"Citizen Action Groups" as new ways of political participation? Is the era of the 'sleeping citizen' coming to an end? asked R. R. Grauhan (1971: 111) in an article published a decade ago. The assumption contained in this question is confirmed in a large number of empirical studies of political participation in Germany. These studies show substantially increased participation in recent years (cf. Armbruster, Leisner 1975; Mirow 1976; Radtke 1976; Sehringer 1977; Barnes, Kaase et al. 1979; Conradt 1978; Rausch 1980). The results of these studies also raise the question of whether "civic privatism" (Habermas 1973: 106 ff), the form of attitude and behavior typical of German political culture for a long time is now a thing of the past.

The increasing political participation of Germans is also worth an attention because it is exercised in different ways. While some of the citizens get involved in politics "conventionally", by using forms of political participation which already exist but are in fact little used, the increasing importance of "unconventional" modes of behavior is noticeable. Political participation in Germany, as it is the case in other Western Democracies, appears to have changed not only in quantity but in quality as well: "Empirical analyses in recent years on a broad comparative basis have proved beyond doubt that the expansion of the action repertory beyond the field of traditional forms of participation is an universal phenomenon in developed Western industrial societies" (Kaase 1976 b: 130 ff, cf. also: Kaase 1976 a; 1976 c; 1979; Kaase, March 1979 b).

Kaase's statement concerns the action repertory of people rather than
participatory acts realized by them. The former term refers to that part of available activities for influencing government decisions which the citizens know and - if necessary - are prepared to use. It includes dispositions to political action, not participation as a form of manifest activity.

Nonetheless, the far-reaching changes in the structure of political participation in Germany can be documented with the aid of this data on action repertory. According to the findings of the Barnes-Kaase-group, the proportion of politically inactive Germans is only 26.6 percent. So, they occupy the position of a strong minority. Only slightly smaller is the percentage of the "Reformists", i.e., people who share in the complete set of "conventional" and in the simple forms of "unconventional behavior". Table 1a shows that the structure of political involvement presently found in Germany is fairly similar to that of Britain, a "classic" democratic polity (cf. also: Kaase, March 1970 c: 172).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Britain</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Austria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inactives</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformists</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformists</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activists</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>(1144)</td>
<td>(1389)</td>
<td>(1613)</td>
<td>(2207)</td>
<td>(1265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Nonclassified Respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>(1203)</td>
<td>(1483)</td>
<td>(1719)</td>
<td>(2307)</td>
<td>(1584)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kaase, March 1979 b: 155 f

Whenever German publications speak of new, unconventional, forms of political action, the term "Bürgerinitiative" (Citizen Action Group) is mentioned. It
refers to a group of persons who have organized for a limited period of time for solving a single problem located in their immediate environment. They either act as self-help groups or they try to solve their problem by influencing local or state or federal authorities. Only this latter form of activity should be understood as political participation in a strict sense (cf. Gabriel 1978 a: 26 ff; other definitions and descriptions can be found in: Zillessen 1974: 4; Mayer-Tasch 1976: 14; Guggenberger; Kempf 1978 a: 12).

Contrary to the opinion expressed in the major part of publications citizen participation in such single-purpose-groups is nothing new. What is truly novel has been the extent of this form of political activity in Germany since the late sixties. According to an opinion-poll by the Infas-Institute (1973) quoted by Mayer-Tasch (1976: 8, 152) approximately 3 percent of the German electorate, i.e., a number more or less corresponding to the number of party members, were active in citizen groups. Thirty-four percent of the respondents declared without reservation and 60 percent under certain conditions their readiness to participate in an action group. Several other polls came to similar results concerning the willingness to participate in such groups (cf. Radtke 1975: 2; Greiffenhagen, Greiffenhagen 1979: 373 M 46 c; Sehringer 1977: 882). The exact number of groups or group members can hardly be estimated reliably (cf. the very different informations in: Ministry of the Interior, Bavaria, 1972: 3; Ebert 1973: 5 ff, Thaysen 1978: 136; Bermbach 1978: 92; Trautmann 1978: 310; Andritzky 1978 a: 341; 1978 b: 18). But all these studies confirm the extent of commitment existing in citizen action groups.

Comparatively little attention was paid, however, to changes in conventional political action. A few data are sufficient to support the assumption that there has been an increasing amount of political participation of the German population in general. Germans have become more active in both senses, conventionally as well as unconventionally, but compared with the common notion of a displace-
ment of the established forms of political participation by some newer modes
the above mentioned conception of a more differentiated and a broader "action
repertory" seems to be more appropriate. Sehringer (1977) presents data which
are hardly compatible with the assumption of declining support for the estab-
lished institutions of political participation (cf. Tables 2a and 2b).

TABLE 2a: PARTICIPATION OF GERMANS IN LOCAL, STATE, AND
NATIONAL ELECTIONS, 1949 - 1976
(NUMBERS ARE PERCENTAGE OF VOTERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal elections</th>
<th>State elections</th>
<th>Local elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-1953</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1961</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1965</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1969</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1972</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1976</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sehringer 1977: 863, Table 1

TABLE 2b: MEMBERSHIP OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND TRADE UNIONS,
1963 - 1978
(Absolute Numbers Are Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Members</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Trade Union Members</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>110.09</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>99.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>147.99</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>107.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>168.36</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>113.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>182.68</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>116.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Sehringer (1977: 873, Table 7; 895: Table 20; Olzog; Liese, 1979; 179; Tempel, 1979: 89; Gabriel 1975: 1 ff; 27 ff; Hättich 1978; Behrmann 1979: 271 ff, 329 ff; Kaase 1979).
The increasing importance of civic action groups - some criticism and an alternative approach.

Some Critical Remarks on "Legitimacy Crisis"

As the arguments presented above show, conventional as well as unconventional forms of political activity have increased in Germany during the past decade. This former aspect of change, however, is ignored by some authors who try to explain the emergence of citizen actions groups since the late sixties. In my opinion, this omission leads to a clear mistaking or at least to an oversimplified description or explanation of the observable phenomena. One of the most common explanations of the emergence and enlargement of citizen groups is as follows: they arise because of structural, functional or even legitimacy crises of the established political system (Guggenberger [1978 a: 19]). Indeed this is Guggenberger's argument in the previous chapter. In an earlier work, he argued that "The 'party state' is presently confronted in a historically new and incomparable way with the problem of increasing withdrawal of support because besides the common claims for legitimacy new claims which cannot be covered by the political or economic system are being raised out of hand" (cf. also: Schiller 1970; 1978; Offe 1972; Lange et al. 1973; Bermbach 1974; 1975; 1978 a; 1978 b; Zillessen 1974; 1978; Batelle Institut 1975; Mayer-Tasch 1976; Rodenstein 1975; 1978; Guggenberger 1978 a; 1978 b; 1979; 1980; Andritzky, Wahl-Terlinden 1978; Armbruster et al. 1979).

Even if we disregard for a moment the empirical data completely incompatible with these suggestions (op. cit., especially: Kaase 1979; Müller, Jukam 1977) and restrict ourselves to a theoretical discussion of the crisis-theorem, some unsolvable problems remain. As supporters of the crisis-hypothesis admit, legitimacy means acceptance of certain objects by certain persons as

In this sense, a legitimacy crisis exists then and only then, if the institutions, norms, values, symbols, etc. of a political system can no longer count on support by its members or at least a major portion of them. It is not the case when some people refuse to accept each political decision made by the incumbent authorities. Before such a far-reaching assertion like the one of an existing legitimacy crisis of German democracy can be taken for granted it should be checked to determine whether a withdrawal of support applies to the polity, its norms and values, etc. or simply to special political decisions. According to David Easton (1965: 171 ff; 1975: 439, 451) it is important to make a difference between the "political community", the "regime", and the "incumbent authorities" as the addresses of legitimacy-beliefs of the electorate. Gamson (1968: 50 ff) adds the "public philosophy" as another dimension. It is also advisable to consider certain actions of the incumbent authorities as in need of authorization.

Quite obviously, these possible forms of (loss of) political support have a rather different effect on a political system's legitimacy and stability. Both, the withdrawal of support for the government in office, and the refusal to accept several governmental or administrative decisions as adequate and binding, are completely normal in a democratic society. According to Easton (1965: 267 ff; 1975: 437 ff) such processes indicate the loss of specific support which only under special conditions will lead to legitimacy or authority crises. These may occur when the supply of specific support fails to be sufficient over a long period of time, and, when this, in turn, produces a decline of diffuse support which is directed towards the "regime" or the
"political community". I would like to make the assumption that the activities of citizen action groups in their major part have to do with the denial of specific support but not with a general loss of diffuse support for the political system. Not only do a number of empirical data on attitudes of German people towards the political system conform to this argument (cf. especially: Conradt 1980; Rausch 1980) but also the results of Muller's study on aggressive political behavior clearly show that a decline in diffuse support does not necessarily lead to political protest (cf. Muller 1977: 127 ff; 1978; 1979: 226 ff). The next part of the paper will introduce some alternative explanations for increasing citizen activities in national and local politics mediated through citizen groups. The prevailing explanations hardly take into account empirical data.

Civic Action Groups in the Context of Research on Political Participation and Political Culture

A first recommendation I would like to make for further research on Civic Groups in Germany is that we assume that the activities carried out by their members represent only a special form of political participation which is imbedded in the larger context of political behavior-structures in democratic politics in general. Conceptual tools for explaining these activities may then be deduced from research on political participation more systematically than has hitherto been the case.

Despite obvious progress in recent years empirical research on political participation still remains at the level of a middle-range theory. It tries to connect certain "dependent" (amount and type of political participation) with "independent" "intervening variables", such as age, sex, religion, ethnicity, organizational affiliation, political attitudes and values and so on (a very good documentation or current research can be found in: Milbrath, Goel 1977).
Changes in the amount and structure of political participation are explainable by shifts among one or — more probably — a larger number of such independent and intervening variables. Among the most familiar concepts in research on political participation is the notion of political culture. According to this approach, first used by Gabriel A. Almond (1956), shifts in political participation are to be deduced from changing orientations towards the political system in general or its most important elements. These orientations may be instrumental, expressive or moral in the Parsons and Shils (1966) sense, they may be conceived as value-orientations, opinions, political attitudes or belief-systems or something else. Central to this concept, however, is the notion of political culture as the controlling and steering "system" of individuals in the respective contexts.

**Changing German Political Culture and Citizen Participation in Politics**

As suggested above, Citizen Action Groups are a particular, issue-related, time-bound, and collective form of political action. Concepts dealing with changes in political participation in general should equally apply to its specific forms. The basic problem to be dealt with in this section is of whether and to what extent the rising importance of Civic Action Groups in the German political process is due to shifts in political culture and what the particular components of political culture are having rendered Germans more "participatory".

As Verba (1965: 513) points out the political culture of a nation is to be understood as the system of political ideas, beliefs, attitudes, expressive symbols and values existing in it. Almond and Verba (1965: 13) define political culture as "the distribution of patterns of orientation toward the political objects among the members of a nation" (cf, also: Berg-Schlosser
1972: 31 ff; Devine 1972: 14 ff; Rosenbaum 1975: 6; Almond 1980; 22 ff; a good summary of the different notions of political culture is provided by Dias 1971).

Political culture, in this sense, is conceived as being built up by the sum or system of orientations shared by the members of the respective policy. These orientations influence the political behavior of the system members which, in turn, is relevant for the appropriate functioning of democratic institutions, at the system level: "The norms to which an individual adheres (and which are defined by the values of the political system under investigation and the expectancies held by system members, OWG) are largely determined by the role the system allows him to play (though the fit between the norms and the structures will rarely be perfect); but these norms have a feedback effect on the structure, reinforcing the structure if the fit between the norms and the structure is a good one, introducing strain into the system if the norm and the structure fit less well" (Almond and Verba 1965: 125).

In their "Civic Culture", Almond and Verba (1965: 13 ff) developed some theoretical categories and items for measuring political attitudes. Their purpose was to describe and to explain the features of three different types of political culture, the "parochial", the "subject", and the "participant" ones. Another type, the "civic culture", in their opinion, consists of elements of all of the forementioned types but it clearly comes most close to the participant type.

The key variables of the political culture approach underlying the classification of these types are on the "orientation-side": Cognitions, affects, and evaluations, and on the "object-side": the political system in general, its input and output structures, and the self as a participant. This is not the place for an extensive criticism of the political culture approach. Instead, I want to show which are the cognitions, affects and evaluations sup-
portive to a democratic and participatory political system and which, because of this property, encourage citizen participation in political life. This is not an easy task because Almond and Verba's research design is only quite loosely related to the theoretical framework introduced by them.

"Democratic Political Culture" - An Attempt at Conceptual Clarification and Operationalization

As we have demonstrated, a political system's values, norms, and symbols are to be internalized and shared by the members of the respective political collectivity if they successfully will be controlling their political behavior. Reconsidering Almond and Verba's objects and forms of orientations, we are able to specify the features of a "participant political culture" as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL CULTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System in General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbally stated, a political culture favoring a stable democracy and a high rate of citizen involvement in politics exists if the following conditions are present:

(1) High levels of political awareness and of information on the characteristics of the political system in general, its input and output structures and processes as well as on the citizen's role in political life (his rights and duties),

(2) Positive affects (feelings) towards the political system (polity, regime, political community), its input and output structures and processes
and the role of citizen in politics,

(3) High **evaluative commitment** to the political system and the individual's place in the political community - the remaining to objects, by definition, are not relevant for systems of value orientations (see below).

(4) Great **willingness to participate** in politics in general, in the political input and output processes, and aptitude for realizing the citizen's role and for cooperating with one's fellow citizen.

Some of the related attitude-items are to be found in Almond and Verba's Five-Nation-Survey. Others still require operationalization. Since the "Civic Culture" has been published, there have been a number of more or less promising attempts at making an empirical register of the idea of "democratic political culture". Some of them are put together in Figure 2 (cf. also: Robinson, Rusk, Head 1968; Robinson, Shaver 1974; Adrian 1977: esp. 151 ff; Milbrath, Goel 1977: 156 ff; Muller 1979: esp. 289 ff; Evans, Hildebrandt 1979: 573 ff). Using the respondent's answers to the given stimuli, they are classified as more or less democratic or participant. A particular's nation's position on the non-democratic/democratic continuum, or, using Almond's and Verba's vocabulary, its denomination as "parochial", "subject", "civic", or "participant" results from the distribution of their members attitudes at the aggregate level.

As far as it concerns the individual political orientations the political culture approach represents a promising conceptual tool in explaining individual political behavior, particularly if we do not charge it with the burden of being an elaborated systematic theory. It rather should be used as a concept of heuristic value for empirical investigation which leads us to looking at some important aspects of political life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Identification</td>
<td>Nation of citizenship&lt;br&gt;Political units and groups toward which one feels positively or negatively&lt;br&gt;Political units and groups with which one is most often involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Trust</td>
<td>Willingness to collaborate with various groups in different types of social action&lt;br&gt;Group memberships&lt;br&gt;Rating of groups in terms of trustworthiness, political motives, types of membership, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Orientations</td>
<td>Belief in the legitimacy of the regime&lt;br&gt;Feelings toward, and evaluations of, major political offices and regime symbols&lt;br&gt;Involvement in political activity supporting or opposing the regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rules of the Game&quot;</td>
<td>How one feels political opinions should be expressed&lt;br&gt;Concepts of political obligations for oneself and others&lt;br&gt;Concepts of how political decisions should be made by government&lt;br&gt;Attitudes toward political deviation and dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>Belief that government is responsive to one's opinions&lt;br&gt;Belief in importance of civic activism and participation&lt;br&gt;Belief in possibilities of political change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Competence</td>
<td>Frequency of voting and other types of political activity&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of political events and their influence on oneself&lt;br&gt;Interest in political affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input-Output Orientation</td>
<td>Satisfaction with governmental policy&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of how political demands are made on government&lt;br&gt;Belief in effectiveness of policy inputs and outputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosenbaum 1975: 9, Table 1.1
Other difficulties arise when the proponents of the political culture approach rely on its ability to link together the "micro"-level of individual orientations with the "macro"-level of system properties, such as democratic stability. It is by no means clear what the meaning of political culture at the system level is: Does it represent the additive distribution of individual political attitudes or is it understood in a strictly functionalist sense as a cultural system being somewhat else and more than the sum of its parts? In this latter case some open questions remain: Are the elements of the political culture closely bound together so that the change of one of them introduces alterations of other elements as well? Is conflict possible between the different segments of political culture or population? Are we dealing with stable patterns of consistent, coherent, and non-contradictory elements? Problems like these which can only be tapped here are far from being resolved satisfactorily.

Another problem arises from using political culture as a set of variables explaining changes in political participation. Socio-cultural phenomena, such as political culture, are to be conceived as intervening variables between the social structures on the one hand and the political behavior on the other (cf. Almond, Verba 1965: 30 ff; Verba, Nie 1972: 125 ff; Milbrath, Goel 1977: 24 ff; Kaase, March 1979 a: 43, figure 2.1, where, however, value orientations are described as independent variables). In explaining shifts in political participation it is therefore very important to disentangle the independent effects of cultural and socio-demographic variables for the former being influences by the latter: An increasing level of education in a nation may directly lead to a higher amount of political involvement - or it may gain its influence indirectly, i.e., mediated by rising cognitive skills, party affiliation, efficacy, and so on. Figure 1 attempts to present the interplay of the determinants of political participation.
Changing Values and Political Attitudes of Germans as Explanations of the Rising Activities of Citizen Action Groups

The handful of studies on socio-cultural change in Germany have, until now, provided two — by no means mutually exclusive — interpretations of the increasing activities of Citizen Action Groups. According to the first, in the past two decades German political culture has changed from the "subject" type described by Almond and Verba towards a more "civic" one. This process led to an increasing willingness to participate in politics and favored in this way, among others, the rise of Citizen Action Groups (cf. Eckert 1970: 43; 1975; Radtke 1976: 16).
If this holds true, the affective orientations of German people towards the inputs and the definition of the role of citizen as a participant must have changed. There is a lot of data available which unanimously confirm this hypothesis.

Trust of fellow citizens is relevant to the assessment of the individual's role in the political process (readiness to cooperate with other people) and to the integration of political community. According to Conradt (1980: 254, Table VII. 19) from 1959 (the year of the Civic-Culture-Survey, OWG) to 1976 the number of Germans who trust their fellow citizen increased from 19% to 39%. The number of people who believed they could express their opinion freely without suffering any disadvantage also rose slightly in the same period of time. Between 1959 and 1971 it increased from 76% to 84% of the respondents. Since then it has fallen, especially among young people, who seem to feel anxious about the so called "RadikalenerlaB" forbidding supporters of extremist political parties to be civil servants. In 1976, the respective percentage of the German sample in a poll was 73% (cf. Conradt 1980: 242, Table VII. 12).

Questions on social desirability of political participation and on subjective political competence supply information on the perceived role of citizen in the political process, particularly in the political input-structures. From 1965 to 1971 the "opinion climate" in Germany obviously became more participatory:

<p>| TABLE 5: ATTITUDES TO POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF MEN AND WOMEN |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Positive Attitude to political activity of | Negative Attitude |                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kmiecik (1976: Table X 4a, 4b, 13a, 13b)
Data on subjective political competence allows not only a comparison for different points in time but also a cross-national comparison. It shows that between 1959/60 and 1974 the subjective political competence of the German citizen increased greatly. In this respect they are hardly different in 1974 to the Britains. This assimilation is more pronounced at the national level of the political system than at the local.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Local Regulation</th>
<th>National Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1959/60</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kaase; March, 1979 b: 141, Table 5.1

It is of particular concern for my argument that the political attitudes of young Germans become increasingly more similar to those of young people in other democracies while those of older generations are still quite different (cf. Allerbeck, Jennings, Rosenmayr 1979; Jennings, Allerbeck, Rosenmayr 1979). The process of democratization of German political culture as the major force leading towards in increasing number of politically active people could be substantiated with more detailed data. But this is not possible here (see for further information: Conradt 1974; 1980; Rausch 1980; Barnes, Kaase and associates 1979; Greiffenhagen, Greiffenhagen 1979; Schmidtchen 1979).

Up to now changes in the type of political participation were not considered. According to the value-change-hypothesis presented by Ingelhart
(1971; 1977; 1979 a; 1979 b; 1979 c) at present in the industrialized Western democracies a shift from traditional "materialist" to modern "post-acquisitive" values is taking place. This value-change also alters the patterns of political activity: While the traditional institutions of "mass politics" lose support among people, new modes of "elite challenging", issue-related, spontaneous, activity emerge as a result of enlarging post-materialist orientations (cf. Inglehart 1977: 3, 14, 289 ff; 1979 a: 302 ff; 1979 c). His description of the new ways of participation are largely the same as the above-mentioned definition of Citizen Action Groups.

If these two types of socio-political orientations dealt with are combined, the following pattern of political action in Germany may be deduced:

(1) The general willingness to participate in politics is influenced by the emergence of a more "civic" political culture. The greater the civic orientation, the higher the willingness to political participation.

(2) The tendency to use conventional or unconventional forms of political behavior is determined, on the other hand, by value-orientations. The stronger the post-acquisitive orientation, the greater the tendency towards unconventional political behavior.

Figure 7 relates political orientations to political participation as follows.

**FIGURE 7: PATTERNS OF POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Towards to Political System</th>
<th>&quot;Non-Civic&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Civic&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materialist</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>Conventional Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Aquisitive</td>
<td>Political Protest</td>
<td>Cumulative Participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, up to now, both concepts explaining shifts in participatory structures in Western democracies have never been combined into a single research design. So, my hypothesis concerning the interplay between "(Post-)Materialism" and "Civic Culture" cannot be proven in the light of empirical data. But, as different as the results of several studies on political participation may be in detail, most of them confirm the assumption that a certain amount of trust in one's own ability to influence political processes, of trust in the political system, of political awareness, information and knowledge represent necessary even if not sufficient conditions of active political participation. The studies on the relationship between value-orientations and political activity show a positive even if not very strong correlation between Post-Materialism and political participation, especially in its unconventional form.

_Citizen Action Groups as a Potential for Political Reformism, Activism or Protest?_

All the data so far reported does not refer to realized political participation but to behavioral dispositions. They are thus only indirectly suitable for explaining the activities of citizen action groups. Unfortunately for the German political system no single empirical study is available permitting a direct examination of our hypotheses. In the few empirical studies which try to compare several civic groups the unit examined is always the group but not the individual member of the group (cf. Lange et al. 1973; Borsdorf-Ruhl 1973; 1975; Batelle Institut 1975; Andritzky, Wahl-Terlinden 1978). Moreover, these studies produce at best a very loose connection between theory and empirical research. As a result of this unsufficient research, we are forced to take our information on citizen participation in such groups from the broader context.
of participation research. This is possible with some benefit as literature on citizen action groups contains a number of references to the action repertory of these groups (cf. Hartlaub 1971: 15 ff; Batelle Institut 1975: 164 ff; Mayer-Tasch 1976: 143 ff; Schuppert 1977: 377 ff; Andritzky, Wahl-Terlinden 1978: 90 ff; Pelinka 1978: 24 ff; Armbruster et al. 1979: 168 ff) which can be directly related to the current state of research on political action repertory of Western publics. Some of the activities typical of civic groups as sharing in a political discussion, forming a local action group for solving a particular problem, attending political meetings, contacting public officials are described by Kaase and Marsh as conventional; others, however (signing petitions, joining a peaceful demonstration, occupying buildings, etc.), are unconventional activities (cf. Kaase 1976 a: 203 ff; 1976 b: 141 ff; Marsh, Kaase 1979 a; Kaase, Marsh 1979 b). The action groups seem to combine these different behavior-modes in different ways, depending, for example, on the particular problem they are trying to solve or upon the institution which is their target. So we can only guess that people who join civic action groups are not to be denominated as "Inactives" or "Conformists" but it remains an open question to be answered in every special instance of whether they are more probably "Reformists", "Activists", or even "Protesters" in the sense of the concept outlined by Kaase and others. This is pictured in Figure 2 on the following page.

A somewhat more detailed information on the role civic action groups play in the participation-system of Germany can be found in the writings of Günther D. Radtke. By using a list of items similar to that of Kaase and Marsh but with different techniques of data-analysis (factor-analysis), he found out that the readiness to participate in civic action groups shows a loading on the same factor as do nine other forms of political activities which comes very close to
FIGURE 2: TYPOLOGY OF POLITICAL ACTION REPERTORY II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protest Potential Scale</th>
<th>Conventional Political Participation Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None of these Activities (0)</td>
<td>None of These Activities (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing a Petition (1)</td>
<td>Read About Politics in Newspapers (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Lawful Demonstrations (2)</td>
<td>Discuss Politics with Friends (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining in Boycotts (3)</td>
<td>Work with Other People in the Community (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing to Pay Rent or Taxes (4)</td>
<td>Spend Time Working for a Political Party or Candidate (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupying Buildings or Factories Sit-ins (5)</td>
<td>Convince Friends to Vote the same way as you (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking Traffic with a Street Demonstration (6)</td>
<td>Attend a Political Meeting or Rally (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining in Wildcat Strikes (7)</td>
<td>Contact Public Officials (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-scalable Respondents</td>
<td>Non-scalable Respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kaase; Marsh (1979 b: 154, Figure 5.1)
the type of political behavior-dispositions referred as "Reformist" by Kaase and Marsh (1979 b: 154 ff). This conforms very well with some findings of the author concerning the reasons members of citizen groups reported as reasons for their involvement. They considered political participation mainly as a means of controlling political leaders, as legitimating political decisions, as rendering them more effective, and as being necessary because politics is an important sphere of individual life (cf. Radtke 1976: esp. 28 f; 43 ff).

On a different point, the findings of Radtke are similar to those of Kaase and Marsh (1979 c: 173 ff). Reformists (as well as Activists) tend to be recruited from the younger, better-educated, male segments of the population and this according to Radtke (1976: 36 f) holds true for supporters of citizen action groups as well (cf. also: Fuhrmann 1977).

**Citizen Action Groups - Forerunners of a New Participation Structure?**

The fact that in recent years citizen action groups have caused a change in the structure of political processes in Germany can hardly be denied. But neither the state of research reached so far nor the experience of political practice in dealing with action groups permits reliable judgments on the importance of these changes. Did the political system of Germany gain a new element or are the activities of civic groups a more or less shortlived fad or are we at the start of a transformation of Western political systems at the end of which we will have the often described "participatory democracy"?

No valid answer can be given to these questions - as there probably is no typical civic action group. We are dealing with a completely heterogeneous pattern of political organization and action if we take into account the aims of the groups, the means they use to achieve their ends, the organization and
membership structure, their fields of activity, and more. The claim made in many writings that the rise of citizen groups is a reaction to structural, functional or even legitimacy problems of Western democracy hardly agree with the information available on political attitudes of Western publics. It should not be denied that in a few subcultures anti-system-affects are spreading and are being organized. But at the moment there is little if any evidence that political aims and attitudes of this sort are typical of the civic action groups. Most of the members are committed to reformist orientation and action. Socio-economic and socio-cultural changes have led citizens to regard specific actions of the political authorities with more skepticism than used to be the case. If necessary, many are prepared to demonstrate for what they consider to be appropriate, among others, by joining civic groups.
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