

The globalization of comparative public opinion research

Pippa Norris

Harvard University

For the *Handbook of Comparative Politics* eds. Neil Robinson and Todd Landman
London: Sage Publications neil.robinson@ul.ie [9,550 words]

One of the most dramatic recent developments, transforming the field of comparative politics during recent decades, has been the expanding range of survey resources facilitating the systematic cross-national analysis of public opinion around the globe. This process started more than four decades ago, with Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba's path-breaking *The Civic Culture* (1963), which was immediately recognized and acclaimed by Philip Converse as 'an instant classic'.¹ Previously a few other cross-national attitudinal studies had been deployed, notably William Buchanan and Hadley Cantril's 9-country *How Nations See Each Other* (1953), sponsored by UNESCO, sociological surveys of social stratification, and USIA surveys of attitudes towards international affairs.² The civic culture survey laid the foundation for the comparative study of public opinion and subsequent cross-national survey research as a distinctive sub-field in political science open to empirical investigation.

To explore the nature and evaluate the contribution of this sub-field, the first part of this chapter examines the globalization of the study of cross-national public opinion over successive decades. The statistical revolution spurred the initial growth in survey research in Europe and the United States, emphasizing individual-level social-psychological variables and quantitative scientific methods. More recently the rise of the European Union, international networks in the social sciences, the diffusion of the market research industry, and the expanding number of democratic states worldwide have all facilitated the growth and scope of data resources. This chapter compares and contrasts the major series of cross-national social survey datasets which are now available, summarized in Table 1, defined as those covering more than one independent nation-state which have established a regular series of surveys of social and political attitudes and behavior. This includes the Euro-barometer and related EU surveys (which started in 1970), the European Election Study (1979), the European Values Survey and the World Values Survey (1981), the International Social Survey Programme (1985), the Global Barometers (1990 and various), the Comparative National Elections Project (1990), the European Voter and the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (1995), the

European Social Survey (2002), the Transatlantic Trends survey (2002), the Pew Global Attitudes project (2002), and the Gallup World Poll (2005).

The final section of this chapter considers some of the perennial critiques of cross-national surveys, including issues about the quality of the data, the equivalence of concepts, and the need to understand public opinion within a broader structural context, and considers how far these raise valid concerns about the limits of this method. The conclusion argues that, despite important limitations, cross-national survey research is invaluable for establishing generalities about human behavior in a way that allows us to test regularities established in single-nation studies. The multiplicity of datasets which are now available for analysis strengthens replication, to ensure robust findings and generalizations. In particular, when large-scale multi-national surveys covering many societies are combined with systematic variations in institutional and societal contexts, this process is capable of providing powerful insights for the study of comparative politics.

The early evolution of survey research

The earliest development of large-scale social surveys can be traced to the statistical movement in late-Victorian Britain.³ Surveys arose with the comprehensive street-by-street investigations into the conditions of poverty in London led by the business philanthropist Charles Booth (which started in 1886), building on Mayhew's more impressionistic observations thirty years earlier, and a similar social survey of working class living condition which the social reformer and businessman Seebohm Rowntree conducted in York in 1897. Some of the earliest work on probability sampling was developed by the Norwegian statistician Kiaer around 1890, while estimates of the sources of error which influence the precision of the results were developed at the LSE by the statistician Arthur L. Bowley.⁴ Bowley also devised and conducted sample surveys of working-class households in four English towns and presented the results in *Livelihood and Poverty* (with A. R. Burnett-Hurst, 1915). The earliest social surveys in Britain called attention to issues of political reform to improve the living conditions for the urban poor.

Building on this work, in the United States the founders of the Chicago school, Harold Gosnell and Charles Merriam, had experimented with the applying statistical and survey methods in pursuit of a new science of politics during the 1920s and 1930s.⁵ This approach was exemplified by *Non-voting, Causes and Methods of Control* (1924), which

employed sampling techniques and survey data. Prior to this, the Swedish social scientist, Herbert Tingsten, had employed aggregate data to understand political behavior, voting choice and turnout.⁶ The advantage of representative sample surveys is that these provided direct insights into the social and attitudinal characteristics of the electorate. Many of the leaders associated with the behavioral revolution were associated as faculty or graduates with the Chicago school, including Harold Lasswell, V.O. Key Jr, David Truman, Herbert Simon and Gabriel Almond. Meanwhile the commercial applied uses of market survey research were also being developed. George Gallup experimented with using voting forms among a scientific sample of voters in each state in 1933, using this to predict the results of the 1934 Congressional races. He founded the American Institute of Public Opinion in 1935 and the British Institute of Public Opinion two years later. Straw polls and even large-scale house-to-house surveys based on self-selection had been used in many studies. The superiority of opinion surveys based on a small but scientifically selected random sample of the adult population came to public attention when Gallup used these techniques to predict successfully a Roosevelt victory in the 1936 presidential election, in marked contrast to the forecast of a Landon win based on the far larger but non-random poll published in the *Literary Digest*.⁷

The first issue of the journal *Public Opinion Quarterly* was published in 1937, seeking to document 'what public opinion is, how it generates, and how it acts.'⁸ A bibliography published in the first issue listed 5,000 titles on mass public opinion. Market research and public opinion surveys rapidly expanded in America in the next few years, including a wide range of polls conducted by George Gallup, Elmo Roper and Archibald Crossley.⁹ During World War II, many social psychologists, sociologists and economists also gained first-hand experience of opinion surveys while working in Washington DC for government agencies and bureaus, such as the Department of Agriculture's Division of Program Surveys studying attitudes among farmers and the Federal Reserve Board which analyzed economic behavior and consumer sentiment. The most well-known use of these techniques was exemplified by the American Soldier study, led by Samuel A. Stouffer for the War Department, examining the social psychology of the armed forces through over one hundred questionnaires administered to military personnel (Stouffer et al 1950). Non-profit organizations also played an important role, notably the Rockefeller foundation which sponsored research on mass communications and the effects of radio.

