

Abstract

Using survey data, the study examines conventional democratic political participation among women in Bogotá and Montevideo in the 1960s and early 1970s. It concludes that male-female differences in participation levels were very small in the areas of formal and socially supported activities, under the special stimulus of a presidential campaign or in the case of less political, more particularistic action. Status and age were found to be important intervening variables tending to reduce but not eliminate female-male differences in level of participation. Women in both cities showed similar patterns of participation, although women were somewhat more likely to participate in Montevideo than in Bogotá, a finding attributed to Uruguay's higher level of development.

About the Author

Robert E. Biles, Associate Professor of Political Science at Sam Houston State University, has done field research in Uruguay, Colombia, and Puerto Rico. His research and publications have focused on political participation, development, and the role of gender.

Women and Political Participation in Latin America: Urban Uruguay and Colombia

by

Robert E. Biles

Sam Houston State
University

Women and International Development
Michigan State University
202 International Center, East Lansing, MI 48824-1035
Phone: 517/353-5040; Fax: 517/432-4845
E-mail: wid@msu.edu; Web: <http://www.isp.msu.edu/WID/>

**Working Paper
#25
June 1983**

WOMEN AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN LATIN AMERICA: URBAN URUGUAY AND COLOMBIA¹

Women, it is widely assumed, have little overt involvement in politics in less modern societies because of traditional gender roles and fewer opportunities for participation in the world outside the home. To the degree that there is participation, it is indirect through the traditional roles of wife, mother, or lover. With modernization, traditional gender roles are thought to break down or modify; and opportunities for employment, education, and involvement in non-traditional roles increase. Participation in politics is thought to follow (Milbrath and Goel 1977:117-18; Rosen and La Raia 1972:353-54; Neuse 1978:133). Research in Latin America and other developing areas, however, suggests that women participate more than had been thought and that development has a complex and, in some respect, negative effect on women. The decline of the extended family, for example, may reduce the equality of women and the time available for activity outside the home. Industrialization and urbanization may increase dependency on men, and work outside the home may decrease women's former indirect power (Pescatello 1973:xiv-xix; Jaquette 1976:66-67; Van Allen 1976). The relationship between development and options for women may be curvilinear, with middle range countries offering more opportunities (Krauss 1974:1708).

The purpose of this paper is to examine the conventional political participation of women in two Latin American democracies at different levels of development to determine the extent of that participation and the impact of development upon it.

Framework of the Study

The Data. For Colombia, the study is based on surveys of the voting age population of Bogotá conducted after the April 1972 departmental and local elections and the April 1974 presidential elections by the Department of Political Science of the Universidad de los Andes. For Uruguay, data are drawn from the author's 1970 survey of the voting age population of Montevideo and from surveys conducted by the Uruguayan polling agency, Gallup Uruguay, during the period 1960-71--that is, prior to the 1973 military takeover. Confidence in conclusions is enhanced by the availability of more than one data set for each nation. The major form of analysis is cross-tabulation with tests of significance and association.²

The Setting. Bogotá, Colombia, and Montevideo, Uruguay, provide excellent environments for testing the impact of gender on participation in Latin American societies at different levels of development. In the early 1970s Uruguay was among the more developed Latin American nations, while Colombia ranked in the middle. Among the twenty Latin American nations, Uruguay was first in life expectancy, second in urbanization, third in literacy, and seventh in per capita GNP (an area, however, of decline in Uruguay). Colombia ranked fifth in urbanization, tenth in literacy and life expectancy, and fourteenth in per capita GNP (Needler 1977:17). Uruguay was a relatively secular society in which the Catholic Church was among the weakest and most progressive in Latin America. Colombia was still considered a highly traditional society in which, for example, the church played a major role. Both Montevideo and Bogotá were large, relatively modern metropolitan centers in which the opportunities for women were higher than in the countryside (López de Rodríguez and León de Leal 1977:211-12). But Bogotá is also the area with the lowest voter

turnout in Colombia (Losada 1978:189). One might expect, then, fewer barriers to the participation of women in Montevideo than in Bogotá. In both societies, the political behavior of women should reflect some of the flavor of the contradictory trends characteristic of developing societies.

In both cities, a variety of stimuli and opportunities existed for participating in politics--an active party system, well-developed interest groups, a highly partisan press, regular elections, and relative freedom of expression (although in both nations, government lack of respect for civil liberties and non-government use of violence were serious problems). In 1970, Uruguay and Colombia were ranked third and fifth, respectively in Latin America on the Fitzgibbon-Johnson Index of images of political democracy held by U.S. Latin Americanists (Johnson 1977:89).

In the 1974 Colombian elections, the principal political parties made a particular effort to attract the support of women, and "Public discussion of the inferior status of women in Colombian society encouraged two of the three presidential candidates to orient themselves to women voters" (Harkess and Pinzón de Lewin 1975:439). As a consequence, women were just as likely as men to report that someone had personally attempted to interest them in the campaign--21 percent of each sex. On the other hand, female political participation is a relatively recent phenomenon in Colombia. Women received the right to hold administrative posts in 1936, citizenship in 1946, and the right to vote and be elected in 1954. They exercised the vote for the first time in 1957--placing them among the last women in Latin America to do so. Uruguay was one of the earliest Latin American nations to extend the suffrage to women (Chaney 1979:169). Enfranchising legislation passed in 1932, and women voted for the first time in 1933.

In most societies, men and women, because they are intermingled and related, share similar distributions of many of the indicators commonly used in social science research to distinguish groups--e.g., family income, class self-identification, age structure, rural-urban residence, and time in urban areas. This was true of both Bogotá and Montevideo. In Bogotá, however, there were some small differences in levels of education. In 1974, 11 percent of the women reported that they had at least some university education compared to 20 percent of the men. At the other end of the spectrum, 92 percent of the women and 97 percent of the men reported that they were literate. In Uruguay, the 1963 census found almost identical proportions of literacy (93 percent) and university or normal school education (4.6 percent and 4.5 percent) between women and men (Dirección 1969).

Perhaps the most important difference between male and female groups is in employment (Anderson 1975:442; Levitt 1967). In the 1974 survey of Bogotá, 79 percent of the men were remuneratively employed, while 66 percent of the women were occupied with "duties of the home," and only 24 percent were employed for remuneration. In Uruguay, 78 percent of the men were economically active in 1963, compared to 24 percent of the women. The most active age group for women was ages 20-24, in which 40 percent were economically active. The proportion steadily declined with age to 15 percent of the 55-59 age groups. Economic activity also varied by place of residence. In Montevideo, the only

metropolitan center in Uruguay, 29 percent of the women were economically active, compared to 19 percent in the rest of the nation (Dirección 1969). Clearly, while social status was shared, the power implied in earning income and the opportunity inherent in regular contact with the world outside the family were not evenly distributed between the sexes.

