

- Redfield, R.
1947 "The folk society." *American Journal of Sociology* 52 (January):293-308.
- Rojek, D. G., F. Clemente, and Gene F. Summers
1975 "Community satisfaction: a study of contentment with local services." *Rural Sociology* 40 (Summer):177-192.
- Schnore, L. F.
1966 "The rural-urban variable: an urbanite's perspective." *Rural Sociology* 31 (June):131-143.
- Seeman, M.
1971 "The urban alienations: some dubious theses from Marx to Marcuse." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 19:135-143.
- Slesinger, D. P.
1974 "The relationship of fertility to measures of metropolitan dominance: a new look." *Rural Sociology* 39 (Fall):350-361.
- Sorokin, Pirim, and Carl C. Zimmerman
1929 *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Steward, C. T., Jr.
1958 "The urban-rural dichotomy: concepts and uses." *American Journal of Sociology* 64 (September):152-158.
- Van Es, J. C., and J. E. Brown, Jr.
1974 "The rural-urban variable once more: some individual level observations." *Rural Sociology* 39 (Fall):373-391.
- Willits, Fern K., and Robert C. Bealer
1963 "The utility of residence for differentiating social conservatism in rural youth." *Rural Sociology* 28 (March):70-80.
1967 "An evaluation of a composite definition of rurality." *Rural Sociology* 32 (June):165-177.
- Willits, F. K., R. C. Bealer, and D. M. Crider
1974 "The ecology of social traditionalism in a rural hinterland." *Rural Sociology* 39 (Fall):334-349.
- Wilson, J. Q.
1968 "The urban unease." *Public Interest* (Summer).
- Wirth, Louis
1938 "Urbanism as a way of life." *American Journal of Sociology* 44 (July).

Appendix A. County population characteristics 1970*

County	1 Urban popu- lation %	2 Pop./sq. mile	3 Farm pop. %	4 White- collar labor force %	5 Median family income	6 Families below poverty line %	7 Poverty families 125% of poverty %
Beaver	0	1	8	29.0	7,289	19.1	21.5
Pine	0	2	13	26.4	7,486	14.2	23.2
Wayne	0	1	13	32.3	5,828	10.5	21.6
Carbon	40.4	11	2	38.9	8,296	11.0	15.1
Salt Lake	95.1	600	.35	55.2	9,770	8.1	11.6

* The data contained in the table were extracted from the *1972 County and City Data Book*, pp. 474-485.

Political and Interpersonal Trust Among Peasants: a Reevaluation¹

Mitchell A. Seligson and José Manuel Salazar X.

Department of Political Science, University of Arizona;

*Oficina de Información, Unidad de Opinión Pública,
Casa Presidencial Costa Rica and Wolfson College,
Cambridge University*

ABSTRACT This paper challenges the widely accepted notion that peasants are more distrustful than urbanites by suggesting that the literature has been flawed by a lack of rural-urban comparisons, by the failure to utilize reliable measures of trust and to distinguish between political and interpersonal trust, and by the lack of convincing empirical evidence for the existence of distrust among peasants. The paper employs two samples (N rural = 531, N urban = 202) from Costa Rica and finds higher levels of interpersonal trust in the peasant sample and lower levels of interpersonal trust among urbanites. In contrast, political trust is found to be higher in the city. Environmental factors are proposed as the explanation for these findings, and data from a sample of land reform beneficiaries (N = 753) are used as evidence of the importance of environment in explaining trust.

"Peasants throughout the world are extremely individualistic and suspicious of others."

(Fromm and Maccoby, 1970:205)

Peasant society is frequently characterized as exhibiting high levels of distrust and suspicion. The consensus is so widespread that Erich Fromm and his collaborator Michael Maccoby were prompted to assert the universality of peasant distrust, as the above-cited quotation implies. Only a few researchers have taken issue with the dominant view.

This paper is designed in hopes of sharpening understanding of peasant society with regard to the question of trust. It will first review briefly the literature on peasant distrust and will then indicate some reasons why the consensus on peasant distrust might be faulty. The

¹ Collection of the peasant data set reported in this paper was supported at various times by grants from the Social Science Research Council's Foreign Area Fellowship Program and from the Danforth Foundation. The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations Joint Population and Development Policy Research Program and the Instituto de Tierras y Colonización (ITCO) of Costa Rica supported the collection of the land reform sample. An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Conference on Attitudinal and Behavioral Changes in Rural Life, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, April 13-15, 1978. The authors would like to thank Susan Beck-Seligson, Gail L. Bernstein, and Minoru Yamagishi for their helpful comments on the earlier version.

paper will then turn to an empirical examination of trust in Costa Rica using survey research data. The dimensionality of trust will be explored and levels of trust between peasant and urbanite will be compared. Finally, an attempt will be made to explain the findings.

Peasant distrust: the literature

Interestingly enough, the early views of peasant life strongly emphasized harmony, trust, and openness. Caro Baroja's (1963) review of the work of ancient historians (Aristophanes, Caesar, Tacitus, and so on) found that it was the city rather than the countryside that was characterized by a poor quality of interpersonal relations. Such views were echoed by Robert Redfield's now-classic study of Tepoztlán, Mexico (1930). After Redfield, however, a steady, almost unbroken stream of critics attempted to dismantle this pleasant image of rural life.

Certainly the major figure to have set the tone for the predominant image of trust among peasants is Oscar Lewis. In his landmark re-study of Tepoztlán, Lewis (1951) painted a picture dramatically different from that of his mentor. Lewis's view, reemphasized in later works, was that "Tepoztecos view people . . . as potentially hostile and dangerous, and their typical reaction is a defensive one" (Lewis, 1960:87). Lewis went on to add that trust in government was almost nonexistent: "Honest government or leadership is considered an impossibility" (1960:90).