Following these initiatives, academic survey institutions studying public opinion and social change became established in the United States through pioneering work at the National Opinion Research Center (1941) which settled at the University of Chicago, Paul Lazarsfeld's Bureau for Applied Social Research (1944) at Columbia University, and the Survey Research Center (1946) at the University of Michigan. In particular, Lazarsfeld's Erie County, Ohio study used probability samples in a campaign panel survey during the Roosevelt-Wilkie presidential race, generating the landmark *The People's Choice* (1944). During the following decades, public opinion surveys based on scientific sampling techniques became more widely used by social science researchers and governments, reflecting the growth of the market research industry and the expansion in social science grants available from major agencies and foundations.¹⁰ The United States was far from alone in this regard; many affluent postindustrial societies such as Britain saw the establishment of commercial market research companies, including Gallup, Harris, MORI, and Roper, and the spread of behavioral techniques in the social sciences in Scandinavia and many countries in Western Europe.¹¹ A strong international community of market research and survey researchers has long existed, exemplified by coverage of public opinion in different countries in the first issue of *Public Opinion Quarterly* and the establishment of the World Association of Public Opinion Research (WAPOR) in 1947.

Democratic participation and the civic culture

Despite important transatlantic connections in the community of social scientists and market research organizations, the vast majority of political and social attitudinal surveys were based on samples of the population in each nation. The use of dedicated cross-national surveys using a single common instrument or battery of questions first arose with the 1948 study *How Nations See Each Other* by Buchanan and Cantril, the USIA International Relations survey, the 1956 International Stratification survey by the sociologists Ganzeboom and Nieuwbeerta, the 1957 *Pattern of Human Concerns* survey also by Cantril, and the 1959 *Civic Culture Study* by Almond and Verba.

The focus of Almond and Verba's work reflected contemporary concern to understand the underlying causes of regime instability reflected the rise of Nazi Germany and Italian fascism. The ground-breaking study presented an ambitious theory of cognitive and affective orientations among the mass population, developing concepts which remain central in the contemporary lexography of political science. The intellectual

roots of the *Civic Culture*, and the sociological and psychological explanation for political behavior, originated during the inter-war era with the Chicago school, notably Charles Merriam's study on *The Making of Citizens* (1931), as well as Harold Lasswell's *Psychopathology and Politics* (1930). Harry Eckstein's work *A Theory of Stable Democracy* was also highly influential.¹² Building upon this foundation, Almond and Verba's theory emphasized that stable democracies required equilibrium with the mass public finely balanced between the dangers of either an excessively apathetic and disengaged citizenry, on the one hand, or an overly-agitated and heated engagement, on the other.¹³ The idea that societies differed in their political culture was hardly novel; indeed it had been the subject of philosophical speculation for centuries, in classic works from Montesquieu to de Tocqueville. But one of the more radical aspects of the civic culture study was the way that empirical support for the theory was derived from a path-breaking cross-national opinion survey, demonstrating that citizen's orientations could be examined empirically among the mass publics in Mexico, Italy, Britain, France and Germany.

This influential model established a quantum leap in the methods and concerns common in comparative political science. It was followed in 1963 by the 8-nation *Political Participation* study sponsored by the International Social Science Council, with Asher, Richardson and Weisberg et al. as the principle investigators. A few years later, Sidney Verba expanded upon his earlier work to develop the *Political Participation and Equality* survey in seven nations in 1966, with collaborators Norman Nie and Jae-On Kim. The eight-nation 1973 and 1981 *Political Action Surveys* by Klaus Allerbeck, Max Kaase, Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Samuel Barnes, Alan Marsh and Ronald Inglehart shared similar concerns, seeking to build upon this foundation and to expand the study of participation to understand 'unconventional' forms of protests and mass demonstrations which were widespread among the trilateral democracies during this decade.¹⁴

The expansion of the European Union and the Euro-barometer

Meanwhile in a parallel development, the use of survey methods in international affairs and by multilateral organizations saw important advances. The 1948 study *How Nation's See Each Other* sought to document attitudes and prejudices among the public and perceptions of foreign affairs. In Europe, in 1962 Jacques-Rene Rabier, in his role as Director General of Press and Information for the European Community, pioneered the first five-nation cross-national survey of mass attitudes towards European integration

and institutions, as the fore-runner of the Euro-Barometer. In 1970, Rabier carried out a seven-nation survey to understand public support for and against European integration, including measures of Materialist/Post-Materialist values, with Ronald Inglehart serving as a consultant in the design and analysis. The results generated additional cross-national surveys in 1971 and 1973, leading to the launch of the Euro-barometer surveys in 1974. These studies have now been carried out every spring and fall since then, reflecting the steadily expanding borders of the European Union, now covering 27 countries. The program was later enlarged by small scale but topical Flash Euro-barometers and the Central and Eastern Euro-barometers; later replaced by the Candidate Countries Euro-barometers. The project was designed to be useful primarily for European Union officials and only secondarily for the research community.

Questions can be identified, trends for the standard items in the Euro-barometer series 1973-2004 can be generated interactively, and descriptive tables, graphs, or data downloaded via the EB website.¹⁵ Data were also integrated into the Mannheim Euro-barometer Trend File 1970-1999 and ZUMA also maintain the online Main Trends Documentation.¹⁶ The data received from the principal investigator are checked, corrected, and formatted to archival standards by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), in cooperation with ZUMA's Zentralarchiv at Cologne and the Swedish Social Science Data Service (SSD). ZUMA maintains a codebook and questionnaire continuity guide, which is an invaluable short-cut since around seventy separate surveys are available. Euro-barometer raw data and documentation (questionnaires, codebooks etc.) are stored at the ICPSR and at the Zentralarchiv and made available for research purposes by other social science Data Archives. Survey results are also regularly published in official reports issued by the Euro-barometer unit of the European Commission.¹⁷ The Euro-barometer series has been commonly used in studies of the politics of the European Union, but, despite the richness of the accumulated datasets, the full potential of this series for comparative politics remains relatively under-utilized. The exemplification of its potential contribution includes Inglehart's *The Silent Revolution* as well as, more recently, the *Beliefs in Government* project headed by Max Kaase and Kenneth Newton.¹⁸ The latter generated a five-volume book series, published in 1995 by Oxford University Press, exploring trends in a wide range of social and political orientations, patterns of political activism, and international attitudes.