Political Participation

"The finding that men are more likely to participate in politics than women is one of the most thoroughly substantiated in social science" (Milbrath and Goel 1977:116). Only with respect to voting is there likely to be a narrowing of the gap (Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978:268). Lower participation is also characteristic of women in Colombia as a whole (Pinzón de Lewin and Rothlisberger 1977:63; Losada Lora and Vélez Bustillo 1979:159). Nevertheless, the differences in Bogotá and Montevideo are not substantial.

Research in a variety of countries indicates that there are four common modes of conventional democratic political participation: voting, campaign activity, communal activity, and particularized contacting (Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978:310-39). The meaning of the first two is fairly obvious. Voting involves the act of casting a ballot in public elections--local or national--while campaign activity may take the form of any of a number of actions aimed at influencing the outcome of an election, such as trying to persuade others how to vote, working for a party, attending rallies, or contributing money. Communal activity refers to non-electoral activity by which citizens, alone or in groups, try to influence public policy. This commonly involves participation in formal groups, the indicator used in this study. Particularized contacting refers to the individual contacting officials to resolve problems relating to the individual or his family--rather than attempting to influence public policy of more general applicability. A broader definition of participation yields an additional mode--political communication--which includes such activities as following politics in the media and discussing politics with others (Biles 1978:88; Booth 1976:632). Factor analysis of Uruguayan and Colombian data produces similar modes--with a slight variation in Uruguay (Losada Lora and Vélez Bustillo 1979:156; Biles 1981:6; Biles 1978:33). Each of these modes will now be examined.

Voting. Although voting is generally the form of participation in which there is the greatest comparability between males and females, there is a general tendency for a higher percentage of voting among men than women. Verba, Nie, and Kim in their seven-nation study covering four continents found that men are more likely to vote in all seven nations but that the differences are less than for other modes of participation (1978:235). Their findings are echoed in other studies (summarized in Milbrath and Goel 1977:116-17 and Krauss 1974:1710). Research, however, indicates a decline in the male advantage and approximate equality of turnout in Chile, Argentina, the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, France, Germany, Sweden, Finland, and Japan (Neuse 1978:130; Lewis 1971:428; Lansing 1974; Lovenduski and Hills 1981:16, 40, 61, 126, 173, 221, 245, 308-309).

Although the evidence is not fully satisfactory, gender differences in voter turnout may have largely disappeared in Uruguay by as early as 1958--slightly earlier than in the United States and Chile. The earliest Uruguayan elections for which survey data are available are 1958 and 1962. Both, unfortunately, are marred because respondents were asked four years later--shortly before the next election. Nevertheless, the results are given credence by the fact that they agree with results obtained shortly after the 1966 and 1971 elections. For all four elections, the surveys by Gallup Uruguay show no significant differences in turnout between the sexes (Table 1). Contradictory evidence comes from the author's survey in which respondents were asked whether they had voted in each of the preceding four elections (1954-66). In the case of the responses for both 1966 and for all of the elections taken together, men were more likely to vote than women. Nevertheless, since only one of the six surveys disagrees with the pattern of equality and that one involves recall of actions from four to sixteen years earlier, it appears reasonable to conclude that there was little difference in the voter-turnout rates of women and men in Montevideo during the period.

Such a pattern of equality of turnout has not as yet emerged in Colombia as a whole. In the six presidential elections after women began to vote in 1957, an average of 54 percent of Colombian men voted, compared to an average of 35 percent for women--a percentage difference of 19. Neither has a clear trend toward greater comparability emerged (Losada 1978:191). Within the nation, however, there has been considerable variation. For example, in the department of Norte de Santander the mean percentage difference in turnout for all elections between 1958 and 1974 was 25, while in matriarchal Guajira the mean female turnout for election of the Cámara was a fraction of a percent higher than the turnout of men (Pinzón de Lewin and Rothlisberger 1977:56; the above analysis is based on actual election returns and census projections).

In Bogotá, female voting has been lower than that of males but not substantially so. In the 1972 survey of Bogotá, 41 percent of the males reported voting, compared to 31 percent of the females ($P = .006$). Women were also more likely than men to have voted less recently or to have never voted ($P \leq .001$). In 1974, men again reported slightly more voting than did women (65 percent vs. 56 percent, $P \leq .001$). When an index was constructed of the 1974 responses to questions about voting in the 1974, 1972, and 1970 elections, the differences in male-female turnout were not significant at the .05 level. In a 1960 election survey in Cali, Colombia's third largest city, 39 percent of the men and 33 percent of the women reported voting (Morcillo, et al. 1972:63). This smaller difference in turnout in the major cities, as compared to the nation as a whole, was supportive of the proposition that women experience more political equality in larger, more modern centers. Caution, however, would seem to be in order, for voting turnout declined as city size increased in Colombia, with Bogotá showing the lowest level of turnout (Losada 1978:194). The greater equality may have been a product of lower male turnout.

The evidence, then, is that a higher proportion of women vote in Montevideo than in Bogotá but that within each city women and men vote in relatively similar proportions--although there is more difference in Bogotá. The substantial equality between males and females in voting is often attributed to

the fact that it is an easy act requiring little time and money and one which is easily mobilized (Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978:268; Lovenduski and Hills 1981:323). The nature of voting by women as a mobilized activity may be seen in the levels of the sense of citizen duty to vote and the sense of political efficacy--both of which are strongly associated with voting and other forms of participation. Women in the United States and Uruguay have a high sense of citizen duty to vote; women in Britain, Italy, and Mexico lag only slightly behind men in their sense of duty to participate in local public affairs. In Uruguay and the United States, this translates into voting rates comparable to those of men. Both men and women have been taught that they should vote, and they do. Men, however, are likely to have a higher sense of political efficacy in both countries, which may serve to propel them to activity even when mobilization is low. "What distinguishes male political participation rates from female political participation rates," Milbrath and Goel argue, "is the male's sense of political efficacy; men are more likely than women to feel that they are qualified to deal with the complexities of politics" (1977:117; Campbell, et al. 1960:58, 259-64; Almond and Verba 1965:329-30). Comparisons in this area could not be made for Bogotá because of lack of data.

Campaign Activity. A second mode of political participation is campaign activity, which manifests gender-related differences in the United States, Austria, India, Japan, and the Netherlands (Verba and Nie 1972:100; Miller, Miller and Schneider 1980:323; Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978:287). In the author's survey of Montevideo, campaign activity was determined by asking "Have you worked actively for some political candidate or contributed money for an election campaign?" Seven percent of the women and twenty percent of the men said they had ($P \leq .001$). Gallup Uruguay found similar relationships for specific campaign activities "in recent years" and in the 1971 presidential campaign (Table 2). Men were more likely to have been candidates, attended political meetings and rallies, and tried to convince others, but not necessarily to have worked in the 1971 campaign.

