

List of West German Participants and Papers for the  
Conference on Cross-National Research in the Social  
Sciences, Ann Arbor, October 3-8, 1977.

Klaus Allerbeck,  
University of Bielefeld

Some Problems of Data Analysis in Comparative Research

Alexander Deichsel,  
University of Hamburg

The Headline-Project. A Cross-Cultural Approach for the Development of Textual Indicators

Ursula Feist,  
INFAS, Bonn-Bad Godesberg

Structural Assimilation versus Ideological Polarization: A Special Case or a Specific Phase?

Rudolf Fisch,  
University of Konstanz

The Organizational Infrastructure of Cross-National Interdisciplinary Survey Research on the Living Conditions of Young families

Thomas Herz,  
Gesamthochschule Siegen

Resources for Cross-National Research

Karl-Otto Hondrich,  
University of Frankfurt

Socio-Economic Aspirations, Towards and Subjective Well-Being in Cross-National Perspective

Hans D. Klingemann,  
ZUMA, Mannheim

First Considerations for a National Social Survey in West Germany

Hans-Juergen Krupp,  
University of Frankfurt

Titel noch offen

Klaus Liepelt,  
INFAS, Bonn-Bad Godesberg

Did TV Decide the German Elections: A Recent Controversy in Data Analysis Seen from a Process Perspective

Walter Müller,  
University of Mannheim

Prospects and Problems of US-German Comparisons of the Status Allocation Process

Günther Schäfer,  
Institut für Systemtechnik  
und Innovationsforschung,  
Karlsruhe

in cooperation with:

Richard I. Hofferbert,  
SUNY, Binghamton

Raimund Germann,  
University of Geneva

Uli Widmaier,  
University of Mannheim

Erwin K. Scheuch,  
University of Cologne

Bernhard Wilpert,  
Wissenschaftszentrum  
Berlin

Policy Innovation in Modern  
Federal Systems: Establishing  
and Implementing Research  
Priorities

Structural Constraints in Compa-  
rative Research: A Step Towards  
a Sociology of Research

The Research Process in Inter-  
national Teams - Structural  
and Groupdynamic Parameters

R E P O R T  
ON A CONFERENCE ON CROSSNATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE  
SOCIAL SCIENCES

by

Max Kaase  
Zentrum fuer Umfragen,  
Methoden und Analysen  
(ZUMA) and  
University of Mannheim

Warren E. Miller  
Center for Political Studies  
Institute for Social Research  
(ISR) and  
University of Michigan

The conference was held at the Center for Political Studies,  
University of Michigan, from October 3 - October 8, 1977,  
under joint sponsorship of the

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

and

National Science Foundation (NSF),  
supported by NSF Grant #SOC77-08885

## 1. Background and Goals of the Conference

In July of 1975, a previous exchange between the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the National Science Foundation resulted in agreement by both organizations that cooperation between their academic communities should be established, or, where it already existed, intensified, in a broad realm of social science subject areas. One such area was defined as "Crossnational Studies and Surveys."

Social scientists engaged in empirical crossnational research have traditionally faced extraordinary intellectual, organizational and financial difficulties. Recognition of those difficulties, in combination with the acute feeling of need for more such research, was responsible for a very swift endorsement by the respective scholarly communities of the DFS/NSF suggestion to consider ways in which international cooperation in the social sciences could be enhanced. For the particular topic of "Crossnational Studies and Surveys" it seemed advisable to hold a conference that would bring together scholars actively engaged in comparative research. Max Kaase, Warren E. Miller and Wolfgang Zapf were approached to ascertain whether they might seek to undertake the task of organizing such a conference. The first of a series of planning meetings took place in Mannheim in September of 1975. The conference ultimately took place in October of 1977, following the formal submission of the proposals for such a conference to the NSF and the DFG and a favorable response from both organizations. It seems worthwhile to recall the organizing principles that were brought to bear on the preparation of proposals for the conference:

- (1) Since the initiative for the conference clearly lay with American and German sponsoring agencies and scholars, the core of potential participants was to come from those two countries. At the same time, the organizers were well aware of the fact that limiting participation to scholars from only two countries would be somewhat artificial in that it would violate well-established concepts of comparative research calling for a broad representation of national systems. This perspective was ultimately reflected in the final roster of participants, although we would have liked to have seen the participants include colleagues from even more countries than were finally represented.
- (2) Consensus was quickly reached among all parties involved that the conference should bring together scholars from a variety of scholarly disciplines who had in common as active involvement in the conduct of empirical cross-national research. The most appropriate way to put this principle into effect was to identify research projects as a recruiting base. Not only did this approach generally work very well, it also helped to establish an additional *raison d'etre* for the conference in that the recruiting process exposed the fact that the amount of actual comparative social research involving both the United States and Germany was much less than we had estimated.

- (3) Particular emphasis was placed on including comparative research projects then being planned because we felt that the conference could have an immediate beneficial effect on those struggling with problems others had already experienced, and somehow coped with, in the past.
- (4) It was felt that the information payoff would be greatest and the impact of the conference optimal when at least two members, one from each nation, would jointly represent a given research project. This, we hypothesized, would bring in more varied views and experiences with each project. In addition, for ongoing projects it would provide the badly needed opportunity to continue informal deliberations, planning and work. Participants in projects in the preparatory stage should, in like manner, be able to profit from the chance to continue developing their work.
- (5) The concept of a working conference such as we envisaged required that each participant make an active contribution to that end. Correspondingly, potential participants were informed that their participation depended on their willingness to prepare a written working paper or make a formal oral presentation.
- (6) The title of the conference implies a certain emphasis on survey studies. However, we were in agreement that the conference should not be limited exclusively to survey studies which are just one - though very important - segment of the social science methodologies used in empirical national as well as crossnational research. This broader emphasis is clearly reflected in the projects represented at the conference.

(7) While there was no a priori theoretical reason why countries of the third and fourth worlds should not have been systematically involved in a conference on crossnational research, the general understanding was nevertheless that this conference should concentrate on crossnational research in the industrially advanced democracies of the West. This decision reflected practical as well as systemic considerations. On the practical side, the German-American nucleus of the conference almost, by necessity, produced such a focus. A further important substantive consideration was that, in our judgment, hardly any comparative survey studies existed which involved a broad range of countries and had been conceptualized and conducted by independent social scientists. Consequently, to bring in a wider range of nations engaged in, or subjected to, survey research would have required a completely different format for the conference.

(8) The organizers were fully aware of the goodwill DFG and NSF had extended toward the stimulation of crossnational research. To aid both organizations in that goal, the conference was explicitly structured to supply maximum information to the DFG and NSF about difficulties in crossnational research that might be overcome by funding agencies with the leverage and leadership potential to improve conditions for such research.

The goals the organizers wanted to achieve through this conference can be summarized as follows:

- Provide opportunities for a high-level exchange of experiences on crossnational research in the social sciences;

- Stimulate actual and future crossnational research;
- Identify problems confronting crossnational research; and
- Provide funding agencies with a concrete catalogue of recommendations aimed at improving the state of cross-national research.

## 2. Status and Problems of Crossnational Research in the Social Sciences

Compared to the total amount of research going on in the social sciences, crossnational research constitutes a very limited and minor set of activities. There are many reasons why this is so, and in this section we will try to address ourselves to this problem. First, it is important to recognize that, in general, much of the most challenging work to be done in the social sciences must be done without the benefit of an established tradition of inquiry pursued by large numbers of well-trained researchers. The contrast with fields where established methodologies complement well-developed theory, and where the implementation of research rests firmly on prior common understandings shared by a large international community of scholars, is most striking where many of the most promising ventures for social science research are concerned. The microeconomist, the sociologist, the political scientist, or the social psychologist often begin their research undertakings without the benefit of the administrative infrastructures, the technical facilities or the substantive context that would be analagous to those developed by many generations of research scientists in other fields. This is, in large part, a reflection of the fact that many major developments in empirical social research have occurred recently, often over little more than the three decades following the second World War.

The movement of social science research from the traditions of library research or from the analysis of governmentally-produced



statistics into the field broadly characterized as survey research has produced a revolution in relevant social science disciplines or their subfields. The revolution is still too recent to have produced either the intellectual or the institutional bases which can be relied upon to define and execute the significant research of the immediate future. In many domains, for example, the process of developing the "invisible college" of dispersed colleagues so essential and so taken for granted in many other fields has only begun. Where, in well-developed research areas, neophyte researchers can count upon informal meetings, conferences and professional conventions for their socialization into established networks of scholars, many senior social scientists depend on comparable occasions for the initial creation of such networks.