Going global: The World Values Survey/European Values Survey

The Euro-Barometer also contributed directly towards the European Values Survey.¹⁹ This project was launched in 1981 by a Belgian Jesuit sociologist, Father Jan Kerkhofs, and a Dutch sociologist, Ruud de Moor, initially to understand why church attendance was falling sharply across Western Europe. The investigators were aware of the Euro-Barometer surveys and they contact Jacques Rabier, who joined them in designing the surveys. Rabier persuaded them to do a broader study of values, on the basis that attitudes towards religion were linked to one's entire worldview. The European Values Survey based at the University of Tilburg was modeled on the Euro-barometer, with some of the same survey organizations and advisers.²⁰

In 1990 the survey was replicated as the World Values Study (WVS) and Ronald Inglehart was charged with widening the geographic coverage, which doubled from 22 countries in 1981 to 41 in 1990-1991. The third wave of the WVS was carried out in 55 nations in 1995-1996. The fourth WVS wave, with 59 nation-states, took place in 1999-2001. The fifth WVS wave was carried out in 2005-7.²¹ The World Values Survey represents a worldwide investigation of socio-cultural and political change. This project has carried out representative national surveys of the basic values and beliefs of the publics in more than 90 independent countries, containing over 88% of the world's population and covering all six inhabited continents. This project is carried out by an international network of social scientists, with local funding for each survey, although in some cases supplementary funds have been used from outside sources. In exchange for providing the data from interviews with a representative national sample of at least 1,000 people in their own society, each participating group gets access to the data from all of the other participating societies. The project is guided by the World Values Survey Association, representing all regions of the world. Coordination is managed by an executive steering committee and secretariat, chaired by Ronald Inglehart at the University of Michigan.

The World Values Study remains the only academic global public opinion survey with a standard instrument administered in countries in all world regions, including growing geographic coverage of societies in the Middle East, Asia and Africa. Time-series analysis is hindered by the fact that country coverage and certain items vary across successive waves, and the 1981-3 first wave focused on post-industrial societies.

Nevertheless the WVS provides a benchmark for many developing societies, such as South Africa, where for many years it was the only widely available cross-national survey monitoring a wide range of social and political values. This study has given rise to numerous publications, in 16 languages.²² The *Human Beliefs and Values* sourcebook makes the data easily available.²³ The WVS website facilitates the online generation of simple descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and cross-tabulations, as well as making available the questionnaires, technical details and the downloadable dataset.²⁴

The International Social Survey Program

In 1972, in the University of Chicago, NORC started the General Social Survey, an annual (subsequently biennial) study of social and political attitudes. Other countries followed suit, including the Allgemeinen Bevölkerungsumfragen der Sozialwissenschaften (ALLBUS) of the Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden, und Analysen (ZUMA) in Mannheim, Germany in 1980 and the British Social Attitudes series conducted by Social and Community Planning Research (SCPR), London in 1983. The International Social Survey Program (ISSP) was established in 1985 to expand cross-national collaboration by bringing together pre-existing, social science projects. The ISSP coordinates research goals among the consortium, thereby adding a cross-national perspective to the individual, national studies. The ISSP started with just six countries but it has gradually grown to cover attitudes in 43 nations, including many industrial and post-industrial societies.²⁵ Each survey covers a representative sample of the national population. The focus is the inclusion of a thematic annual module with a battery of items carried in existing social national surveys, with the annual theme covering rotating issues in the social sciences, such as national identity, the role of government, religion, the environment, work orientations, and gender roles. Considerable attention is paid towards standardizing the social and demographic background information in the surveys. The ISSP has a more limited geographic scope than the World Values Survey, and a narrower thematic focus than the WVS or the Euro-Barometers. Nevertheless, the survey provides considerable depth on each thematic topic, with some comparisons over time where modules are repeated, and a rigorous focus on establishing the quality of cross-national survey methods. The ISSP has generated almost 3,000 publications, including various edited collections.²⁶

The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems

One of the most notable off-springs of the behavioral revolution were the programs of academic election surveys based on national probability samples of the electorate, which followed the establishment in 1948 of the American National Election Study series at the University of Michigan. Similar programs of national election studies were established in Sweden (1956), Germany (1961), Norway (1965), Britain (1963), and the Netherlands (1971). Often there were direct exports from the Michigan team, a process exemplified by the establishment of the British Election Study by Donald Stokes and David Butler, a series carried out by teams of scholars in each subsequent British general election. Stokes also collaborated with Don Aitkin in the first Australian national election study in 1967. Election studies shared many common intellectual roots, commonly using a similar (although not identical) survey research design and questions to monitor long-term patterns of social, partisan and ideological alignments, political and social values, attitudes towards specific election issues and government performance, and voting choice and participation. Nevertheless, at least until recently, important inconsistencies of methodology and questionnaire design even in the same series of elections within countries, as well as between nations, hampered comparative research efforts over time, as well as cross-nationally.

The launch of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems in the mid-1990s strengthened collaborative links among national election studies in over 50 nation-states, by developing a common battery of questions to be carried in each country. The International Committee for Research into Elections and Representative Democracy (ICORE), founded at the 1989 ECPR Joint Workshops, played an important role in getting the project off the ground. The initial idea was to try to understand voting choices under varying conditions and institutional rules, suggesting the need to maximize the number of countries and types of national election under comparison.²⁷ The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) brings together an international team of collaborators who have incorporated a special battery of survey questions into the national election studies, based on a representative sample of the electorate in each country. Data from each of the separate election studies is coordinated, integrated and cleaned by the Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, at the University of Michigan. The dataset is designed to facilitate the comparison of macro and micro-level electoral data. Module 1 of the CSES (1996-2001) allows comparison of a

representative cross-section of the electorate in 37 legislative and presidential national elections in 32 countries. The geographic coverage is remarkably diverse, ranging from Belarus and Ukraine to Canada, Australia and Belgium. The focus on voters' choices, the cross-national integration, and above all the timing of the data collection (within a year following each of the elections), provide a unique opportunity to compare voting behavior in a way that is not possible through other common sources of comparative data such as the World Values Survey. Fieldwork, data-collection, and integration of the third module is underway. Data for each wave is released for analysis as soon as it has been collected and deposited. The CSES facilitates cross-national electoral analysis although data analysis is complicated by the diverse range of global regions, regimes, and levels of democracy included in the study. This suggests adoption of a 'most different' comparative strategy, rather than the familiar regional/area approach. The integration of the data collected from each national election survey, for example the demographic and social coding, is also far more complicated than in a single-funded or single-instrument survey, such as the Euro-barometer. The main strength of the CSES is the capacity for multi-level analysis combining analysis of voting behavior and political participation within contrasting institutional contexts.