Gender also had a significant impact on campaign activity in Bogotá. Two questions from the 1974 survey loaded on the campaign participation mode--how many rallies for presidential candidates one attended and whether one personally helped a candidate in his political labors. The gender-related differences for both variables were quite small. Eighty percent of the women and seventy-four percent of the men had attended no rallies, while eight percent of the women and twelve percent of the men had attended two or more ($P = .01$). Candidates received help from nine percent of the women and thirteen percent of the men ($P = .04$). There were no questions on campaign activity in the 1972 survey. In a survey of five regions of Colombia, however, a small relationship between gender and campaign activity was found (Losada Lora and Vélez Bustillo 1979:158).

Campaign activity, then, is a form of political participation in which only a minority of either men or women participate. In Bogotá and Montevideo, the minority of male campaign activists was slightly larger than the female minority. Nevertheless, a significant proportion of women participated in campaigns in both polities. Although differences in wording of the questions make precise comparison impossible, it appears that women did not participate

more in campaigns in Montevideo than in Bogotá, as one might have expected from Uruguay's higher level of development. Reported levels of campaign work were relatively similar.

It should be noted that in spite of their significant role as citizen activists in campaigns, women were substantially under-represented in political leadership positions--in Colombia, particularly at the departmental and municipal levels. In campaign organizations, women were found particularly in those sections aimed specifically at women and were involved more in campaign execution than strategy making (Harkess and Pinzón de Lewin 1975:455, 458-59; Laserna Jaramillo n.d.:33-35; but see Pinzón de Lewin and Rothlisberger 1977:45-46). Similar findings are reported for Peru, Chile, the United States, and Canada (Chaney 1979:90; Giele 1978:59; Fowlkes, Perkins, and Rinehart 1979:772; Vickers and Brodie 1981:62-66).

Contacting. The third mode of participation, particularized contacting, appears to be only weakly affected by gender. Perlman reports a small relationship in a Rio favela (1976:172). Verba and Nie (1972:99) report only a weak relationship in the United States, a finding in keeping with the data for Montevideo and Bogotá. Using questions based on those of Verba and Nie, Losada Lora and Vélez Bustillo found no relationship between gender and particularized contacting in a survey of five regions of Colombia (1979:158). The indicators of particularized contacting available in Bogotá and Montevideo tap favor seeking and receipt. The 1974 Bogotá survey asked: "Politicians try to provide direct benefits to their supporters. In your case, have you received some benefit?" Only three percent of the women and two percent of the men said they had. In 1972, in response to a similar question about direct benefits from their own party, eight percent of the women and six percent of the men said yes (not significant for either year).

In the author's survey of Montevideo, respondents were asked if they had been able to make use of the help provided by political clubs (the major channel of political patronage and favors in Uruguay). Twenty percent of the men said they had or could receive help compared to eleven percent of the women ($P = .001$). Similarly, in a Gallup Uruguay survey of Montevideo, sixteen percent of the men and ten percent of the women said they had "visited a politician to ask a favor of him" ($P < .01$). Two other surveys, however, found no difference. Eleven percent of each gender in urban Uruguay had "employed the services of some politician," while forty-three percent of men and forty-five percent of women in Canelones, the department surrounding Montevideo, said they know a politician from whom they could ask a small favor (Gallup Uruguay 1968b:3, 1968c:95, 1966a:31). While not definitive, the data do support the conclusion that gender is not a major factor in particularized contacting. There is no significant relationship in either the Colombian national or the Bogotá data, while gender is not consistently related to favor seeking in the urban areas of Uruguay. The differences in questions make comparison difficult, but it appears that women have more particularized contacts in Montevideo than in Bogotá.

Communal Activity. Organizational activity is both an important source of political behavior and a form of participation through which considerable influence may be exerted (Lane 1959:187-95; Almond and Verba 1965:244; Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978:130). Gender commonly affects organizational membership. In fact, Almond and Verba (1965:248) report that "The national differences in the number of individuals participating in associations can be largely explained by differences in the proportion of women who report such membership." In each of the five countries they studied, except the United States, twice as many men as women were organizational members. In their seven-nation study, Verba, Nie, and Kim (1978:246) found that men were more active members of organizations in each of the nations, except the United States, which manifested little male/female difference (1978:246). Organizational membership appears to be low among women in other parts of Latin America (Jaquette 1976:59).

Using questions measuring active involvement in community problem solving, Losada Lora and Vélez Bustillo (1979:158, 164) found only a small association between gender and communal activity in their survey of five regions in Colombia. The indicators of communal activity available for Bogotá and Montevideo measure organizational membership. In the 1972 survey of Bogotá, respondents were asked if they belonged to any of eight kinds of organizations. Although a majority of both genders reported no memberships, men were more likely than women to belong to at least one organization (30 percent vs. 11 percent, $P = .001$).

Differences appear less marked in Montevideo. In the author's survey, 52 percent of women and 56 percent of men were members of at least one organization (among seven types); 24 percent of women and 34 percent of men belonged to two or more organizations ($P = .003$). In a Gallup Uruguay survey of Montevideo which reported the proportion of men and women belonging to each of twelve kinds of organizations, women had a mean percentage difference of only four less per type (1968b:34). A major 1963 survey of Uruguay's rural dispersed population found that men were more likely to belong to professional organizations or unions (12 percent of men, 2 percent of women) and civic groups (15 percent, 8 percent) but that the sexes were comparable in membership in social and religious groups (30 percent of each gender; first two significant; CLEH 1963:421-26). A stronger relationship was found in a Gallup Uruguay survey of urban Uruguay; 56 percent of men but only 35 percent of women belonged to one or more organizations (1966c:47). It should be noted that even if this latter relationship is correct, the male-female difference is not as great as in four of the five countries in The Civic Culture (1965:247). Moreover, urban Uruguayan women are not confined to social and religious organizations. In the author's survey of Montevideo, fourteen percent of women and thirteen percent of men belonged to cooperatives, seven percent of women and ten percent of men to professional organizations, and thirteen percent and twenty percent to unions.

The data are supportive of the findings in many nations that women are less likely to belong to organizations than are men. Nevertheless, the differences appear smaller in Montevideo than in Bogotá and more comparable to the pattern

of small differences found in the United States. Women were far more likely to belong to organizations in Montevideo than Bogotá. Even rural Uruguayan women appeared to be more active than women in Bogotá.

Political Communication. The final mode, political communication, is important both as a means to influence and as an activity satisfying in itself. In the United States and Western Europe, it is associated with gender, although education, social class, and nationality are variously found to be more important determinants (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee 1954:243; Lane 1959:83; Miller, Miller, and Schneider 1980:311; Inglehart 1981:301-302). This was also true for Montevideo and Bogotá, although gender has only a small impact in Bogotá.