Thus, in the past the creation of comparative crossnational survey research projects has typically depended on the fortuitous development of interpersonal familiarity and informal networks of scholars that are the latent products of meetings and conferences that bring people together for quite different purposes. Viewed positively, the various international congresses of social scientists of the past three decades have been occasions for a crucial capital investment. That investment has produced networks of scientists who have come to know each other sufficiently well to move through the beginning stages of planning necessary for the ultimate conduct of research. The negative perspective recognizes that the members of existing networks are there more by accident than by design, with many individuals outside the ambit simply because there has never been an occasion for them to develop the personal familiarity that is necessary for their inclusion in the pool of colleagues interested in problems that demand

crossnational research for resolution. The extent of this problem becomes apparent when investigators who have been successful innovators in nationally based research attempt to extend their work into other national settings.

A second major problem impairing crossnational research originates in marked national differences in the level of development of the organizational and technical infrastructure needed for crossnational research. In concert with the absence of widely shared conceptual approaches and theoretical understandings, these differences have often led to a very specific and often very unsatisfactory mode of research organization. With the impetus provided to American social sciences by innovations associated with World War II, many crossnational research projects have been conceived, organized, and executed by American scholars without the collegial participation of their peers in the countries within which the research was carried out. So called "safari" research has been colloquially identified as such where the scholarly entrepreneur leaves his or her native soil, carries out a data-collecting expedition abroad, and returns home having had little contact with the natives other than that absolutely necessary to secure the trophies of the hunt. Some of the conditions which encouraged or even made necessary this mode of research in the past no longer obtain, or at least have been altered in a very significant manner. This is particularly true with regard to the development of non-American research organizations which have the administrative and technical capacity to carry out significant data collection and data processing. However, despite having such support for research activities now available in many countries,

particularly within the North Atlantic community, it is still most difficult to mount truly collaborative efforts at crossnational research because of the frequent need to make the preliminary investment in the conceptual organization of the research described above. In the interest of getting on with the research, and with some assurance of access to the administrative and technical facilities that are needed, there is still a great temptation for the individual scholar, particularly the senior scholar, to design and execute crossnational research without enlisting more than minimal assistance from peers in the research community in the national sites where the research is being conducted.

This has led to significant charges of cultural imperialism. Of perhaps equal importance, it has also meant the research projects are unnecessarily parochial. Once the weaknesses of the unitary perspective of the single scholar become a part of the project, none of the strengths which like-minded colleagues who possess deeper understandings of their own countries might contribute are brought to the project. Not only are there opportunities lost where the quality of the project itself is at stake, but opportunities are also lost for the broadening and strengthening of the collegial network that should provide the reservoir of talent and skill for future undertakings. The centrally designed and executed project has only limited byproducts to add to the institutionalized strength of the social research enterprise.

The crossnational research project that has each cultural or national unit represented within the set of principal investigators is almost certain to be a better project. Although some degree of inequality among collaborators is inevitable, the offsetting or reinforcing strong points of each almost certainly add to the merit

of the final project. Unfortunately, the promise is seldom realized because the costs in money, effort and opportunities lost frequently become too great for the putative leaders of a research project to endure. Even among international colleagues who know each other and who are familiar with each other's past work, the crucial period of cooperative interaction in the design of a new collaborative project is now often so prolonged and beset with so many obstacles as to discourage the initial enthusiasm and limit the ability of the would-be partners to sustain the partnership. Where the obstacles have been overcome, the advantages have been manifest with sustained, highly motivated, multiple participation in crossnational research producing more significant work that is less open to fundamental criticism, particularly where misunderstandings and misinterpretations of crossnational differences are at issue.

Next to these two important structural considerations, other exogenous developments have also contributed to dampen the spirit of intellectual challenge that guided and motivated much cross-national research in the social sciences conducted in the late fifties and through the nineteen sixties. At least some of these problems should be briefly mentioned. Particularly in Europe in the sixties, the institution of the "university" underwent a dramatic change from the Humboldtian concept of searching for knowledge and of recruiting for the community of scholars, the "invisible college," to the mass production of education with a heavily vocational character. The politicization of the university and crush of the postwar baby boom added their share increasingly to de-emphasizing research and emphasizing teaching as well as administrative activities. The

legitimacy crisis diagnosed for the postindustrial societies of the West fully embraced the universities and resulted in an emergence of parochial thinking superimposed by political authorities, university administration and politically involved students. This intellectual climate no longer encouraged an internationalist orientation, and particularly hurt the systematic social sciences which depend so much on comparative research for their theoretical development.

There are many corollaries to this process. The internal reward system of the universities changed; scholars now make their reputation at home. Also, the absence of institutionalized infrastructures for crossnational research forces a disproportionate amount of intellectual and technical resources to be diverted to crossnational projects and thereby advantages those colleagues whose projects are locally oriented. Then too, the increasing emphasis on "being socially relevant with one's research" has encouraged one-system orientations because research results are usually derived with the application to one socio-political system in mind. Finally, in the German case the fact that the researchers cannot fund their own time (or even part thereof) through grants has definitely limited the opportunities for qualified senior scholars to consistently work on a research project for a certain amount of time.

Obviously, these difficulties for crossnational research are not the only ones worth mentioning. Our main interest in this section of the report is to call to mind that it is not just by accident that systematic crossnational research has not blossomed like so much other research in the social sciences. We are aware of the fact that some of the problems mentioned cannot be resolved by funding agencies or

by individual members of the research community. But there are other difficulties where those organizations which sponsor research can implement changes that would substantially increase the chance for and the payoffs of crossnational research. It was these topics to which this conference was mainly addressed.

### 3. The Conference, colloquially known as "HANDS ACROSS THE SEAS"

#### 3.1 Introductory Remarks

The conference was attended by 35 American and European social scientists (see Appendix One for the complete list of participants). Although some participants were engaged in their first crossnational ventures, the cumulative experience across the entire group of participants reflected experience with between 35 and 40 projects conducted over the past 20 years.

The conferees included economists, historians, psychologists, sociologists, and political scientists who were engaged in projects involving crossnational survey research. The substance of their research interests ranged even more widely than did their disciplinary origins, and included comparative analyses of social mobility, national econometric models, living conditions of young families, political party organization, bureaucratic elites, political party organization, industrial democracy, mass media, electoral dissatisfaction, protest and change, and public policy formation (educational policy) in federal systems, as well as crossnational analyses of social indicators and comparative analyses of socio-economic aspirations and satisfaction. Participation in national survey research was a common experience

for all; consequently, although some participants had had extended experience in comparative research utilizing aggregate data produced by governmental units, the discussions emphasized those problems inherent in projects that are dependent on initiating comprehensive data collections.

The conference was held at a time in which there has been increased international concern over the future of American-European cooperation in basic research. This concern was not only expressed by the two sponsoring agencies DFG and NSF, but also by the American National Academy of Sciences, the British Royal Society, and other national research organizations (as reported in a recent issue of Science magazine\*).

Although the conference participants clearly reflected the more abstract concerns over national and international science policy, their perspectives were even more heavily shaped by their own experiences which in many cases reached back over the past two decades. In apparent contrast to apprehensions about declining international collaboration in the natural sciences as reflected in the Science report, the universal experience of the assembled social scientists was that of having engaged in collaborative crossnational research despite a persistent historical absence of support for such activities. Although many of the participants might well have supported the Science argument that international cooperation in the sciences has never depended on formal government-to-government agreements, the feeling was widely shared that reliance on ad hoc arrangements that do not have some type of "official" sanction is becoming even more

---

\*Science, October 14, 1977, pp. 175-177.

tenuous than in the recent past. The exceptional interest shown by all those invited to participate in the conference was a manifestation of their deep interest in seeking changes in policies shaping social research that would facilitate international cooperation in the future.

Given the diversity of disciplines and research topics represented at the conference, the similarity of experiences and the uniformity of the prescriptions for overcoming obstacles confronting those who would cooperate in crossnational research is remarkable. The principal source of variance in the perspectives offered by conference participants was related to variations in the maturity of the research traditions they represented. The recognition of those differences is vitally important because it is not only faithful to differences within the social sciences but it marks the even larger distinction between the social sciences and the natural or physical sciences. Within the conference, differences by research field distinguished the emphasis placed on the problems confronting econometric modelers from those more pressing for students of status allocation and social mobility. The most comprehensive list of problems was provided by researchers pursuing work concerned with mass publics involving such research topics as electoral behavior, public policy preferences, or national social indicators. Scholars faced with the fewest problems were those whose cooperative efforts began with easy agreement among collaborators on problem definition, on the differential relevance of competing theories or alternative conceptual schemes, and on the appropriateness of selected measurement procedures and analysis techniques. Where consensus or agreement on such basic matters has to be developed in order to transform shared substantive interests into



cooperative research undertakings, the barriers to crossnational work are understandably much more difficult to surmount. Nevertheless, the great similarities of experiences reported by conference participants led to the conclusion that virtually all of the problems plaguing the less mature research efforts were embraced, although frequently in diminished form, by those pursuing older lines of inquiry.

