THE THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT:
A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE SUBJECT
At the end of the course, Individuals will analyze the elements of the communication and will explain the basic principles of this course.

9.   The Theory of Human Development: A Cross-Cultural Analysis

9.1   Abstract of Cross Culture
This lesson demonstrates that socioeconomic development, emancipative cultural change and democratization constitute a coherent syndrome of social progress – a syndrome whose common focus has not been properly specified by classical modernization theory. We specify this syndrome as 'human development', arguing that its three components have a common focus on broadening human choice.

Socioeconomic development gives people the objective means of choice by increasing *individual resources*; rising *emancipative values* strengthen people's subjective orientation towards choice; and democratization provides legal guarantees of choice by institutionalizing *freedom rights*. Analysis of data from the World Values Surveys demonstrates that the linkage between individual resources, emancipative values and freedom rights is universal in its presence across nations, regions and cultural zones; that this human development syndrome is shaped by a causal effect of individual resources and emancipative values on freedom rights; and that this effect operates through its impact on *elite integrity*, as the factor which makes freedom rights effective.

9.2   Introduction of Cross Culture
Researchers concerned with development and change in human societies followed three major trajectories of societal change. The most fundamental one – socioeconomic development – has been described as set of closely linked changes including technological innovation, productivity growth, improving health and life expectancy, increasing incomes, rising levels of education, growing access to information and increasing social complexity (among many others, see Lewis

THE THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT:
A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

1955; Rostow 1961; Bell 1973; Chirot 1986; Perkin 1996; Rowen 1996; Barro 1997; Estes 1998; Rodrik 1999; Hughes 1999; Sen 2001).

The second process – value change – comes along with socioeconomic development when expanding markets and social mobilization diversify and intensify human activities, such as commercial transactions and civic exchange.

These processes strengthen horizontal bargaining relations and weaken vertical authority relations that restrict human autonomy (Weber 1958; Banfield 1958; Eckstein 1988; Coleman 1988). Fading constraints on human autonomy tend to reshape people's value orientations in ways that have been described in various terms, such as the emergence of 'civic cultural' values (Almond & Verba 1963), 'individual modernity' (Inkeles & Smith 1974; Inkeles 1983), 'postmaterialistic values' (Inglehart 1977, 1990), 'liberal values' (Brint 1984; Flanagan 1987; Nevitte 1996), 'anthropocentric values' (Bürklin et al. 1996) and 'self-expression values' (Inglehart 1997; Inglehart & Baker 2000).

Whatever the terminology, most theories of value change coincide in the notion that traditional conformity values, which subordinate human autonomy to community discipline, tend to give way to more emancipative values that emphasize human choice. Accordingly, we characterize this process as an emancipative value change.

A third major process involves a society's political institutions. The most notable development in this field has been a massive trend towards more democracy. This happened in two ways during the past three decades. Most obviously, many authoritarian regimes changed into formal democracies by adopting democratic constitutions in the 'Third Wave of Democratization' (Huntington 1991; Sørensen 1993; Kurzman 1998; Nagle & Mahr 1999; Dorenspleet 2000). At the same time, a more subtle change has taken place in established democracies.

Since the late 1970s, most of them have implemented or extended direct democratic institutions (Cronin 1999; Scarrow 2001) and they have experienced rising levels of direct civic participation (Barnes et al. 1979; Budge 1996; Dalton 2001; Norris 2002). Some scholars see these changes as an acceleration of a more enduring historical trend towards democracy (Gurr et al. 1990; Modelski & Perry 1991; Diamond 1993; Jaggers & Gurr 1995).

As often as the processes of socioeconomic development, emancipative value change and democratization have been described, they have been called into question (see Randall &

THE THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT:
A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

Theobald 1998). It has been debated, for instance, whether these processes manifest irreversible linear trends or follow cyclical patterns with major setbacks; whether they are uniformly global or culture-specific in a way that prescribes an inherently Western model; and even whether they are desirable or not.

