a large number of cases in order to measure "average" relationships between "variables" that are often taken out of context. Statistical methods look for general trends and probabilistic associations; deviant cases are regarded (and often dismissed) simply as "outliers." Qualitative methods usually insist on satisfactory explanation of every case under consideration.⁴

There are many different forms of comparative analysis. One of the most useful classifications has come from Charles Tilly, who distinguishes between several kinds of comparison:

- *individualizing comparison*, "in which the point is to contrast specific instances of a given phenomenon as a means of grasping the peculiarities of each case";
- *universalizing comparison*, which "aims to establish that every instance of a phenomenon follows essentially the same rule";
- *variation-finding comparison*, which purports "to establish a principle of variation in the character or intensity of a phenomenon by examining systemic differences among instances"; and
- *encompassing comparison*, which "places different instances at various locations within the same system, on the way to explaining their characteristics as a function of their varying relationship to the system as a whole."

This categorization represents differences in purpose rather than in method. As Tilly observed, "The four types of comparison differ ... with respect to the sorts of statements they yield rather than with respect to

the logic of comparison as such. Their relative value depends on the intellectual task at hand."⁵

Additional classifications focus on methods and techniques of comparative analysis. Still relevant is the work of John Stuart Mill, who over a century and a half ago distinguished between two forms of comparative logic. Using the "method of agreement," cases with similar values on a dependent variable—the phenomenon to be explained, such as the outbreak of social revolution—are compared according to values on a theoretically determined set of independent variables. By a process of elimination, those independent variables with differing values are dismissed from consideration, leaving those independent variables with similar values as possible "causes" of common outcomes on the dependent variable. Mill's "method of difference" reverses the procedure, comparing cases with differing values on the dependent variable and eliminating independent variables with similar values from consideration as explanatory or potentially causal factors.⁶ Table 1.1 depicts these methods in schematic form.

More recently Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune have offered an analogous distinction. On the one hand, comparisons based on a "most-similar-systems" (MSS) design involve a deliberate selection of cases with similar values on preselected variables, thus permitting close analysis of covariance between other variables. On the other hand, a "most-different-systems" (MDS) design utilizes cases with similar outcomes on the dependent variable but different values on a broad range of independent variables, leaving only those independent variables with similar values as possible explanatory or causal factors (Table 1.2).⁷ (The concepts are similar to Mill's but the language is reversed: MSS is analogous to the "method of difference" and MDS is analogous to the "method of agreement.") MSS designs lend themselves especially well to intraregional comparisons, such as among nations or communities within Latin America, since location within a single region can operate as a "control" for the effects of a substantial range of potential independent variables. MDS designs are especially pertinent for cross-regional comparisons, such as among cases in Latin America and Eastern Europe or East Asia, since location within different regions can introduce variation in a broad range of independent variables. At the same time, MSS designs are especially helpful in the initial search for and elaboration of plausible hypotheses; MDS designs are particularly suited to testing and verification of established hypotheses.

There are further affinities between these methodological alternatives. As Gary Gereffi observes in Chapter 2 of this volume, MSS designs are especially appropriate for "individualizing" and "variation-finding" comparisons, whereas MDS designs lend themselves to "universalizing"

TABLE 1.1 Methods of Agreement and Difference

<i>Method of Agreement</i>	<i>Case 1</i>	<i>Case 2</i>	<i>Case 3</i>	
Variable I	a	b	c	} overall differences
Variable II	d	e	f	
Variable III	g	h	i	
Variable X	x	x	x	} crucial similarity
Variable Y	y	y	y	

<i>Method of Difference</i>	<i>Positive Cases</i>	<i>Negative Cases</i>	
Variable I	a	a	} overall similarities
Variable II	b	b	
Variable III	c	c	
Variable X	x_1	x_2	} crucial difference
Variable Y	y_1	y_2	

where $x_1 \neq x_2$ and $y_1 \neq y_2$

Source: Adapted from Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers, "Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22, no. 2 (April 1980): 174–197, esp. 184.