### 3.2 Organization of the Conference

The organizers of the conference had already stated in their grant application that they intended to start out with two plenary sessions, then establish work groups for the next days and conclude with another set of plenary sessions. This format was also the one finally adopted for the conference, with a few minor changes. One of the changes pertained to the fact that it turned out to be impossible to reproduce and disseminate the complete set of sixteen working papers (see Appendix Two for a list of the working papers) far enough ahead of time to permit participants a chance to acquaint themselves with the papers. Thus the organizers felt that it was necessary to set aside half a day at the beginning of the conference for the reading of the papers.

This is how the conference schedule finally looked:

Sunday, October 2:           Arrival of participants

Monday, October 3,  
9-12:                   Plenary Session. Opening of conference by organizers. Discussion of program proposed by organizers. Critical evaluation of goals to be achieved through the conference. Allocation of participants to working groups.

Monday, October 3, afternoon:	Reading of papers.
Tuesday, October 4, 9-12:	<u>Plenary Session.</u> Presentation of comments by Scheuch on problems and prospects of crossnational research. Discussion.
Tuesday, October 4, 14-17 through	
Thursday, October 7, 9-12:	Convention of work groups. Preparation of summary statements by work groups.
Thursday, October 7, 14-17:	<u>Plenary Session.</u> Presentation of work group reports. Discussion.
Thursday, October 7, evening:	Preparation of written work group reports.
Friday, October 8, 9-12:	<u>Plenary Session.</u> Continuation of discussion of work group reports.
Friday, October 8, 14-17:	<u>Plenary Session.</u> Concluding discussion. Evaluation of conference. Agreement on next step to be taken regarding preparation of conference report.

The most important aspect of the conference was the effort the work groups put into the preparation of statements intended to help colleagues and funding agencies to avoid major pitfalls of crossnational research and to improve its quality.

There were four work groups. The participants in each were:

- I. to review modes of resolving conceptual problems in the comparative analyses of data produced by ongoing as well as past comparative studies:

Prof. Samuel H. Barnes

Prof. Ronald D. Brunner

Prof. Samuel J. Eldersveld\*

---

\*Group Chairpersons

Prof. Dr. Karl-Otto Hondrich\*  
 Prof. Keith Hope  
 Prof. Ronald F. Inglehart  
 Prof. Edward O. Laumann  
 Prof. Dr. Guenther F. Schaefer  
 Prof. William H. Starbuck

II. to assess problems of crossnational indicator development and standardization of measurement procedures:

Prof. Dr. Klaus R. Allerbeck  
 Dr. Alexander Deichsel  
 Prof. David L. Featherman  
 Frau Ursula Feist  
 Prof. Dr. Max Kaase\*  
 Dr. Walter Mueller  
 Prof. Edward N. Muller\*  
 Dr. Burkhard Struempel  
 Prof. Theo van der Tak

III. to assess the value of producing crossnational data sets for secondary analyses and other materials to be used in professional training in the conduct of cross-national research:

Dr. Thomas Herz\*  
 Prof. M. Kent Jennings  
 Dr. Hans D. Klingemann  
 Prof. Brad Richardson\*  
 Dr. John Robinson  
 Prof. Donald J. Treiman

IV. to survey problems encountered in crossnational research conducted under different types of scientific sponsorship and with different research infrastructures supporting the participants:

Prof. Philip E. Converse  
 Prof. Dr. Rudolf Fisch  
 Prof. Richard I. Hofferbert  
 Prof. Dr. Hans-Jurgen Krupp\*  
 Dr. Klaus Liepelt  
 Dr. Alan Marsh  
 Dr. Warren E. Miller  
 Prof. Dr. Erwin K. Scheuch

---

\*Group Chairpersons

Prof. Philip J. Stone  
 Dr. Richard Wertheimer  
 Dr. Bernard Wilpert

The following subsections will try to summarize the statements and discussion in the four work groups (the detailed reports of the work groups can be found in Appendix Three).

### 3.3 The Work Group Reports

#### 3.3.1 Work Group I:

To review modes of resolving conceptual problems in the comparative analyses of data produced by comparative studies. The work group started out with the assumption that basic agreement on concepts and theories cannot be expected to precede significant new work in many domains of crossnational social research, and particularly not in the domains based on survey research. The members of the group agreed that, at a relatively high level of abstraction, the methodological and conceptual problems encountered in crossnational or crosscultural research are not intrinsically different from those encountered in intranational research. However, it was also suggested that the literature on social methodology and meta theory has given so much attention to generic similarities in the research process across the domains of social inquiry that the very real differences in the contexts of individual investigations have often been overlooked or ignored.

Insofar as cooperating research scholars must share common understandings pertaining to conceptual and theoretical schemes, but often attempt to begin collaboration without having met these preconditions, a necessary first stage in much crossnational research must involve the deliberate creation of shared conceptual under-

standings and theoretical perspectives. At the present state of development of the social sciences, the invisible colleges from which compatible research partners may be selected are often defined by friendship networks that have had their origins in travels, conferences, and intellectual exchanges initiated for quite other purposes. By its very nature, crossnational research depends on foreign travel, and yet support for that travel has been and is rather curiously circumscribed. International contacts are often facilitated by general purpose, good will efforts, such as the Fulbright Program, that are intended to serve the most broad objectives associated with international good will and the broadening of horizons for the travelling scholar. International travel organized specifically to permit the exploration of common interests among scholars who are already acquainted has often been denegated as "boondoggling" as though it would serve only private, nonprofessional objectives. Although there is usually some support available for international congresses of the various social science disciplines, there is seldom a willingness on the part of those who control resources to provide comparable support for highly focused conferences intended to serve very specific research needs. As a consequence, many of the projects represented in the conference had been dependent on project members taking advantage of travel legitimated for other objectives in order to serve their personal scientific needs. There is no question but that the various post World War II exchange programs for individual scholars, both junior and senior, and the activation of international associations that hold periodic meetings have been the foundation on which most of the existing projects of crossnational research have rested. That foundation has, however, not been

conceived to further the interests of scholars in highly specific sub-fields and is not calculated, either in terms of timing or in principles of selection, to provide efficient support for the development or the conduct of particular crossnational research projects. The conference work group recommended that funding programs be established to support specialists' meetings and the establishment of close interpersonal communication among subsets of the social science community who might wish to explore the possibility of transforming individual research interests into collaborative, crossnational research projects.

Many of the conference participants reported that their cooperative projects began only after a deliberate search for potential colleagues with whom they might work in other national settings. In the absence of well-developed professional networks, a collaborative research project must begin with this most elemental state of locating potential research partners. The tentative initial identification must then be followed by the intensive interaction necessary to determine whether or not the apparent coincidence of research interests is matched by shared understandings of the problem, of the concepts, hypotheses, and theories relevant to the problem, of the operational measures necessary to translate research objectives into research operations, and of the analytic modes that will be employed once new data are in hand.

The conference work group was also much concerned with the consequence of inequalities in intellectual and material resources that often exist among those who do undertake collaborative crossnational research. The frequency and the severity of the problems rooted in inequality led the work group to recommend that support for crossnational research be broadly conceived to include support for training

and institution building relevant to the project. Given a broad commitment to the continued improvement of the capacity to carry out crossnational research, each new project can make a substantial and enduring contribution to the training of talented but inexperienced colleagues and to the development of the organizational infrastructures that will be necessary to sustain future research. The conference work group thus recommended that funding institutions should try to be particularly flexible where such secondary objectives can be sought in the conduct of crossnational projects.

In reviewing the experience of those participating in the several projects represented in the work group, it was observed that the problems stemming from diverse theoretical orientations and conceptualizations often reappear at the point of data analysis. Despite having reached a degree of consensus sufficient to permit the design of research instruments and the subsequent collection of data, the transition from the abstractions of planning to the concrete problems of interpreting the results of data analysis is often a period of particular difficulty for participants in crossnational work. Even the most skilled of individual scholars attest to changes in emphasis, if not direction, which new insights provided by data impose on research well before a project reaches completion. In important respects this is, of course, no more than a manifestation of the fact that creative, innovative research properly leads in new directions not thoroughly anticipated by the original design of the project. Where discovery of the unexpected, and insight into the previously unknown, are the hallmarks of creative work, they may also threaten discontinuity if not disintegration of crossnational projects. Recognizing this, the conference work group recommended that research scholars build into their

project plans provision for data confrontation conferences to be held before the final stages of data analysis, interpretation and writing.