In Uruguay, the relationship between gender and political communication appears to be affected by the degree of political stimulus present. Between presidential election campaigns, women were less involved in political communication than men but showed comparable levels under the stimulus of the approaching election. Similarly, political interest and party identification were little related to gender during a campaign but were related in low stimulus, non-campaign situations (Biles 1977:7, 17). The evidence on political communication falls into two areas. First, between campaigns, Uruguayan women appeared to have a stronger preference for the more passive sources of political information. According to the author's 1970 survey, Uruguayan men discussed politics and read about it more than did women, but there were no statistically significant differences in the more passive activity of listening to political information on radio and television. Second, in non-campaign periods, there was roughly equal general exposure to the media between males and females, but a higher preference for political news on the part of men. Women and men, for example, read newspapers in equal proportions, but men were more likely to read editorials and government news (Gallup Uruguay 1965:29-32, 1968a:98, 1962:39). In rural Uruguay, where media exposure is much lower for male and female, the two genders were about equal in general newspaper reading and radio listening, but men were more likely to prefer news programs (21 percent to 19 percent; CLEH 1963:427-30). At the time of the 1971 elections, however, gender-based differences declined. Respondents were asked four questions about listening to the candidates on radio and television and reading editorials and party platforms. Women had a mean percentage difference of only four less than men in Montevideo and five in the urban interior (Gallup Uruguay 1971a:21-29).

The data from Bogotá are somewhat supportive of the findings in Montevideo. In the 1974 survey, there were five indicators of political communication--"the two media of communication you used the most to follow the election campaign," following the campaign by radio or by newspaper, and discussing politics. In 1972, there were two measures--attention to the campaign and the media used to follow the campaign. In the 1974 presidential election campaign, there were no statistically significant differences in the proportions who reported not following the campaign in the media in general or in specific media. During the 1972 state and local campaign, however, significantly more women (54 percent) than men (45 percent) paid "no attention" to the campaign ($P = .05$). Off-year elections are less salient events than presidential

elections in Colombia. For example, during the years 1958-78, national voter turnout in presidential years had a mean percentage difference of 14 higher than turnout in non-presidential years (Losada 1978:186).³ It would appear that in the higher stimulus (presidential) elections, women in Bogotá are more likely to follow politics in the media.

With respect to media preference, the type of election did not appear to make a difference in Bogotá. In both election years, women and men alike preferred the more passive radio and television over the more demanding newspapers as sources of campaign information. Women, however, had a slightly greater preference than did men for radio and television, while slightly more men than women preferred newspapers ($P = .004$, 1972; $P = .05$, 1974).

In both Bogotá and Montevideo, a majority of women and men alike discussed politics with others, but men were more likely to do so. In 1974 in Bogotá, 65 percent of men and 58 percent of women reported discussing politics with someone during the campaign ($P = .001$). In the 1970 Montevideo survey, 62 percent of women and 82 percent of men were "accustomed to talking about political matters with other people" at least occasionally ($P < .001$). A 1968 Gallup Uruguay survey of Montevideo found that 45 percent of women and 58 percent of men "talked about politics" at least occasionally (1968b:17). The gap appears to be larger in Mexico, where Blough found that 55 percent of men and 25 percent of women "talked about politics at least occasionally" (1972:206).

Among those who discuss politics, gender affects with whom the discussion is held. The home was the most important locale for political discussions in the United States, Montevideo, and Bogotá, but it was most important for women (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee 1954:102; Gallup Uruguay 1968b:18). Of those Montevideo women who discussed politics, 80 percent did so with family members, compared to 59 percent of the men. Women who discussed politics were also more likely than men to discuss it with friends. But men (with more employment) were more likely to talk politics with co-workers and slightly more likely to discuss it with politicians and public officials. A similar pattern is found in the 1974 Bogotá survey. Among those who discussed politics, women were more likely than men to do so with family and neighbors (69 percent of women to 32 percent of men), while men were more likely to discuss politics with persons outside the home and neighborhood, such as co-workers (45 percent vs. 18 percent).

In summary, in both cities following politics in the media appeared to be affected by the degree of stimulus, with gender-related differences tending to disappear during high stimulus presidential campaigns. Men in both cities were more likely to discuss politics, although the differences were less in Bogotá. Among women, political discussions were more likely to be confined to primary groups. The level of political discussion among women was comparable in the two cities, while attention to politics in the media was higher among women in Montevideo.

Over-All Participation. Gender is related to the over-all level of political participation in a variety of polities, although the association is weaker in the United States. "The disparity in activity grows greater as one

moves up from mass political activities such as voting, to more difficult political acts, to occupancy of political office" (Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978:235; Evans 1981:40-41).

Data from both Bogotá and Montevideo support the finding of greater over-all participation by men but indicate that substantial numbers of women are more than minimally active. To measure over-all participation in Bogota, scales composed of the responses to three questions were devised. For 1974, the questions were whether the respondent voted, did campaign work, or discussed politics. For 1972, organizational membership was substituted for campaign work. In both years, gender was associated with participation levels. In 1974, only 16 percent of the men and 25 percent of the women reported having done none of the acts; 51 percent of the men and 42 percent of the women had done two or more ($P < .001$). In the non-presidential year 1972, participation was down, but the pattern was similar; 57 percent of the women and 41 percent of the men did none of the acts, while 16 percent of the women and 27 percent of the men did two or more ($P = .001$). For Montevideo, a scale was composed of voting, talking politics, campaign work, and political club membership. Gender was clearly related. Fifty-eight percent of women and thirty percent of men had done one or no acts, while seven percent of the women and twenty-two percent of the men had done three or more ($P = .001$). Construction of scales for the Montevideo data similar to those for Bogotá indicates higher over-all levels of participation among Montevideo women.

Intervening Variables: Status and Age

A word of caution is in order. The finding of low bivariate associations between gender and participation in Bogotá and Montevideo may not tell the full story. Much research indicates that bivariate findings may mask differing patterns among women in different circumstances (Milbrath and Goel 1977: 117-18). Two of the more important intervening variables are status and age.

With the Bogotá data, it was possible to examine the effects of status and age as intervening variables for voting, political communication, organizational membership, and over-all participation for 1972. Three indicators of status were used--economic stratum and education for both years and class self-identification for 1974. For Montevideo, turnout in the 1966 election, the turnout index, campaign work or contribution, favor seeking, group membership, and discussing politics were examined with age, class self-identification, and education as intervening variables.

