

LCSR SUMMER SCHOOL – 2012

Summaries of guest lectures

It is traditional for the LCSR to invite famous social scientists to schools, workshops and conferences of the Lab for giving lectures on substantive topics of contemporary social research¹.

By tradition, four guest lectures were scheduled in the program of the LCSR Summer School 2012. The reporters were Peter Schmidt, famous methodologist and the head of the International Scientific-Educational Laboratory for Socio-Cultural Research at the HSE; Hermann Duellmer, professor of the University of Cologne and co-author of Inglehart and Welzel; Zsofia Ignacz, PhD Candidate at the Humboldt University in Berlin; and Igor Zadorin, the director of the “Euroasian Monitor” project.

A group of research assistants of the Lab summarized those lectures and now we are publishing a collection of brief reviews of them at our website for all interested in.

Hermann Duellmer: *Testing the revised theory of modernization: measurement and explanatory aspects.*

During his lecture Hermann Duellmer told the participants of the school about his study aimed at modifying the way of empirical analysis supported Ronald Inglehart’s modernization theory².

According to Inglehart’s concept modernization leads to a value shift in two directions which are from traditional to secular-rational values and from survival to self-expression values. Professor Duellmer tried to test empirically the theory by analyzing the example of cohort replacement after the 2nd World war. The main

¹ Ronald Inglehart, Christian Welzel, David Sumpter, Agda Bi Puranen, Peter Hedstrom, and some other prominent scholars were the lecturers on our events

² Duellmer's investigation is co-authored by Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel

aim of the exploration was testing the reliability and the external validity of the model.

Theoretically it is possible to distinguish two phases of economic development. During the modernization phase there was a shift from agrarian to industrial relations. Its main feature was bureaucratization. This phase was characterized by replacement of religious legitimization of authority by secular-rational legitimization and by the emphasis on material output for individuals. In general, modernization leads to formation of secular-rational values. The second phase is postmodernization. It is characterized by shift from maximization of individuals' material well-being to maximization of social well-being and by emancipation from authority.

Hermann Duellmer considered socio-economic development on both national and individual levels. Professor Duellmer stated a hypothesis about polarization of materialist and postmaterialist values. He checked this point with the help of cohort analysis. According to his hypotheses, younger cohorts tend to share more secular-rational as well as self-expression values. The largest gap should be found between pre-war and war generations on the one hand and postwar generations on the other hand. As to cross-level interactions, post-industrial societies are expected to bear larger differences in both types of values.

Furthermore, professor Duellmer argued that culture plays an important role along with socio-economic development. He pointed out some possible cultural factors: communism, education and socio-economic status. There was a hypothesis that communist societies tended to share more secular-rational values than other societies. At the same time Hermann Duellmer emphasized this should primarily refer to countries that survived the collapse of the Soviet system. This collapse was also expected to reduce self-expression values. Education and socio-economic status, in their turn, increased both types of values.

Professor Duellmer used data on 68 countries from both European Values Study and World Values Survey. Human Development Index was used as a degree of

socio-economic development. Three cohorts were constructed (before 1945, 1946-1965, 1966-1987).

First, Duellmer empirically checked the models developed by Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel and conducted multilevel analysis on that basis. According to the model, the appropriate indicators of self-expression values turned out to be postmaterialism, non-negative attitude to homosexuality and consent to sign a petition. Being very happy and having a high level of trust do not refer to such values. Significant indicators of secular-rational values include God being unimportant, autonomy being important and abortion being acceptable. Not respecting authority and low national pride do not reflect secular-rational values.

Hence, after removing insignificant indicators professor Duellmer introduced an alternative model constructed via simultaneous CFA. More differences between countries were observed in survival and self-expression values than in traditional and secular-rational values. Professor Duellmer also showed with the help of SEM models that the oldest cohort (1945-1965) did not differ in values from the rest of the country whereas there were differences in the two younger cohorts.