Lewis's observations regarding political and interpersonal distrust among peasants have been echoed by numerous scholars in their research on Latin America, Europe, and other parts of the world. Foster's (1967b:91) research in Tzintzuntzan, Mexico, led him to conclude that the villagers held a deep "suspicion and mistrust of others." Work in yet another Mexican village by Maccoby (1967:337) revealed that "There is little deep friendship among villagers. Few feel trust or fellowship outside their own families." Fromm and Maccoby's (1970) definitive monograph on that village came to the same conclusion. In terms of interpersonal distrust, they reported an "extreme distrust and fear of others" (1970:38) and found that "they are selfish, [and] suspicious of each others' motives" (1970:37). Fromm and Maccoby are quite clear in their emphasis that villager distrust is not confined to neighbors, but is a more general phenomenon: "the peasants distrust each other and are afraid that both fellow villagers and outsiders will steal from them if they have the opportunity" (1970:208). Furthermore, distrust of politicians runs quite deep: "the villagers distrust all leaders and suspect them of using their positions to get what they can from others" (1970:209). Apparently the distrust found among Mexican villagers is seen as being carried with them when they migrate to United States border towns along the Rio Grande. "Human relations," finds Rubel (1970:261), "are acted out in an ambient of generalized distrust and defensiveness."

Additional work in Latin America further emphasizes the theme of distrust. One study of a village in Colombia (Reichel-Dolmatoff, 1961) concluded that suspicion was rampant among the peasants. Rogers's (1969:26) study of Colombian peasants, based on a sample drawn from a wide range of villages, came to identical conclusions: "peasant communities are characterized by a mentality of mutual distrust, suspiciousness and evasiveness in interpersonal relations." Rogers (1969:26) goes on to conclude that interpersonal distrust is directly related to political distrust: "The interpersonal distrust of peasants carried over into their attitudes toward government."

Research in Europe mirrors the findings on Latin America. In the field of political science no study of peasants has been cited more frequently than Banfield's (1958) analysis of a village in southern Italy. While several reviews have been written challenging Banfield's interpretation as to the causes and durability of "amoral familism," few question his finding that the villagers are highly distrustful, particularly of politicians: "In a society of amoral familists it will be assumed that whatever group is in power is self-serving and corrupt . . ." and "the voter will place little confidence in the promises of the parties" (1958:99). Banfield further asserts that "the amoral familist who is an office-holder will take bribes when he can get away with it. But whether he takes bribes or not, it will be assumed by the society of amoral familists that he does" (1958:92).

Banfield's view of peasants is supported by Lopreato (1961:586), who found that in another southern Italian village, Stefanconi, "the peasants . . . are given to suspicion, quarrels, vituperation, abuse, violence and conflicts of all sorts." Lopreato's (1967:425) review of interpersonal relations in village Italy concluded that "suspicion of one's fellowmen is rampant in south Italian peasantry. In its purest state it reveals in the peasant an individual engaged in a one man's war against all others." This Hobbesian view was further confirmed by Friedmann's study of southern Italy, which found among peasants a "mentality of mutual distrust" (1967:332), a mentality that considered the government to be the peasant's "worst enemy" and that was reflected by the peasant's "absolute distrust of the intentions of all governments" (1967:330).

Peasant distrust in Europe is by no means confined to southern Italy. Research by Wylie on a peasant village in France found that "all the families were suspicious of each other" (1964:194) and that "most people believe that it is wise to keep important things to oneself, to avoid involvement with 'the others' insofar as it is possible." Distrust of government is also found in village France according to Wylie:

The hostility toward government is real and it is deep Voters of Peyrane say that the heads of their parties and of all other political parties, are a "pile of bandits" It is the

duty of the citizen *not* to cooperate with these men, as the civics books would have people do, but rather to hinder them, to prevent them in every possible way from increasing their power over individuals and over families (1964:207-209).

Other studies in Europe have detected political distrust among peasants in Spain (Pitt-Rivers, 1961:159) and interpersonal distrust among villagers in Greece (Blum, 1965). Work in other areas, especially India, has uncovered the same pattern. Carstairs (1958:44), commenting on his experience in India, reports that "From the beginning to the end of my stay, my notebooks record instances of suspicion and mutual distrust." Dube (1958:82) and Bailey (1971:308) emphasize distrust in government in village India, the latter stating that "the peasant looks upon outsiders (including officials) as his enemies."

In short, the overwhelming thrust of the literature on peasant society emphasizes both political and interpersonal distrust. Foster (1967a:297), in summarizing this literature, notes that the evidence strongly shows "much suspicion, criticism, and lack of cooperation." Hence, despite the classical evidence to the contrary and despite Redfield's early report on Mexican peasants, the great bulk of the evidence accumulated since Lewis's research in the late 1940's has emphasized peasant distrust.

Peasant distrust: a critique

Despite the overwhelming evidence presented above, there are at least four separate problems characteristic of the literature on peasant distrust that lead one to question the literature's validity.

The central weakness of the literature is that it is not comparative in scope. Almost without exception researchers report high levels of distrust in a given peasant society without comparing the levels either to those found in the society as a whole or to those present in other sectors. One important exception is the paper by Lopreato and Saltzman (1968). Rethinking Lopreato's (1961) earlier work, reported on above, they identify a central problem with previous research:

The bulk of the discussions about peasants has so far taken this class of people *in isolation*. As a result, readers have been encouraged to assume that the characteristics attributed to peasants are peculiar to them. That, however, is a faulty procedure, for it is entirely possible that the situation as represented by a class of peasants reflects the social conditions of the large society as a whole (1968:133).