The European Voter, the European Election Study, the Comparative National Elections Project

Resources for the comparative study of voting behavior are supplemented by the integration of six separate national election studies series, including those conducted over successive decades in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Germany, and Britain, into the European Voter dataset.²⁸ One important limitation concerns how far differences in wording and classification schemas used in separate questionnaires in the series of national election studies can be regarded as providing conceptual equivalence. This is important for reliable comparisons of basic background variables, such as social stratification and religiosity, as well as for analysis of ideological and issue positions. Where successive teams of researchers lead the research design, amendments to coding schemes, core topics, or question wording are often introduced over time into national election surveys. In such situations, it is difficult to establish if these discontinuities produced subtle but significant differences in responses, or whether public opinion has indeed altered. In addition, the comparative framework is limited to parts of Northern Europe; the dataset excludes available series such as the American

National Election Study, as well as many European countries, such as France, Spain, and Ireland, which have not established an equivalent continuous series. The time-series is also irregular, with series starting in 1956 in Sweden but only in 1971 in the Netherlands and Denmark. Nevertheless, with these provisos, the integrated European Voter dataset has facilitated systematic cross-national time-series analysis for classic issues in voting behavior, such as whether social cleavages and partisan identification have gradually weakened their imprint on the electorate in successive elections across West European polities.

Since 1979, the quinquennial series of European Election Study (EES) has also explored voting choice, participation, and ideological issues in the direct elections to the European Parliament, as well as facilitating comparison of mass-elite attitudes, the evolution of the European community, and perceptions about the EU's performance.²⁹ The scope of the survey has expanded with EU membership. The EES has generated a series of books and articles, contributing to important methodological innovations as well as expanding our understanding of the conditions of voting choice and turnout in 'second-order' contests.³⁰

The Comparative National Elections Project (CNEP) is another related study, coordinated by Richard Gunther, currently including two-dozen national election surveys conducted in 19 countries since 1990. It has evolved in three distinct phases: CNEP I, CNEP II, and CNEP III, which have steadily widened the global coverage. All share a concern with the processes of intermediation through which citizens receive information about policies, parties, candidates during the course of election campaigns, thus reviving the long neglected research perspective of the Columbia School established by Paul Lazarsfeld and his colleagues in the 1940s and 1950s. The study is particularly rich on questions about information flows via primary and secondary networks, as well as the role of the mass media.³¹

The Global-barometers

Rather than a single entity, the global-barometer series consists of five separate regional projects, loosely coordinated, and originally inspired by the Eurobarometer model. These focus upon attitudes towards democracy, governance, economics, political participation, and national identity, with a special focus on newer democracies in developing nations. The *New Europe* series, coordinated by Richard Rose, has focused upon monitoring the process of cultural change in political and economic attitudes

following the breakdown of communism. The annual survey has been conducted in selected Central and Eastern Europe and it has resulted in numerous papers and books. Under the leadership of Marta Lagos (MORI, Santiago), the *Latinobarometer* has conducted pioneering work monitoring annual trends in attitudes towards democracy. The series started with eight nations in 1995, initially funded by the EU, and it has subsequently expanded to cover representative samples of the publics in eighteen countries in the region. Founded as a private, non-profit institution, the survey has been less widely utilized by Latin Americanists than might be expected, given the topic and the quality of the data. Online interactive access to the questionnaire database is available.³²

The *Afro-barometer* was pioneered by Michael Bratton, Robert Mattes, and E. Gyimah-Boadi who developed networks of surveyors in many countries, such as Mali, Tanzania and Zambia which have never had a series of social scientific surveys of political and social attitudes.³³ The *Afro-barometer* has conducted three rounds of national probability sample surveys covering 18 African countries in the most recent study. It also serves as a model of transparency by releasing full information about the work in progress, including questionnaires, publications, funding, and associates, as well as depositing all data through archives and its own dedicated website.³⁴

The *East Asia Barometer* joined the network in 2002, sharing similar concerns to monitor public attitudes towards democratization and economic development, with eight nations coordinated in the survey by Yun-han Chu in Taiwan.³⁵ The study expanded in 2006 to become *the Asian Barometer* covering 17 nations (Japan, Mongolia, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Singapore, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal).³⁶ Lastly, under the leadership of Mark Tessler at the University of Michigan, in 2006 the *Arab Barometer* conducted surveys of economic and political attitudes in five Arab societies (the Palestinian Territories, Jordan, Morocco, Algeria and Kuwait).³⁷

Contemporary survey research is therefore now covering large parts of the developing world, such as Africa and the Middle East, which were previously neglected, thereby building up the infrastructure of experienced fieldwork teams, market and social science research organizations, and survey analysts that will pay dividends in future. The surveys facilitate cross-national networks among networks of collaborators, while also retaining the flexibility of regional autonomy to focus on specific themes of most

interest to each area. The Global-barometer project is seeking to strengthen the collaborative linkages to use consistent question wording and methodologies.³⁸ An important challenge is to make sure that this data is not simply exported to the west but that it is available and utilized by the social science communities within each region, by equipping the next generation of graduate students with the necessary intellectual frameworks, skills, and infrastructure to exploit the data.

The European Social Survey

The European Social Survey (the ESS), which started in 2002, is an academically-driven social survey designed to chart and explain the interaction between Europe's changing institutions and the attitudes, beliefs and behavior patterns of its diverse populations.³⁹ The survey covers two-dozen nations (in Western and Central Europe) and it uses rigorous methodologies. The survey contains a core battery of questions that is replicated every two years in addition to rotating thematic modules, allocated to teams of scholars on a competitive basis. Core funding comes from the European Commission's 5th Framework Programme, with supplementary funds from the European Science Foundation which also sponsored the development of the study over a number of years, while surveys in each country are funded by each national social science council. The project is directed by a Central Coordinating Team led by Roger Jowell at the Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University. The organization of the survey emphasizes transparency and employing high standards in sampling and fieldwork practices, and it carefully standardizing the collection of social and demographic background data. The central coordination and funding of the ESS, the care in crafting and testing the questionnaire, and the development of additional contextual data, provides a model for cross-national survey research.

The Pew Global Attitudes Survey

US-based survey organizations have also contributed towards the expansion of global resources. In response to the aftermath of 9/11, Afghanistan and Iraq, attention in the United States has turned increasingly towards understanding how the world (particularly Muslim societies) views America. 'Soft diplomacy' through the mass media has also spurred greater interest among the international relations and foreign policy community into issues of global cultural similarity and difference.

In response, in 2002 Andrew Kohut at the Pew Center for the People & the Press launched the *Pew Global Attitudes Survey*, an annual attempt to monitor public opinion in many countries, using market research. The project is a series of worldwide public opinion surveys, originally of more than 38,000 people in 44 countries in 2002, and expanded in 2003 with additional surveys to a total of nearly 75,000 people among the 50 populations surveyed (49 countries plus the Palestinian Authority). The initiative built on an earlier study, the *Pulse of Europe* (1991). The project encompasses a broad array of subjects ranging from people's assessments of their own lives to their views about the current state of the world and important issues of the day. The Pew Global Attitudes Project is chaired by former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright. The project is funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, with a supplemental grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The published reports have attracted considerable media attention as well as interest in the State Department and in the broader policy community.