Status. Education and other sources of status provide important resources and incentives which may translate into greater political participation for women. For example, women with a college education in the United States have participation rates similar to those of college educated men in a wide range of activities (Soule and McGrath 1977:180-82; Lansing 1974:17-18). Thus, lower education rates for women can be a major source of lower political participation. In addition, research in the United States and Chile indicates that low status affects women's participation more than that of men (Chaney 1979:87). Verba, Nie, and Kim found, however, that among the seven nations studied--none Latin American--only in the United States did women convert education into

political activity at a noticeably higher rate than did men (1978:244). Nevertheless, in the Latin American context, class may prove particularly important (Chaney 1979:87).

In Bogotá, there were important differences between the two elections. In 1974, the data showed the expected pattern: differences associated with gender were largely accounted for by differences between males and females among those of lower status, while there were few differences in political participation between men and women of higher status. In 1972, however, it was particularly among those of higher status that males were more likely to participate.

When voter turnout for the 1974 elections were cross-tabulated with gender as the independent variable while controlling for status, a similar pattern emerged with all three status indicators: among lower status individuals men were more likely to vote than were women; while among higher status individuals, the gender-related differences disappeared. Among working class identifiers, for example, there was a percentage difference of 16 in favor of men ($P < .001$), while only one percent separated women and men in the middle class (not significant). A nation-wide survey of urban women conducted in Colombia in 1975 adds partial support to these conclusions. It found that social strata was clearly related to the 1974 voter turnout of women. (Education, however, had only a small association with female turnout; Pinzón de Lewin and Rothlisberger 1977:53-55). Thus, the over-all tendency of men to vote more than women may be attributable to the lower resources available to working class women for overcoming traditional sex roles or limitations.

When similar procedures were performed for "discussing politics during the campaign," essentially the same results emerged. Among working class identifiers, the percentage difference in favor of men was again 16 ($P \leq .001$), while the differences disappeared in the middle class (percent difference of three in favor of women; not significant). In keeping with the 1974 bivariate pattern, when the status variables were used with the questions concerning following the campaign in the media, no statistically significant relationships with gender emerged for any of the status levels of the variables. Apparently, in 1974 there was no relationship between gender and following the campaign in the media for either high or low status bogotanos. Finally, the index of over-all participation was examined. For all three indicators of status, lower status men participated more than lower status women, while there was little difference between the sexes for the middle and higher status respondents. In summary, in 1974 there were gender-related differences in participation among the working class but not the middle class in Bogotá for at least voting, discussing politics, and over-all level of participation.

In 1972, on the other hand, it was among those of higher status that males out-participated females in voting and following the campaign. In the cases of organizational membership and the participation index, status was not a factor. Men were more likely to participate at all status levels. With respect to the voting mode in 1972, there were no statistically significant differences in the turnout of women and men among those of working class or lower middle class stratum or those with grade school or incomplete secondary education. There were, however, significant differences among those of middle

to upper stratum (13 percent difference; $P = .01$) and those with advanced secondary or some university education (16 percentage points; $P = .02$). The same pattern was repeated for the political communications mode (measured by following the election campaign and the media used to follow the campaign). Among those of higher strata or education, there were statistically significant differences. Men were more likely to follow the campaign and to prefer newspapers. In contrast to the 1974 findings, the increased status did not eliminate differences in participation levels between men and women. For some forms of participation, men participated more at all status levels. In the case of other forms, it was precisely among those of higher status that men participated more.

With the data available, it was not possible to determine with certitude why the 1972 and 1974 patterns differed in Bogotá. One possible explanation derives from the fact that 1974 was both a presidential and congressional election year, while 1972 involved only departmental (state) assembly and local council elections. In Bogotá the stimulus of a presidential race had considerable impact on women of whatever education and men of lower education. In 1972 there was little difference in the turnout of women of grade school and university education (percent difference of seven), while with men there was a percent difference of 27. Women of both levels and men of lower education voted in roughly similar proportions. Under the stimulus of a presidential election, all three groups increased their turnout by 18 to 31 percentage points. Men with higher education were less affected, increasing their turnout by only 11 percentage points. The result was that in 1974 men of both levels and women with higher education were roughly comparable in participation, with lesser educated women voting at a lower level.

The data suggest, then, that higher status men had the stimulus and the resources to vote at a high level regardless of the stimulus of the campaign. Those who were disadvantaged within the system (women and lower status men), however, were more likely to be affected by the stimulus of a campaign. The two less disadvantaged groups (higher status women and lower status men) responded more to the campaign. The most disadvantaged groups (lower status women) reacted to the stimulus of a campaign but had insufficient resources to respond to the same degree. Both gender and status limitations have been at work. In a low stimulus situation, only the most gender and status advantaged group (high status males) stood out in voting participation. In a high stimulus election, it was the most disadvantaged group (low status females) which voted least. The finding that women are particularly affected by the political stimuli and resources is in keeping with bivariate Uruguayan and Bogotá findings for political communication and with Verba, Nie, and Kim's finding that for women education and other resources often do not convert into political activity at the same rate as for men (1978:251).

With the Uruguayan data, different patterns emerged with the two measures of status--class self-identification and education. When class identification was held constant, gender continued to be associated with participation of both the working and the middle classes for voting, campaign work, discussing politics, and over-all participation. Only in the cases of organizational membership and contacting were there no statistically significant differences between working class women's and men's participation, but middle class men

were more likely to participate than middle class women. The general pattern for the modes of participation was that middle class women tended to participate more than working class women, but having middle class identification did not increase participation sufficiently to match that of middle class men. Why? One possible explanation is that Uruguayan women did not convert resources into political activity faster than did men. This explanation, however, is disputed by the findings below when education is held constant. Rather, it may be that class self-identification and perhaps class itself were not sufficiently related to the resources available to the individual women. Class status for the women derived in large measure from the status of their husbands and fathers. This does convert into individual resources such as education and income for some, but for others there are dependency, less education, and little control over income. Hence, when class identification and objective measures of status are cross-tabulated, there is considerable "misidentification."

When education is used as the intervening variable for the Montevideo data, the expected pattern emerges. For all of the measures of participation, there are no statistically significant differences in the level of participation between women and men with a university education. But there are significant differences for each of the modes for those with primary and secondary education. (The only exception is organizational membership, for which there are significant differences only among those with secondary education--primary or university.) For each variable, with this one exception, the male-female gap in level of participation declines with increasing education to become insignificant among those with a university education. This reinforces the findings elsewhere of the key role of education in enhancing the participation of women (Lansing 1976:178) and suggests that it is a better predictor of participation than the more diffuse class self-identification.