In viewing the well-documented distrust characteristic of southern Italian peasants in the light of data obtained in a national sample,

Lopreato and Saltzman (1968:137) are surprised to find that peasants, more than any other class, conceive class relations in terms of amity rather than animosity and that peasants are less suspicious than any other class. If southern Italian peasants are, in comparative perspective, less distrustful than other sectors of Italian society, then it may well be that peasants elsewhere are similarly less distrustful than other social groups.

A second failing of much, but not all, of the research is the limited attention to empirical verification. Because much of the research on peasant society has been conducted by cultural anthropologists, little of it has employed quantitative techniques to measure social-psychological attitudes.² Furthermore, if we are to attempt to make any comparative assessment of trust, we must have measures of the concept that are reliable in both peasant and nonpeasant society. Consequently, we must not only quantify the concept in order to be able to make comparisons, but we must also be sure that our measures correctly interpret attitudes in all sectors of the population.

A third problem with the literature is its failure to carefully distinguish between political and interpersonal trust, a distinction that has long been a part of empirical attitude research (Agger *et al.*, 1961). "Political trust," according to Miller (1974:952), "can be thought of as a basic evaluative or affective orientation toward the government The dimension of trust runs from high trust to high distrust or political cynicism." Interpersonal trust, variously measured by "faith in people" or "misanthropy" scales, is an attitude expressing "one's degree of confidence in the trustworthiness, honesty, goodness, generosity, and brotherliness of people in general" (Robinson and Shaver, 1973:612). In many cases, researchers report on generalized distrust in all individuals and institutions. In other cases the two foci (people versus government) are distinguished, but it is assumed that they are closely linked, with interpersonal distrust spilling over into distrust of government.

A final difficulty with the literature is the general absence of any clear explanation of the cause of the high levels of distrust among peasants. Some researchers believe that distrust is inherent in the personality of the peasant and that changes in the environment would have little impact in altering attitudes (Banfield, 1958:166). Others (Lopreato, 1967) believe that hunger, poverty, exploitation, fear, and other such environmental factors produce distrust.

This paper attempts to remedy the defects in the previous work by: (1) comparing peasant attitudes to the attitudes of urbanites; (2) applying measures that are reliable and that appear to have closely

² One important exception is the Fromm and Maccoby study (1970). However, even though they report high levels of distrust, they did not measure this concept.

similar meaning in both rural and urban contexts; (3) distinguishing between political and interpersonal trust; and (4) attempting to determine the cause of whatever differences in levels of distrust are encountered.

Data

The data analyzed in this paper are drawn from Costa Rica, a small Central American country with a population of approximately two million. Costa Rica offers two distinct advantages as a setting for the research. First, it is a country with a relatively large peasant sector. The 1973 Costa Rican census reports 59 percent of the population living in rural areas and 35 percent of the economically active population engaged in agriculture (Dirección General, 1975). Second, in contrast to much of the rest of Latin America, there is in Costa Rica a strong tradition of democratic rule (Johnson, 1976). Hence, questionnaire items commonly used to measure political trust in the United States and in European democracies can be applied in Costa Rica much more readily than they might be applied elsewhere in Latin America. The advantage of using standard trust indicators, of course, is that the method facilitates comparisons with widely available data bases from other nations.

Additional details describing peasants in Costa Rica are reported on extensively elsewhere (Berk-Seligson and Seligson, 1978; Salazar N. *et al.*, 1978; Seligson, 1972, 1975a, 1975b, 1977a, 1977b, 1978a, 1979, forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b; Seligson and Berk-Seligson, 1978).

It should be emphasized that research on Costa Rican peasants has indicated that they, too, are characterized by distrust. Thus, a major study of the Turrialba area of Costa Rica (Loomis *et al.*, 1953:206) has found evidence of peasant distrust. Similarly, a recent survey of Costa Rican life finds indications of rural alienation (Booth *et al.*, 1973:198-200). However, because of the relative absence of political repression, it is unlikely that levels of political distrust among Costa Rican peasants would approach those found elsewhere in Latin America. So in countries like Guatemala, El Salvador, Ecuador, and Peru, where many peasants are considered by urban groups to be ethnically inferior because they are Indian and where peasants have frequently suffered severe repression, one would expect much higher levels of political cynicism than among Costa Rican peasants. Nevertheless, according to the literature, *within* Costa Rica we should expect to find that peasants are more distrusting than are urbanites.

Two samples are analyzed in this paper: a peasant sample and an urban sample. The first sample included a probability sample of 531 male peasants, interviewed in a project directed by the senior author. The sample was stratified, clustered, and of probability design, and

the sample included 66 peasant communities distributed in five of Costa Rica's seven provinces. Additional details of this sample are contained in Seligson (1974). The design of the second sample was similar to that of the peasant sample, and included a total of 815 respondents drawn from urban areas of Costa Rica.³ Half of the respondents in the second sample were female and were dropped from the analysis in order to make the sample comparable to the all-male peasant sample.⁴ In total, there were 262 segments in this sample. Every second respondent in the urban sample was asked the identical battery of trust questions used in the rural questionnaire, leaving an N of 202 for the urban sample.