TABLE 1.2 Most-Similar-Systems (MSS) and Most-Different-Systems (MDS) Designs

	<i>MSS Design</i>		<i>MDS Design</i>	
	<i>Case 1</i>	<i>Case 2</i>	<i>Case 1</i>	<i>Case 2</i>
Variable I	a	a	a	b
Variable II	b	b	c	d
Variable III	c	c	e	f
Variable X	x_1	x_2	x_3	x_3
Variable Y	y_1	y_2	y_3	x_3

where $x_1 \neq x_2$, $y_1 \neq y_2$, $x_3 = x_3$, and $y_3 = y_3$.

comparisons. In effect, MSS strategies probe underlying and systematic differences between cases. MDS designs, by contrast, test the existence and durability of specified relationships between variables, regardless of values on other variables—that is, relationships that are “universal” and thus oblivious to context. As Carlos Waisman has also pointed out, MSS approaches can also serve a subsidiary function for universalizing comparisons, as can MDS designs for individualizing and variation-finding strategies.⁸

As Lijphart has maintained, statistical analysis can make major contributions to these efforts. I refer not to the straightforward accumulation of numerical data; this can often be a thoroughly simplistic exercise, although the judicious juxtaposition of quantitative information can play a useful role in qualitative, small *N* comparisons. Instead, I refer to the use of statistical methods that measure the form, strength, and significance of associations between variables across a relatively large number of cases. It goes without saying that fascination with statistical techniques can lend itself to methodological excess and substantive banality. Tilly has made this point with playful exaggeration:

There is the abuse of the Great Blender, in which we take numerical observations on a hundred-odd national states, made comparable by the magic fact of appearing in parallel columns in a statistical handbook, and run multiple regressions or factor analyses in order to discern the dimensions of development, of modernity, or political instability, or some other ill-defined global concept. There is the abuse of the Ersatz Laboratory, in which survey teams establish themselves in a number of different countries, translate a common questionnaire into the various local languages, then send out interviewers to ask the questions of presumably comparable samples of individuals or households in each country, code up their results into standard categories, then pool the information thus manufactured into an analysis of cross-cultural variation in the relationship between *X* and *Y*, with *Z* controlled. Let us not forget the abuse of the Cultural Check-board, in which hired graduate students read stacks of ethnographic articles and monographs, recording for each “society” encountered the presence or absence of patrilocal residence, early weaning, male puberty rituals, couvade, and dozens of other traits, then transform their judgments into holes in Hollerith cards, so that someone else can run statistical analyses to determine either which “societies” resemble each other most, or which cultural traits vary together. ... I will not inflict any more dreary examples upon you.⁹

But as Tilly hastens to observe, these abuses do not constitute an indictment of statistical analysis *per se*. They reveal only the dangers of mindless application.

In fact, there exist statistical counterparts for each of the different forms of comparative analysis. Standard measures of statistical association (such as regression and analysis of variance) explore underlying patterns of variance and covariance, thus resembling the "variation-finding" type of comparison. Construction and comparison of individual scores, for single variables or composite scales, can assist "individualizing" comparisons. A variety of techniques, including time-series analysis, can promote the search for "universalizing" comparisons.¹⁰ And network analysis, among other approaches, can make important contributions to the analysis of "encompassing" comparisons.¹¹

As a heuristic device, Table 1.3 displays potential relationships between comparative and statistical methods. Columns in the table refer to conceptual goals of comparison: individualizing, variation-finding, universalizing, or encompassing. Row entries display corresponding modes of analysis: MSS, MDS, or global research designs.¹² Primary strategies are likely to be used for initial analysis of entire data sets; secondary strategies can be especially helpful for refinement of preliminary findings, often through application to subsets of the data. As presented in the bottom row, statistical techniques could be suitable for either primary or secondary analysis. The connections here are indicative, rather than restrictive; my purpose is to open up the range of methodological choice, rather than to narrow it. As Tilly and others have made clear, the most outstanding work in social science makes use of a broad variety of methods and techniques in order to focus on the intellectual task at hand.¹³