Age. Age may also affect the participation of women and men. There are both life-cycle and generational factors. In general, the middle aged of both gender participate more than the old and the young, but if the male-female gap in participation is a function of traditional roles and situations, the gap between male and female participation should be less among the young. Verba, Nie, and Kim find a smaller gap among the young in four nations, a similar gap in two, and a larger gap in one (1978:266). In the 1974 Bogotá sample, only the case of voting lends support to the smaller-gap-among-the-young hypothesis--and that imperfectly. Those sixty years of age and over have the largest percentage difference (23, $P = .03$), while the middle aged and young have smaller gaps (7 and 10, $P = .05$ and $.04$ respectively). With respect to attention to the media, there are no statistically significant gender-related differences for any of the three age groups. In the cases of discussing politics and the over-all level of participation, the only statistically significant relationships are among the youngest respondents--those aged 21 to 29. Age, then, has no clearly consistent impact on male-female political participation in 1974.

The data for 1972 clearly suggest the rejection of the hypothesis of generational change producing more equality in participation among the young. Four variables are available: voting, following the campaign, organizational membership, and the participation index. In all four cases, the young have a

statistically significant male-female gap in participation equal to or greater than that of the older cohorts. If traditional roles and situations limit women's political participation, the younger generation does not appear to be breaking them down.

On the other hand, it may be that life-cycle factors are important. The differential barriers to participation may be breached as one grows older. The data lend some support to this hypothesis. In the case of the communications mode, there are no statistically significant differences in participation between the sexes among the older respondents for any variable in either survey. Neither are there significant differences in over-all participation for the older cohort for the two years. A significant gap comparable to those of the young and middle aged does exist among the old in the case of organizational membership in 1972. With respect to voting, the oldest of the largest gap in 1974 but no significant differences in 1972. In summary, there is some support for the life-cycle hypothesis. As people grow older, there may be a decline in gender-based differences in over-all levels of participation and some modes, notably political communication and possibly voting.

In contrast to the evidence from Bogotá, the Montevideo data provide more support for the generational change hypothesis, although there is some evidence for both hypotheses. With respect to generational change, the smallest gap in participation is found among the young for over-all participation, contacting, and discussing politics. In the case of over-all level of participation, the gap for low participation increases from 18 among the young to 25 among the middle aged to 31 among the elderly. For high participation, the gaps (percentage difference) are 8, 17, and 17 from youngest to oldest. While the differences are less among the young, the over-all level of participation of women is significantly less than that of men for all three age levels. Support for life-cycle factors reducing the male advantage is found only in the case of organizational membership. The data for voting and campaign activity support neither hypothesis.

A Few Conclusions

The evidence is strong that by the early to mid-1970s women in Bogota and Montevideo no longer fit the traditional image of political marginality. But neither had they broken completely with traditional patterns nor achieved full political equality. In the areas of formal and socially supported participation, under the special stimulus of a presidential campaign, or in the case of less political, more particularistic action, male-female differences were small or nonexistent. Thus, gender-based differences in voter turnout had largely disappeared in Montevideo and were moderate in Bogotá. Differences in levels of political communication in both cities declined sharply under the stimulus of presidential campaigns, and particularized contacting showed inconsistent or no significant association with gender. In the area of organizational membership, women were less likely to participate, but the pattern differed between the two cities. In Montevideo, the differences were less substantial than in Bogotá. In other respects, however, patterns appeared more traditional. In Montevideo, women had a strong sense of duty to vote but a low sense of political efficacy. Women in both cities were less likely to be involved in campaigns and had lower rates of over-all participation. Even

where there was participation, it was often circumscribed. Women who discussed politics were more likely to do so primarily with family and neighbors. Even activist women working within the parties tended to do so in traditional female roles.

The analysis reinforces the finding elsewhere of the importance of status for increasing the participation of women. Women with more personal resources tended to participate more than women with fewer resources and to overcome the participatory advantage of men. The analysis also suggests two refinements. First, class self-identification proved less valuable than education as a predictor of participation in Montevideo, probably because it said less about the actual resources available to women. Second, not only the resources available to women but the stimulus provided by the political environment affected the degree of political participation--producing equality with men in high stimulus situations such as presidential elections and inequality in lower stimulus situations such as local elections. Age also served as an intervening factor influencing the degree of participation. In Bogotá, the evidence supported the conclusion that at least in some areas, including over-all participation, the life cycle tended to reduce the gap between women and men. The gap in male-female participation declined with age. In Montevideo, a tendency toward generational change in the direction of greater equality appeared stronger. The participation gap was least among the young. Importantly, status and age in both cities tended to reduce but not eliminate male-female differences.

It was expected that the common threads of Latin American culture, metropolitan location, and democratic process would produce similarities in patterns of participation for women in the two cities but that differences in levels of development would produce greater participation in Montevideo. In general, these expectations were met. There is considerable similarity. Voting and political communication are relatively common for women in both cities, while campaign activity and contacting are considerably less common. Women in both cities are affected by the availability of resources and the stimulus of campaigns. While exact comparisons are difficult because of differences in question phraseology and the exact nature of the act involved, it appears that women have comparable levels of campaign activity and political discussion in the two cities. In most areas, however, women appear to participate more in Montevideo. These areas include: voting, particularized contacting, organizational membership, following politics in the media, and over-all level of participation. This is in keeping with Montevideo's higher state of development. Indicative that change was taking place in Montevideo is the evidence that the gap in participation was smallest among the young.

Two words of caution are in order. In positions of leadership, particularly elective office, women are grossly underrepresented (Pinzón de Lewin and Rothlisberger 1977:59; Biles 1977:38), a situation also found in the United States, Western Europe, and other parts of Latin America (Lovenduski and Hills 1981:325; Krauss 1974:1711; Jaquette 1976:68). It is only in the area of citizen participation that considerable equality exists. Second, this study deals in depth only with Bogotá and Montevideo (and to a lesser degree the urban interior of Uruguay). Generalizations to the nations as a whole were possible only in a few instances.

TABLE 1

Relation of Gender to Reported Voter Turnout by Year
and Voting History in Montevideo
(Percentage Reporting Voting)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>			
1958 ^a	67%	68%			
N (100%)	(535)	(628)			
1962 ^a	83%	79%	<u>Voting History</u>		
N (100%)	(208)	(192)			
1966 ^a	80%	79%	Voted in All ^b	Female	Male
N (100%)	(392)	(376)	N (100%)	55%	71%*
				(359)	(325)
1966 ^b	77%	89%*	Voted "in recent years" ^a	78%	83%
N (100%)	(422)	(397)	N (100%)	(433)	(417)
1971 ^a	95%	95%			
N (100%)	(321)	(284)			

^a Sources: Gallup Uruguay, 1962:21; 1966b:79; 1967:7; 1968b:3; 1971b:1. Data for 1971 are for urban Uruguay. Turnout was higher in 1971 because of the imposition of sanctions to enforce compulsory voting.

^b Source: Author's survey. "All" represents the respondent's having reported voting in each of the elections for which eligible, 1954-66.