The questionnaire included two groups of questions related to the two dimensions of trust mentioned earlier: trust in government and interpersonal trust. The interpersonal trust items were taken from the Survey Research Center's "Trust in People Scale" (Robinson and Shaver, 1973:615-618) and Rosenberg's "Faith in People Scale" (1957). The trust in government questionnaire section is an expanded version of Olsens' (1969) "Political Alienation Scale," as used in surveys directed by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center (Miller, 1974:953). The complete text of the questions is contained in Table 2.

Findings

The dimensionality of trust

The first goal of the analysis is to establish empirically the multidimensional nature of trust in Costa Rica and, furthermore, to show that the dimensions uncovered are similar in both the peasant and the urban samples. In order to accomplish this goal, the trust indicators in both samples were subjected to a factor analysis (principal components with unities on the main diagonal). The results are displayed in Table 1.

Both hypothesized dimensions (that is, trust in government and interpersonal trust) are revealed quite clearly in both samples. The strength of the factors for both samples is almost identical. This analysis demonstrates that it is inappropriate to lump political and interpersonal trust together, since they are quite clearly two separate dimensions. The analysis also helps demonstrate the validity of the indicators, since a nearly identical dimensional structure is uncovered in both samples.

³The urban sample was conducted under the supervision of the junior author and Lic. Miguel Gómez B., director of the Unidad de Opinión Pública, Oficina de Información, Casa Presidencial, Costa Rica. Both authors are grateful to Lic. Gómez for making the data set available to them.

⁴The urban areas surveyed included metropolitan San José (the capital of the country), the provincial capitals, and other major population concentrations in the central valley (*valle central*) of Costa Rica.

Table 1. Varimax rotated factor matrices of trust in government and interpersonal trust items* urban and rural

Variable**	Urban loadings		Rural loadings	
	Trust in government	Interpersonal trust	Trust in government	Interpersonal trust
<i>Trust in government</i>				
A. Is government interested in solving problems of the majority or important families?	.68	.19	.71	.00
B. Is government interested in problems of people like you?	.67	.25	.65	.08
C. Does government help you, hurt you, or neither?	.63	.07	.66	.09
D. Do public servants get jobs because of preparation or kinship ties?	.62	.15	.57	.07
E. Are public servants prepared or not?	.60	-.06	.53	.03
F. How often can you trust government?	.58	.13	.61	.00
G. How much tax money does government misspend?	.57	-.02	.66	.11
H. How many public servants are honest?	.45	.29	.56	.20
<i>Interpersonal trust</i>				
I. Can you trust the majority of people?	.02	.80	.00	.67
J. Do the majority of people take advantage of you?	.10	.79	.15	.71
K. Do people watch out for themselves?	.12	.64	.09	.72
L. Do you know who you can count on in times of need?	.12	.53	.05	.50
Eigenvalue	3.47	1.66	3.33	1.60
Percent of variance	28.9	13.8	27.8	13.3

* For the complete text of the questions, see Table 2.

** The variables appear in the order of the loadings in the urban matrix.

Comparative levels of trust

The literature reviewed above would strongly suggest that higher levels of both interpersonal and political distrust would be found among the peasant sector when compared to the urban sector. As can be seen in Table 2, that expectation is not confirmed.

Examining first the questions on trust in government, we find that of the eight items, six are in the predicted direction (that is, of greater trust in the urban sector), although only four of the six are statistically significant. The relationships are all quite weak. The two questions that demonstrate higher trust in rural areas are items D and E, both of which focus on public servants rather than on the abstraction government.

The data on interpersonal trust reveal precisely the opposite pattern from that predicted. Responses to all four of the items show that interpersonal trust is higher in the countryside than in the city, although one of the questions does not reveal a statistically significant difference and none of the relationships is particularly strong.

The finding that trust in public servants (items D and E) is higher in the countryside than in the city breaks with the overall rural pattern of political distrust. This anomaly is probably most easily explained by the higher levels of interpersonal trust in the countryside. That is, since peasants have higher trust in their fellow man than do urbanites, it is probable that the trust in government questions which personalize the government are subject to a correction factor: peasants transfer some of their interpersonal trust to public servants, while urbanites transfer some of their interpersonal distrust to public servants.

Explanation

It is appropriate at this point to attempt to explain the results reported above. In particular, we want to know why peasants exhibit higher levels of interpersonal trust and lower levels of political trust than do urbanites. It might be hypothesized that both political and interpersonal trust are rational reactions to environmental conditions rather than characteristics inherent in the personality of peasants and urbanites. In this section of the paper an attempt will be made to provide evidence that supports this hypothesis.

We suggest that the lower levels of political trust among peasants is a direct result of the marginal position of peasants in terms of their receipt of government services. As in the rest of Latin America, Costa Rican government expenditures are highly unequally distributed, with the lion's share going to urban areas. As a result, health services, transportation, communication, and education are all inferior in rural Costa Rica when compared to urban Costa Rica (Booth, 1974). The fact that rural deprivation in Costa Rica is nowhere near as extreme as it is in most of the rest of rural Latin America perhaps explains why political trust levels in rural Costa Rica are not dramatically lower than those found in urban areas. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that peasants report an accurate perception of reality when they report that the government is uninterested in their problems and that the government is harmful rather than helpful.