Transatlantic Trends

Similar factors prompted the launch of the *Transatlantic Trends* project in 2002, an annual public opinion survey examining American and European attitudes toward the transatlantic relationship.⁴⁰ Indeed this concern reflects some of the earliest surveys about how national publics regard each other, and the role of public opinion in foreign policy. Sponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Compagnia di San Paolo, with additional support from other foundations, the survey focuses upon attitudes in the United States and up to a dozen European countries. The study looks at a range of issues including the state of transatlantic relations; perceptions of international threats, such as terrorism, energy dependence, immigration, and global warming; attitudes toward the EU as a global actor in development, trade, peacekeeping, reconstruction, and combat; transatlantic cooperation on international challenges such as Afghanistan, Iran and Russia, and democracy promotion as a foreign policy goal. The surveys are designed primarily for journalists and policymakers, rather than for academic research.

Gallup International *Voice of the People*

The last survey under comparison, coordinated by Gallup International, is similar in orientation to the Pew survey but with a more commercial orientation. In 2002, Gallup International conducted a worldwide survey of 60 nations monitoring attitudes towards

issues such as the environment, terrorism, global issues, governance and democracy. In 2003 this survey was conducted again covering Western Europe, the USA and Canada but also Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America. Highlights of the results are published on their website but the published report (containing detailed cross-tabulations) and the electronic data are available only for commercial purchase. Gallup International offers the opportunity for clients to add items to the questionnaire, also at cost. Information about the quality of the detailed methodology, sampling, and field-work practices in countries where surveys are uncommon, such as in the Middle East and Africa, are available on Gallup's website. Both Pew and Gallup are therefore breaking new ground by expanding their geographic coverage in ambitious attempts to monitor public opinion around the world. This contributes to the available resources available for analysis although it remains too early to evaluate the quality and utility of these surveys.

The globalization of public opinion surveys

What facilitated these developments? Many political and intellectual factors have contributed towards the internationalization of attitudinal and behavioral survey. As the world has become more interconnected through globalization, the social sciences have been tugged in its wake. The gradual expansion of the borders of the European Union played a direct role, as the European Commission has monitored public opinion on a regular basis since the early-1970s through the Euro-barometer and related surveys of mass and elite opinion. In turn, the existence of the Euro-barometer, including the fieldwork organizations and collaborators, served as a model shaping many other initiatives, such as the 1981 European Values Study and the 1979 European Elections Study. Regional and international associations of political scientists have strengthened professional networks and institutional linkages, notably the International Political Science Association and especially the European Consortium of Political Research, with regular workshops and conferences which strengthened intellectual and social networks among teams of collaborators. The growth of electoral democracies has also probably facilitated the study of public opinion, since this development facilitates freedom of expression for conducting independent social surveys and publishing the results of the analysis, also triggering the demand for commercial market research companies and non-profit social science institutes, free from political interference and overt state censorship. Many of the surveys, from the Civic Culture to the CSES and

globalbarometers, have been driven by the urge to understand the process of democracy and democratization. International development agencies, such as the UNDP, the World Bank, and Transparency International, have increasingly recognized that programs seeking to expand democracy and good governance need to monitor public opinion, as well as using the standard 'objective' developmental indicators.

Particular scholars in the field have had a decisive and enduring impact. Many colleagues have contributed to this process, including early pioneers such as Sidney Verba at Harvard University, Jacques-Rene Rabier in the European Union, Ronald Inglehart at the University of Michigan, Jaques Thomassen at the University of Twente, Richard Gunther at Ohio State University, Marta Lagos at MORI-Chile, and Roger Jowell at City University, all of whom played seminal roles, through initiating, managing, and sustaining major cross-national surveys which have had multiplier effects through funding public opinion institutes and training the next generation of field-work staff and survey analysts. The availability of training institutes has also contributed, such as the Michigan and Essex summer schools in social statistics, through strengthening skills in quantitative analysis among the younger generation of social scientists in many countries. Modern international communications, notably the ease of communicating among colleagues and distributing electronic datasets online through the standard social science archives and dedicated websites, have greatly facilitated awareness and use of these resources. Whether leading or following, intellectual fashions have also contributed towards this process, eroding interest in traditional approaches to area studies focused on specific countries, and encouraging the demand among the younger generation of researchers in Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe for more systematic cross-national comparison of political culture and behavior, conducted within varying institutional contexts.

The most recent spur has been the events of 9/11 and their aftermath in the Afghanistan and Iraq war, renewing American interest about public opinion in the rest of the world. In particular, this has stimulated new research in areas such as the Middle East where previously cross-national social science surveys have been non-existent or scarce. These developments have gradually transformed the geographic scope of coverage, with an exponential surge in the available survey resources occurring during the last decade, allowing comparativists to move 'from nations to categories', one of the key but elusive goals of the sub-discipline.

Methodological issues arising from cross-national surveys

Nevertheless the expansion worldwide has occurred has also raised critical challenges about ensuring the quality and comparability of the cross-national surveys.⁴¹ Some of these concerns are far from novel; indeed concern dates back to the original Almond and Verba study.⁴² These concerns have arisen with greater urgency, however, with the growing spread of methods, techniques and theoretical frameworks in diverse cultures and contexts, including across varied developing societies.⁴³

The first issue which is often raised is about conceptual equivalence.⁴⁴ McIntyre voiced the concern whether core concepts such as national pride, used in the Civic Culture study, carried similar meanings in the context of societies such as Italy, Germany and Britain.⁴⁵ This issue is a constant challenge for cross-national questionnaires which extends far beyond matters of linguistic translation. Languages are not just ways to communicate the same ideas and values; instead they may carry alternative ways of thinking and understanding. This problem is often encountered when ideas such as the left-right continuum or the liberal-conservative scale are interpreted quite differently in different societies; for example 'liberal' in the United States is usually understood as social liberalism located on the 'left' of the political spectrum, while 'liberal' in Europe is commonly regarded as 'economic' or 'free market' liberalism located on the center-right. The complexity of notions which are carried in social surveys, such as the concepts of 'democracy', 'corruption', 'religiosity' or 'nationalism', may well generate responses to the same words and phrases which are far from functionally-equivalent.

