

STUDENT DISSENT IN LATIN AMERICA: TOWARD A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS*

Dani B. Thomas and Richard B. Craig, Kent State University

INTRODUCTION

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS HAVE LONG PLAYED AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN LATIN AMERICAN politics. Preceding by several decades the first signs of youthful protest in the United States, student activism in Latin America has been persistent and often decisive. For example, student groups were instrumental in the overthrow of regimes in Cuba (1933, 1959), Guatemala (1944), Venezuela (1958), and Bolivia (1964). At one time or another, virtually every governing strongman in the region has had to contend with varying opposition from student groups. Indeed, as Robert Alexander has noted, "in the past four decades they have constituted one of the most important pressure groups in twenty republics."¹

This long-acknowledged role in national politics notwithstanding, only recently have students received a measure of scholarly attention commensurate with their reputation for activism. Only a decade ago Frank Bonilla could say, "student organizations seem to have a permanent and institutionalized place in Latin American society, yet little analysis has been made of the main features of this distinctive social phenomenon."² Since that time, however, there has been a marked increase in the number of studies concerned with students and politics in Latin America. Most of the literature published in the 1960's is related to the general themes of political socialization and elite recruitment. More recently several studies have appeared which purport to deal with the factors that differentiate the politically active from the inactive student. These studies have emphasized the influence of such variables as SES background, age, sex, year in school, and academic major on the students' political outlook and ambitions.³ As survey techniques have become more widespread in such research, there has been notable progress in the study of student attitudes and opinions. Such progress in attitudinal research notwithstanding, there has been little systematic research on student political *behavior* itself.⁴ The present study is undertaken to help fill this rather peculiar void. It is primarily an attempt to systematically identify some of the factors that are associated with, and which presumably affect, student political activity on a broad scale in Latin America. More specifically, the study is designed to explore some possible linkages between student activity and certain aspects of the broader political environment.

* The authors would like to thank Professor John Daily of Georgia Southern University for his help on methodological matters and for his permission to use the data from an earlier joint project. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Howard Hamilton of Kent State University for his insightful comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

Several commentators on students and politics have alluded to the importance of such factors. S. M. Lipset, for example, asserts that environmental characteristics comprise the most important set of variables in any investigation of the political behavior of university students, especially in the developing areas.⁵ Ian Weinberg and Kenneth Walker agree with Lipset's statement and have set forth a typology of institutionalized student politics based on the assumption that the most important factors affecting student political activities are the characteristics of the political system in which they occur.⁶ Beyond this initial assumption, there is little in the Weinberg and Walker typology of value to the present study. Their sole concern is with institutionalized (i.e., organized) politics whereas the present effort focuses on more noninstitutionalized and spontaneous forms of student activism (i.e., demonstrations and the like). Furthermore, Weinberg and Walker treat Latin America as a whole and, as a result, do not consider national variations.⁷

With specific reference to Latin America, Kalman Silvert has argued similarly that the impact of student intrusions into politics varies with the general social environment.⁸ He argues that student political activity is most likely to be effective in systems where the institutional infrastructure is weak and where other potentially more powerful interest groups are unorganized.⁹ In the course of his discussion, Silvert points out that "unless the unique historical development of each country is taken into account . . . attempts to categorize the range and effectiveness of student participation in politics may appear simplistic."¹⁰ But, he nevertheless goes on to say: "Still, it should be possible to derive a set of categories sufficiently flexible to give realistic play to each unique case, yet precise enough to be meaningful."¹¹

In establishing his own categories, Silvert presents a four-fold typology as a means of highlighting the linkages between student political activity and the political environment: (1) Situations of stable, traditional societies: Nicaragua, Haiti, and Paraguay. The political role of students in such nations is negligible. (2) Situations of beginning modernization and disarray: El Salvador, Guatemala, Ecuador, Peru, the Dominican Republic, and Panama. It is here, claims Silvert, that students can exercise their greatest power. (3) More mature situations of temporary resolution: Colombia, Venezuela, and Bolivia. Students play an active role in these systems, but their effectiveness is limited by the growth of other groups. (4) Situations of institutional complexity and relative strength: Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Chile, and Cuba. In such an environment student power is said to be limited by pluralism and a complex social class system.

The present study was in part suggested by Silvert's analysis. Practical considerations precluded a study of student political behavior in all Latin American republics; therefore, Silvert's typology was used to generate a more manageable set of countries that could be considered *representative* of variations in the region as a whole. Accordingly, in an effort to compare levels of student political activity, ten countries were selected in such a way as to include at least two examples of each of the four types of political environments described by Silvert. (The ten countries selected for the analysis are listed in Table 1.) To further narrow the scope of in-

quiry, the investigation was restricted to those activities of students which were recorded for each of the ten countries from 1961 through 1966.¹²

CONCEPTUAL BASIS

Population

In an effort to provide a "population" of student political actions sufficient for exploratory research, the subject index to the *New York Times* was consulted for any information relevant to students and/or politics in each of the ten countries in the period 1961–1966. From a preliminary list of over two hundred citations, an examination of the newspaper articles themselves produced a total of 96 separate instances of reported political actions for the six years under investigation. The frequency of reported actions, as can be seen in Table 1, ranged from a low of 1 in Paraguay to a high of 26 in Argentina.

TABLE 1

Number of Student Actions Reported in Ten Latin American Countries, 1961–1966

Category ^a	Country	Number of Cases	Rankings
1. Stable, Traditional Society	Haiti	2	9
	Paraguay	1	10
2. Beginning Modernization & Disarray	Panama	13	3
	Peru	6	8
3. More Mature; Situations of Temporary Resolution	Colombia	6	8
	Bolivia	7	6
	Venezuela	13	3
4. Institutional Complexity & Relative Strength	Argentina	26	1
	Brazil	13	3
	Mexico	9	5

^a Source: See Appendix A (no. V)

It should be noted that no claim to total representativeness can be made on behalf of the cases so provided. First, the 96 instances reflect a definite bias in favor of the more newsworthy items related to students in Latin America. As a result, the majority of the cases reported are instances of dramatic and often violent protests, strikes, street demonstrations, or riots. Second, there is the problem of accuracy; i.e., there is no way of determining to what extent the reports contain distortion or misrepresentation of the facts. Finally, it must be recognized that for the sake of brevity and space, newspaper accounts often exclude important qualifying information or material on events which preceded a particular manifestation of student unrest. These limitations notwithstanding, our understanding of the origins and parameters of student protest and dissent is such that the reported cases offer a valid starting point for comparative research in student political behavior.

Latin American Research Review

Dependent Variables: Frequency, Size, and Extent of Violence

For present purposes, the simple ordinal ranking of the ten countries in terms of the number of cases reported can be viewed as a tentative scale of student politicization. Thus, Argentina ranks first in level of student political activity; Brazil, Panama, and Venezuela tie for second; Mexico is third; while Haiti and Paraguay are the countries with the fewest number of student actions reported. As will be seen, it is possible to take this "scale" and compare it statistically with various measures of political development in order to determine whether incidence of student actions is significantly related to any of the properties commonly associated with the modernization or stability of the larger political system.