The idea of the data confrontation conference or seminar had its origin in the field of comparative political analysis. Perhaps as a commentary on the still primitive state of intellectual development of the field of comparative politics, the first availability of directly comparable data with which to conduct rigorous tests of hypotheses in multiple national settings disclosed the extent to which presumed agreement on theoretical propositions was easily challenged and destroyed. The earliest of these experiences, dating back to the mid-1960s, were based on secondary analyses of existing data. They provided the model, however, for subsequent data confrontation conferences in which problems of interpretation and theoretical significance are exposed in the course of analytic work rather than remaining in need of reconciliation at the conclusion of such work. It perhaps goes without saying that the more primitive the understanding of a research problem the more necessary such early confrontations of theory and data. The need is also a direct function of the complexity of the problem being studied and of the multiplicity of national perspectives that must be drawn together in a crossnational enterprise.

### 3.3.2 Work Group II:

To assess problems of crossnational indicator development and standardization of measurement procedures.

A direct corollary to the problem of creating and maintaining conceptual convergence in crossnational research is found in the more detailed set of problems having to do with measurement, including not only the normal concerns of reliability and validity but including,



with particular emphasis, problems of standardization of measurement. The task of transforming theoretical concepts into research operations capable of producing data to represent the concepts in multinational settings therefore is of utmost importance.

The discussion of the development and standardization of measurement useful in crossnational research recognized that such research often forces researchers to reconsider concepts and operations that have become commonplace on the national level. The work group emphasized that the proper conduct of crossnational research often leads to the development of more generic or "higher level" concepts to encompass what would otherwise remain as national idiosyncrasies in the data. Beyond reminders providing appropriate illustrations of the obstacles to the development of indicator equivalencies across national boundaries, the work group suggested a series of activities that would facilitate the minimization, if not the removal of such obstacles.

Although it may generally be argued that too many major national research undertakings invest too little in the development and validation of measures of the theoretically important variables in a study, the same deficiency is even more pronounced and very probably more disastrous where innovative crossnational research is concerned. It seems clear that future studies must be organized in a manner to make possible the conduct of extended pilot studies, or pretests, and the joint consideration of the results of such preliminary work. Without careful attention to the problems of measurement, all of the difficulties discussed under the heading of conceptual problems are simply exacerbated at the point of data analysis and interpretation.

As research on particular topics or within particular disciplines and subdisciplines matures, and as the number of studies based on crossnational data collections increases, there are numerous modes for reducing the need for pretesting or for the conduct of pilot studies prior to launching new research projects. There are, for example, many research domains that could benefit at the present time from concerted attention to problems of standardization. Research conferences or seminars on the topic of standardization could resolve many current disagreements in the substantive literature and could produce guides to standardization that could be widely utilized by other research scholars.

Inasmuch as the meanings of data intended to represent concepts are often determined by the country-specific context in which the data were collected, it would be possible and immensely useful to create a series of country-specific indicator handbooks in which distributional arrays and descriptions of interrelationships among variables could illuminate the range of meanings that might be attached to specific variables for different theoretical purposes. The emphasis on such country-specific displays of data reflects the widely shared if not universal assumption that crossnational research must rest on thorough-going understandings of each of the countries involved. Although the goal of a research project may be supra-national, the path to the goal must be provided by preliminary analyses that are basically intranational. The same perspective prevails where the objective is to understand better various institutional configurations within a single country through comparing and contrasting those configurations with their counterparts in other national settings. In short, whether the search is for an improved

understanding of country-specific phenomena or for generalizations relevant to supranational theory, the integrity of the data depends on their meaningfulness in their indigenous contexts, and that meaningfulness can be judged in turn only through a deep understanding of the national origin. The tension between maintaining that integrity while achieving standardization across cultural boundaries is, of course, one of the basic tensions inherent in crossnational research. Attention to problems of measurement, calibration, and standardization must be a continuous part of the social science research undertaking.

### 3.3.3 Work Group III:

To assess the value of producing crossnational data sets for secondary analyses and other materials to be used in professional training in the conduct of crossnational research.

The need to take advantage of prior research, whether to seek greater cumulation of knowledge or more simply to learn from the work of others, led the group to consider the need for preserving data from crossnational research for use by others. In keeping with the conference's general concern for developing the human resources needed for crossnational research, substantial emphasis was placed on the utility of crossnational data sets for use in training future researchers. Research scholars can be sensitized to the full range of conceptual and technical problems discussed by the first two work groups through the experience of working directly with data collected by others. Indeed, through the secondary analysis of materials collected to serve the primary research objectives of others, sensitivity to future problems can be turned into firsthand familiarity with the methods and technicalities of problem resolution.

Quite apart from making possible this kind of professional training, data available for secondary analysis can often provide an important supplement to the data to be collected in crossnational research. (And, of course, for many lines of inquiry the availability of data resources already created by others may eliminate entirely the need for new data collection.) This is particularly true where survey research is concerned, because virtually all projects, and crossnational projects in particular, are multipurpose projects which generate a rich array of data that may be used for many research purposes.

The continued availability of survey data, for exploitation through training or substantive secondary analysis, rests, in turn, on the development and maintenance of data archives. Although general problems of the development and maintenance of archival capabilities were discussed by the group, the more immediate concern was with the task of moving data from completed research into existing archival resources. Although some funding agencies have had a standing policy of encouraging funded researchers to deposit their data with archives, the implementation of such policies should have higher priority. The implementation could take many forms, such as adding a supporting component to budgets requesting research support or, following the completion of research projects, making money available to one or more archives to underwrite their cost of archival processing and documentation. The general experience has been that where principal investigators are forced to choose between extending data collection analysis and writing on the one hand, or providing for archival processing of their data on the other, they inevitably enhance their

short-run advantage at the expense of the larger community's long-run interest in acquiring access to the data. Funding agencies, therefore, must in all probability take greater initiative to insure the continued utilization of project-produced data.

#### 3.3.4 Work Group IV:

To survey problems encountered in crossnational research conducted under different types of scientific sponsorship and with different research infrastructures supporting the participants. The deliberations of the fourth conference work group were merged with the observations of the other three groups to produce the following comments and recommendations.

Where support for crossnational research is concerned, there is usually a need for simultaneity of funding from multiple sources. As will be noted later, participants in the conference uniformly opposed the concept of funding through a single international agency, at least at this point in the development of the social sciences. If funding for the research is to come from nationally based funding agencies, the research collaborators must synchronize their individual applications for support.

Conference members were agreed that in funding projects that are to be a part of crossnational projects there is a basic need to include "international overhead." Identifiable costs are inevitably added to research projects that are based on collaborative crossnational activity because of the geographic diffusion of the research activity and the problems of coordinating activity among several principal investigators.

It was agreed that in general, funding for collaborative cross-national research must also be available for longer time periods than "normal" because it seems inevitable that the individual schedules of principal investigators located in very different institutional settings will be forced to accommodate various unanticipated demands that are not directly associated with the research. Funding policies must therefore recognize that the total amount of time actually devoted to collaborative crossnational work will exceed that devoted to research projects of comparable magnitude carried out by individual investigators.

As a first step in such recognition it was hoped that funding organizations could be persuaded to move away from the traditional low regard in which international travel and international conference activity are held. Although the low regard may stem from occasions of abuse, a general policy of being unreceptive for requests for individual and collective traveling, meeting and focused conference activity ignores the manifest need for such activities in planning and organizing specific projects of collaborative research. The low regard for the facilitation of direct personal communication and interaction also ignores the crucial byproduct of the development of personal networks and their maintenance because it fails to recognize the crucial role of interpersonal networks in prompting and sustaining all collaborative research, particularly crossnational research.

On a somewhat different level conference members concluded that their varied experiences indicated that the problems that are uniquely associated with multisited collaborative research must be recognized as including greater risk in the achievement of research objectives. This has often been true, at least through the stages leading up to

data collection, because of the large numbers of unknowns typically associated with the development of consensus on the theoretical, conceptual, and operational foundations of the work.