At the same time, while a particular challenge in interpreting the results of cross-national surveys, this problem is far from unique to these studies. Multilingual and plural societies face similar language issues, for example in India, as do cities and regions of the United States, such as California and New York, with a high proportion of immigrants and non-native speakers. Indeed the broader issue of whether the same wording generates the equivalent meaning also applies to interpreting any group differences in response within any society, for example whether there are shared understandings among social classes, regions, or sexes. The most appropriate, although not the perfect, standard way to try to ensure language equivalence uses processes of translation and then 'back' translation, which seeks to ensure linguistic consistency. The questionnaire designers should also provide supplementary notes for translators explaining the

intended meaning of questions, to help identify functionally-equivalent phrases.⁴⁶ Rigorous tests should ideally also be employed, including piloting new questions prior to wholesale roll out and also checking by comparing the error structure for several items, and thus the reliability and validity of these questions in different languages.⁴⁷ In addition exploratory factor analysis can be used as a check on whether attitudinal and ideological scales have similar meaning in different societies.

Another major issue concerns the strict standards which should be used to evaluate the quality of any survey data and any systematic sources of error or bias. Even modest methodological differences in coding schemes, questionnaire design and item order, sampling processes, fieldwork and interview techniques, or cooperation and response rates can contribute towards misleading interpretations of the significance of any cross-national differences in attitudes and values.⁴⁸ There are three main categories of cross-national datasets, and these differ substantially in how far they facilitate control of standards. *Centralized surveys* are administered and coordinated by a team of investigators, who raise and pool common core resources, with a single dedicated questionnaire instrument translated into different languages (exemplified by the Eurobarometers directed by the European Commission). *Collaborative surveys* are also centrally administered by a core team with a single common survey instrument, but fieldwork for each national survey is mainly funded from local sources (e.g. the World Values Survey). Lastly, *integrative projects* bring together locally administered and locally-funded surveys (e.g. The European Voter Study).

Common standards are easiest to maintain in the first category, and most difficult in the last. Making sure that methods and techniques are similar is a considerable challenge even with the same survey instrument, such as the European Social Survey, used by different fieldwork organizations. It is even more problematic in projects such as the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems and the European Voter, which seek to integrate standards used in independent parallel national surveys. The battery of items in the CSES, for example, can be carried in the main face-to-face questionnaire or it may be administered through a self-completion supplementary questionnaire. Standardization is as important for the background demographic and social variables, especially classifications based on social stratification, religious faith and ethnic identity, as it is for attitudinal and behavioral items, such as voting and party choice or ideological self-placement. Even modest variations in coding conventions, question order, fieldwork

timing, or sampling procedures can seriously limit the comparability of the responses. Unfortunately demographic and social classifications, random probability or quota sampling methods, and forms of interviewing or non-response rates may be deeply institutionalized in the procedures used by each survey organization. Piggybacking a few questions into omnibus commercial or attitudinal surveys in each country is highly problematic, due to differences of sequencing and item order. Where there are common resources sponsoring the survey instrument and fieldwork, and a tight organizational and decision-making structure among teams of collaborators, as with the European Social Survey, this is most likely to ensure the most rigorous and consistent technical standards. Yet for many reasons, including lack of resources, most cross-national surveys do not have this framework. The best approach in these circumstances is to make sure that all procedures and technical matters are clearly documented and that this is available to researchers, who can then decide how best to handle any inconsistencies. In addition, the expansion in the availability of surveys in multiple countries facilitates replication of results, so that generalizations made on the basis of a few cases, or a single region, can be tested in other contexts and different conditions.

Conclusions

Opportunities for cross-national survey research have been transformed out of all recognition over the last decades. Until the early-1970s, most cross-national surveys of public opinion were largely focused upon affluent post-industrial societies, particularly Western Europe as a natural comparative laboratory, where market research organizations had become widely established, where there were dense networks of scholars and data archives, and where foundations and social science councils had the resources to support academic research. The 1985 launch and gradual expansion of the International Social Survey Program, accompanied by the transformation of the European Values Survey into the World Values Survey in 1990, represented the start of the globalization of public opinion research, a trend which continues today. Developing societies had most commonly used administrative and social surveys, as well as collecting census data, for information about social conditions. An example was the first national household survey, which was pioneered in India in 1950.⁴⁹ Mexico had also been included in some of the early of the earliest surveys on political participation. But until the early-1990s, few cross-national surveys which systematically monitored social and political attitudes and behavior based on random samples of the general population

were available covering a wide range of developing nations. The availability of cross-national datasets was transformed by the gradual expansion of successive waves of the World Values Survey since 1991 to over 90 nation-states, the network of national electoral studies brought together under the umbrella of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, the global barometer series covering a wide range of countries in Latin America, post-Communist states in the New Europe barometer, Africa, and Asia, as well as the 2002 European Social Survey, Transatlantic Trends, and the Pew and Gallup global surveys launched in recent years.

The multiplicity of surveys is to be welcomed by facilitating replication both across years and among nations. Some of the more commercial initiatives may fail, for example if America withdraws into itself and turns away from the world again, in its periodic cyclical fashion. Yet it seems likely that the underlying momentum will continue in subsequent decades, as younger generations of social scientists trained in survey methods and public opinion analysis are developing in each world region. Questions can be raised about the quality of sampling and fieldwork, especially for surveys conducted in developing nations which have not built up experienced market research companies and established social science institutes. There are also issues about the reliability of conducting public opinion surveys in countries such as Belarus and China with repressive regimes which regularly suppress freedom of expression and opinion. Nevertheless the expansion of datasets has the important benefit of allowing replication across different surveys, thereby allowing independent cross-checks. Questions can be raised about the quality of questionnaire translations and the employment of equivalent standards across different nations - debates which have been with us ever since *The Civic Culture*. Yet in counterbalance there are certain distinct practical advantages associated with conducting surveys in developing nations, namely much lower refusal and non-response rates (currently approaching record levels for opinion polls conducted in the US), as well as relatively low budgets for fieldwork. Over time, as greater experience is gained, and as an institutional survey infrastructure is developed in the social sciences, these initiatives will gradually mature.