Beyond the mere quantity of student actions, it is of interest to determine whether certain kinds of student activities are associated with any aspects of the political environment. In other words, what factors, if any, help to distinguish certain styles of student activity or protest? With this question in mind, each of the 96 cases was coded for two *dependent* variables: one dealing with the number of participants in a specific action (*size*), and the other concerned with the level of *violence* (or peacefulness) which characterized the activity. The former variable (*size*) is also viewed as an *independent* variable; hence, the number of participants index is correlated with the level of violence index as well as the various other independent variables.¹³

Independent Variables

The large number of independent variables reflects the exploratory nature of the study.¹⁴ These variables can be broadly characterized as representing three levels: (1) a *macro-level*, which includes various indices of political development in the national political system; (2) a *middle-level*, which incorporates variables pertaining to the educational system; and (3) a *micro-level*, which takes into account situational factors such as the type of issue at stake in a particular action.

Macro-level variables. As noted at the outset, the chief concern of this study is reflected in an emphasis on possible linkages between frequency and style of student "direct action" and particular characteristics of the society in which that action takes place.¹⁵ Accordingly, data have been collected to provide measures for a number of variables broadly related to the concept of political development. If it is the case, as Lipset and Silvert have suggested, that a hearty propensity for political activity on the part of students is a reflection of the relative tension and instability in the larger polity, then we might expect concrete evidence to this effect to emerge from a comparison of various levels of political development and stability with our index of student politicization.

Following Silvert's argument, it would seem reasonable to expect that a high level of student activity would characterize those systems having an underdeveloped pressure group network. Several of the macro-level variables in this analysis are pertinent to Silvert's thesis. For example, each of the three classes or scales of political party development (variables 7, 8, 9 in Appendix A) taps a particular di-

mension of the political infrastructure which Silvert regards as crucial to the prospects of student political power. Likewise, the series of variables (nos. 10–16) taken from *A Cross Polity Survey* can be considered indicative of the relative impact of associations, institutions, and anomic interest groups on governmental policy. This permits an operational testing of Silvert's claim that in order for students to be active and "influence the course of national political life . . . other power centers must be in such disarray as to elevate the relative power of any organized group."¹⁶

Middle-level variables. Many writers have emphasized the influence of the educational system itself on the political activity of Latin American university students. Robert E. Scott has studied university students and the University Reform Movement in several Latin American countries and maintains that most student demonstrations "stem from a sense of frustration growing out of real deficiencies in educational facilities or from a feeling of insecurity that magnifies government decisions which the students see as undermining their present situation or their future hopes."¹⁷ Scott is supported in this conclusion by such observers as Risieri Frondizi,¹⁸ former rector of the University of Buenos Aires and brother of ex-President Arturo Frondizi, Orlando Albornoz,¹⁹ and John P. Harrison.²⁰ Albornoz and Harrison have examined the political implications of the University Reform Movement and contend that the movement has politicized members of the academic community and, in the process, has transformed the university from an institution of academic training and excellence into a center of political and social concern.²¹

Kenneth Walker has made a comparative study of the Reform Movements in Colombia and Argentina. He claims that it is the relative success of the movement more than any other variable which is responsible for the variance in activity among the student populations in each country.²² In the present study, Harrison's three-fold classification of the *success of the Reform Movement* is used as an ordinal estimate for the single middle-level variable.²³ A comparison on the scores on this variable with the dependent variables (frequency, size, and extent of violence) provides some indication as to whether Walker's observations on Colombia and Argentina are capable of accounting for differential political activity in the other republics as well.

Micro-level variables. In addition to the above variables, each of the 96 cases was coded according to (1) scope (no. 19) and content (no. 20) of *issue involved* in an action or protest and (2) whether or not a clearly identifiable precipitator or catalyst was present to instigate the student action (no. 21).²⁴ To illustrate the scoring procedure on these scales, the *scope* variable was broken down into the broad categories of (1) university-wide issues, (2) matters of national political concern, and (3) issues dealing with international or foreign policy questions. Each case was then rated as to which category most appropriately described the scope of the issue at stake, with ambiguous or unclear cases excluded. The same procedure was used for the *issue content* variable except, of course, for the classifications. In the latter, the following categories were employed: (1) issues in which the activity was primarily an expression of nationalism; (2) issues whose content was broadly relevant to university reform or autonomy; and (3) those instances where the specifics varied

Latin American Research Review

but the general issue was one of student opposition to government policy or practices. Again, those cases not falling within these categories were omitted.

Owing to the exploratory nature of this study, our analysis is restricted to only the most significant relationships which were discovered between independent and dependent variables. The sections which follow deal, in order, with (1) systemic correlates of differential student political activity; (2) factors associated with various sizes of student protest; and (3) conditions that appear to be crucial in a consideration of student political violence. A concluding note offers a summary of major findings and points to some suggested areas for future research.

SYSTEMIC CORRELATES OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

It will be recalled that frequency of student action was generally greater in more highly developed political systems. Present findings indicate a significant relationship between frequency of student actions and political development, variously defined. The same relationship obtains when three of the first four independent variables (democratic ranking, stability, and extent of social mobilization) are correlated with the rankings of the ten countries in terms of number of actions reported. For example, note the correspondence in Table 2 between the "correlates of democracy" ranking of 1961 and the positions of the countries on the ordinal scale of the incidence of reported student actions. Using Spearman's *r_{ho}*, the rank order correlation of student activism and level of democratic development is .66, and is statistically significant at the .05 level.

A comparison of the *social mobilization* and *societal welfare* ranks with the frequency scale yields similar results. The extent of *social mobilization* relative to other Latin American countries is found to correlate positively and significantly with

TABLE 2
Association of Rate of Student Activism and Level of Democratic Development

Country	Rank on Democratic Scale ^a	Rank by Rate of Activism ^b
Argentina	1	1
Mexico	2	5
Colombia	3	8
Brazil	4	3
Venezuela	5	3
Peru	6	8
Panama	7	3
Bolivia	8	6
Haiti	9	9
Paraguay	10	10

^a Source: Appendix A (no. 1)

^b Rate of Activism = Number of Incidents Reported in *New York Times*

the activism ranking ($r_{ho} = .74, p < .01$).²⁵ This supports the notion that students are more prone to engage in significant political actions in a milieu of rapid social change. The data are also consistent with Silvert's observations regarding student behavior in systems beginning to undergo "institutional disarray" as a consequence of stepped-up modernization.²⁶ Silvert, however, is more concerned with *qualitative* factors in student activism than we are here; i.e., he is interested in the actual political power wielded by students compared to other groups in society. Since the present objective is to explain differential *rates* of student activism and, hence, the focus is on *quantitative* factors (i.e., numbers of demonstrations, etc.), the similarities with Silvert's work should not be exaggerated.