Table 2. Comparisons of trust: peasant and urbanites

	Urbanite	Peasant
<i>Trust in government</i>		
A. Would you say that government is interested in solving the problems of the majority of Costa Ricans, or are they interested only in the problems of some important families?		
majority	43.1%	37.7%
important families	56.9	62.3
	p = ns	
B. Some say that government isn't interested in the problems of people like you. Others say that government is interested in the problems of people like you. What do you think?		
interested	57.4	49.3
not interested	42.6	50.7
	p = .03 Tau b = .08	
C. Do you think that what government does helps you, hurts you, or neither helps nor hurts you?		
helps	22.7	24.2
neither	58.8	42.3
hurts	18.5	33.5
	p = .01 Tau c = .08	
D. Do you think that the majority of public servants get their jobs because they have necessary preparation, or do you think they get them through friendship and kinship ties?		
preparation	25.9	33.5
friendship and kinship	74.1	66.5
	p = .03 Tau b = .07	
E. Do you think that among the public servants the majority does not have the preparation necessary for the job, or the majority does have the preparation, or there are some who do and some who do not have the preparation?		
majority prepared or some prepared	60.7	73.6
majority unprepared	39.4	26.4
	p < .001 Tau b = .10	

Table 2. Continued

	Urbanite	Peasant
E. How often do you think that one can trust government to do the right thing? Do you think you can trust them almost always, almost never, or sometimes?		
almost always	23.7	13.0
sometimes	46.0	26.3
almost never	30.3	60.7
	p < .001 Tau c = .24	
G. Would you say that government misspends a lot of the money that the people pay in taxes, a little of the money, or part of that money?		
little or none	31.3	22.0
some	11.4	19.6
a lot	61.9	58.4
	p = ns	
H. Do you think that among public servants there are many who aren't honest, there are some who aren't honest, or there are a few who aren't honest?		
few or some honest	79.1	65.4
majority dishonest	20.9	34.6
	p = .004 Tau b = .13	
<i>Interpersonal trust</i>		
I. Do you think that you can trust the majority of people, or do you think that one must watch himself carefully in friendships?		
you can trust	16.0	17.1
one must watch himself	84.0	82.9
	p = ns	
J. Do you think that the majority of the people would try to take advantage of you if the opportunity presented itself, or do you believe that the majority wouldn't try to take advantage of you?		
not take advantage	25.8	28.4
take advantage	79.5	71.6
	p = .01 Tau b = .08	

Table 2. Continued

	Urbanite	Peasant
K. Do you think that most of the time people watch out for themselves, or do you think that most of the time people try to help each other?		
help each other	20.0	30.3
watch out for themselves	80.0	70.0
	p = .003 Tau b = .10	
L. Some say that in these times one doesn't know who one can count on in times of need. Others say that one does know who one can count on in times of need. What do you say?		
One knows	55.8	77.7
One doesn't know	44.2	22.3
	p < .001 Tau b = .22	

One way to test this explanation for peasant political cynicism would be to interview a group of peasants who have been singled out for special government assistance and to determine if such peasants are more trusting of government than are those who have received no special attention. To test this possibility, a third data set will be analyzed briefly here. A sample of Costa Rican peasants (N = 753) was interviewed in a project directed by the senior author. All of the respondents were beneficiaries of the country's agrarian reform program, and all had received land from the government. In many cases the land was accompanied by agricultural credit, housing loans, wage subventions, technical assistance, and other support. No other sector of the Costa Rican peasantry has received such a degree of government assistance.

The data reported in Table 3 compare this privileged sector of the peasantry with the cross-section sample of peasants reported on in Tables 1 and 2.⁵ It should first be noted that the dimensionality uncovered in both the urban and peasant sectors (as reported in Table 1) is also found among the peasant beneficiaries of land reform (in other words, two factors emerge in the beneficiary sample). This find-

⁵ The two peasant samples did not demonstrate significant differences in background characteristics (for example, age, education, urban experience, and so on) that might be responsible for differences in attitudes (Seligson, 1978b), so significant differences in political trust levels reported on below are viewed as being produced by the peasants' reactions to the reform program.

Table 3. Comparisons of trust: peasants and agrarian reform beneficiaries

	Peasants (N = 531)	Peasant beneficiaries of agrarian reform (N = 753)
A. Would you say that government is interested in solving the problems of the majority of Costa Ricans, or are they interested only in the problems of some important families?		
majority	37.7%	45.9%
important families	62.3	54.1
	p < .01 Tau b = .08	
B. Some say that government isn't interested in the problems of people like you. Others say that government is interested in the problems of people like you. What do you think?		
interested	49.3	71.5
not interested	50.7	28.5
	p < .001 Tau b = .23	
C. Do you think that what government does helps you, hurts you, or neither helps nor hurts you?		
helps	24.2	40.5
neither	42.3	46.9
hurts	33.5	12.6
	p < .001 Tau c = .27	
D. Do you think that the majority of public servants get their jobs because they have the necessary preparation, or do you think they get them through friendship and kinship ties?		
preparation	33.5	28.6
friendship and kinship	66.5	71.4
	p = ns	
E. Do you think that among the public servants the majority does not have the preparation necessary for the job, or the majority does have the preparation, or there are some who do and some who do not have the preparation?		
majority prepared or some prepared	71.6	89.2
majority unprepared	26.4	10.8
	p < .001 Tau b = .21	

Table 3. Continued

	Peasants (N = 531)	Peasant beneficiaries of agrarian reform (N = 753)
F. How often do you think that one can trust government to do the right thing? Do you think you can trust them almost always, almost never, or sometimes?		
almost always	13.0	11.8
sometimes	26.3	53.2
almost never	60.7	35.0
	p = <.001 Tau c = .22	
G. Would you say that government misspends a lot of the money that the people pay in taxes, a little of the money, or part of that money?		
little or none	22.0	13.3
some	19.6	28.2
a lot	58.4	58.4
	p = ns	
H. Do you think that among public servants there are many who aren't honest, there are some who aren't honest, or there are a few who aren't honest?		
few or some honest	65.4	69.3
majority dishonest	34.6	30.7
	p = ns	

ing further increases our confidence in the two-dimensional structure of trust and in the intersample reliability of the questions used.