After the presentation Eduard Ponarin recommended to improve theoretical justification of cohort differences. Furthermore, he emphasized that according to Duellmer's results, culture was not as important as it was according to Ronald Inglehart and hence it confirmed Karl Marx's theory in some aspects. Peter Schmidt drew our attention to the construct validity of items and to some other methodological points.

Zsofia Ignacz: The effects of generational ties on justice attitudes.

Zsofia Ignacz presented the paper which was intended to be her PhD dissertation. The investigation she conducts seeks to answer the following question: to what extent does socialist legacy determine justice attitudes toward wage distribution after the transition in post-socialist countries? In the paper, Zsofia suggests inferring the effect of socialist legacy by looking at the generation effect on justice attitudes within post-socialist countries. In order to separate the generational from

the age effect a multiple cross-section dataset, the International Social Justice Project (1991-2006), is used. Zsofia applies data on 4 waves for Germany (GDR only) and Hungary. She expects that there will be a significant effect of generational membership on both justice attitudes toward rules and justice attitudes toward outcomes.

Zsofia emphasized that the issue has been researched a lot on the individual level since 1960-s, but not enough attention has been paid to it on the macro level. However, the research that was done on the macro level has some disadvantages. First, method of unexplained variance is used. Second, outcomes on the macro level do not explain what it means for the individuals. Moreover, time lag effect is insufficiently modeled. As a result, the generational aspect of attitudes toward wage distribution is under researched.

Zsofia refers to generations as to groups of birth cohorts basing on Mannheim's definition of generations. Age is identified as difference between period (a point in time) and cohort. She uses attitudes towards outcomes (gap between actual and just income of chairman and unskilled worker) as dependent variables in linear regression analysis. Moreover, she applies Jasso index which makes it possible to compare preferred and perceived wages. Her independent variables are generations defined for each country, age and waves. Control variables are the following: gender, employment, education and household income per capita.

Zsofia stated the following hypotheses. First, the various generations will have different effects on justice attitudes. The longer you lived in socialism the less likely you will accept the current wage gap. This hypothesis was not proved to be true in both Hungary and GDR. Second, the farther you are from transition, the more likely you will accept the inequalities. This adaptation will be moderated by a level of nostalgia. This hypothesis is true neither for Hungary nor for GDR. Third, the older you are, the more likely you will accept inequalities. This hypothesis describes the situation in Hungary.

Zsofia is thinking of developing her paper further. One of the possible solutions is setting the dummy variables measuring generations to equal. Another way is applying loglinear regression instead of linear one.

Igor Zadorin: *Integrations Attitudes and Orientation in the Post –Soviet Countries. The Results of project “Integration Barometer EABR”*

Igor Zadorin, the founder and the director of the “Euroasian Monitor”, with colleagues gave a speech about preliminary results of the ongoing "Integrations Barometer EABR" project.

This investigation is aimed at revealing attitudes of citizens of the post-Soviet states towards possible integration of their countries. Research group developed a concept of ‘attraction’ which means a general attitude towards other nations, countries and cultures. Then they operationalized it by using questions on three dimensions of integration attitudes, namely, political, economic and socio-cultural ones.

During the project a general survey was conducted in almost all of the countries of the CIS. The Bogardus scale was used in the questionnaire. Respondents were asked about their attitudes towards three large groups of countries. The first group included post-Soviet states, the second one consisted of the most developed countries of the European Union. Finally, the most influential countries in the world like the USA, China and some others were grouped in the third category. The two latter groups were constructed as control ones to make it clear what was the real amount of attraction among the people to former Soviet republics in comparison with attraction to countries from other regions of the world.

The first stage of the project yielded many interesting findings. The general trend is that the interest for other countries is much higher in less developed countries of the post-Soviet space and is very low for the states who are the leaders of the region. It is so not only concerning attraction to countries of the area but also all other states and regions over the world. Citizens of less developed countries wish to work in more developed European countries even less than in Russia. On the

other hand, people in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus republic like each another but are much more interested in collaboration with Europe and much less interested in other countries of the CIS. Proportion of isolationists is also the highest in Russia and Ukraine. In some countries, like the Baltic States, there is no interest in collaboration with any state of the CIS at all. In Azerbaijan and Georgia people are interested in collaboration respectively with Turkey and Iran, and the USA much more than in integration with former compatriots from the post-Soviet states.