When defined in terms of *societal welfare*, political development is once again found to bear a strong relationship to the level of student activism. The actual value of the rank order correlation between student activism and societal welfare is .80, and is statistically significant at the .01 level.²⁷ When operationalized solely in terms of political *stability*, however, political development does not correlate significantly with the student politicization index ($r_{ho} = .32$). The absence of a stronger linear relationship is due largely to the fact that in traditionally stable societies, such as Paraguay and Haiti, the politicization level among students is exceedingly low.²⁸

CONDITIONS RELATED TO THE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Using the number of reported political actions as the basis for a crude ordinal index of student politicization leaves much unsaid about the different *kinds* of student actions which take place. Obviously, not all of the incidents reported are of the same genre; sporadic symbolic incidents, such as the burning of the U.S. flag or the picketing of a foreign embassy, are vastly different from, for instance, a massive demonstration or a general student strike. It is therefore necessary to consider, insofar as possible, some of the characteristics associated with various types of student actions. Accordingly, one of the objectives of the present study is to explore some of the factors related to differential levels of student participation.

Each of the 96 reported instances was scored for the number of student participants involved, according to the following criteria: (1) *Factional*. Reported action was confined to a small group of students usually labeled "extremist"; (2) *Moderate*. Number of students is larger than a "handful," smaller than "massive"; (3) *Massive*. Here the particular action was either endorsed or actively engaged in by most students or was at least reported as "massive" in nature. From this rough categorization it is possible to identify those conditions which co-vary with the extent of student mobilization for articulating demands.

Party Structure and Demonstration Size

Statistically, the only *macro-level* variable found to have relevance here is that by which the political party system for each country is classified according to degree of *institutionalization* relative to the others.²⁹ In Table 3 the observed frequencies are

shown in the cross-tabulation of these two variables with chi squared (χ^2) serving as a measure of statistical significance, and Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma (G) being used as a measure of the association of the two variables. In this case, the observed frequencies deviate markedly from the distribution one would expect solely on the basis of chance if the two variables were unrelated and completely independent of one another. As a result, the chi squared statistic ($\chi^2 = 19.1$) is significant at the .01 level, which means that the observed frequencies depart from chance expectations to a degree that could be attributed to chance on the average of less than one time out of a hundred. Note also that the Gamma statistic (G) is significant at the .001 level ($G = +.39$), indicating that the two variables are positively related.

TABLE 3
Size of Student Demonstration by Type of Party System in Ten Selected Countries, 1961–1966
(number of demonstrations)

Demonstration Size	Type of Party System			Total
	Developed Parties ^a	Undeveloped Parties ^b	No Parties ^c	
Small	17	9	7	33
Medium	11	11	0	22
Large	5	25	8	38
Total	33	45	15	93 ^d

G = +.39, p < .001

^a Mexico, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela

^b Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil

^c Haiti, Panama, Paraguay

^d Three cases were omitted for insufficient evidence.

Descriptively this means that in those systems with well-developed political parties (i.e., Mexico, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela), student demonstrations typically do not reach the scale found in systems with no institutionalized party structures. In countries where the party structure is relatively weak—Bolivia, Brazil, and Argentina are examples here—there appears a greater likelihood for massive student actions. Although it is considerably more difficult to move beyond such a descriptive analysis and explain such data, these findings appear to be consonant with Silvert's observations regarding the impact of student actions; that is, in an atmosphere of institutional weakness, student political power is elevated. Although present data do not permit an evaluation in terms of the effectiveness or impact of such activity, they do indicate that massive student actions are significantly more plentiful in an environment characterized by relative institutional disarray.

Scope and Content of Issue and Demonstration Size

Perhaps the most significant finding in terms of relationship between demonstration size and the broader, systemic characteristics is that they are generally uncorrelated. Aside from the exception noted above, present evidence suggests that *macro-level* variables are generally unrelated in any systemic way to the number of students mobilized for an expression of political concern. From these results, the most effective predictors of demonstration size are clearly the situational factors related to the scope and nature of the issue in dispute.

As is indicated in Table 4, there seems to be an inverse relationship between the *scope of the issue involved* and the *size of action*.³⁰ The moderate negative association of these variables is due primarily to the cell frequencies in columns 1 and 3 which deal, respectively, with issues basically of university and international concern. As can be seen, there is only a slight discrepancy between observed and expected frequencies in the 42 incidents in which the principal issue was classified as "national" in scope. In essence, these findings suggest that broad-based student political actions are likely to be dependent on issues immediately and directly relevant to most students.

TABLE 4
Size of Demonstration by Scope of Issue Involved for Selected Instances of Student Political Action in Latin America
(number of demonstrations)

Demonstration Size	Issue Scope			Total
	University	National	International	
Small	4	14	15	33
Medium	4	13	5	22
Large	16	15	6	37
Total	24	42	26	92 ^a

$$\chi^2 = 13.9, p < .01$$

$$G = -.50, p < .001$$

^a Four cases were omitted because of insufficient information.

Further support for this view is contained in Table 5 wherein *issue content* and *size of action* are cross-tabulated.³¹ Of particular significance is the size distribution in the 30 instances in which the basic contention was centered around the perennially sensitive issues of university reform and/or autonomy. Moreover, of the incidents reported, 38 were classified as "massive" in size; significantly, the basic issue in more than half of the broadbased actions was in some manner related to the politics of university reform.

Summarizing, present evidence highlights the importance of situational considerations, especially the scope and content of the particular issue involved, in predicting the general proportions any given action is likely to assume. Thus, the

TABLE 5

Size of Demonstration by Content of Issue Involved for Selected Instances of Student Political Action in Latin America (number of demonstrations)

Demonstration Size	Content of Issue ^a				Total
	Nationalism	University Re- form, Autonomy	Anti- Regime	Other	
Small	12	5	10	6	33
Medium	5	5	10	2	22
Large	8	20	10	0	38
Total	25	30	30	8	93 ^b

$\chi^2 = 18.6, p < .01$

^a Content of Issue data are not ordinal; therefore G was not computed.

^b Three cases were omitted because of insufficient information.

probability of massive protest is greatest when the issues are closest to home or when they involve what Silvert calls “more primary definitions of interest” than is generally the case in smaller student political ventures. It is under these circumstances that students are likely to achieve a working consensus and present a united front. As William Hamilton concludes in his study of student activism in Venezuela: “In general, the issues on which the students can act most effectively are those dealing with education, and especially with the university. These are the issues on which the students are most likely to agree and least likely to be divided by general party policies. . . .”³²

CONDITIONS RELATED TO STUDENT VIOLENCE

As noted earlier (Table 2), a significant correlation exists between the relative incidence of student political activity and a composite, judgmental index of political development derived from ratings provided by Latin American specialists on a number of variables relevant to modernization. Those countries which rated highest on these *correlates of democracy* experienced a significantly greater number of student demonstrations, marches, protests, etc., in 1961–1966 than did the other, less developed nations. This finding becomes more interesting in light of the relationships which emerge when the student actions are studied in terms of the factors associated with differential levels of violence in the incidents. For the purposes of exploration, each dispute was coded in terms of the following classification: (1) peaceful, no violence reported; (2) property damage, minimal violence reported; (3) property damage and/or only bodily injury reported; and (4) loss of life experienced as a result of confrontation.³³

Political Culture and Student Violence

If the ordinal scale for *correlates of democracy* is taken as a tentative index of political culture, assuming that the more democratic cultures receive higher ratings here relative to the other countries, it can be seen that, generally, student political action takes on a significantly more peaceful style in those systems buttressed by a relatively "democratic" political culture. Conversely, in the lesser-developed systems, where student actions are proportionately less frequent, the incidents which do occur are more likely to end and, possibly, though it is more difficult to determine, begin in violence. The data on which this interpretation is based are presented in Table 6. Again, it is far more difficult to *explain* these patterns than it is to *describe* them. Suffice it to say that, on the basis of limited empirical evidence, the political tone of student protests and demonstrations—with "tone" here viewed in terms of the extent of violence—is not unrelated to the nature of the larger political and social environmental context.