It was also noted that financial support for crossnational research should be provided under policies that recognize inequalities in local infrastructures, particularly on the technical side. Accommodation to such national differences may take a number of forms and should include the possibility that the less well developed of the participating organizations should be more richly supported in order to attain equity in their participation. At the other extreme it was recognized that on some occasions the overall interests of efficiency would be served through providing disproportionately heavy support to those organizations already equipped and prepared to carry a commensurately disproportionate share of the research burden.

Finally, conference members generally agreed that policies for funding crossnational research projects should keep in view the fact that each project provides opportunity for the development of active social-professional networks from which, in the longer term, research partners for future projects can be chosen with minimal risk and reduced cost because of their experientially based development of the understandings necessary to work together as research partners.

More generally, the experience of the conference participants indicated that crossnational research in the social sciences has languished because of a number of obstacles confronting the funding of such research. On the American scene, perhaps in particular, the private foundations that once provided core support for international scholarship now give crossnational research, particularly basic research, very low priority and cannot be looked to for the support of such activity. Within one of the basic sources of support

for the social sciences, the National Science Foundation, there has been inadequate organizational recognition of the problems unique to crossnational research. Within the Foundation and elsewhere there is general lack of recognition of the problems associated with "big social science," and the peculiar nature of collaborative crossnational ventures further confounds their ability to provide adequate support for such research. As a result of these and other deficiencies in both the private and public sectors, there is presently only very limited support for collaborative crossnational activity available in the United States.

On a somewhat different plane, it was felt that there is often an absence of policies designed to implement cooperation among the various nationally based funding agencies. As a consequence, the conference participants felt there was a need for all such agencies to develop policies that would provide, in the first instance, for regular exchanges of information about simultaneous proposals for requests for funding to support crossnational research in each of the nations involved. Moreover, it was generally recognized that in launching multinational research activities there is a pressing need for synchronization of review procedures leading to the approval or rejection of project proposals. The discussion of this need led to the recognition of a further need for policies that will accommodate interagency differences in review criteria and that will promote increasing responsiveness to and recognition of relevant decisions made by the various national funding agencies. The participants recognize the difficulty of developing such policies in that they might require the principal funding agencies within each country to give up some autonomy in their own decision-making process and to accept somewhat



higher risks in their own decision making than would otherwise be normal. Basic to all such policies there would have to be a concerted agreement to assign selective priorities based on the international nature of the research.

#### 4. Recommendations by the Conference to Research Foundations Aimed at Improving the Magnitude and Quality of Crossnational Research

##### 4.1 General Considerations

Participants in the conference were fully agreed that the problems confronting those who would undertake crossnational research would more likely be exacerbated than resolved by the institutional development of new international agencies with mandates to support international research activities. The preferred change should take place within the present sources of support for basic social science research. In particular, there is a clear need for greater organizational emphasis on crossnational research within the relevant national funding agencies.

Some notable accomplishments are already evident. Within the National Science Foundation, greater communication and improved co-operation between the International Division and the Social Science Division is clearly useful. Given the interdisciplinary nature of much crossnational research, cooperation among the social science programs in the National Science Foundation is of obvious importance. Current efforts by Foundation personnel to increase their informal contacts across national lines are most promising because cross-national research will, at least in the immediate future, depend on a high degree of cooperation among various national funding agencies.

Nevertheless, informal changes within and among national funding agencies will not solve the basic problem. The crucial scientific role of crossnational-crosscultural research must ultimately be reflected in the organizational structures as well as the policies of the funding agencies. Within the existing structure of the National Science Foundation, the possibility of establishing a special program for international research within the Social Science Division should be explored. With the creation and staffing of a special program, with its own budget, policies governing the support of an international research program could be made sufficiently flexible to permit Foundation participation in the joint funding of research across national lines.

In the European context a similar lack of programs pertaining specifically to crossnational research can be diagnosed. Particularly harmful to fully cooperative crossnational research is the lack of institutionalized cooperative procedures among national funding agencies when it comes to the evaluation of the research projects. There is evidence of severe problems created for crossnational research because of the lack of synchronized review procedures preventing researchers from proceeding with their work according to schedule. It would be desirable to check whether the European Science Foundation could be interested in these problems and consider some remedial action. But also within national funding agencies new policies are necessary to cope better with crossnational research. These policies would include being responsive to the need for exploratory planning activity that often must precede researchers' decisions to join together in collaborative research activity. Such a program should be mandated to provide support over longer time periods than normally contemplated

under present funding policies. While the commitment of funds over a long period should certainly be contingent on continued evidence of progress and adequate scientific performance, the ability of participants to plan with some assurance of support over the full span of the project is vitally important. Finally, with a special program mandated to support international research, the allocation of costs for the international overhead could be made with a greater recognition of the importance of those concepts to the conduct of the research.

International cooperation whether initiated by a collectivity of individual members of the international research community or whether encouraged by formal statements of funding-agency policy will be severely limited as long as international cooperation is no more than a coincidental byproduct of research programs that take their definition of mission from national orientations further bounded by disciplinary perspectives.

#### 4.2 Special Recommendations

We have mentioned before that a detailed report of the deliberations and recommendations by the four work groups is appended to this report. Thus there is no need to reiterate these recommendations. Nevertheless, not all recommendations carry equal weight. Since participants in the conference are highly interested in making a concrete, noticeable impact on the situation of crossnational research with regard to research funding agencies, we propose that DFG and NSF as well as - probably at a somewhat later point - other funding agencies in the US and Europe, take steps to discuss and implement the following ten recommendations endorsed consensually by the conference participants:

- Recommendation 1: Funding agencies, for a variety of reasons, have been reluctant to face the particular problems and financial constraints typical for cross-national research. It is not implausible to assume that this reluctance has contributed to the languishing of crossnational research. Funding agencies should recognize the important role of crossnational research for the development of social science and reassess their policies towards that research.
- Recommendation 2: A major problem in consensually designed cross-national research projects is the lack of coordination between funding agencies regarding the review process. Agencies are most urgently encouraged to consider procedures designed to permit synchronized reviews and decisions towards crossnational research projects.
- Recommendation 3: As a basic premise, crossnational research is ideally conceived as a consensually designed enterprise involving a research group from each country participating in the study. Endorsing this format, however, requires that adequate funding is made available to permit scholars to convene at critical crossroads of the project.
- Recommendation 4: Typically, crossnational projects are subject to unexpected changes in research foci, research design and the actual conduct of the project. Funding agencies should build provisions into their review and control procedures to accommodate such changes.
- Recommendation 5: A problem not at all unique to crossnational research but making itself especially felt there is the loss of scholarly vigor once the analysis phase of a project is reached. In addition, crossnational projects run the enormous danger that the conceptual consensus is not carried along into the analysis stage of the project. It is therefore absolutely mandatory that funding agencies demand and provide funds for data confrontations seminars to take place after all the data have been collected and prepared for analysis.
- Recommendation 6: Funding agencies should not only encourage but even initiate inventory and indicator studies of important socio-demographic and substantive concepts. It would be a grave misunderstanding to assume that such studies are of lesser scientific value than primary research. To the contrary, inventory and indicator studies require full command of a given subfield and would be of unmeasurable value for crossnational research.

- Recommendation 7: Funding agencies should exercise strict control to insure that the highest possible amount of indicator equivalence in correspondence with the present state of the art is actually achieved by the researchers.
- Recommendation 8: As long as good inventory/indicator handbooks are not available crossnational studies require extensive pretesting. Therefore, funding agencies should demand thorough pilot studies and provide adequate funding for these studies.
- Recommendation 9: Studies based on samples from large and diverse populations are by far the most frequent among empirical social science studies. In cross-national research principal investigators must ascertain full comparability of sampled populations across nations and detailed documentation of the sampling procedures. Funding agencies should monitor the implementation of these principles in the conduct of crossnational research.
- Recommendation 10: Large sums of money are consistently spent for empirical social science research. The small number of crossnational research projects and the enormous costs of such projects require a maximum use of the collected data by the community of scholars. Funding agencies should, therefore, commit scholars receiving grants for crossnational research to deposit the collected data in data archives with free access by the scientific community.