Second, it should be noted that levels of interpersonal trust (not shown in Table 3) are nearly identical in both peasant samples. Hence, agrarian reform did not affect interpersonal trust levels. This finding is to be expected, since the reform has little or no connection with interpersonal relations. Rather, as expected, the impact of reform is seen in its effect on political trust. On seven of the eight variables, the reform peasants demonstrate greater levels of trust in government. Of particular interest are questions B and C, in which government interest in and assistance to the individual is measured. It is on these variables that the strongest difference between the cross-section of peasants and the agrarian reform beneficiaries is noted. The findings provide strong support for the hypothesis that peasant distrust in government is related not to peasant personality but to the environment.

Evidence supporting the contention that interpersonal distrust is a result of environmental factors comes from a comparison of crime rates in rural and urban Costa Rica. A 1976 survey conducted in Costa Rica found that within the metropolitan region of San José, Costa Rica, 30.1 percent of the respondents stated that they or someone in their family had been a victim of a crime within the previous two years. Obviously, when nearly one-third of the metropolitan population reports being victimized by crime, interpersonal trust levels must be affected. In towns and smaller cities outside metropolitan San José (namely, Cartago, Heredia, and Alajuela), the figure fell to 13.6 percent. Unfortunately this question was not asked in rural areas, but the striking decline from the metropolitan region to the much less congested smaller towns suggests even lower rates probably exist in rural zones.

Further evidence of the impact of environment comes from a comparison of political participation rates. Elsewhere (Seligson and Booth, 1979b; Booth and Seligson, 1979) it has been shown that voter turnout is significantly lower among peasants than it is among urbanites, whereas local-level communal participation (in projects, organizations, committees, and so on) is significantly higher among peasants. We interpret this data as tending to support our view that peasants are cynical about national politics, and hence that they vote less often in elections (although other factors may be responsible for the lower turnout). At the same time, peasants find it easier to get along with their neighbors than do the urbanites, and consequently the peasants participate more often in communal activities.⁶ A similar

⁶ An anonymous reviewer of this paper suggested that the rural-urban attitude differences may be more readily explainable by individual socioeconomic and demographic characteristics than by contextual factors. In order to test this possibility, summated scales of political and interpersonal trust were computed for both the rural and urban samples, and these scales were correlated with age, income, and education. Age had no significant relationship to either variable in the urban sample, and only a slight negative correlation ($r = -.11$, sig. = .009) to interpersonal trust in the rural sample. That is, the older residents were slightly less trusting interpersonally. Since the urban sample had a mean age somewhat lower than the rural sample (37.8 versus 42.5), the negative association between age and interpersonal trust would appear to result in lower interpersonal trust among the peasants rather than the higher trust that was actually found. Education was positively correlated with both interpersonal and political trust in the urban sample ($r = .30$, sig. < .001; $r = .14$, sig. = .04) and positively correlated with interpersonal trust in the rural sample ($r = .08$, sig. = .03). Since education levels are much higher in the urban sample than they were in the rural sample (the average urban dweller reported some secondary school completed, whereas the rural dweller had an average of 2.8 years of school completed), we should expect to find higher political and interpersonal trust in the urban sample, which we do not. Finally, income was positively associated with both political and interpersonal trust ($r = .16$, sig. = .02; $r = .16$, sig. = .02) in the city, but it was not correlated with either attitude in the rural area. Again, these correlations would lead us to expect higher political and interpersonal trust in the urban area, since the income for those respon-

finding is reported by Stanfield (1968) in his survey of rural Brazil. He reports that farmers in the most remote areas expressed higher levels of trust in their neighbors than did people who lived in more developed regions.

Conclusions

This paper has attempted to demonstrate that the current state of knowledge on peasant attitudes needs reevaluation. It has been shown that as a result of a number of failings of previous research, the earlier findings of high political and interpersonal distrust among peasants must be called into question. It has been found, using data from Costa Rica, that while political distrust among peasants is higher than political distrust found among urbanites, interpersonal distrust is significantly lower. The explanation for these findings is cast in terms of environmental factors that stimulate trust and distrust; some evidence is provided to support the validity of this conclusion.

It would appear, based on the evidence presented above, that attitudes are, at least to some extent, a rational response to environmental factors. Considerable recent research on both urban and rural Latin America has demonstrated that political behavior (especially political participation) is largely a response to contextual factors (Booth and Seligson, 1978; Cornelius, 1973; Dietz, forthcoming; Moore, 1978; Seligson, 1978a; Seligson and Booth, 1979a).

Research among the poor in the United States has demonstrated similar conclusions. As one investigator put it, "the dominant theme [among the poor] is the sense of being cheated. One's government is not concerned enough with one's well-being . . . and fails to meet their own deeply felt day-to-day needs" (Lipsitz, 1969). The "war on poverty" in the United States was in part an attempt to mitigate feelings of cynicism among the poor. Governments in Latin America concerned about the possibility of peasant insurrection should recognize that peasant political cynicism is not simply a function of being a peasant, but rather a function of being deprived of government services.

