A Harvard Paperback

$5.95

BECOMING MODERN

Individual Change in Six Developing Countries

Alex Inkeles and David H. Smith

BECOMING MODERN

Individual Change in Six Developing Countries

Alex Inkeles and David Horton Smith

Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts

Second printing 1976
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 73-92534
ISBN 0-674-06375-9 (cloth)
ISBN 0-674-06376-7 (paper)
Printed in the United States of America

to
DANIEL LERNER
and
KARL DEUTSCH
who first rode upon the tiger

Acknowledgments

Although two of us did most of the analysis on which this book is based, the conception and execution of the project as a whole is not accurately accounted for unless one adds the names of Howard Schuman and Edward Ryan. Together with the authors, these men developed the basic theoretical orientation of the entire venture and translated the underlying ideas into the practical form of a research design and a detailed questionnaire. Dr. Schuman established and directed the field staff which did the interviewing in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh); Dr. Ryan played a parallel role in Nigeria, and each supervised the coding of the materials collected by his national field team. To our profound regret, work and careers took both to new posts while we were still at an early stage in the analysis of the data. Nevertheless, their influence continued to be firmly interwoven in the fabric of the project as it was later developed.

We are also in great debt to the other directors of the national field teams who joined the project when it was further along, yet who came in time to make important contributions to its conception, design, and execution. These included: in Chile, Juan Cesar Garcia, ably assisted by Carlotta Rios and Anna Maria Pinto; in Israel, Uzi Peled; in Argentina, Perla Gibaja; and in India, Amar K. Singh. In addition, Olatunde Oloko served as associate director in Nigeria, while Amadullah Mia and Nuril Islam gave special assistance to Dr. Schuman in East Pakistan. Without the dedication these people manifested, the determination they displayed in the face of endless distractions and obstacles, and the intelligence and perceptiveness they brought to bear on every situation, the project could not have hoped to succeed even remotely as well as it did.

In this context we should also note that our ability to identify these talented young researchers and to secure their services depended, in a number of instances, on the cooperation and support given by local academic leaders such as Peter Heintz in Chile, Gino Germani in Argentina, A. F. A. Husain in East Pakistan, and K. O. Dike in Nigeria. These distinguished scholars also gave freely of their advice and criticism, and we are pleased to express our appreciation for their generosity.

In view of the scope and scale of our research we could neither process our data nor extract its full meaning without the aid of a substantial number of research assistants. Harriet Wasserstrum was an important early incumbent of the role in which she displayed great energy, gratifying promptness, an uncanny memory, and a creative imagination. Erika Fox rendered numerous and diverse services, among others playing a key role in the development of OM-500, the scale most often used in this book. After the project moved to Stanford early in 1971 Larry Meyer was our chief assistant. Although hired as a computer programmer, a part he played with consummate skill, he quickly transcended the limits of that role. The impact of his incisive comments and thoughtful criticism was felt in every section of our manuscript. Indeed, to the senior author, to whom fell the responsibility for writing the final draft, Meyer became more a colleague than an assistant.

Our full-time research assistants were supplemented by a considerable number of graduate students employed on a part-time basis. For us, their service added much needed extra hands, and the stimulus of fresh perspectives coupled with youthful energy. Three of the students found in the project materials the basis for a doctoral dissertation: Gunther Boroschek on political attitudes and values in Argentina and Chile, Rowan Ireland on the consequences of a factory's modernity, and John Williamson on attitudes about birth control. In addition, two of the longest and most productive of our associations with graduate students were those with Reeve Vanneman and Martin Whyte, who wrote excellent memoranda on numerous topics. Bonnie Erikson served as a resident statistical consultant, and the effect of her wise counsel and stern admonishments is especially evident in the chapters on the construction and content of the modernity (OM) scales. We also benefitted from the work of Sumru Aksoy on urbanism, Peter Evans on occupational patterns, Gilda Mara on ruralism, Lorne Tepperman on work experience, and Miron Zuckerman on life satisfactions. Contributions were also made by David Eaglesfield, David Lopez, Rachel Javetz, Phyllis Kazen, Howard Ramseur, Nancy Silverman, Ellen Simons, Richard Suzman, and Nancy Williamson. In addition, we enjoyed the services of several scholars well beyond student status, in particular Anna Maria Pinto, who analyzed our data on the family, and Metta Spencer who worked on a number of topics.