Recognition of these methodological and analytical concerns is essential to fulfillment of the newly emerging agenda for social science

TABLE 1.3 Analytical Strategies and Methodological Approaches

<i>Mode of Analysis</i>	<i>Conceptual Purpose</i>			
	<i>Individualizing</i>	<i>Variation-Finding</i>	<i>Universalizing</i>	<i>Encompassing</i>
Primary comparative strategy	MSS	MSS	MDS	Global
Secondary comparative strategy	MDS	MDS	MSS	MDS, MSS
Relevant statistical technique	Individual scores	Regression, analysis of variance, etc.	Regression, time series, etc.	Network analysis

research on Latin America. Are we ready to deal with these challenges? What tasks lie ahead? □

REVIEWING THE RECORD: TRENDS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

What have been the predominant patterns in social science research on Latin America? In this brief overview I attempt to establish a baseline for assessing the state of theoretical and methodological preparedness within the field. This is by no means a complete survey of existing literature; citations are intended to be illustrative, rather than exhaustive.

Theoretical Debates

Social science on Latin America has evinced a cyclical tendency to embrace and discard grand theoretical schemes. Imbued with the optimistic hubris of the 1960s, students of Latin American politics, especially those from the United States, found ready and congenial answers in what had come to be known as "modernization theory." The argument posited simple causal connections: Economic development creates middle-class sectors, whose members, in turn, espouse political democracy, either as a tactical means of gaining power or as an expression of enlightened values (the difference did not seem to matter at the time). The greater the level of economic development, the greater the likelihood of democratic politics. This postulation appeared to find empirical support in rudimentary cross-national analyses. It carried implications for U.S. policy and foreign aid, and it offered hope for the future.

It proved too good to be true. Instead of dispensing prosperity, economic development (such as it was) accentuated the concentration of wealth and exacerbated existing inequalities. The middle strata, relatively privileged, forged little if any sense of class consciousness and, in critical moments of decision, joined with ruling classes in opposition to popular masses. Political outcomes took a decidedly authoritarian turn, as shown by the lamentable experiences of Brazil (1964), Argentina (1966), and Chile (1973)—three of the most-developed countries of the continent. Its postulates apparently disproven, modernization theory fell into widespread disfavor.

Into this vacuum came the *dependencia* approach, which accepted modernization theory's linkage of socioeconomic causes with political outcomes but which turned the answer upside down: Since Latin America's economic development was qualitatively different from that of North America and Western Europe, it produced different results. Specifically, according to this argument, Latin America's experience was deter-

mined by the pervasive fact of its "dependency." An inherent characteristic of dependent development is its tendency to intensify inequities, allocating benefits to sectors involved in the world market and denying them to marginal groups. As Guillermo O'Donnell asserted in the early 1970s, ruling elites eventually come to face a clear-cut choice: Sacrifice growth or pursue it through repression of the working classes (thus reducing wages, controlling inflation, and attracting international investment). The elites chose the latter course, thus precipitating vicious coups in Brazil, Argentina, and Chile. Repressive regimes did not emerge despite Latin America's economic development; they emerged because of it.¹⁴ Bolstered by this explanation, the idea of *dependencia* became the dominant analytical paradigm throughout the field, especially in the United States.¹⁵

In the 1980s reality would challenge expectations once again. Just as Latin America was suffering its most protracted economic depression since the 1930s, countries of the region managed to jettison authoritarian regimes and embark on processes—however uncertain—of liberalization and/or democratization. Scholars seeking explanations for this unexpected (but welcome) turn of events, examined the roles of ideology rather than economics, agency rather than structure, volition rather than determination. Democracy came to be viewed as the achievement of courageous leaders and/or civil society, rather than an automatic consequence of economic performance. Events in Eastern Europe and the termination of the Cold War seemed to verify this general observation.