* Significant at $P \leq .05$.

TABLE 2

Relation of Gender to Campaign Activity in Urban Uruguay
(Percentage Reporting Activity)^a

Activity	Montevideo 1968 Done in Recent Years		Montevideo Done in 1971 Campaign		Urban Interior	
	G e n d e r					
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Attend Political Meetings	33%	47%	27%	41%	32%	47%
Participant in a political rally	10	21	--	--	--	--
Go to political clubs	--	--	18	24*	14	27
Work in a campaign	9	21	10	13*	9	13*
Try to convince others to vote like you	--	--	19	28	18	24
Be a member of the commission or figure in the list of candidates of a club	6	14	--	--	--	--
Number of cases (100%)	(436)	(417)	(357)	(305)	(435)	(402)

^a Columns do not add up to 100%. Each item is separate. Sources: Gallup Uruguay 1968b:3; 1971a:19-34.

* Differences not significant at P = .05.

NOTES

1. This paper was presented at the National Meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, Washington, D. C., March 4-6, 1982. The author thanks the Fulbright program for financial support of field work in Colombia; the Department of Political Science of the Universidad de los Andes for the use of their data; Gabriel Murillo and Carlos Martínez of the Universidad de los Andes for advice and assistance; the Shell International Studies Fellowship and O.A.S. Research Fellowship Programs for financial support in Uruguay; Gallup Uruguay and its director, Luís Alberto Ferreira, for access to data; Mr. Ulises Graceras for advice and assistance; Sam Houston State University for released time under a Faculty Research Grant and for computer services; Laura Ingle for assistance in computation; and Shirley McCarty for typing.
2. The Colombian surveys were multistage cluster samples (N for 1972 = 732; N for 1974 = 1,463). The author's survey of Montevideo used multistage cluster sampling, while Gallup Uruguay used stratified three-stage area probability samples. For the author's survey, N = 852. Sample size for Gallup Uruguay varied from 400 to 1,500 but was generally greater than 800 for Montevideo and 1,400 for urban Uruguay (Montevideo and the urban interior). Significance is accepted at .05 for Chi-square. Percent difference, Asymmetric Somer's d, and Asymmetric Lambda, as appropriate, are used to measure association (Garson 1971:154, 162). SCSS and SPSS were used for computation.
3. In neither Colombia nor the United States, however, is there a tendency for the male-female gap in voter turnout to be larger in non-presidential than presidential years. In the period 1965-78 in the United States, the mean difference in male-female turnout for presidential years was 7.6 percent compared to 6.8 percent for off-year elections (Miller, Miller, and Schneider 1980:317). For Colombia in the period 1958-74, the mean difference was 19.6 percent for presidential years and 18.0 percent for nonpresidential years (Losada 1976:11).

REFERENCES

- Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba
1965 The Civic Culture. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Anderson, Kristi
1975 "Working Women and Political Participation." American Journal of Political Science 19 (August):439-53.
- Berelson, Bernard, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee
1954 Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Biles, Robert E.
1981 "The Modes of Political Participation in Bogotá, Colombia." Paper presented at the International Studies Association/Southwest meeting, Dallas, TX (March 25-28).

1978 "Political Participation in Urban Uruguay: Mixing Public and Private Ends." In John A. Booth and Mitchell A. Seligson (eds.) Political Participation in Latin America, Vol. I, Citizen and State. New York: Holmes and Meier.

1977 "The Semi-Liberated Woman: Female Political Behavior in Uruguay." Paper presented at the Southwestern Political Science Association meeting, Dallas, TX (March 30-April 2).
- Blough, William
1972 "Political Attitudes of Mexican Women." Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs 14 (May):201-24.
- Booth, John A.
1976 "A Replication: Modes of Political Participation in Costa Rica." Western Political Quarterly 29 (December):627-33.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes
1960 The American Voter. New York: John Wiley.
- Chaney, Elsa M.
1979 Supermadre: Women in Politics in Latin America. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- CLEH (Centro Latinoamericano de Economía Humana)
1963 Situación económica y social del Uruguay rural. Montevideo: Ministerio de Ganadería y Agricultura.
- Dirección General de Estadística y Censo (Uruguay)
1969 IV Censo de Población y II de Vivienda, Datos Definitivos, Cifras Principales. Montevideo (1963 census).

Evans, Judith

- 1981 "USA." In Joni Lovenduski and Jill Hills (eds.) The Politics of the Second Electorate: Women and Public Participation. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fowles, Diane L., Jerry Perkins, and Sue Tolleson Rinehart

- 1979 "Gender Roles and Party Roles." American Political Science Review 73 (September):772-80.

Gallup Uruguay

- 1971a Indice Gallup de Opinión Pública, Number 180-181 (November).
- 1971b Indice Gallup de Opinión Pública, Number 182-183 (December).
- 1968a Investigación Sobre la Problemática Nacional, Reference 642/2/68. Montevideo.
- 1968b Indice Gallup de Opinión Pública, Number 96-97 (May).
- 1968c Investigación de Opinión Pública Sobre Gobierno y Problemática Nacional, Reference 669/12/68. Montevideo.
- 1967 Indice Gallup de Opinión Pública, Number 72 (January 30).
- 1966a Encuesta de Opinión Pública: Departamento de Canelones (May). Montevideo.
- 1966b Encuesta: Opinión Política e Imagen de Candidatos y Partidos, Reference 569/66 (September). Montevideo.
- 1966c Indice Gallup de Opinión Pública, Number 68-70 (November 30-December 30).
- 1965 Image, Attitudes and Media Study. Montevideo.
- 1962 Sondeo Político del Departamento de Montevideo, Reference 222/61 (February). Montevideo.

Garson, David

- 1971 Handbook of Political Science Methods. Boston: Holbrook Press.

Giele, Janet Zollinger

- 1978 Women and the Future: Changing Sex Roles in Modern America. New York: Free Press.

Harkess, Shirley and Patricia Pinzón de Lewin

- 1975 "Women, the Vote, and the Politics of the Colombian National Front." Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs 17 (November): 439-64.