Generally speaking, it means that population of possible centers of integration does not consider other states of the CIS as strategic partners. Nevertheless, these are only preliminary results and Igor Zadorin with his group are continuing to work on the project.

The lecture was very interesting and instructive, and caused a lot of questions. As it was mentioned above, Zadorin et al. demonstrated only descriptive statistics, so most comments were about strategies of empirical analysis of the data collected during the project. Eduard Ponarin recommended adding individual-level data. There were some questions about indicators of attraction. Julia Zelikova criticized the conceptual framework of the survey, especially the concept of 'attraction'. But all participants of the discussion agreed that Integration Barometer of EABR could be a good basis for further research for many scholars. And Igor Zadorin finished his lecture by claim to collaborate with his organization in this research.

Peter Schmidt: *Within and between-country value diversity in Europe: A latent class approach.*

Professor Schmidt presented a research project that he conducted in collaboration with Vladimir Magun and Maxim Rudnev. Their study was devoted to investigation of differences between countries in their value systems. According to Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, the between-country diversity is much larger than within-country diversity. However, Peter Schmidt argued from the Shalom Schwartz's theory's of basic values point of view that if we look at

European countries the between-country deviations in values are weaker and within-country deviations are stronger than it could be expected from Inglehart's and Welzel's perspective.

The objective of the research was to form a classification of Europeans based on their basic human values and to reveal the determinants of value class membership.

The researchers used data on 33 countries from the European Social Survey. The research is based mainly on the fourth wave. The sampled countries include 12 post-communist, 7 Mediterranean, 5 Nordic and 9 Western European countries.

The values were measured with the help of four sets of variables on different aggregation levels. The "first level" values comprise 21 questionnaire items which were grouped into 10 value indices ("second level" values) such as hedonism, stimulation, etc. The "third level" values are represented by the following value categories: openness to change (hedonism, stimulation, self-direction), conservation (tradition, conformity, security), self-transcendence (universalism, benevolence) and self-enhancement (power, achievement). Pairs of these values are related reciprocally: with an increase in subjective importance of one value category, the importance of its opposite decreases. Those relations allowed the construction of two "fourth level" value dimensions (value axes): conservation – openness to change, self-enhancement – self-transcendence.

In order to make within- and between-country comparisons value-fractionalization index was used. That index indicated the evenness of the membership distribution among different classes: the higher the fractionalization is, the more even the distribution is.

Six latent classes with different combinations of values were extracted. Contrary to initial hypothesis, the biggest class (38%) was the one with the zero preferences of the respondents. This class is much more represented in post-Soviet and Mediterranean than in Western European and Nordic countries.

The within-country diversity is very high. 25 of the observed countries have representatives of all 6 latent classes, 31 countries – of at least 5 classes. The least diverse country is Turkey which includes the representatives of 3 classes.

In general Nordic and Western countries have different country profiles on the one hand, and Mediterranean and post-Communist countries on the other hand. Furthermore, within-country heterogeneity is higher in Nordic and Western-European countries than in Mediterranean and post-Communist countries. Hence, heterogeneity is higher in more developed countries.

Individual socio-demographic characteristics predict class membership to some extent. Belonging to more conservative classes is positively associated with age whereas belonging to more open classes is negative associated with age. Women belong to conservative classes relatively more often than men. The class with zero preferences is more represented among younger educated males who are employed and live in big cities. One of the questions that should be answered in the further studies is if this “no-preference” class will survive under the alternative approaches to value measurement.

After the presentation some methodological points were discussed. Chris Swader was interested in the reasons of choosing these particular values, extracting namely 6 latent classes and in the exact meaning of class. He also assumed that World Values Survey could be a more appropriate database for the research purposes. Eduard Ponarin made a point that ranking could be a more preferable instrument than separate evaluation of different items.