One point, however, can be hardly denied: if socioeconomic development, emancipative value change and democratization occur, they tend to go together. Poor societies, whose citizens suffer from scarce resources – most obviously in Sub-Saharan Africa – tend to be dominated by conformity values that reflect constraints on human autonomy. These societies are usually governed by authoritarian regimes. Even if they have a democratic constitution, such formal democracies seldom operate effectively because highly corrupt elites deprive people of their rights (Heller 2000).

At the other end of the continuum, the citizens of OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) societies profit from an affluence of individual resources and their prevailing values are characterized by a stronger emphasis on human emancipation. These citizens are usually governed by democratic regimes in which freedom rights are effectively set in practice.

This insight is not new. In fact, it is conventional wisdom of classical modernization theory (see Lerner 1958; Lipset 1959; Coleman 1968; Pye 1990; Diamond 1992). What is new, is the empirical evidence that has been added in recent years. Thanks to the World Values Surveys, this applies in particular to the role of value change (Inglehart 1997; Inglehart & Baker 2000). Nevertheless, we still lack an integrated theory of social change.

Modernization theorists have argued that there are close relations between socioeconomic development, emancipative values and degrees of democracy, but they did not sharpen the common focus of these three phenomena. 'Modernization' was
either used as an umbrella term that was defined by enumerating its concrete components but not by what integrates them (e.g., Lerner 1968: 385); or it was described in such general terms as 'functional differentiation' (Mouzelis 1999), allowing one to subsume almost anything under 'modernization'. In conclusion, there is no general definition of modernization that clarifies in which common principle its various components converge.

Empirical studies reflect this lack of conceptual integration. Most analyses focus on only one of the three relationships between socioeconomic development, value change and democracy. Even the few studies that deal with all three processes dissolve the whole

THE THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT:
A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

complex into single pairs of relations, each of which is discussed in separation (Muller & Seligson 1994; Inglehart 1997; Sides 1999; Inglehart & Baker 2000). As a result, the debate is fragmented into three separate strings.

Summarizing these contradictions, Dahl (1998) concluded that 'the exact nature of the relationship among socioeconomic modernization, democratization, and the creation of a democratic culture is almost as puzzling today as it was a quarter-century ago'. It remains puzzling because no one, as far as we know, started from the most fundamental question: 'What is the common denominator underlying socioeconomic development, emancipative value change and effective democracy?' This question is made all the more pressing by the striking coincidence of these three phenomena, as we will demonstrate. We start from this fundamental question and elaborate on the syndrome as such before we dissolve the whole complex into separate relations.

We unfold a concept based on the principle of *'human choice'*. This principle is implicit in modernization theory (Lewis 1955), but its capacity to integrate related changes in socioeconomic structure, political culture and regime institutions has not yet been fully developed. The following section unfolds the concept of 'human development' as an integrating framework.

Anand and Sen (2000) introduced the term 'human development', arguing that 'human choice', or the capability of human beings to choose the lives they want, should be the ultimate measure of social progress. We share this humanistic approach, but, following Welzel (2002a), we elaborate the concept of *'human development'* more comprehensively in a way that includes political culture.

Using this framework, we analyze data from the World Values Surveys together with socioeconomic data from Vanhanen (1997), civil and political rights ratings from Freedom House and estimates on elite corruption from Transparency International. Subsequent sections demonstrate that the syndrome of human development operates across nations, regions and cultural zones; that this syndrome is shaped by a process in which socioeconomic development and rising emancipative mass values lead to rising levels of effective democracy; and that the effect of emancipative values on effective democracy operates through their impact on elite integrity. Indeed, elite integrity (i.e., the reverse of elite corruption) is the factor that makes formal democracy effective.

THE THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT:
A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

9.3   <u>Theory</u>

The three components of human development - Our conception follows Welzel (2002), arguing that socioeconomic development, rising emancipative values and effective democracy work together in promoting human choice among societies (see also,Welzel & Inglehart 2001). Socioeconomic development includes a bundle of processes (e.g., urbanization, social mobilization and occupational differentiation) that increase social complexity and multiply social transactions between human beings (Bendix 1974; Durkheim 1988; Simmel 1984; Blau 1994).

These tendencies help to emancipate people from closed in-group discipline, to weaken vertical authority relations and to strengthen horizontal bargaining relations, giving people greater autonomy over their resources. Moreover, socioeconomic development not only individualizes available resources, it also enlarges these resources: rising incomes, skills and information facilities increase people's physical and intellectual resources.

Socioeconomic development diminishes the most existential constraints on human choice by increasing *individual resources*. These resources give people the objective *means* of choice. This view is as old as Aristotle and has been argued from Adam Smith and Karl Marx to Amartya Sen. Emancipative cultural change is the second component relevant to human choice.When growing individual resources widen the scope of possible human activities, the strive for self-realization, autonomy and emancipation finds greater leverage, strengthening people's desire to have free choice and control over their lives.

Rising *emancipative values* direct people's subjective orientations towards human choice, contributing the *motives* component to this theme. This is consistent with the notion that choice is not only a matter of one's means but also of one's mind and motivation (Rokeach 1960). Democracy is the third component of human development. It is related to human choice because it institutionalizes legal rights that guarantee choices in people's private and public activity. However, it is important that these rights are not only formally guaranteed but work effectively in practice.

This is what distinguishes effective democracy from formal democracy. Effective democracy contributes *effective rights* to human choice and thus represents its *rules* component. Effective democratization, in this sense, is any extension of people's effective rights. This notion can be traced back to Mill and Dewey who saw effective opportunities for 'individual self-development' (Macpherson 1977) as the core value of democracy.

THE THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT:
A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

Individual resources, emancipative values and effective rights represent the means, motives and rules components of human development. These components are provided by socioeconomic development, emancipative value change and democratization, respectively.

The three components of Human Development all coincide in their focus on human choice. Progress in any of these components improves a society's '***conditio humana***', giving people larger means, stronger motivations and more effective guarantees to make use of their personal potential. Human development of societies means growing human choice on a mass level.

Human development is not a teleological concept. It does not imply that its three components necessarily grow in a linear upward direction. Societies can move in either direction: progressing or regressing. However, our theory does imply that people's means, motivations and rights tend to develop coincidentally, either narrowing or widening the range of human choice.

The concept of 'human development' goes beyond standard modernization theory in having both a ***wider scope*** and a ***sharper focus***. Usually, theories cannot maximize scope and focus at the same time, but the concept of **'human development'** does. On the one hand, its scope is comprehensive, integrating major changes in socioeconomic structure, political culture, and regime institutions. On the other hand, this concept is sharply focused on one theme: the growth (or decline) of human choice.

9.4 The Two Linkages of Human Development

We suggest that the human development syndrome is shaped by two linkages: a *means-motives linkage* that connects emancipative values with individual resources, and a *motives-rules linkage* that ties effective rights to emancipative values.

The Means-Motives Linkage: A public's prevailing value orientations reflect the constraints imposed on human autonomy by more or less pressing social conditions. These constraints are most existential and pressing in the socioeconomic sphere, when scarce resources deprive people of many options in their life. Usually, people tend to adapt their aspirations to these constraints (Schwartz 1992; Diener et al. 1995; Cummins 2000; Eckersley 2000; Schmuck et al. 2000).This mechanism – known in social psychology as 'aspiration adjustment' (Costa et al. 1987) – has emerged through human evolution because

THE THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT:
A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS

it secured survival (Birch & Cobb 1981; Doyal & Gough 1991; Tooby & Cosmides 1992). Aspiration adjustment leads people to aspire for the most pressing things first and to avoid wasting energy on unattainable goals (Maslow 1988). Downward adjustment of aspirations works against the higher-ordered human strives, in particular for self-expression. Striving for self-expression requires freedom and choice, and cannot unfold under pressing social constraints. Yet, the striving for self-expression is latent in each person: it follows from the simple fact that human beings are self-conscious.

This insight led many theorists – including Marx, Maslow, Inkeles and Flanagan – to the conclusion that less pressing and more permissive social conditions (which offer greater choice) create greater satisfaction and fulfillment. Indeed, data from the World Values Surveys support the view that greater human choice increases individual life satisfaction. In each of 148 national representative surveys, conducted in such diverse societies as Uganda, China, Iran, Brazil, Sweden or Poland, there is a highly significant correlation between people's life satisfaction and their perception of how much choice they have in shaping their live.