- Inglehart, Margaret L.
1981 "Political Interest in West European Women: An Historical and Empirical Comparative Analysis." Comparative Political Studies 14 (October):299-326.
- Jaquette, Jane S.
1976 "Female Political Participation in Latin America." In Lynne B. Iglitzin and Ruth Ross (eds.) Women in the World: A Comparative Study. Santa Barbara: Clio Books.
- Johnson, Kenneth F.
1977 "Research Perspectives on the Revised Fitzgibbon-Johnson Index of the Image of Political Democracy in Latin America, 1945-75." In James W. Wilkie and Kenneth Ruddle (eds.) Statistical Abstract of Latin America, Supplement 6, Quantitative Latin American Studies: Methods and Findings. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center.
- Krauss, Wilma R.
1974 "Political Implications of Gender Roles: A Review of the Literature." American Political Science Review 68 (December):1706-23.
- Lane, Robert E.
1959 Political Life. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Lansing, Marjorie
1976 "Political Change for the American Woman." In Lynn B. Iglitzin and Ruth Ross (eds.) Women in the World: A Comparative Study. Santa Barbara: Clio Books.
1974 "The American Woman: Voter and Activist." In Jane S. Jaquette (ed.) Women in Politics. New York: Wiley.
- Laserna Jaramillo, Dorotea
n.d. "Participación política de la mujer en la campaña 1974." Unpublished manuscript, Departamento de Ciencias Políticas, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia.
- Levitt, Morris
1967 "The Political Role of American Women." Journal of Human Relations 15:23-25.
- Lewis, Paul H.
1971 "The Female Vote in Argentina, 1958-1965." Comparative Political Studies 3 (January):425-41.
- Lopez de Rodríguez, Cecilia and Magdalena León de Leal
1977 "El trabajo de la mujer." In Magdalena León de Leal (ed.) La Mujer y el Desarrollo en Colombia. Bogotá: Asociación Colombiana para el Estudio de la Población.

- Losada, Rodrigo
1978 "El Significado Político de las Elecciones de 1978 en Colombia." Coyuntura Económica, 8 (August):183-201.
- 1976 Las Elecciones de Mitaca en 1976: Participación Electoral y Perspectiva Histórica. Bogotá: FEDESARROLLO.
- Losada Lora, Rodrigo and Eduardo Vélez Bustillo
1979 "Quiénes participan en política en Colombia, Como y por qué?" Coyuntura Económica 9 (April):143-64.
- Lovenduski, Joni and Jill Hills (eds.)
1981 The Politics of the Second Electorate: Women and Public Participation. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Milbrath, Lester W. and M. L. Goel
1977 Political Participation. 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Miller, Warren E., Arthur H. Miller, and Edward J. Schneider
1980 American National Election Studies Data Sourcebook, 1952-1978. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morcillo, Pedro P., et al.
1972 "Estudio sobre abstención electoral en las elecciones de marzo de 1968 en Cali." Colombia Política--Estadísticas Básicas 1935-1970. Bogotá: Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística.
- Needler, Martin C.
1977 An Introduction to Latin American Politics. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Neuse, Steven M.
1978 "Voting in Chile: The Feminine Response." In John A. Booth and Mitchell A. Seligson (eds.) Political Participation in Latin America, Vol. I, Citizen and State. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Perlman, Janice E.
1976 The Myth of Marginality: Urban Poverty and Politics in Rio de Janeiro. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pescatello, Ann (ed.)
1973 Female and Male in Latin America, Essays. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Pinzón de Lewin, Patricia and Dora Rothlisberger
1977 "Participación política de la mujer." In Magdalena León de Leal (ed.) La Mujer y el Desarrollo en Colombia. Bogotá: Asociación Colombiana para el Estudio de la Población.

- Rosen, Bernard C. and Anita La Raia
1972 "Modernity in Women: An Index of Social Change in Brazil." Journal of Marriage and the Family 34 (May):353-54.
- Soule, John W. and Wilma E. McGrath
1977 "A Comparative Study of Male-Female Political Attitudes at Citizen and Elite Levels." In Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage (eds.) A Portrait of Marginality: The Political Behavior of American Women. New York: David McKay.
- Van Allen, Judith
1976 "African Women, 'Modernization,' and National Liberation." In Lynne B. Iglitzin and Ruth Ross (eds.) Women in the World: A Comparative Study. Santa Barbara: Clio Books.
- Verba, Sidney and Norman H. Nie
1972 Participation in America. New York: Harper and Row.
- Verba, Sidney, Norman H. Nie, and Jae-On Kim
1978 Participation and Political Equality, A Seven-Nation Comparison. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vickers, Jill McCalla and M. Janine Brodie
1981 "Canada." In Joni Lovenduski and Jill Hills (eds.) The Politics of the Second Electorate. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

WOMEN AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ISSN# 0888-5354

The WID Program at Michigan State University began its *Women in International Development Publication Series* in late 1981 in response to the need to disseminate the rapidly growing body of work that addressed the lives of women in Third World countries undergoing change. The series cross-cuts disciplines and brings together research, critical analyses and proposals for change. Its goals are: (1) to highlight women in development (WID) as an important area of research; (2) to contribute to the development of the field as a scholarly endeavor; and (3) to encourage new approaches to development policy and programming.

The *Working Papers on Women in International Development* series features journal-length articles based on original research or analytical summaries of relevant research, theoretical analyses, and evaluations of development programming and policy.

The *WID Forum* series features short reports that describe research projects and development programs, and reviews current policy issues.

EDITOR: Anne Ferguson
MANAGING EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Pam Galbraith
DISTRIBUTION & PRODUCTION MANAGER: Barry Crassweller

EDITORIAL BOARD: Margaret Aguwa, Family Medicine; Marilyn Aronoff, Sociology; James Bingen, Resource Development; Ada Finifter, Political Science; Linda Cooke Johnson, History; Assefa Mehretu, Geography; Anne Meyering, History; Ann Millard, Anthropology; Julia R. Miller, College of Human Ecology; Lynn Paine, Teacher Education; Paul Strassmann, Economics; David Wiley, African Studies Center; Jack Williams, Asian Studies Center; Kim A. Wilson, Institute of International Agriculture; Khalida Zaki, Department of Sociology.

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS: To provide an opportunity for the work of those concerned with development issues affecting women to be critiqued and refined, all manuscripts submitted to the series are peer reviewed. The review process averages three months and accepted manuscripts are published within ten-to-twelve weeks. Authors receive ten free copies, retain copyrights to their works, and are encouraged to submit them to the journal of their choice.

Manuscripts submitted should be double-spaced, sent in duplicate, on disk or emailed (to wid@pilot.msu.edu) in WordPerfect compatible format and include the following: (1) title page bearing the name, address and institutional affiliation of the author; (2) one-paragraph abstract; (3) text; (4) notes; (5) references cited; and (6) tables and figures. The format of the article must follow the format as depicted in our "Style sheet". Submit manuscripts to Anne Ferguson, Editor, WID Publication Series, Women and International Development Program, 202 International Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1035, USA. Style sheets are available upon request.

TO ORDER PUBLICATIONS: Publications are available at a nominal cost and cost-equivalent exchange relationships are encouraged. To order publications or receive a listing of them, you may write to the WID Program, 202 International Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1035, USA or check out our Web site (<http://www.isp.msu.edu/wid/>) which also has all the ordering information and an order form. Orders can also be sent to us via email at (wid@pilot.msu.edu).