TABLE 6

Level of Violence in Student Demonstrations by Democratic Ranking for Ten Selected Countries, 1961–1966
(number of demonstrations)

Level of Violence	Democratic Score				Total
	High	Moderate-High	Moderate-Low	Low	
Peaceful	20	14	5	3	42
Somewhat Peaceful	8	10	9	2	29
Somewhat Violent	7	3	2	3	15
Violent	1	5	2	2	10
Total	36	32	18	10	96

$$G = +.35, p < .001$$

Further research, especially of a systematic and comparative nature, is needed before the association between student political style and national political culture is confirmed and amplified. Nevertheless, this evidence suggests the presence of a significant relationship.

The credibility of this view is further supported by the statistically significant negative associations which were discovered between *level of violence* in student direct actions and other variables of political development. Tables 7 and 8, respectively, show the relationship between student *violence* and *political stability* and stage of *political development*. The latter is particularly noteworthy because the independent variable in this case is represented by Silvert's four-fold classification of political environments in terms of level of development. Interestingly, both tables indicate a

TABLE 7
Level of Violence in Student Demonstrations by Political Stability in Ten Selected Countries, 1961–1966
 (number of demonstrations)

Level of Violence	Level of Stability				Total
	High	Moderate-High	Moderate-Low	Low	
Peaceful	19	14	6	3	42
Somewhat Peaceful	13	4	7	5	29
Somewhat Violent	6	2	4	3	15
Violent	2	2	4	2	10
Total	40	22	21	13	96

G = + .33, p < .001

TABLE 8
Level of Violence in Student Demonstrations by Stage of Development in Ten Selected Countries, 1961–1966
 (number of demonstrations)

Level of Violence	Stage of Development ^a				Total
	Institutional Complexity	Temporary Resolution	Relative Disarray	Stable Traditional	
Peaceful	29	7	5	1	42
Somewhat Peaceful	11	8	9	1	29
Somewhat Violent	6	5	3	1	15
Violent	2	6	2	0	10
Total	48	26	19	3	96

G = + .48, p < .001

^a Source: Appendix A (no. V)

positive association between the comparative level of political development and the relative incidence *and* peacefulness of student actions.

Situational Issues in Student Political Violence

In view of the spontaneous character of many student actions in the political sphere, it would seem reasonable to expect situational factors to play an instrumental role in either enhancing or minimizing the prospects for violence in any given encounter where students are a party. Quite clearly, present evidence shows this to be the case; however, to a degree, the relationships which are found are not those that one might expect on the basis of casual observation. For example, Table 9 shows the relationship discovered between *demonstration size* and the *degree of violence* and it reveals a significant *negative* correlation for these two variables.

STUDENT DISSENT IN LATIN AMERICA

TABLE 9

*Level of Violence by Number of Participants for Selected
Instances of Student Political Action in Latin America
(number of demonstrations)*

Level of Violence	Number of Participants			Total
	Few	Moderate	Many	
Peaceful	9	9	23	41
Somewhat Peaceful	16	9	4	29
Somewhat Violent	4	3	6	13
Violent	4	1	5	10
Total	33	22	38	93 ^a

$$\chi^2 = 15.0, p < .05 \quad G = -.24, p < .001$$

^a Three cases were omitted because of insufficient information.

In this case the only appropriate explanation seems to be that in the larger demonstrations students are typically more organized and, evidently, the massive size of such protests is considered to be a sufficient sign of student concern on an issue. A resort to violent tactics in order to dramatize political demands is apparently deemed unnecessary in this context. Generally speaking, then, the idea that massive demonstrations, by virtue of their large and often unwieldy number of participants, are more likely to result in violence than the small or moderate-sized protests, is not supported by present evidence.

Finally, as regards the chances for violence in any given encounter where students are participants, the *content of the issue involved* represents an important consideration. Table 10 reveals some interesting patterns in this regard. Although chi-squared is not a wholly reliable measure of statistical significance here because more than 20 percent of the expected frequencies are less than 5, the table nevertheless suggests that the nature of the issue in student disorders is a crucial consideration in assessing the prospects for violence.³⁴

In those instances where student actions were essentially expressions of nationalist sentiment (column 1), violence is usually minimal in spite of the apparent desire of militant groups to exploit such situations and provoke widespread violence.³⁵ While issues relevant to university reform have been at the heart of half of the ten most violent confrontations, the difficulty in generalizing from this is pointed up by the fact that nearly half of the most peaceful incidents were concerned with the same type of issue. It is thus necessary to recognize the importance of situational factors peculiar to each case in discussing the determinants of student political violence. At present, the most informative studies of student violence have been forced to adopt a case study approach in order to give full play to the multitude of conditions which presumably influence the extent of violence experienced in student disorders.³⁶

TABLE 10

Level of Violence by Content of Issue Involved for Selected Instances of Student Political Action in Latin America
(number of demonstrations)

Level of Violence	Content of Issue				Total
	Nationalism	University Reform, Autonomy	Anti-Regime	Other	
Peaceful	9	18	14	1	42
Somewhat Peaceful	14	3	6	6	29
Somewhat Violent	1	6	6	2	15
Violent	1	5	4	0	10
Total	25	32	30	9	96

$\chi^2 = 24.8, p < .01$ $G = +.18, p < .01$

In this context, it seems most useful to consider the *content of the issue* involved as a necessary, but not sufficient, condition in interpreting the precursors of student political violence. Very often the most crucial consideration in assessing the causes of student violence, regardless of what tactics are used by the students, is the nature of the initial response by governing authorities to student claims. For example, in those cases where authorities have forcefully responded to sporadic attempts by extremist groups to undermine the ruling elite—e.g., Venezuela during the period under study—by restricting the range of liberties traditionally guaranteed under the university reform laws, the student response has typically been more violent. However, a great deal more research is needed before the most significant precursors of student violence can be identified and studied comparatively.

CONCLUSIONS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Four substantive conclusions emerge from this exploratory analysis of student dissent in Latin America. First, there is scant evidence to justify any claim that a systematic association exists between the extent and form of “direct action” undertaken by students and various aspects of the larger political system. The outstanding exception to this was the finding that the frequency of such student actions is significantly greater in the more “developed” political systems. As to size of demonstrations, the only systemic variable found to bear a significant relationship was party institutionalization, though the association is exceedingly complex and difficult to explain.

Secondly, similar conclusions are warranted at an intermediate level: the only middle-level variable in the study (Harrison’s three-fold breakdown of the relative success of the University Reform Movement) failed to correlate significantly with either of the dependent variables. Present evidence points to the paramount impor-

tance of situational factors in accounting for variance in size and degree of violence of student political protests.

Third, in searching for determinants of the number of participants in student actions, it is instructive to consider the impact of issue scope and content. The nature of the relationship of both variables to demonstration size shows that massive protests are definitely more commonplace if the issue involved is one of immediate and direct relevance to most students, e.g., if the issue deals with university politics or policy related to the traditionally sensitive matter of University Reform and autonomy. Accordingly, the more peripheral the issue to most students' concerns, the lower the number of participants.

While from a purely quantitative point of view, student dissent is more frequently encountered in the more modernized nations, it was found that the degree of violence associated with such protests is significantly higher at the lower stages of modernization. Contrary to expectations, it was further discovered that the number of participants is a poor predictor of the level of violence in student demonstrations. In fact, a moderate though statistically significant negative association was found between demonstration size and extent of violence.

Finally, issue content was found to be an important factor in accounting for differences in the level of violence in student protests. Of the cases in which severe violence was reported, half began as protests over policies broadly related to University Reform or autonomy. Beyond these substantive findings, which are admittedly tentative, a number of equally important methodological issues have been tapped—issues directly relevant to the development of any empirically-based theory of student activism. We therefore conclude by turning to the most salient of these issues, briefly noting how such matters affect research on students and politics generally and in Latin America specifically.

Most analysts of student political activism in Latin America and elsewhere have approached their subject more "directly" than is the case here. Specifically, this more direct approach has usually meant "going to the horse's mouth" and seeking the determinants of student activism in data provided by the students themselves in response to surveys or questionnaires. The benefits of such a strategy are numerous and self-evident. Perhaps the widespread acceptance of such an approach is best evidenced by the increased number of studies using survey research to analyze Latin American students in the past decade.

The present study seeks to contribute to this growing body of literature by deliberately adopting what might be termed an "indirect" or "environmental" approach to student political activity. Despite the limitations of this approach,³⁷ it is our belief that such an attempt to discover the conditions associated with student action is justifiable—indeed worthwhile—for several reasons. First, the broadened scope of such an inquiry forces a consideration of the generally ignored relationship of student activity to the political processes of the larger political system. Second, by concentrating on *actual instances of activity*, this approach adds a more meaningful dimension to those discussions of "activism" and "politicization" which do not specify

objective criteria by which to identify activism and politicization. Inasmuch as the initial concern is student *behavior*, it would seem advantageous to pursue, insofar as possible, a strategy of investigation which emphasizes concrete actions over other, less objective measures of the phenomena of interest. Third, the present approach yields findings which are at once systematically derived and comparative in nature. If expanded and refined in terms of the quantity of cases and quality of measurement, such an approach offers the promise of identifying genuine cross-national dimensions which are essential to an understanding of the level of activity of a particular segment of political society, namely, the students. Finally, the worth of the current approach lies also in its suggestive nature: the unexpected statistically significant associations force the investigator to consider new facts or examine old facts from a fresh perspective. With a minimum number of *a priori* assumptions, the analyst is less constrained to interpret his observations solely within the context of a theory or model which may or may not be useful or appropriate.

Taken in its entirety, this strategy seems to merit consideration within the context of research aimed at providing a model of student politicization in the developing nations. In this light, the present analysis offers an interesting contrast to an earlier attempt by Koplin to formulate such a model.³⁸ Briefly, the latter model is based on three broad independent variables: (1) the nature of the educational system; (2) the propensity of the political elite to impose sanctions in an effort to curb student actions; and (3) the relative congruity or incongruity between the values of students and those of political authorities. Koplin sees the interactions among these three factors as responsible for the general politicization among student elements in a given country; she is supported in her claims by one case study of Ghanaian students.³⁹ However, considerable evidence exists to suggest that the model is of limited value in the study of Latin American student politics. In fact, the direction of student activity which is suggested by the model is, in practice, largely contradicted by the Latin American experience.

Perhaps a more economical approach to model-building—and one which would run less risk of empirical invalidation—would be to invert Koplin's procedure; i.e., begin with several observations and attempt to discern empirical uniformities and patterns systematically *before* the theoretical model is postulated in full. In this way, the chances of encountering an early empirical contradiction are minimized; subsequently, the patterns which emerge may be pieced together inductively so as to build a model of student politicization that is closely tied to the empirical events which it organizes and subsumes. This procedure would inhibit the tendency of the researcher to view events through theoretical lenses that might distort the behavioral landscape under investigation. Whatever its shortcomings, the present approach is not likely to produce findings which are wholly or partially a function of an invalid preconceived theory or model. With this in mind, the present study can be viewed, in part, as representing a "pre-theory" methodological alternative to previous efforts at model building.

The essence of these remarks, while obviously intended to defend our own ap-

STUDENT DISSENT IN LATIN AMERICA

proach, should not be misconstrued as an attempt to condemn all research formulated within a theoretical framework. To be sure, simply discovering some correlations among an assortment of variables in the absence of such a framework can hardly be considered fruitful unless such an approach can generate propositions and generalizations that are at once both theoretically plausible and empirically testable. Given the limitations as to scope and purpose of this article, we are somewhat hesitant, in attempting to meet these "atheoretical" standards, to claim generality for the substantive conclusions reached above. At the same time, we can see no immediate, compelling reasons to call into question the genuineness and generality of the patterns and relationships regarding student political behavior which we have observed in ten Latin American countries during a six-year time period.

In the future, other researchers may be attracted to the relationships outlined above and, as a consequence, bring more extensive evidence to bear on some of these issues. In that event, almost as a matter of course and regardless of results, our knowledge of the major dimensions and dynamics of student dissent in Latin America will have grown considerably.

NOTES

1. Robert J. Alexander, *Latin American Politics and Government*, 20 (N.Y., 1965).
2. Cited in John H. Petersen, "Recent Research on Latin American University Students," *Latin American Research Review*, 5:1: 37 (1970).
3. In addition to Petersen's review (above), see S. M. Lipset, ed., *Student Politics*, 1-53 (N.Y., 1967), for a summary of many of these studies.
4. This is not to say that there has been a dearth of material written on the topic of university student behavior, for, indeed, a great deal has been published on this problem. The point here, however, is that there has been virtually no *systematic, comparative* research which has investigated actual instances of student activity. The present approach differs from earlier efforts in that the data base comes primarily from an identifiable "population" of student political activities reported from 1961 through 1966. Thus, "activism" in this context refers to the relative incidence of *actual* student political activities and not to self-descriptions (e.g., activist, non-activist, etc.) provided in responses to survey questionnaires. An example of the latter approach to the study of student activism is John H. Petersen, "Student Political Activism in Guatemala," *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs*, 13: 78-88 (1971).
5. S. M. Lipset, "The Political Behavior of University Students in Developing Areas," *Social and Economic Studies*, 37-75 (March, 1965).
6. Ian Weinberg and Kenneth Walker, "Student Politics and Political Systems: Toward a Typology," *American Journal of Sociology*, 75: 77-96 (1970).
7. Roberta Koplin has formulated a model similar to Weinberg and Walker's. Koplin, however, is more concerned with non-institutionalized forms of student politics; and as such, her model is substantially more relevant to the present study. (The Koplin model has certain drawbacks which precluded its utilization in the present study. These weaknesses become apparent in the conclusion when Koplin's approach is contrasted with the methodology employed herein). Koplin, "A Model of Student Politicization in the Developing Nations," *Comparative Political Studies*, 1: 373-390 (1968).

Latin American Research Review

8. Kalman H. Silvert, "The University Student," In: *Continuity and Change in Latin America*, John J. Johnson, ed. (Stanford, 1964).
9. *Ibid.*, 217. Silvert is supported in this claim by Glazer's work on Chilean students. See Myron Glazer, "Chile," In: *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*, Donald K. Emmerson, ed. (N.Y., 1968).
10. Silvert, "The University Student," 222.
11. *Ibid.*
12. These years were chosen because published information on the various measures for independent variables was most plentiful during this time period.
13. Each variable is described in greater detail in the appendices. Appendix A, for example, contains the source of information used in operationalizing all of the variables; Appendix B specifies some of the criteria used to translate the variables into empirical referents, which permitted quantification and comparison.
14. The rationale for this kind of approach rests heavily on certain assumptions of statistical tests of significance. "Strictly speaking," as Robert D. Putnam points out, "significance testing is merely a way of checking inferences from a random sample to the universe from which that sample is drawn. On the other hand, Blalock and Gold have argued that significance tests may help us sift important from unimportant findings even when there is no question of inferring to a larger universe." The latter objective—sifting important from unimportant findings—is of primary value here since it is difficult, for lack of similar previous studies, to say *a priori* which relationships bear scrutiny and which do not. Ideally, tests of significance in exploratory research facilitate a separation of significant and insignificant results. For an example of a similar methodological position, see Robert D. Putnam, "Toward Explaining Military Intervention in Latin American Politics," *World Politics*, 20: 93 (Oct., 1967). Also see Hubert Blalock, Jr., *Social Statistics*, 270 (N.Y., 1960), and David Gold, "Some Problems in Generalizing Aggregate Associations," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 7: 16–18 (Dec., 1964).
15. The term "direct action" refers to those instances of student action which have traditionally had the greatest influence on the surrounding political environment (e.g., street demonstrations, strikes, marches, and protests). Since these are the kinds of activities reported in the *New York Times* for this time period, Bakke's term is used here to identify the population of activity under investigation. E. Wight Bakke, "Students on the March: The Case of Mexico and Colombia," *Sociology of Education*, 37: 200–208 (1964).
16. Silvert, "The University Student," 217.
17. "Student Political Activism in Latin America," *Daedalus*, 97: 70 (1968).
18. Frondizi's opinions are cited in Silvert, *loc. cit.*
19. Orlando Albornoz, "Academic Freedom and Higher Education in Latin America," *Comparative Education Review*, 10: 250–256 (1966).
20. John P. Harrison, "Confrontation with the Political University," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 334: 74–83 (1961).
21. See Petersen, "Recent Research," 39.
22. Kenneth N. Walker, "A Comparison of the University Reform Movements in Argentina and Colombia," *Comparative Education Review*, 10: 257–272 (June, 1966).
23. Harrison, "Confrontation," 79.
24. The term "precipitator" refers to any action by a non-student political force to which the student activity was clearly a response. The objective here is to discern the differing characteristics of "unprovoked" and "provoked" student disorders.

STUDENT DISSENT IN LATIN AMERICA

25. The empirical referents for the social mobilization variable are briefly listed in Appendix B. The scale was borrowed from Ernest A. Duff and John F. McCamant, "Measuring Social and Political Requirements for System Stability in Latin America," *American Political Science Review*, 62: 1125–1143 (Dec., 1968).
26. Silvert, "The University Student," 223. Lipset discerns this same thesis in the non-empirical literature dealing with students in Latin America. For example, he quotes Havighurst as saying that "apparent greater student interest in national politics among Latin American students is probably a reflection of more general uncertainty and instability in Latin America Thus national politics becomes a matter of concern to everybody." Cited in Lipset, "The Political Behavior of University Students," 54.
Generally the data from this study support Havighurst's speculation; however, the relationship between system stability and university student politicization is far from the simple linear one he suggests. It is significant that present evidence shows *both* democratic political culture *and* rapid societal change (and its attendant disequilibrating influence) to be characteristic of systems that experience comparatively large numbers of student demonstrations and protests. In sum, pure incidence of student penetrations into the political sphere seems to reflect the tensions inherent in the pursuit of political and social development.
27. The indices for the *societal welfare* variable are shown in Appendix B. The scale is also taken from Duff and McCamant, "Measuring Social and Political Requirements." Here we must note the possibility that a methodological artifact is partially responsible for the high correlation between activism and societal welfare. As can be seen in Appendix B, one of the three indices for the latter variable was *level of educational services* and, although this sub-index was weighted only so as to comprise 25 per cent of the composite measure, it is possible that the contribution to the total variable is such that the two variables being correlated (activism and societal welfare) are not operationally independent of one another. From this standpoint, it might be argued that more educational services will mean more students and thus a greater likelihood for student incidents. While we have not controlled for this specific possibility, we are confident that the statistical associations between various measures of development and student politicization are genuine and not spurious. The presence of the relationship when other indices of development are used supports this contention.
28. It is worth reiterating that the composite picture provided by the data considered so far does *not* indicate that students are more prone to demonstrate or protest in the relatively unstable political systems. In fact, aside from the exceptions noted in Paraguay and Haiti, the reverse relationship appears to be true; that is, students are typically more active in those systems generally considered to be stable vis-à-vis others. Nevertheless, this does not contradict the claims of Silvert, Lipset, and Havighurst; more accurately it demonstrates the need to consider the quality of student activities in addition to the mere quantity. The remainder of the paper is given over to such a consideration.
29. This classification is to be found in Appendix B and C; the original source is Duff and McCamant, "Measuring Social and Political Requirements."
30. The criteria used for classifying issue scope are admittedly gross; nevertheless, the categories seem adequate in distinguishing between the narrow issues which are unlikely to attract wide student concern and the broader issues of more immediate relevance. These criteria are listed in Appendix C.
31. The classification for *issue content* is as follows: (1) nationalism as the prime issue; (2) university reform or autonomy biggest issue; (3) anti-regime expression of some sort; and (4) other (unclear or ambiguous). These categories were suggested by Alexander's discussion of the issues which have traditionally inspired student actions of significant proportions.
32. William C. Hamilton, "Venezuela," In: *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*, 380; Donald K. Emmerson, ed. Hamilton further notes that "only in the field of educational

Latin American Research Review

policy do all three factors—unity, recognized interest, and the availability of effective means—operate in the students' favor."

Another finding not dealt with in the text concerns the role of "precipitator" in marshaling vast quantities of students into expressions of political interest. A high positive correlation was found between demonstration size and the presence of a clearly identifiable precipitator which served to rally students around the perception of a common cause. To illustrate, only 2 of 38 "massive" student actions failed to report any evidence of a prior act by opposing forces which provoked the student response.

33. It is virtually impossible from the data to determine which level of violence characterized *students' tactics*. Nevertheless, it is assumed that there is, statistically, a respectable correlation between student tactics and the level of violence which evolved from the confrontations.
34. A word of caution is in order with regard to the use of chi-squared as a test of statistical significance for Tables 9 and 10. As a general rule, the use of χ^2 presumes that not more than 20 percent of the expected cell frequencies in a contingency table will consist of an n of 5 or fewer observations. In Tables 9 and 10 we have clearly violated this assumption; the cells with expected frequencies of less than 5 comprise 33 and 50 percent of the cells in these two tables, respectively. To fully eliminate the problem of statistical reliability here would require an expansion of the scope of this analysis and, more specifically, an increase in the number of cases composing our "universe" of student behavior. Having decided against the latter alternative, believing that such a course would produce diminishing returns in view of the effort required, we are thus willing to acknowledge that χ^2 is possibly quite imprecise as a measure of statistical significance here. Accordingly, the findings suggested by these two tables are tentative and should be taken with extreme caution.
35. Interestingly enough, the majority of the 25 cases so classified dealt with the demonstration of student contempt for the U.S. and its policies toward Latin America. Such demonstrations occur quite frequently in the Canal Zone where the issue of U.S. control and presence is very sensitive. Similarly, many such expressions of nationalist feeling by students take place as a protest against the publicized presence of a high ranking U.S. official on campus or in the capital city of a given country. Generally these protests have attracted only a fraction of the membership of the student federation in large universities and, typically, have resulted in some degree of violence (usually property damage, the stoning of a motorcade, or flag desecration). There have been exceptions to this pattern; e.g., the disruptions which attended the much publicized visits of Vice President Richard Nixon to Caracas in 1958 and Nelson Rockefeller to various capitals in 1969.
36. See, for example, Bryant Wedge, "The Case Study of Student Political Violence: Brazil, 1964, and Dominican Republic, 1965," *World Politics*, 21: 183–206 (Jan., 1969). Wedge's study, although it employs a rather sophisticated analytic framework, contains a great deal of historical information. This seems to be characteristic of the studies of political violence; there are so many historical contingencies involved that cross-national analyses are severely handicapped in covering all relevant factors. The same problems are illustrated in the various studies of the Kent State crisis of May 1970. It simply does not seem feasible to develop variables which will provide satisfactory explanations of the violence at Kent State, Jackson State, and elsewhere without primary consideration being given to the peculiarities of each case.
37. Of these limitations, three are particularly noteworthy. First, no consideration is given to what might be called the "perceptual interface" of student activity. That is to say, it is assumed that the conditions for which tentative measures have been derived bear at least a general resemblance to the political milieu as it is perceived by students. To what extent this is a valid or invalid assumption cannot be determined by present evidence. However, it might be profitable to undertake a comparative study of certain "objective" indices of political conditions relative to the "subjective" interpretations of those conditions by student

STUDENT DISSENT IN LATIN AMERICA

groups. Very likely, some discrepancy exists and has definite implications for student political behavior. The example of Brazil up to 1964 is a case in point. In the early 1960's during the Goulart-Quadros period, the National Student Federation was the most powerful of any in Latin America. [See Joseph Love, "Sources for the Latin American Student Movement," *Journal of Developing Areas*, 1: 215-226 (Jan., 1967)]. In large part this prestige can be attributed to what Edelman calls a highly "symbolic alignment" between the UNE and the national leadership. Significantly, this symbolic alignment sprang from the favorable disposition of Goulart toward his former student organization. It thus seems likely that the course of Brazilian student politics was heavily influenced by this subjective identification with the national political elite. See Murray Edelman, *The Symbolic Uses of Politics* (Urbana, 1964). All of this is admittedly speculative, but the point is that such possibilities were impossible to investigate in the present study and might be worth scrutiny in the future.

Second, this approach is limited in terms of explaining differential levels of effectiveness by students in articulating their demands. Again, practical considerations precluded any measurement of student impact on the larger political scene.

Finally, this study suffers from a lack of attention to group differences in student tactics both within and between countries. Obviously, certain groups, e.g., those which identify with liberation movements, typically rely on more violent tactics than others. Unfortunately, the data base for this study is insufficient to permit a classification in terms of the style and nature of different student political groups.

38. Koplin, "A Model of Student Politicization in Developing Nations."

39. Roberta Koplin, David Finlay, and Charles Ballard, Jr., "Ghana," In: *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*, 64-102; Donald K. Emmerson, ed.

APPENDIX A

Data Sources for all Variables

Variable number	Variable Content	Source Number and page
1	Correlates of democracy ranking	I, 520
2	Stability-instability ranking	II, 1140
3	Social mobilization index ranking	II, 1131
4	Societal welfare index ranking	II, 1132
5	System capability (extractive)	II, 1133
6	System capability (distributive)	II, 1133
7	Type of party system I	III, 99
8	Type of party system II	II, 1137
9	Type of party system III	III, 97
10	Freedom of group opposition	III, 87
11	Interest articulation by associations	III, 89
12	Interest articulation by institutions	III, 90
13	Interest articulation by non-associations	III, 91
14	Interest articulation by anomic groups	III, 92
15	Interest articulation by political parties	III, 93
16	Political participation by the military	III, 113
17	Relative success of University Reform	IV, 79
18	State of political development	V, 222
19	Scope of issue at stake	VI
20	Content of issue at stake	VI
21	Presence of clearly identifiable precipitator	VI
22	Extent of general student participation	VI
23	Extent of violence associated with action	VI

Latin American Research Review

Sources: I. Russell H. Fitzgibbon and Kenneth F. Johnson, "Measurement of Latin American Change," *American Political Science Review*, 105 (Sept., 1961); II. Ernest A. Duff and John F. McCamant, "Measuring Social and Political Requirements for System Stability in Latin America," *American Political Science Review*, 62 (Dec., 1968); III. Arthur S. Banks and Robert B. Textor, *A Cross-Polity Survey* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963); IV. John P. Harrison, "The Confrontation with the Political University," *The Annals*, 324 (March, 1961); V. Kalman H. Silvert, "The University Student," In: *Continuity and Change in Latin America*, John J. Johnson, ed. (Stanford, 1964); VI. *New York Times* (1961–1966).