Conference Participants

The conference was organized by Max Kaase, University of Mannheim and Zentrum fuer Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen; Warren E. Miller, Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, and Wolfgang Zapf, University of Mannheim. The conference was held at the Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, October 2-8, 1977. Participants included:

Klaus R. Allerbeck, Fakultät fuer Sozialwissenschaften der  
Universität Bielefeld

Samuel H. Barnes, Department of Political Science, University of  
Michigan

Ronald D. Brunner, Special Legislative Assistant for Energy Policy  
to U.S. Representative Philip Sharp

Philip E. Converse, Departments of Political Science and Sociology,  
University of Michigan

Alexander Deichsel, Seminar fuer Sozialwissenschaften der Universität  
Hamburg

Samuel J. Eldersveld, Department of Political Science, University  
of Michigan

David L. Featherman, Department of Rural Sociology, University of  
Wisconsin (Madison)

Ursula Feist, Institut fuer Angewandte Sozialwissenschaft, Bad  
Godesberg

Rudolf Fisch, Fachbereich Psychologie Soziologie, Universität  
Konstanz

Thomas Herz, Fachbereich 1, Gesamthochschule Siegen

Richard I. Hofferbert, Department of Political Science, State  
University of New York at Binghamton

Karl-Otto Hondrich, Arbeitsgruppe Soziale Infrastruktur

Keith Hope, Nuffield College, Oxford

Ronald F. Inglehart, Department of Political Science, University  
of Michigan

M. Kent Jennings, Department of Political Science, University of  
Michigan

Hans-D. Klingemann, Zentrum fuer Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen

Hans-Juergen Krupp, Praesident jer Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universitaet,  
Frankfurt

Edward O. Laumann, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

Klaus Liepelt, Institut fuer Angewandte Sozialwissenschaft, Bad  
Godesberg

Alan Marsh, Social Survey Division, Office of Population Censuses  
and Surveys, London

Walter Mueller, Lehrstuhl fuer Soziologie III, Universitaet Mannheim

Edward N. Muller, Department of Government, University of Arizona

Bradley Richardson, Department of Political Science, Ohio State  
University

John Robinson, Communications Research Center, Cleveland State  
University

Guenther F. Schaefer, Institut fuer Systemtechnik und Innovations-  
forschung, Karlsruhe

Erwin K. Scheuch, Institute fuer Angewandte Sozialforschung der  
Universitaet Koeln

William H. Starbuck, School of Business Administration, University  
of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)

Philip J. Stone, Department of Sociology, Harvard University

Burkhard Struempel, Institut fuer Markt- and Verbrauchsforschung,  
Freie Universitaet Berlin

Donald J. Treiman, Department of Sociology, University of California  
(Los Angeles)

Theo van der Tak, Graduate School of Management, Delft

Richard Wertheimer, The Urban Institute

Bernard Wilpert, Internationales Institut fuer Management und  
Verwaltung, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin

Working Papers

The following papers were prepared for the conference and provided a foundation for many of the conference discussions:

Allerbeck, Klaus R.	Some Problems of Data Analysis in Comparative Research
Deichsel, Alexander	The Headline Project. A Cross- Cultural Approach for the Development of Textual Indicators
Eldersveld, Samuel J.	The Comparative Parliamentary and Civil Service Project: Con- ceptual and Technical Problems
Feist, Ursula; Guellner, Manfred; and Liepelt, Klaus	Structural Assimilation vs. Ideological Polarization on Changing Profiles of Political Parties in West Germany
Fisch, Rudolf	The Organizational Infrastructure of a Cross-National, Inter-Disci- plinary Survey on the Living Con- ditions of Young Families and Their Children
Hofferbert, Richard I., and Schaefer, Guenther F., with Germann, Raimund, and Widmaier, Uli	Policy Innovation in Modern Federal Systems: Establishing and Imple- menting Research Priorities
Herz, Thomas	Resources for Cross-National Research
Inglehart, Ronald F.	The Roots of Political Action: Progress and Problems in a Cross- National Research Project
Klingemann, Hans-D.	Note on a General Social Survey in West Germany
Krupp, Hans-Juergen	The Contribution of Microanalytic Simulation Models to the Theory of Income Distribution
Mueller, Walter	Prospects and Problems of US-German Comparisons of the Status Allo- cation Process
Muller, Edward N.	A Brief History of the Project: Gesellschaftliche und Politische Indikatoren fuer Unterstuetzung/ Opposition, Zufriedenheit/ Unzufriedenheit und Beherrschung/ Machtlosigkeit



Richardson, Bradley

Strategies for Comparative Political  
Behavior Research

Treiman, Donald J.

The Conduct of Comparative Research

van der Tak, Theo

Problems and Complications in Comparative  
Elite Research - the Dutch Case

Wilpert, Bernard

The Research Process in International  
Team - Structural and Group Dynamic  
Parameters

## APPENDIX THREE

Reports from the Work GroupsWORKING PAPER FOR PLENARY SESSION CONSIDERATION AT  
CONFERENCE ON CROSSNATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

## Notes from Deliberations of Group I:

To review modes of resolving conceptual problems in the comparative analyses of data produced by ongoing as well as past comparative studies.

Discussing usefulness and particularities of cross-cultural studies, the group agreed

- from a methodological and conceptual perspective cross-cultural research is not basically different from any other kind of social research
- but that there are some conceptual problems which are particularly prominent in crossnational studies.

Consequently, the following remarks do not aim at teaching others how to conceptualize comparative studies, but

- point to some problems and solutions which arise in the process of conceptualization,
- formulate recommendations on how to deal with those problems in a very practical way.

First problem

Establishing a shared symbol system and an agreement about basic research procedures among participants from different nations (cultures).

Possible solutions

- a) Relying on pre-existing friendship networks
- b) Meetings of a more or less informal nature to discuss research interests and project ideas before submitting a written proposal
- c) Exchange programs for professors and/or graduate students

Recommendation

Specialist meetings and the establishment of "work groups" with members from different countries should be supported. Seed money should be made available to these groups (patterned after the Council for Western European Studies).

## Group I

Second problem

Which kind of research model is preferable?

Solutions

- a) Centrally designed projects. A researcher with a pre-existent model hires participants in different countries. Advantage: Low costs for conceptual consensus. Disadvantage: Insensitivity to important cultural variations because of lack of in-depth knowledge of the other countries as research sites.
- b) Consensually designed projects. Researchers from different countries work out a concept together. Advantage: Higher motivation and consideration of cultural peculiarities on the conceptual level.
- c) Extension and validation studies.

Studies are replicated

- in a different cultural (national) context
- at different times

Advantages: Theoretically, the hitherto neglected influence of cultural (national) variables enters the picture and social change becomes visible. Low conceptual and analysis costs.

- d) Crossnational comparison of national data in a new theoretical perspective (secondary analysis). Advantage: No data-producing costs.

Recommendations

Although all models can be justified depending on particular circumstances, we strongly support the consensually designed project, certainly as preferable to the centrally designed on the grounds of motivation and equal rewards. The strong point of such projects (consensually designed) is that they involve all participants with the conceptual problems from the outset.

As to the other alternative models, special emphasis should be given to the attitude of funding agencies towards extension and validation studies. The argument that those studies are not "original" fails to see that they open up new perspectives on the influence of cultural and macrosocial factors and on social change processes. They also stand for continuity and change in social research and have a high training effect at low cost. Nevertheless, they may lead to the problems inherent in cooperation between research teams with unequal intellectual and material resources. Plus the problem

## Group 1

of achieving commitment to the project by developing mutual intellectual perspectives from the beginning of the project through equal involvement in theoretical development.

To secure cooperation and training of researchers in less developed countries, special provisions should be made

- to make research cooperation for them "materially" rewarding, relevant to their careers if possible
- to contribute to the establishment of a research infrastructure and training programs

### Third problem

Credibility of concepts. The terms, in which the research framework and the variables are defined, have to be functionally equivalent across cultural boundaries.

#### Recommendation

Provision should be made that professional social scientists specialize in the "translation of meaning" and that cross-cultural projects may draw on their expert knowledge or have means to build up expert knowledge themselves.

### Fourth problem

Conceptual changes may become necessary in the course of the research process, due specially to emerging crossnational problems (interviewers, coding, political difficulties, etc.).

#### Recommendation

Funding institutions should try to be particularly flexible with respect to crossnational projects.

### Fifth problem

After the project gets under way, national teams diverge from agreed-upon concepts and theoretical directions of the project and get lost into their own idiosyncrasies.

#### Recommendation

Data confrontation conferences should be planned to stimulate ideas and secure common concepts.

Group 1

Sixth problem

Scientific value and political implications (for instance, for Common Market politics) of crossnational results are not recognized by a larger public.

Recommendation

A concluding conference including a larger scientific audience and possible clients should discuss the results. This may also be useful for the planning of research for the future, new research or replication of research across time.

WORKING PAPER FOR PLENARY SESSION CONSIDERATION AT  
CONFERENCE ON CROSSNATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Notes from Deliberations of Group II:

To assess the problems of crossnational indicator development and standardization of measurement procedures.