References

- Agger, Robert E., Marshal N. Goldstein, and Stanley A. Pearl
1961 "Political cynicism: measurement and meaning." *Journal of Politics* 23 (August):477-506.
- dents was considerably higher than in the rural area (mean urban = 2,900 colones monthly; mean rural = 760 colones monthly).
- Our conclusion from examining these correlations is that individual attitudes do not help explain the higher levels of political trust in the city and the higher levels of interpersonal trust in the countryside. On the contrary, they appear to provide evidence leading to the conclusion that both political and interpersonal trust should be higher in the city, where income and education are higher and where age is lower.
- Bailey, F. G.
1971 "The peasant view of the bad life." Pp. 299-321, in Teodor Shanin (ed.), *Peasants and Peasant Societies*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, Ltd.
- Banfield, Edward C.
1958 *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Berk-Seligson, Susan, and Mitchell A. Seligson
1978 "The phonological correlates of social stratification in Costa Rican Spanish." 46 *Lingua* (No. 1):1-28.
- Blum, Richard, and Eva Blum
1965 *Health and Healing in Rural Greece*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Booth, John A.
1974 *Características Sociográficas de las Regiones Periféricas de Costa Rica*. San José, Costa Rica: Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal.
- Booth, John A., and Mitchell A. Seligson
1978 "Images of political participation in Latin America." Pp. 3-33, in John A. Booth and Mitchell A. Seligson (eds.), *Political Participation in Latin America*, Vol. 1: Citizen and State. New York: Holmes and Meier.
1979 "Peasants as activists: a reevaluation of political participation in the countryside." *Comparative Political Studies* 12 (April):29-59.
- Booth, John A., Miguel Mondol Velásquez, and Alvaro Hernández Carvajal
1973 *Tipología de Comunidades*, Tomo II: Estudio Para una Tipología de Comunidades. San José, Costa Rica: Dirección Nacional de Desarrollo de la Comunidad-Acción Internacional Técnica.
- Caro Baroja, Julio
1963 "The city and the county: reflections on some ancient commonplaces." Pp. 27-40, in Julian Pitt-Rivers (ed.), *Mediterranean Countrymen*. Paris: Mouton.
- Carstairs, G. Morris
1958 *The Twice Born: A Study of a Community of High Caste Hindus*. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press.
- Céspedes, Victor Hugo, Alberto di Mare, Claudio Gonzalez Vega, and Eduardo Lizano
1977 *La Pobreza en Costa Rica*. San José: La Academia de Centro America.
- Cornelius, Wayne A.
1973 *Political Learning Among the Migrant Poor: The Impact of Residential Context*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- Dietz, Henry
forthcoming *Poverty and Problem-Solving Under Military Rule: The Urban Poor in Lima, Peru*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Institute of Latin American Studies.
- Dirección General de Estadística y Censos
1975 *Censos nacionales de 1973: Población*. San José, Costa Rica.
- Dube, Shyama Charan
1958 *India's Changing Villages: Human Factors in Community Development*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Foster, George M.
1960-61a "Interpersonal relations in peasant society." *Human Organization* 19 (Winter):174-178.
1960-61b "A rejoinder to comments." *Human Organization* 19 (Winter):183-184.
1967a "Introduction: peasant character and personality." Pp. 296-300, in Jack M. Potter, May N. Diaz, and George M. Foster (eds.), *Peasant Society: A Reader*. Boston: Little, Brown.
1967b *Tzintzuntzan: Mexican Peasant in a Changing World*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Friedmann, F. C.
1967 "The world of 'La Misericia.'" Pp. 234-336, in Jack M. Potter, May N. Diaz,