Dependency theory was dead. Yet the problems it addressed—inequality and underdevelopment—are still alive and well. In fact, it could be argued that dependency went out of fashion just as Latin America was becoming more, not less, dependent on the international "core" of the world system. As Barbara Stallings has observed, theory and reality have been persistently out of phase with one another. Dependency thinking emerged from Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s, just at a time when world developments were undermining the core argument. Multinational corporations were becoming less important, and developing countries were able to assert their independence through petrodollar borrowing and state-owned enterprises; as a result, Latin America was feeling less "dependent." Then, in the 1980s, the dependency framework was abandoned, just as constraints in the international economic system—particularly the debt crisis—were becoming more important and Latin America was becoming more "dependent." This enduring disjuncture between theory and reality helped discredit the dependency school.¹⁶

The *dependencia* idea also suffered from its policy implications. In contrast to the "realist" school of international behavior, the dependency approach focused its explanatory powers on problems of socioeconomic

development as well as international relations. The realist school, however, pays very little attention to such issues. "It is also clear," as Richard Fagen has said, "that there was (is) a central prescriptive or normative dimension to *dependencia*. Here the key notion is that because dependency is a structural condition ... only structural changes can alleviate the ills associated with dependent development. In line with the national/international duality mentioned above, these structural changes must take place both 'at home' and 'abroad.'" The dismissal of *dependencia* stemmed precisely from the fact that its normative and policy prescriptions seemed so complete. And when its policies failed—largely because the problems were beyond the reach of any policy instrument—the whole apparatus fell out of favor.¹⁷ The eventual exhaustion of import-substitution industrialization (after decades of success) and the demise of socialism have thus led to abandonment of what was essentially an analytical tool.¹⁸

As a result, the field of Latin American studies no longer has a preeminent paradigm. Paradoxically enough, however, the collapse of dependency theory may have the beneficial effect of promoting rigorous social research. In the absence of an overarching conceptual framework, scholars may turn their focus toward empirical hypothesis-testing and examination of questions at the so-called middle range of social science theory.¹⁹ It has been asserted more than once that the "paradigm crisis" of the 1980s has stimulated primary research and that, in this sense, has been "healthy" for the social sciences. As Indalecio Perdomo Lafargue has maintained, it is precisely this development that has helped make the present outlook for social science "extremely promising."²⁰

In the meantime, modernization theory has shown signs of coming back to life. One of its central precepts—the postulation of a systematic relationship between economic development and political democracy—appears to have gained broad support from processes of liberalization in Eastern Europe, Latin America, and elsewhere in the world. Samuel P. Huntington has argued that intermediate levels of development—measured by gross national product (GNP) per capita—establish a zone for transition from dictatorship toward democracy.²¹ Mitchell Seligson has made a comparable case for Latin America throughout the 1980s.²² Now couched in cautious terms, the proposition holds that economic development is only a *necessary prerequisite* for democracy, not a sufficient condition. But for proponents of the modernization school, the ultimate implication is clear: Modernization theory was essentially correct. It was merely ahead of its time.

Although there has been considerable tumult in the advancement and rejection of general theory, Latin American social science has made discernible progress in the formulation, application, and refinement of key

analytical constructs. One has to do with social mobilization and political participation of underrepresented groups; as Jane S. Jaquette demonstrates in Chapter 5, the role of women and the place of gender issues constitute a defining feature for political systems. Another feature deals with the importance of social coalitions and of state-society relations, as David Collier argues in his examination and reassessment of the concept of "corporatism" in Chapter 6. Still another characteristic concentrates on the persisting and central role of the state, as Evelyn Huber reveals in Chapter 7. Despite its cyclical tendency, social science research on Latin America has thus reached consensus and clarity on a number of major conceptual questions.

Methodological Approaches: Quantification

Just as there have been cyclical patterns in theory, there has been a notable surge and decline in quantitative research on Latin America over the past generation. Prompted in part by the "behavioral revolution" in political science, a small group of scholars began to apply quantitative techniques in the 1960s and 1970s. James W. Wilkie, a historian, initiated the trend with his study of budget allocations and social indicators in the aftermath of the Mexican Revolution.²³ And a promising political scientist, Philippe C. Schmitter, issued a clarion call for statistical approaches to cross-national aggregate data.²⁴

There followed a series of investigations on the origins and structure of political elites in Latin America. My own work on the composition and recruitment of political elites in Mexico employed contingency tables, mobility matrices, measures of association, and path analysis.²⁵ Roderic A. Camp has produced a stream of valuable studies about the social origins of Mexican leaders, though his approach tends to be somewhat descriptive and his methods rarely move beyond bivariate tables.²⁶ At a much higher level of technical sophistication, Peter McDonough made excellent use of network analysis to examine political elites in authoritarian Brazil.²⁷ And, more recently, Barry Ames has employed powerful statistical techniques to examine "survival" strategies of Latin American political leaders.²⁸

In contrast to research on the United States and Europe, there has been very little attention to congressional behavior in Latin America. Using factor analysis and interactive analysis of variance, I once studied the determinants of roll-call voting and party coalitions in the Argentine Chamber of Deputies from 1904 to 1955.²⁹ Similarly, Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos performed a path-breaking analysis of fragmentation and radicalization in the Brazilian Congress from 1946 through 1964.³⁰ Taken together, these works articulate and to some extent verify a fundamental

proposition: Increasing levels of political polarization among civilian political elites precede and may even provoke military intervention.

Electoral behavior has also attracted statistical research. Over the years, scholars have produced important studies on the social determinants of voting patterns in a variety of countries—Argentina,³¹ Brazil,³² and Ecuador.³³ Even in Mexico, where electoral outcomes have so often been determined well in advance, political conditions have prompted serious research on voting.³⁴ Such studies tend to rely on ecological analysis, matching the socioeconomic characteristics of census districts with aggregate election returns. Most analyses employ simple correlations, though some use multiple regression and path analysis.³⁵

It is to be regretted that, even in its heyday, dependency theory promoted a conspicuously slim corpus of quantitative analysis. Though many of its propositions seemed amenable to statistical scrutiny through use of cross-national aggregate data, rigorous tests were few and far between. Robert Kaufman and his associates subjected a number of hypotheses to statistical tests, mainly through bivariate correlations,³⁶ and Kenneth Bollen used multiple regression to examine the political corollaries of peripheral and semiperipheral status in the world system.³⁷ In general, however, the dependency movement produced precious little empirical investigation.³⁸

Throughout the 1980s, quantitative approaches fell into substantial disfavor. This rejection probably stemmed from a variety of reasons, from normative distaste for statistical neopositivism to intellectual disdain for its allegedly meager results. In some circles, quantification also came to be identified—incorrectly, in my view—with theoretical tenets of the then-discredited modernization school. And among *dependentistas*, conceptual debates drew attention to abstract and doctrinal issues, instead of primary research. After a promising start in the 1960s and 1970s, quantification was suddenly out of favor.

Technological innovation and political liberalization began to alter this picture during the 1980s, as research on public opinion began making giant strides. In Mexico, for instance, authentic public opinion polls first appeared in connection with the election of 1988. Since then, activity has flourished, as Miguel Basáñez shows in Chapter 10, and intense debates between progovernment *oficialista* cadres and independent (or opposition) groups have added to popular interest. In Argentina, too, the development of public opinion research has been closely related to the process of democratization. During the 1980s, public opinion research came to be widely used for candidate selection and campaign strategizing, and accuracy in predicting election results proved essential for gaining credibility; exit polls also established checks on official tabulation of election results. In her contribution to this volume,

Elena Bashkirova finds similar links between public opinion research and democratization in Russia and Eastern Europe; but as Catherine M. Conaghan argues in the case of Peru, polling results can also serve to stifle and "domesticate" the expressions of public opinion.

Many surveys were designed for short-term and practical applications, but they have begun to yield high-quality social science. The late Edgardo Catterberg carried out an outstanding study of continuity and change among political attitudes in Argentina during the 1980s.³⁹ And Frederick C. Turner, a longtime expert on public opinion research, has compiled a major collection of essays on the social determinants of political beliefs.⁴⁰

In the future, quantitative approaches can make significant contributions to research on the newly evolving agenda for the region. Studies of political elites can shed much light on questions about turnover and continuity during periods of democratic transition. To what extent have new groups come to replace authoritarian cadres? On what bureaucratic levels? Do "democratic" leaders come from the same social background as their authoritarian predecessors? Such questions are of vital importance throughout Eastern Europe. They are critically pertinent to Latin America as well.

Legislative behavior also merits rigorous analysis. Disregard for this subject may have stemmed from the perception that legislatures were never genuinely important in Latin America, especially (and obviously) during periods of authoritarian rule. But that is not the case today. In democratizing countries, legislatures have assumed substantial roles, and executive-congressional relations pose questions of major political importance. Moreover, contemporary debates about the relative merits of presidentialism and parliamentarism—most evident in Argentina, Chile, and Brazil—entail conflicting visions of legislative performance. Implicitly or explicitly, propresidentialists minimize the capacities of congressional bodies; proparlamentarists tend to exaggerate them. Responsible advocacy of either position requires a clear and rigorous understanding of the determinants of legislative behavior in contemporary Latin America.

Elections offer additional subjects for study. If and as processes of democratization continue, there is urgent need for original research on a broad variety of themes: The debilitation of party systems, the impacts of electoral engineering, the determinants of electoral behavior, and the significance of voter apathy and abstentionism. Many of these topics can be analyzed through the use of quantitative methodology, and results of these analyses can be interpreted within cross-regional comparative frameworks. Moreover, elections can offer useful opportunities for the examination of political behavior beyond the act of voting itself—in such areas as political culture, elite-mass relations, and political learning.

Yet there has been remarkably little solid research on electoral behavior in the 1980s and 1990s. For all its imperfections, ecological analysis of aggregate data could greatly enhance understanding of the interaction of social and political structures. The resulting emphasis on sociopolitical context, rather than individual attitudes, illustrates an important connection between electoral studies and public opinion research. When they use political polls, researchers should make sharp and consistent distinctions between the study of *beliefs* and *behavior*. Voters may think one way but vote otherwise because of fear or other factors.

Similarly, there is much to be done in the field of survey research. It would be extremely useful to monitor public opinion along the lines of the well-established "EuroBarometer" project, to place Latin America within appropriate comparative context, and—as Frederick C. Turner displays in his chapter—to redefine the entire concept of political culture. Secondary analysis of existing survey material also provides considerable opportunity to examine the social basis and attitudinal correlates of political belief and to examine patterns of change over time. This is a wide-open field.

Methodological Approaches: Comparative Analysis

Comparative analysis of Latin America is most conspicuous by its scarcity. Scholars have tended to focus their investigative energies on the region itself, on selected subregions, or, most commonly, on one country at a time. In part, this reflects genuine respect for the complexity of national experience, as well as the need to gain command of substantial bibliographies. Yet it also reveals a widespread belief that every country is somehow "unique," that it stands apart, and that it defies comparison with other nations. (There is more than a little irony here, since the assertion of "uniqueness" itself represents a comparative judgment.) Whatever the reason, regional specialists, on the whole, have displayed substantial aversion to the comparative enterprise.

Of course, there have been some intraregional applications of comparative analysis, matching countries of the region against each other. A principal advantage of this approach is that it provides an opportunity to "hold constant" some variables and study patterns of covariation for the relatively small number of variables under examination. In keeping with the "most-similar-systems" method of comparative analysis, in other words, it is possible to control for experiences that countries of the region (or subregion) have in common—such as colonization, ethnic composition, economic structure, links with the United States—and to focus attention on relationships between variables that display substantial variance among the countries under study.