Therefore despite important limitations, cross-national survey research is invaluable for establishing generalities about human behavior, allowing us to test regularities arising from single-nation studies. The multiplicity of datasets which are now available for analysis in different societies strengthens replication, to ensure robust

findings and generalizations, for example comparing trends in religiosity or class voting in the same countries using the Euro-Barometer, the World Values Survey and the European Voter study. Most importantly, the availability of many large-scale multi-national surveys covering many societies allows us to move from the analysis of countries to the study of public opinion under a wide variety of institutional and societal contexts, such as in developing and post-industrial economies, in predominately Muslim or Orthodox societies, in newer democracies in Mediterranean and Eastern Europe, or under democratic and autocratic regimes. Aggregating public opinion at societal level across multiple countries allows systematic tests of some of the core concerns in the discipline, such as whether underlying individual-level attitudes such as trust or political efficacy are conducive to the stability of democratic stability, as the civic culture study suggested. With a sufficiently large number of countries, the linkages between culture, social structure, and regime institutions can be examined. Through this process, the sub-field is gradually moving from the comparison of individuals and groups within countries as the core unit of analysis towards the comparison of people living under different types of societies and regimes, a development which is capable of providing powerful new insights for the study of comparative politics.

Biographical note: Pippa Norris is the McGuire Lecturer in Comparative Politics at Harvard University. Her latest major publications are *Driving Democracy* (for Cambridge University Press) and *Making Democracy Deliver* (an edited report for UNDP). Further details are available at pippanorris.com.

Table 1: Key features of the cross-national series of surveys

Series	Series started (i)	Frequency	Total nations (latest survey) (ii)	Data downloadable (iii)	Coordinating Organization	Online resources Http://
Euro-barometer and related studies	1970	Bi-annual	27	Public archives	Directorate General Press & Comms, European Commission	Organizing & reports: http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/ Data and continuity guides from ZUMA, Cologne Archive: www.gesis.org/en/data_service/eurobarometer
European Values/ World Values Study- Study	1981-1983	Approx. 5 years	92	Public archives	Ronald INGLEHART, Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan	Organizing and data; www.worldvaluessurvey.org/
International Social Survey Program (ISSP)	1985	Annual	38	Public archives	Secretariat: Bjørn HENRICHSEN, Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD), Bergen	Organizing: www.issp.org/ Data and continuity guide from the ZUMA Cologne Archive: www.gesis.org/en/data_service/issp/
Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)	1996-2001	Module every 5 years	31	Public archives	Secretariat: David HOWELL, ISR, University of Michigan. Chair: Ian McAllister, ANU	Organizing and data: http://www.cses.org
Comparative National Election Study	1990	Irregular	19	Public archives	Richard GUNTHER, Ohio State University	Organizing and data: http://www.cnep.ics.ul.pt/
Global-barometers, including:						http://www.globalbarometer.net/
New Europe Barometers	1991	Irregular	16		Richard ROSE, CSPP, Aberdeen University	www.cspp.strath.ac.uk
Afrobarometer	1999	Annual	18	Public archives	Michael BRATTON	www.afrobarometer.org

					(Michigan State), Robert MATTES (IDASA, SA) and Dr E. GYIMAH- BOADI (CDD Ghana)	
Latino-barometer	1995	Annual	18	Tables only	Marta LAGOS, MORI, Santiago	www.latinobarometro.org
Asian barometer	2001	Annual	17		Yun-han Chu, Taiwan	www.eastasiabarometer.org http://www.asianbarometer.org/
Arab Barometer	2005	Annual	5		Mark Tessler, University of Michigan	http://arabbarometer.org/
The European Social Survey (ESS)	2002	Biennial	21	Public archives	Roger JOWELL, Center for Comparative Social Surveys, City University	Organizing: http://naticent02.uuhost.uk.uu.net Data from the Norwegian archive: http://ess.nsd.uib.no .
Transatlantic Trends	2002	Annual	13	Public archives	German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Compagnia di San Paolo	http://www.transatlantictrends.org
The Pew Global Attitudes Survey	2002	Irregular	54	Via website	Andrew KOHUT, Director, The Pew Research Center for the People & the Press	http://pewglobal.org/
Gallup International <i>Voice of the People</i>	2002	Annual	60	Only tables released	Meril JAMES, Secretary General Gallup International	www.voice-of-the-people.net/

Notes: (i) In some cases there were often pilot studies and forerunners, such as the European Community Study, but this date is the recognizable start of the series in its present form. (ii) The number of countries included in each survey often varies by year. (iii) If not deposited in public archives or directly downloadable, access to some data may be available from the surveys organizers on request, but there might also be charges for access.

Note: The paper greatly benefitted from detailed and invaluable comments and observations made to an earlier draft by Ronald Inglehart and Ian McAllister, including information about the historical evolution of the Euro-barometer and the European Values/World Values Surveys, as well as background to the CSES.

¹ Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; Philip E. Converse. 1964. 'Review of Almond and Verba's *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in five Nations*.' *Political Science Quarterly* 79 (4): 591-593.

² A comprehensive chronological list of comparative survey research resources and datasets is available at http://www.gesis.org/en/data_service/eurobarometer/handbook/index.htm; see also Wolfgang Donsbach and Michael Traugott. 2008. *The SAGE Handbook of Public Opinion Research*. London: Sage.

³ Martin Bulmer, K. Bales and K.K. Sklar. (eds). 1992. *The social survey in historical perspective, 1880-1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

⁴ Martin Bulmer. 1998. 'The problem of exporting social survey research.' *The American Behavioral Scientist* 42(2): 153-167.

⁵ Martin Bulmer. 1986. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

⁶ Herbert Tingsten. 1963 [1937]. *Political behavior; studies in election statistics*. Totowa, N. J., Bedminster Press.

⁷ Archibald M. Crossley. 1937. 'Straw Polls in 1936.' *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 1 (1): 24-35

⁸ DeWitt Clinton Poole. 1937. Editor. 'Forward.' *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 1 (1): 3-5.

⁹ John Geer. Ed. 2004. *Public Opinion and Polling around the World: A Historical Encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio.

¹⁰ Jean M. Converse. 1987. *Survey research in the United States: Roots and emergence 1890-1960*. Berkeley: University of California Press

¹¹ Robert A. Dahl. 1961. 'The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest.' *The American Political Science Review* 55(4):763-772.

¹² Harry Eckstein. 1961. *A Theory of Stable Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

¹³ For the intellectual history of the origins of the civic culture study, see Gabriel Almond. 1996. 'The civic culture: Prehistory, retrospect, and prospect.' Center for the Study of Democracy, University of California, Irvine. <http://repositories.cdlib.org/csd/96-01>; Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. Johns Hopkins Press.