- and George M. Foster (eds.), *Peasant Society: A Reader*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Fronum, Erich, and Michael Maccoby
1970 *Social Character in a Mexican Village: A Sociopsychanalytic Study*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Johnson, Kenneth F.
1976 "Scholarly images of Latin American political democracy in 1975." *Latin American Research Review* 11 (No. 2):129-140.
- Landsberger, Henry A., and Antonio Saavedra
1967 "Response set in developing countries." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 31 (Summer):214-229.
- Lewis, Oscar
1951 *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Restudied*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
1960 *Tepoztlán, Village in Mexico*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Lipsitz, Lewis
1969 "On political belief: the grievances of the poor." Pp. 142-172, in Philip Green and Stanford Levinson (eds.), *Power and Community*. New York: Random House.
- Loomis, Charles P., et al.
1953 *Turrialba: Social Systems and the Introduction of Change*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lopreato, Joseph
1961 "Social classes in an Italian farm village." *Rural Sociology* 26 (September):266-281.
1967 "How would you like to be a peasant?" Pp. 419-437, in Jack M. Potter, May N. Diaz, and George M. Foster (eds.), *Peasant Society: A Reader*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Lopreato, Joseph, and Janet E. Saltzman
1968 "Descriptive models of peasant society: a reconciliation from southern Italy." *Human Organization* 27 (Summer):132-42.
- Maccoby, Michael
1967 "Love and authority: a study of Mexican villagers." Pp. 336-346, in Jack M. Potter, May N. Diaz, and George M. Foster (eds.), *Peasant Society: A Reader*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Miller, Arthur H.
1974 "Political issues and trust in government: 1964-1970." *American Political Science Review* 68 (September):951-972.
- Moore, Richard J.
1979 "The urban poor in Guayaquil, Ecuador: modes, correlates, and context of political participation." Pp. 198-218, in Mitchell A. Seligson and John A. Booth (eds.), *Political Participation in Latin America, Vol. II: Politics and the Poor*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Olsen, Marvin E.
1969 "Two categories of political alienation." *Social Forces* 47 (March):288-299.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian A.
1961 *The People of the Sierra*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Redfield, Robert
1930 *Tepoztlán: A Mexican Village*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reichel-Dolmatoff, Gerardo, and Alicia Reichel-Dolmatoff
1961 *The People of Aritama: The Cultural Personality of a Colombian Mestizo Village*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Robinson, John P., and Philip R. Shaver (editors)
1973 *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Rodgers, Everett Morris
1969 *Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Rosenberg, Morris
1957 "Misanthropy and political ideology." *American Sociological Review* 21 (December):690-695.
- Rubel, Arthur J.
1970 "Perceptions of social relations: a comparative analysis." Pp. 255-266, in John H. Burma (ed.), *Mexican-Americans in the United States*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman.
- Salazar N., José M., Ernio Rodríguez C., and José M. Salazar X.
1978 "Costa Rica: una política agraria innovadora." *Estudios Sociales Centroamericanos* 20 (May-August):47-110.
- Seligson, Mitchell A.
1972 "The 'dual society' thesis in Latin America: a reexamination of the Costa Rican case." *Social Forces* 51 (September):91-98.
1974 "The peasant and agrarian capitalism in Costa Rica." Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.
1975a "Agrarian capitalism and the transformation of peasant society: coffee in Costa Rica." *Special Studies Series, no. 69*. Buffalo, New York: Council on International Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo.
1975b "La tesis de 'la sociedad dual' en América Latina una reexaminación del caso de Costa Rica." *Revista de Ciencias Sociales (Costa Rica)* 10 (October):33-47.
1977a "Agrarian policies in dependent societies: Costa Rica." *Journal of Interpersonal Studies and World Affairs* 19 (May):201-232.
1977b "Prestige among peasants: a multidimensional analysis of preference data." *American Journal of Sociology* 83 (November):632-652.
1978a "Development and participation in Costa Rica: the impact of context." Pp. 145-149, in John A. Booth and Mitchell A. Seligson (eds.), *Political Participation in Latin America, Vol. I: Citizen and State*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
1978b "La reforma agraria en Costa Rica, 1942-1976: La evolución de un programa." *Estudios Sociales Centroamericanos* 19 (enero-abril):55-82. (Translated and reprinted in "Agrarian reform in Costa Rica, 1942-1976: evolution of a program," *Land Tenure Center Research Paper Series, No. 117*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, January, 1978.)
1979 "Unconventional political participation: cynicism, powerlessness, and the Latin American peasant." Pp. 134-146, in Mitchell A. Seligson and John A. Booth (eds.), *Political Participation in Latin America, Vol. II: Politics and the Poor*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
forthcoming-a *Peasants of Costa Rica and the Development of Agrarian Capitalism*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
forthcoming-b "Public policies in conflict: land reform and family planning in Costa Rica." *Comparative Politics*.
- Seligson, Mitchell A., and John A. Booth
1979a "Development, political participation, and the poor in Latin America." Pp. 3-8, in Mitchell A. Seligson and John A. Booth (eds.), *Political Participation in Latin America, Vol. II: Politics and the Poor*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
1979b "Structure and levels of political participation in Costa Rica: comparing the countryside with the city." Pp. 62-75, in Mitchell A. Seligson and John A. Booth (eds.), *Political Participation in Latin America, Vol. II: Politics and the Poor*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Seligson, Mitchell A., and Susan Berk-Seligson
1978 "Language and political behavior: a methodology for utilizing the linguistic component of socioeconomic status." *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (August):712-741.

- Stanfield, John David
1968 "Interpersonal trust and modernization in rural Brazil." East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.
- Wylie, Laurence
1964 *Village in the Vaucluse: An Account of Life in a French Village*. Revised edition. New York: Harper and Row.

Rural Sociology 44(3), 1979, pp. 525-542
Copyright © 1979 by the Rural Sociological Society

Family Land and Developmental Cycles Among Illinois Farmers¹

Sonya Salamon and Shirley M. O'Reilly
Department of Human Development and Family Ecology,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

ABSTRACT A field study carried out among an ethnic community of farmers brought to light four types of family developmental cycles relating to the farm enterprise. Ethnographic data are presented to delineate characteristic traits of each type focusing on family farming goals and the timing of retirement, intergenerational land transfers, and purchases of land. Survey data demonstrate a relationship between the age of an operator's first purchase of land and a family development cycle type.

It is commonly accepted that successive generations of a family are linked in a variety of ways. Physical resemblances are obvious in most families, but psychological and emotional traits of individuals appear to transcend generations and have been widely explored. In urban families where residence and occupation are generally distinct, family members may each separate family preoccupations from a professional career. However, in farm families, where family social relationships merge with those of work, these preoccupations are fully expressed in economic decisions. Nowhere are these matters more crucial than in the decisions regarding timing of retirement, land transfer, and purchase of additional acreage. It is our intent here to demonstrate that these decisions are less matters of individual choice than the product of the family socialization process modulated in due course by significant family and external events.

Agricultural folklore says that to enter farming one must inherit land, marry land, or become a tenant. Grassroot wisdom thereby acknowledges that a farm family business is not the product of a single generation, but rather is intimately tied to the intergenerational land transfer process. Each farm household is regarded as being in some phase of a *developmental cycle* of the larger family group of which it is a part. The members and their activities inevitably change, but the form of the unit is reproduced in a regular, cyclical process in which land transfer plays a crucial role (Fortes, 1966).

*
¹This work was conducted as part of Project 60-302 of the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. It was supported in part by funds from the Hatch Act and from the University of Illinois Research Board. The authors would like to thank Vicki Lockhart and Ann Keim, who aided in collection of data. We are indebted to Frederick C. Fliegel and Myron Salamon for reading and making many useful comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript.