



Trajectories of Development: A Further Test

Gerhard Lenski; Patrick D. Nolan

Social Forces, Vol. 64, No. 3. (Mar., 1986), pp. 794-795.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0037-7732%28198603%2964%3A3%3C794%3ATODAFT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1>

Social Forces is currently published by University of North Carolina Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/uncpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Trajectories of Development: A Further Test*

GERHARD LENSKI, *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

PATRICK D. NOLAN, *University of South Carolina*

Following publication of our paper, "Trajectories of Development: A Test of Ecological-Evolutionary Theory," (*Social Forces*, September 1984), we received a letter from Pierre van den Berghe in which he suggested that we may have misclassified Haiti in our original analysis and thus have lost an opportunity to obtain an added check of our basic conclusions. Readers of that paper may recall that our study of Third World nations showed that those which had a tradition of plow agriculture have been much more successful in adapting to the modern industrial era than those which had a tradition of hoe or digging stick horticulture. However, because of the concentration of the latter in sub-Saharan Africa, it was not clear whether the mode of production or the geographical locale of these societies was responsible for the striking differences we found.

In an effort to resolve this dilemma, we examined as a special test case Papua New Guinea, which lies on the other side of the globe from Africa, but which has employed horticulture as its primary mode of production. As we reported, the data on this society much more closely approximates data on the average industrializing horticultural society than data on the average industrializing agrarian society. This supported our contention, based on ecological-evolutionary theory, that the mode of production, rather than the African locale, was the critical factor responsible for our findings.

Van den Berghe's letter led us to undertake a closer inspection of Haiti, since it promised to be a second critical test case. Our review of relevant literature (Kurian; Lundahl; Zuvekas) supports his contention that Haiti was misclassified in our original analysis. Its technoeconomic heritage, like that of Papua New Guinea, is indeed primarily horticultural, and since it is well outside the continent of Africa it provides another opportunity to see if our results were due primarily to the horticultural heritage which Haiti shares with *all* the societies we labeled "industrializ-

*Address correspondence to Gerhard Lenski, Department of Sociology, Hamilton Hall 070A, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

© 1986 The University of North Carolina Press

ing horticultural," or if they were due primarily to the African locale, which it does not share with most of them.

Of a total of 26 measures for which data on Haiti could be compared with the averages for industrializing agrarian and industrializing horticultural societies, we found that Haiti more closely resembled the former in 6 instances and the latter in 20. When we combined redundant measures (i.e., multiple measures of the same variable at different time periods), we found that Haiti more closely resembled the average industrializing agrarian society on 2 measures, the average industrializing horticultural society on 11 measures, and the results were mixed on 4 measures. If we combine the results from Haiti with those we reported previously for Papua New Guinea, we find that these two non-African industrializing horticultural societies conform to the agrarian pattern on only 4 of the nonredundant measures, while conforming to the horticultural pattern on 19, with 5 additional measures yielding mixed results. Thus, the reclassification of Haiti provides further support for our earlier conclusion, namely, that technoeconomic heritage, rather than geographic locale, is the critical factor responsible for the differences we obtained.

In closing, we note that the reclassification of Haiti does not alter to any great degree the tables we reported in our original paper. The only changes in the tests of significance worth noting were in the data on economic growth rates for the decade of the 1960s. In the original paper we reported that the difference in the growth rate for GNP in that decade was significant only at the .155 level. With Haiti reclassified, the significance level improved to .05. With respect to the growth in GNP per capita during the same decade, the significance level improved from .076 to .05. Copies of the revised tables, as well as the data for Haiti, are available from the authors upon request. Finally, we wish to thank Linda Reif of Ohio State University for locating the references we used as sources for our reclassification of Haiti.

References

- Kurian, G. T. 1982. *Encyclopedia of the Third World*. Rev. ed. Facts on File.
 Lundahl, Mats. 1983. *The Haitian Economy: Man, Land and Markets*. St. Martin's.
 Zuvekas, Clarence. 1978. *Agricultural Development in Haiti*. Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.