¹⁴ Samuel Barnes and Max Kaase et al. 1979. *Political action: Mass participation in five western democracies*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

¹⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/cf/index_en.cfm

¹⁶ Details can be found at: <http://www.za.uni-koeln.de/>

¹⁷ Details can be found at: <http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg10/incom/epo/eb.html>

¹⁸ See Ronald Inglehart. 1977. *The Silent Revolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; Max Kaase and Kenneth Newton. 1995. *Beliefs in Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁹ I greatly appreciate the comments that Ronald Inglehart conveyed in personal communications about the historical evolution of the Euro-barometer and the European Values/World Values Surveys.

²⁰ <http://www.europeanvalues.nl/index2.htm>

²¹ Full methodological details about the World Values Surveys, including the questionnaires, sampling procedures, fieldwork procedures, principle investigators, and organization can be found at: www.worldvaluessurvey.org

²² Among the many publications emerging from this project, books include Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris. 2003. *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2004. *Sacred and secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; and Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

²³ Ronald Inglehart, Miguel Basàñez, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Loek Halman and Ruud Luijkx. eds. 2004. *Human Beliefs and Values: A cross-cultural sourcebook*. Mexico: Siglo XXI Editores.

²⁴ www.worldvaluessurvey.org

²⁵ ISSP has grown to 43 nations, the founding four--Germany, the United States, Great Britain, and Australia-- plus Austria, Ireland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Italy, Israel, Norway, the Philippines, New Zealand, Russia, Japan, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Poland, Sweden, Spain, Cyprus, France, Portugal, Slovakia, Latvia, Chile, Denmark, Brazil, South Africa, Switzerland, Venezuela, Belgium, Finland, Mexico, Taiwan, South Korea, Uruguay, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Turkey and China. In addition, East Germany was added to the German sample upon reunification.

²⁶ Roger Jowell, Sharon Witherspoon, and Lindsay Brook, Eds., 1989. *British Social Attitudes: Special International Report*. Aldershot: Gower; Roger Jowell, Lindsay Brook, and Lizanne Dowds, Eds. 1993. *International Social Attitudes: The 10th British Social Attitudes Report*. Dartmouth; Roger Jowell, John Curtice, Alston Park, Lindsay Brook, Katrina Thomson, and Caroline Bryson, eds. 1998. *British - and European - Social Attitudes: The 15th BSA Report*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

²⁷ For the use of the dataset for this purpose, see Pippa Norris. 2004. *Electoral Engineering*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

²⁸ Jaques Thomassen. Ed. 2005. *The European Voter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Data and methodological details are available from ZUMA, <https://info1.za.gesis.org/cei/evoter-db.asp>

²⁹ For details about the methodology, research design and questionnaire, see <http://www.europeanelectionstudies.net/>

³⁰ Book publication include, amongst others, Cees van der Eijk and A. Arbor, Eds. 1996. *Choosing Europe? The Electorate and National Politics in the Face of Union*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press; Richard Katz and Bernhard Wessels. 1999. *European Parliament and European Integration*. Oxford, Oxford University Press; Hermann Schmitt and Jaques Thomassen, Eds. 2000. *Political Representation and Legitimacy in the European Union*. Oxford, Oxford University press; Wouter van der Brug and Cees van der Eijk, Eds. (forthcoming): *European Elections and Domestic Politics. Lessons from the Past and Scenarios for the Future*. Southbend, University of Notre Dame Press.

³¹ See Richard Gunther, Hans-Jürgen Puhle & José Ramón Montero. Eds. 2007. *Democracy, Intermediation, and Voting on Four Continents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://www.cnep.ics.ul.pt>

³² <http://www.latinobarometro.org/>

³³ Publications emerging from the Afrobarometer series include Michael Bratton, Robert Mattes and E. Gyimah-Boadi. 2004. *Learning about Reform in Africa: Public Opinion, Democracy, and Markets* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

³⁴ For information about the methodology and data, see <http://www.afrobarometer.org>

³⁵ See <http://www.eastasiabarometer.org>

³⁶ <http://www.asianbarometer.org/> Takashi Inoguchi, Akihiko Tanaka, Shigeto Sonoda, & Timur Dadabaev Eds. 2006. *Human beliefs and values in striding Asia. East Asia in focus: Country profiles, thematic analysis, and sourcebook based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2004*. Japan: Akashi Shoten.

³⁷ <http://arabbarometer.org/>

³⁸ <http://www.globalbarometer.net/>

³⁹ For details, <http://naticent02.uuhost.uk.uu.net> . See also Roger Jowell, Caroline Roberts, Rory Fitzgerald and Gillian Eva. Eds. 2007. *Measuring Attitudes Cross-nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey*. London: Sage Publications.

⁴⁰ <http://www.transatlantictrends.org>

-
- ⁴¹ Manfred Kuechler. 1987. 'The utility of surveys for cross-national research.' *Social Science Research*, 16, 229-244; Roger Jowell. 1998. 'How comparative is comparative research?' *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 168-177; Manfred Kuechler 1998. 'The survey method: An indispensable tool for social science research everywhere?' *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(2): 178-200.
- ⁴² Sidney Verba. 1971. 'Cross-national survey research: the problem of credibility.' In *Comparative methods in sociology: Essays on trends and applications*. Ed. I. Vallier. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- ⁴³ For a thorough overview and discussion, see Alison Park and Roger Jowell. 1997. *Consistencies and differences in a cross-national survey*. London: SCPR.
- ⁴⁴ Jan van Deth. Ed. 1998. *Comparative Politics: The Problem of Equivalence*. London: Routledge.
- ⁴⁵ Alistair McIntyre. 1973. 'Is a science of comparative politics possible?' In *The Philosophy of Social Explanation* Ed. Alan Ryan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ⁴⁶ Janet A. Harkness. 2007. 'Improving the comparability of translations.' In *Measuring Attitudes Cross-nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey*. Eds. Roger Jowell, Caroline Roberts, Rory Fitzgerald and Gillian Eva. London: Sage Publications.
- ⁴⁷ See the recommendations by William E. Saris and Irmtraud Gallhofer. 2007. 'Can questions travel successfully?' In *Measuring Attitudes Cross-nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey*. Eds. Roger Jowell, Caroline Roberts, Rory Fitzgerald and Gillian Eva. London: Sage Publications.
- ⁴⁸ Manfred Kuechler 1998. 'The survey method: An indispensable tool for social science research everywhere?' *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(2): 178-200; Anthony Heath, Stephen Fisher and Shawna Smith. 2005. 'The globalization of public opinion research.' *Annual Review of Political Studies* 8: 297-333.
- ⁴⁹ Martin Bulmer. 1993. *Social Research in Developing Countries: Surveys and Censuses in the Third World*. London: Routledge.