I. General

This report is structured so that on the basis of some assumptions to be specified immediately, major problem sets are lined out and practical recommendations are made. The points of view emerging from this paper reflect a substantial amount of consensus among group members.

II. Assumptions

1. The discussion of indicator development and standardization in crossnational research (CNR) emphasized the feeling of the group that comparative research frequently forces researchers to reconsider concepts and operationalizations - and frequently on the national level. It is our understanding that the proper conduct of CNR often requires critical evaluation of such concepts and necessitate the development of "higher level" concepts. In terms of the (ever-present and well-known) problem of indicator equivalence we hold that:
  - a) formal indicator identity should be striven for with an awareness of the problems to be encountered here (language equivalence),
  - b) institutional differences have to be explicitly taken into account and may require indicators which are not immediately and directly comparable.
2. Conceptually, indicators referring to various levels of the socio-political system have to be systematically distinguished (micro-macro dimension) and are relevant for CNR. The emphasis of the conference on survey studies and the individual competencies of the group members will "load" the presentation towards the micro-side of the coin. Here we will mainly distinguish between socio-demographic and attitudinal/behavioral indicators.
3. In terms of analysis strategies, we consider the position valid that the analysis of crossnational data sets will usually analyze countries individually and will only in exceptional and well-founded instances consider pooled analyses the appropriate analysis technique (see Allerbeck paper).

## Group II

4. Our comments refer mostly to cross-sectional population studies. Studies of special populations may well require differing emphases regarding the various points we will discuss.
5. The main thrust of the group's effort was directed towards practical measures to be taken to improve CNR and to be recommended to sponsoring agencies.
6. The recommendations offered by the group have two target populations: a) our academic colleagues and co-researchers, and b) the funding agencies.

III. Socio-demographic variables in CNR

1. A major pitfall in CNR is the lack of information on comparable (functionally equivalent) socio-demographic indicators (e.g., educations).

It is recommended that

- a) simple inventory studies be funded which provide an overview of the ways that relevant socio-demographic variables are used by the census, academic, and market research organizations in a given country in order to give a maximum of practical information about such countries. Data archives could be particularly useful for the establishment of such inventories. The ZUMA "standard demographic" book and the book by the Social Science Research Council are examples of such inventories.
- b) crossnational single-indicator studies be funded which produce "indicator handbooks" permitting those engaged in CNR to derive practically applicable advice in regard to the use of such indicators in CNR.

N.B.: It will be necessary to provide regular updates to such "indicator handbooks".

2. It is deemed desirable by the group that a maximum convergence (and convergability) of survey and census data be achieved, so that the sample estimates can be properly evaluated against the population information. In order to facilitate the necessary changes in survey questions (see, e.g., the time-series problem) we recommend that calibration (norming) studies be conducted (e.g., on the basis of split-half tests) that permit a precise evaluation of the relation between "old" and "new" versions of given sets of questions.
3. The following recommendations pertain to more general problems:

## Group II

- a) These agencies should recognize the high relevance of the various proposed studies for the better conduct of national as well as crossnational research and should allocate sufficient funds for these studies. An understanding must be achieved that such studies are scientifically relevant and require high competence and skills.
- b) Funding agencies should be actively encouraged to seek out such studies.

IV. Attitudinal/behavioral variables in CNR

1. Compared with other specialist stages of the conduct of social surveys - sampling design logic and analysis - questionnaire design remains at a depressing level of underdevelopment. We are constrained within a conventional mode of response that relies upon an exchange of language between an interviewer and the respondent. As our demands upon respondents have become more complex and abstract, the language-dependent questionnaire has become increasingly less satisfactory as an instrument of inquiry. Commonly, we still rely upon brusquely limited verbal response categories to batteries of unlikely propositions and hope to tease out the elegance of human thought through single-order multivariate analysis. We propose, therefore, that

- far more effort be spent in improving the efficiency and reliability of the means of response.

This proposal has a special urgency in CNR. Levels of cognitive stimulus-recognition and the consistency of the nature of recognition are serious problems in national surveys. The intervention of language differences in crossnational surveys multiplies these difficulties to insupportable levels. To overcome these difficulties we further propose that

- we should proceed towards far more complex forms of response-modes through a process of simplification.

For all surveys perhaps, but necessarily in CNR, the process of attitude measurement must be stripped down to its essential parts and reassembled in such a way as to minimize language dependency and maximize opportunities for respondents to think about the core concept we wish to measure instead of thinking about the language of its expression. Response modes must be "deverbalized". The following are some working ground rules:

- a) Attitudinal stimulus-objects should be presented in concrete form. It follows that agree-disagree inferential attitude



## Group II

statement techniques should be avoided and simplified reality-tested objects be presented using scale responses wherever possible.

- b) A far more imaginative approach is required in presenting stimuli. The use of visual aids should be encouraged. Card-sorts, using stimuli both literal and pictorially designed, encourage a highly desirable stimulus-consistency in cross-national questionnaire design. It provides far more control over the measurement process and control leads to consistency.
- c) The core of our problem in crossnational attitude measurement is that affective judgements are made by members of different national and cultural communities in differing cognitive contexts. (This may also be true of differing social classes, but at least they speak a similar language.) Having stripped down, nailed down, and deverbilized affective judgements, we are then free to explore contexts by allowing cognitive language contexts to vary infinitely by the use of open-ended follow-up questions to ask people what they understood by the object(s) they evaluated. An excellent example of this occurs in the Eight-Nation Study. Rather than construct a Left-Right political dimension through conventional forms of issue-questioning, respondents were asked to mark with a pencil where they located their own outlook on a ten-box scale:

LEFT 

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

 RIGHT

This task completed, respondents were asked to explain what they understood by the terms "Left" and "Right". The success of this device is difficult to understate. Such probes are expensive, of course, but might well be done selectively on random sub-samples to minimize cost.

- d) The (nearly) nonverbal response mode has great potential cross-nationally for higher development. Games may be devised, containing internal logics that, conveniently, imply their own scaling algorithms. We should be seeking modes of response that contain logical imperatives that constrain respondents to use judgments that are common to all human thought processes. Attitudes may be inferred from respondents' game-playing that reach much higher levels of insight than may be achieved with verbal techniques. They tap skills possessed by most respondents and encourage an altogether higher level of respondent interest and quality of thought. They will enable us to be as clever in design-approaches as we ought to be now and liberate our respondents to be as clever as they actually are.
2. Because of the problems just outlined, extensive pilot work is a necessary condition of good CNR. Not only are we thinking here of extensive pretesting, but also of the application of pretest-posttest designs to eliminate idiosyncratic findings. It is

## Group II

therefore imperative that

- sufficient funds are made available for the pilot phase of a given project, and that this phase is better understood than before as a vital part of the total research project.
3. The well-known problem of particular response modes (e.g., response set) takes on a new dimension in CNR. It seems entirely possible that culture-specific response modes do exist which differentially influence the crossnationally collected data. We therefore recommend that
    - crossnational studies of response modes be actively encouraged and funded.
  4. There are many instances when behaviorally oriented measures are superior to attitudinal measures. We recommend that
    - such measures are used whenever possible, provided that institutional or contextual properities of a given socio-political system do not invalidate comparisons between such behavioral indicators.
  5. Just as with socio-demographic indicators, "inventory studies" of central research concepts and their operationalizations in CNR are still badly missing. We therefore recommend that
    - such "inventory studies" of central attitudinal/behavioral indicators are undertaken. As a national example we refer to the ISR measurement handbooks for the U.S.

#### V. Other recommendations

In the following we extend a series of recommendations that derive from the discussion of topics that played a less central role during the group's sessions.

1. Of the many problems occurring in sampling, we picked out two and offer the following recommendations:
  - a) Comparability of populations across nations (or other cross-national units) should always be ascertained (e.g., personal vs. household sample; age; institutionalized population).
  - b) Detailed sampling point information should be provided to assess cluster effects and permit the construction of proper weights. In addition to the "main" data set, a sampling data set on the basis of the initial valid address material should

## Group II

be constructed allowing the precise assessment of completion rates and the structure of losses.

2. We emphasize that all variables and derived measures should be precisely and extensively documented. Sponsoring agencies should control the production of this information.
3. Funding agencies for CNR should take the necessary steps to ascertain that the data - in due time - be handed over to data archives.
4. To ease use of crossnational data, particularly for secondary analysis, and to enhance analysis capabilities we recommend that aggregate data (ecological, political) be added to the data set. Furthermore, we recommend that an event data set (or a functional equivalent) be established to prevent misinterpretations or interpretations "out of context" (see the Almond-Verba Study).