APPENDIX B

Indicator Description and Level of Measurement for Variables

Variable	Indices and/or Type of Measurement
1. Correlates of democracy	Survey data derived from ratings on various sub-indices by Latin American specialists (ordinal)
2. Stability-instability ranking	Relative position of countries on ranking of differences in score for variables 4 minus 3 below (ordinal)
3. Social mobilization	Composite index of rankings on (a) exposure to mass media (newspapers per 1,000 people, radio receivers per 1,000 people and T.V. receivers per 1,000 people); (b) % pop. economically active in labor unions; and (c) urbanization (ordinal)
4. Societal welfare	Composite index of rankings according to (a) per capita GDP; (b) level of health services (medical doctors per 1,000 inhabitants and hospital beds per 1,000 inhabitants); and (c) level of educational opportunities and services (% 15 and older literate, % 13–19 in secondary schools, and daily calorie intake per capita). The first index is weighted for 50% of the composite for the variable; the other 2 are equally weighted—i.e., 25% each (ordinal)
5. System capability (extractive)	Composite index of (a) taxing power of government (total taxes collected 1966 as a % of GDP); and (b) average annual grants and loans from U.S. and international agencies, 1962–66 as % of 1965 GDP (ordinal)
6. System capability (distributive)	Relative expenditures on public education as a % of GDP (ordinal)
7. Type of party system I	See Appendix C (nominal)
8. Type of party system II	See Appendix C (nominal)
9. Type of party system III	See Appendix C (nominal)
10. Freedom of group opposition	Judgmental classification; categories listed in Appendix C (nominal)
11. Interest articulation by associations	Judgmental classification; categories listed in Appendix C (nominal)

STUDENT DISSENT IN LATIN AMERICA

12. Interest articulation by institutions	Appendix C—same as above (nominal)
13. Interest articulation by non-associational groups	Appendix C—same as above (nominal)
14. Interest articulation by anomic groups	Appendix C—same as above (nominal)
15. Interest articulation by political parties	Classification shown in Appendix C (nominal)
16. Political participation by military	Classification shown in Appendix C (nominal)
17. Success of University Reform Movement	Judgmental classification. Categories listed in Appendix C; source listed in Appendix A (nominal-ordinal)
18. Stage of development	Classification shown in Appendix C; source cited in Appendix A (nominal-ordinal)
19. Scope of issue involved	Classification shown in Appendix C; ratings provided by authors and tested for reliability by separate scoring (nominal-ordinal)
20. Issue content	Classification described in Appendix C and the text. Ratings were provided by authors and tested for reliability as before (nominal)
21. Precipitator	Classified either "yes" or "no" by authors on basis of information in newspaper accounts (nominal)
22. Extent of participation by students	Classificatory breakdown described in text, identified in Appendix C. Classification provided by authors with check for reliability (ordinal)
23. Extent of violence associated with action	Same classification procedure as above; provided by authors with check for reliability. See Appendix C (ordinal)

APPENDIX C

Codebook for Latin American Student Interest Articulation

Column number	Information Coded
1–10	Country in which demonstration occurred
11–12	Last two digits of years of specific protest
13–15	Reference number
16	<i>Democratic Ranking</i> (Fitzgibbon & Johnson) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Argentina 2. Mexico 3. Colombia 4. Brazil 5. Venezuela 6. Peru, Panama 7. Bolivia, Haiti, Paraguay
17	<i>Stability-Instability Rank</i> (Duff & McCamant) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Panama, Paraguay 2. Argentina 3. Mexico

Latin American Research Review

4. Brazil
5. Haiti, Colombia
6. Venezuela
7. Peru, Bolivia
- 18 *Social Mobilization* (Duff & McCamant)
 1. Venezuela
 2. Argentina
 3. Mexico
 4. Peru, Panama
 5. Brazil
 6. Colombia, Bolivia
 7. Paraguay, Haiti
- 19 *Societal Welfare Rank* (Duff & McCamant)
 1. Argentina
 2. Venezuela
 3. Panama
 4. Mexico
 5. Brazil
 6. Paraguay, Colombia
 7. Peru, Bolivia, Haiti
- 20 *System Capability (Extractive)*
 1. Brazil
 2. Bolivia, Panama
 3. Peru, Paraguay
 4. Venezuela, Colombia
 5. Argentina, Mexico, Haiti
- 21 *System Capability (Distributive)*
 1. Peru, Panama
 2. Venezuela, Colombia
 3. Argentina, Brazil
 4. Mexico, Paraguay
 5. Bolivia, Haiti
- 22 *Party System (Qualitative I)*
 1. Broadly aggregative
 2. Class-oriented, multi-ideological
 3. Personalistic, situational or ad hoc
 4. Latin Liberal Constitutional
 5. Latin Social Revolutionary
- 23 *Party System (Qualitative II)*
 1. Institutionalized parties of national integration
 2. Parties weak in complexity, autonomy, adaptability or integration
 3. No institutionalized parties
- 24 *Party System (Quantitative III)*
 1. One party dominant
 2. Two party
 3. Multi-party
 4. No parties
- 25 *Freedom of Group Opposition*
 1. Autonomous groups, free to enter politics, or oppose government
 2. Autonomous groups, free to enter politics, but not to oppose government
 3. Autonomous groups, tolerated internally and outside government
 4. No genuinely autonomous groups

STUDENT DISSENT IN LATIN AMERICA

- 26 *Interest Articulation by Associational Groups*
1. Significant
2. Moderate
3. Limited
4. Negligible
- 27 *Interest Articulation by Institutional Groups*
1. Very significant
2. Significant
- 28 *Interest Articulation by Non-Associational Groups*
1. Significant
2. Moderate
3. Limited
- 29 *Interest Articulation by Anomic Groups*
1. Frequent
2. Occasional
- 30 *Interest Articulation by Political Parties*
1. Significant
2. Moderate
3. Limited
4. Negligible
- 31 *Political Participation by the Military*
1. Interventive
2. Supportive
3. Neutral
- 32 *Issue Involved (Scope)*
1. University-wide
2. National (extra-university politics)
3. International
0. N.A. unclear
- 33 *Relative Success of University Reform*
1. Successful
2. Moderate to limited success
3. Negligible
- 34 *Clearly Identifiable Precipitator*
1. Yes
2. No
- 35 *Extent of General Student Participation*
1. Factional (small number, extremist)
2. More than factional, less than massive
3. Massive (support of most students or student federation)
0. N.A. unclear
- 36 *Style: Violence Index*
1. Peaceful
2. Property damage (intended as well)
3. Property damage, bodily injury
4. Property damage, bodily injury, loss of life
- 37 *Silvert Typology*
1. Institutional complexity; relative strength
2. Mature; situation of temporary resolution
3. Beginning modernization and disarray
4. Stable, traditional society

Latin American Research Review

38

Issue Content

1. Nationalism or anti-regime
2. University autonomy or reform
3. Anti-regime, "revolutionary" or "subversive"
4. Other or ambiguous