If pressing social conditions restrict human choice, people are forced to reduce their actual emphasis on self-expression, although this downward adjustment of aspirations has psychological costs in that it diminishes life satisfaction. Downward adjustment of aspirations is nevertheless necessary to make a living under pressing human conditions, such as those prevailing in poor societies where scarce resources drive people into a struggle for survival.

Survival strategies may constitute a Hobbesian **'homo homini lupo'** situation in which outsiders are distrusted as hostile competitors for scarce resources. Distrust towards outsiders forces individuals into rigid in-group discipline that leaves little room for human autonomy. Banfield (1958) examined the Southern Italian community of Montegrano to describe such a typical survival situation. Putnam (1993) reaches similar conclusions in his description of differences between Italian citizens of the affluent North and the poor South, finding that Southern Italians distrust their fellow citizens. These citizens tend to place emphasis on group discipline, social control, hierarchy, moral rigidity and strong authority – conformity values that prevail under restrictive human conditions.

Inglehart (1997) demonstrated for a much wider array of countries that the public's suffering from scarce resources tend to be dominated by conformity values. Similarly, societies whose people dispose of more individual resources place stronger emphasis on

emancipative values. This reflects the fact that the benefits of conformity values recede when existential constraints on human choice fade. Accordingly, conformity values tend to give way to emancipative values, which is reflected in greater tolerance of human diversity, higher life satisfaction and stronger emphasis on individual freedom. According to Flanagan (1987), this value change reflects a functional mechanism of aspiration adjustment at the societal level.

9.5   The Motives-Rules Linkage
Living an emancipated life involves activities, both private and public, that require a legal space based on effective freedom rights. Emancipative orientations are therefore inherently directed towards effective rights. So, if emancipative orientations gain momentum among the broader public, their directedness towards effective rights should be consequential for the stability of political regimes.

If growing individual resources give rise to emancipative orientations within an autocracy, people will consider authoritarian rule as an illegitimate restriction of their rights. Confronted with an elite unwilling to democratize, these people will withdraw as much material and moral support as they can. This makes authoritarian rule increasingly ineffective and costly.

The exhaustion of a regime's resources and the loss of legitimacy make two events more likely: that a faction of the elite splits off in an attempt to regain legitimacy by mobilizing popular support for liberal reforms (Przeworski 1992), and that democratic dissidents campaign for holding free elections (see Foweraker & Landman 1997; McAdam et al. 2001). Depending on the strength and spread of emancipative orientations, the mobilization of the public will then be channeled in the direction of democratization, helping to terminate an authoritarian regime and to establish freedom rights.

9.6   Formal Democracy & Effective Democracy
The Indian case illustrates how important it is to differentiate between formal democracy and effective democracy. India is without doubt a formal democracy that guarantees its citizens a wide array of freedom rights, but as Heller has pointed out (2001), most Indians do not have the resources enabling them to exert their rights effectively.

Democracy is central to human development because it gives the citizens formal rights. Codifying these rights creates formal democracy, which is a necessary component of effective democracy: without formal democracy there can be no effective democracy. Yet

formal rights are not sufficient to make democracy effective. Formal rights are effective to the extent that the elites respect these rights in their actual behavior. Law-abiding elite behavior, or what we call 'elite integrity', is an expression of the 'rule of law' that, as Linz and Stepan (1996) and many others have claimed, distinguishes effective democracy from formal democracy. Hence, in order to measure effective democracy, we weigh formal democracy by elite integrity, using elite integrity as a grading factor that either downgrades or upgrades given levels of formal democracy.

9.7   The Mass-System Linkage in Human Development

Our theory of human development maintains that effective democracy is linked to emancipative mass values and that these values are in turn linked to people's available resources. However, while the linkage between effective democracy and emancipative values becomes manifest only at the societal level, the linkage between emancipative values and available resources originates at the individual level from where it simply accumulates to the societal level. This accumulation reflects mass tendencies that are important to understand the mass-system linkage in human development.