WORKING PAPER FOR PLENARY SESSION CONSIDERATION AT  
CONFERENCE ON CROSSNATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Notes from Deliberations of Group III:

To assess the value of producing crossnational data sets for secondary analyses and other materials to be used in professional training in the conduct of crossnational research.

1. Orientation

The question of preparing data-based instructional materials and the broader question of improving the secondary research environment are intimately related.

Instructional packages using secondary analysis serve four functions: training in substance, training in method, development of sensitivity to cross-unit differences and stimulation of awareness of new research possibilities.

Secondary research may be important in the development of primary research.

The economies of comparative secondary research are especially important.

2. Archival Problems and Suggestions

Opportunities for secondary analysis would be advanced if:

Funding agencies would require principal investigators to make explicit commitments to archive their data sets as part of grant agreements.

A portion of data collection grant funds were allocated for coordination between archive representatives and PI's during the early stages of the data management process.

A handbook of archive requirements and suggested data documentation procedures were prepared.

Use of existing archive data sets and future archive materials would be facilitated by:

Preparation of crossnational equivalents of the ICPSR American Election Studies Continuity Guide, i.e., a variable-locating system based on data sets with a comparative design or comparative analysis potential.

## Group III

Development of a handbook of question items used in comparative surveys or surveys having a comparative potential showing where questions were used and what countries were covered by the studies.

Use of the Zentralarchiv retrieval system or some similar retrieval device to facilitate development of continuity guides, question-item handbooks and information on variable clusters in particular studies.

### 3. Crossnational Meaning and Measurement Problems

Secondary research capabilities would be improved by:

Urging PI's to document fully any special circumstances at the time of the data collection effort which could affect interpretation of findings, e.g., "visibility" of specific issues at the time of election surveys.

Preparation of crossnational documentation materials on such basic system differences as educational systems, the "ecological" correlates of urban-rural and regional differences, etc.

Development of comparative bibliographies on national differences in such areas as political organizations, community society and electoral campaign practices.

Holding measurement seminars or conferences in selected concept areas and involving scholars from several nations would improve comparative theory and measurement, particularly if they were held in several stages with opportunities for measurement and concept testing during the intervening intervals.

### 4. Other Topics

Efforts by various archives to identify comparative research that has not yet been archived are a good idea and preparation of lists of such studies would be helpful.

Crossnational coordination of single-nation studies on common topics should be facilitated.

WORKING PAPER FOR PLENARY SESSION CONSIDERATION AT  
CONFERENCE ON CROSSNATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Notes from Deliberations of Group IV:

To survey problems encountered in crossnational research conducted under different types of scientific sponsorship and with different research infrastructures supporting the participants.

Crossnational research is necessary to accomplish any of a number of goals including: (1) to increase ranges in variations of the phenomena being studied; (2) to provide variance in relevant institutional arrangements; (3) to replicate research under conditions of maximum independence of observation; and (4) to disseminate scientific technology.

The elements of crossnational research that may distinguish it from nationally based and nationally bounded research consist primarily of the need for collegial collaboration involving two or more principal investigators and of course the need to locate the conduct of the research in two or more sites. The collaborative nature of crossnational research is fundamental to the collegial nature of the research enterprise and is doubly necessary in the conduct of crossnational research to eliminate any of the connotations attached to the so-called safari research of decades recently passed. Of equal importance is the need for the senior research personnel to have a thorough command of the national cultures involved in the research. Although in principle it may be possible for single scholars to initiate and execute crossnational research, the preferred mode, quite clearly, rests on equal roles for scholars indigenous to the national cultures within which the research is conducted.

A number of problems flow from the essential nature of collaborative multisited activity. These problems may vary with the maturity of the research domain, but in virtually all of the major multinational experiences represented in the conference there has been a demonstrated need to include in the research process, time and opportunity to develop consensus on the conceptual basis for the research, on the options for operationalization of the concepts, and on the procedures for instrument development. Even more obvious is the subsequent need for multiple data collections, joint work on data reduction and integrated collaborative participation in data analysis and in scholarly writing.

Where support for crossnational research is concerned, there is a need for simultaneity of funding from multiple sources. There is a basic need for that funding to include "international overhead," i.e., the costs that are added to the research project because of the international nature of the research and possibly because of differences in the development of the local infrastructures supporting the research at each site. The funding must also be available for extended time

## Group IV

periods as the individual schedules of the principal investigators must accomodate ongoing activity other than the research and as the sheer amount of time needed for the collaborative effort inevitably extends the research calendar. On a somewhat different level, the problems that flow from multisited collaborative research must be recognized to include the acceptance of greater risk, at least through the stages leading up to data collection, because of the larger number of unknowns associated with the project. Financial support for cross-national research should anticipate inequalities in local infrastructures particularly on the technical side, inequalities that may need to be accommodated and may be overcome only with some marginal capitalization of one or another of the organizational units engaged in the conduct of the research. Finally, the essentially collaborative nature of crossnational research demands a recognition of the long-term need to permit the invisible colleges (defined by common research interests of individuals) into active social networks from which research partners can be chosen with minimal risk because the partners have engaged in a mutual vetting of each other in the course of extended contracts in different settings.

Crossnational research has languished because of numerous obstacles confronting the funding of crossnational research. On the American scene perhaps in particular, the private foundations that once provided the core support have over time given crossnational research very low priority and can at present not be relied upon to support such activity. Within the principal source of support for basic social science, the National Science Foundation, there is presently inadequate organizational recognition of the problems unique to cross-national research. As a result of difficiencies in both the private and the public sector there is presently only very limited funding available in the United States.

More broadly, there is an apparent absence of fundamental policy to implement cooperation among the various national funding agencies. As a consequence, there is a clear need for developing policies that will provide regular exchanges of information about simultaneous submissions of requests for funding to support crossnational research in each of the nations involved. In a research project there is need for a mode of synchronization of review procedures leading to the approval or rejection of project proposals. There is a need for policies responsive to the need for a sharing of international overhead costs. There is finally a need for policies that will accomodate international differences in review criteria and will promote increased responsiveness to and recognition of relevant decisions made by other national funding agencies. This may well mean that each nation's principal agency must be willing to give up some autonomy in its own decision-making process, must be willing to accept a somewhat higher risk than would otherwise be normal, and must be willing to give priority based on the international nature of the research. National

## Group IV

funding agencies should develop procedures for joint consideration of multinational proposals to minimize asymmetrical discussions that delay or deny support to one or more national research groups while others receive support.

There is a clear need for greater organizational emphasis on cross-national research within the relevant national funding agencies. The problems confronting those who would undertake crossnational research would more likely be exacerbated than resolved by the institutional development of international agencies with mandates to support international research activities. The preferred change should take place within the present sources of support for basic social science research. Some notable accomplishments are already evident. Within the National Science Foundation, greater communication and improved cooperation between the International Division and the Social Sciences Division is clearly useful. Given the interdisciplinary nature of much cross-national research, cooperation among the social science programs in the National Science Foundation is of obvious importance. Current efforts by Foundation personnel to increase their informal contacts with each other across national lines are most promising because crossnational research will at least in the immediate future depend on a high degree of cooperation among various national funding agencies.

Nevertheless, the various informal changes within and among national funding agencies will not solve the basic problem. The crucial scientific role of crossnational-crosscultural research must ultimately be reflected in the organizational structures as well as the policies of the funding agencies. Within the present structure of the National Science Foundation, the possibility of establishing a special program for international research within the Social Sciences Division should be explored with the creation and staffing of a special program. With its own budget, policies governing the support of an international research program could be made sufficiently flexible to permit Foundation participation in the joint funding of research across national lines. These policies would include being responsive to the need for exploratory planning activity that often must precede researchers' decisions to join together in collaborative research activity. These policies would also be responsive to the need for flexibility in the timing of funding decisions. Such a program should be mandated to provide support over longer time periods than normally contemplated under present funding policies. While the commitment of funds over a long time period should certainly be contingent on continued evidence of progress and adequate scientific performance, the ability of participants to plan with some assurance of support over the full span of the project is vitally important. Finally, with a special program mandated to support international research, the allocation of costs for the international overhead could be made with a greater recognition of the importance of those concepts to the conduct of the research.



## Group IV

International cooperation whether initiated by a collectivity of individual members of the international research community or whether encouraged by formal statements of funding agency policy will be severely limited as long as international cooperation is no more than a byproduct of research programs that take their definition of mission from national orientations further bounded by disciplinary perspectives