A project so large as ours inevitably becomes a collective enterprise, some kind of team operation, in which the administrative officer comes to play a critical role. We were extremely fortunate in having the services of three exceptionally capable incumbents in that office. From the inception of the project through the completion of the fieldwork, Sharlee Segal exercised firm, competent, and energetic control over our financial and administrative affairs. Martha Puff displayed equally sterling qualities in managing our office after the project moved to Stanford in 1971. For the greater part of the life of the project, however, our affairs were in the hands of Elizabeth Dunn. She dealt with large budgets, mountains of paper, swarms of student assistants, and a goodly number of sensitive computer programmers and senior analysts with grace and quiet efficiency. Her contribution was indispensable to the project, and the director owes her a special and personal debt of gratitude.

A study based on long interviews in six developing countries which generated tens of thousands of "open-ended" comments, presented a data-processing job of formidable proportions. That the data was transferred to IBM cards and computer tapes with great accuracy we owe to Brian Sinclair, who later also played a key role in implementing our special program for regression analysis; Marta Fisch, who also subsequently served a term as our computer programmer; and Leslie Howard, who had earlier assisted Dr. Singh in collecting the data in India. Lynn Joiner and Sonia Cairoli also did yeoman service in this cause.

The task of getting all the recorded facts out of the computer in some appropriately transformed but meaningful fashion fell to a series of efficient and imaginative programmers. In addition to those already noted we should mention Marijo Miller Walsh, who did most of the trying and massive runs in the first stages of our work in analysis of the data, and Wendy Jackson who ably carried the burden in the middle phase of our work. Burt Baldwin was responsible for a long and complex series of regression analyses, and Peter Lemieux devised our basic program for matching men by computer. Two of our undergraduate assistants, Gary Welch and John Duffy also made numerous contributions to the job of data processing over a long interval.

As we progressed in our writing, each chapter benefitted enormously from the gentle admonishments and wise counsel offered by Marina Finklestein, late editor of the Center for International Affairs. For typing and proofreading the manuscript through what must, at times, have seemed endless revisions, we owe thanks to Elizabeth Burke, Erika Fox, Corey Patterson, and Martha Puff. Amnon Igra helped with the tables, and Dean Nielsen with the footnotes, and both assisted in other ways as well. A critical reading of the penultimate draft was undertaken by Elizabeth Dunn, S. N. Eisenstadt, Bonnie Erickson, Joseph Kahl, Larry Meyer and

Howard Schuman, who made many incisive comments and numerous excellent suggestions. We admit to having accepted only a select number of these, so that any remaining faults are to be laid exclusively at our door. In the last stages of editing, proofreading and seeing the manuscript through production we benefited from the help of Karen Miller and Richard Suzman.

We have been mainly singling out individuals for appreciation. People, not institutions, do research. Yet we could not have carried out our work except for our good fortune in finding a succession of institutional sponsors with the courage to underwrite the sort of high-risk venture our project was defined as being. For their generous support we are grateful to the Rockefeller Foundation, the Cultural Affairs Division of the Department of State, the National Science Foundation, The Ford Foundation, the National Institutes of Mental Health, and the Spencer Foundation. In addition, the University of Southern California and Boston College contributed substantial amounts of free computer time.

The Center for International Affairs at Harvard University constituted a setting in every way congenial to scholarly research, with numerous colleagues who provided just the right mixture of involved criticism and independence-fostering detachment. In this association, however, the key figure was Robert Bowie, Director of the Center. His continuous interest in and unwavering support for our work over many years was critical in enabling us to carry it to a successful conclusion. Finally, when the senior author and the project headquarters moved to Stanford University, we received considerable support from Arthur Coladarci, Dean of the School of Education.

In the field, we could not have managed without the generous cooperation of institutions in our host countries. They introduced us to the local community and gave us acceptable standing there, provided us with precious space, helped us to locate interviewers, and in several cases released members of their staffs for service with our project. We are particularly grateful to the College of Social Welfare of the Dacca University, the Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University of Ibadan, the UNESCO-sponsored Latin American School of Social Sciences at Santiago, Chile, the DiTella Institute in Buenos Aires, the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research in Jerusalem, and the Department of Psychology of the Ranchi University in India. There were many others we cannot mention for lack of space, but which we do remember. Therefore, we take this opportunity, impersonal as it necessarily is, to give our warmest thanks to those organizations and people who helped us in so many ways.

We wish also to thank all the people and institutions who have kindly permitted us to make use of material from the project previously published by the authors and subsequently adapted for use in this volume. These include:

The American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C., as publishers for David H. Smith and Alex Inkeles, "The OM Scale: A Comparative Socio-Psychological Measure of Individual Modernity," *Sociometry* 29, no. 4, December 1966.

K. Ishwaran, as editor, and E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands, as publisher, for Alex Inkeles, "The Fate of Personal Adjustment in the Process of Modernization" and "The School as a Context for Modernization," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 11, no. 2, June 1970 and 14, nos. 3–4, 1974, respectively.

A. R. Desai, as editor, and Thacker & Co., Ltd., Bombay, India, as publisher, for Alex Inkeles, "Fieldwork Problems in Comparative Research on Modernization," in *Essays on Modernization of Under-developed Societies*, vol. 2, 1971.

Nancy Hammond, as editor, and Social Science Research Bureau, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, as publisher, for Alex Inkeles, "A Model of the Modern Man: Theoretical and Methodological Issues," in *Social Science and the New Societies: Problems in Cross-Cultural Research and Theory Building*, 1973.

Cole S. Brembeck and Timothy J. Thompson, as editors, and D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, as publisher, for Alex Inkeles, "The Role of Occupational Experience," in *New Strategies for Educational Development*, 1973.

Contents

Part IV. Summary and Conclusion

I

The Fundamentals

1

Introduction

Every era confronts its distinctive social and political dramas. In the mid-twentieth century, center stage has frequently been dominated by the struggle of the so-called "third world," first for liberation from the colonial powers and then for development and for entry into the modern world. The sixties were to be the "decade of development." Yet many of the emerging nations developed very little, if at all, and some slid backward. To this outcome, general political instability and specific tribal, religious, and ethnic conflict made their contributions.

However, there was more to the explanation. Experience underlined what some observers had already pointed out: diplomatic recognition and membership in the United Nations do not create a nation-state. Many of the new states were actually only hollow shells, lacking the institutional structures which make a nation a viable and effective socio-political and economic enterprise. Economic and technical dependence on the colonial power had to be replaced by indigenous activities, institutions of government had to be adapted or newly created, school systems had to be revamped and extended, and all this, plus a myriad of other tasks, had to be accomplished with relatively meager resources. No wonder then that progress in nation building has not been more spectacular.

It required time to realize that nation building and institution building are only empty exercises unless the attitudes and capacities of the people keep pace with other forms of development. That such articulation is not simply, or perhaps not even primarily, a function of independence is clear from much of recent history. Mounting evidence suggests that it is impossible for a state to move into the twentieth century if its people continue

to live in an earlier era. A modern *nation* needs participating citizens, men and women who take an active interest in public affairs and who exercise their rights and perform their duties as members of a community larger than that of the kinship network and the immediate geographical locality. Modern *institutions* need individuals who can keep to fixed schedules, observe abstract rules, make judgments on the basis of objective evidence, and follow authorities legitimated not by traditional or religious sanctions but by technical competence. The complex production tasks of the *industrial order,* which are the basis of modern social systems, also make their demands. Workers must be able to accept both an elaborate division of labor and the need to coordinate their activities with a large number of others in the work force. Rewards based on technical competence and objective standards of performance, strict hierarchies of authority responsive to the imperatives of machine production, and the separation of product and producer, all are part of this milieu, and require particular personal properties of those who are to master its requirements.

In addition, modern political and economic institutions alike make certain general demands on the people who work within them. They require a greater acceptance of personal mobility, occupational and geographic; a greater readiness to adapt to changes in one's mode of working and living, indeed a propensity to be an innovator; more tolerance of impersonality, of impartiality, and of differences which may characterize the diverse backgrounds of fellow employees in complex organizations. Neither type of institution has much tolerance for fatalism or passivity, but rather favors persistent effort and confident optimism.

These and related qualities are not readily forthcoming from people rooted in traditional village agriculture, locked into near-feudal landholding patterns, dominated by self-serving elites desperate to preserve their power, dependent on inadequate and antiquated public institutions, and cut off from the benefits of modern science and technology as well as the stimulation of modern mass communication. However, alongside the struggle for national liberation and development, there has been, and continues to be, a struggle for personal liberation.

Some of the men and women tied by the binding obligations of powerful extended kinship systems have sought to assert their rights as individuals. Some have tried to win more freedom of choice in residence, occupation, political affiliation, religious denomination, marriage partner, friend, and enemy. They have sought to replace a closed world, in which their lives tread the narrowest of circles, with a more open system offering more alternatives and less predestination. From a desperate clinging to fixed ways of doing things, some have moved toward readiness for change. In place of fear of strangers and hostility to those very different from themselves, some have acquired more trust and more tolerance of

human diversity. From rigidity and closed-mindedness, they have moved toward flexibility and cognitive openness. They now seek to break out of passivity, fatalism, and the subordination of self to an immutable and inscrutable higher order, in order to become more active and effective, and to take charge of their individual lives and of their collective destiny.

This process, however, occurs slowly, and, unfortunately, it usually affects only a few. Naturally, every national population is large enough to include some individuals who have quite spontaneously developed the qualities which make for quick adaptation to the requirements of the modern world. Some ethnic and religious groups also seem more likely to generate individuals of this type. Swiss Protestants, East European Jews, Parsis in India, and the Ibo in Nigeria all seem to qualify. Most men and women must, however, acquire their modernity on a more individual basis. *It seemed to us there was no more relevant and challenging task for social psychology than to explain the process whereby people move from being traditional to becoming modern personalities.*

We started, then, with the conviction that men are not born modern, but are made so by their life experience. We thought we knew how the process works, and we set out to test our theory. To accomplish our objective we had to make clear what we meant by a modern man. We derived our conception of the modern man in part from the forms of conduct we saw as likely to be inculcated by work in the factory, which we took to be the epitome of the institutional pattern of modern civilization, and in part from our estimate of the qualities more generally required of incumbents of the numerous roles — such as student, citizen, audience, producer, consumer, and family member — essential to the functioning of a large contemporary urban-industrial society. The details of our conception of the modern man are spelled out below. In the course of this book we hope to discover how far this conception reflects reality, and to show how much it can help us understand the process of individual modernization.

Our next task was to convert our conception of the modern man into a tool useful for research. This we tried to do by creating a long and fairly complex interview schedule based on questions and answers each of which could be scored to indicate whether a respondent was more inclined to the modern or to the traditional pole. Using a separate subset of questions to reflect each topic, we explored all of the themes we had built into our own conception of the modern man as well as themes which other theorists had identified as relevant to judging individual modernity. One of the major challenges facing us was to discover whether these discrete elements held together in a more or less coherent syndrome which one could sensibly speak of as designating a "modern man," or whether they would prove to be a mere congeries of discrete

and unrelated traits, each of which characterized some modern men and not others. Answering this challenge involved us in a complex methodological excursion into the construction of an attitude-value-behavior scale.

In fact, it proved possible to develop a composite scale to measure individual modernity in general, one which had considerable face validity, met quite rigorous standards of test reliability, and could be effectively applied cross-culturally. The effort to develop such a scale was no mere exercise. For example, a few subthemes which *we* had assumed to be part of the syndrome of individual modernity, and some which had been nominated by *others,* failed to make a case for themselves in our empirical test. The scale also provided an essential condition for the main objective of our study — to explain what makes men modern. It enabled us to distribute men validly and reliably along a dimension of individual modernity. It then became our task to explain why particular individuals fell at one or the other end of the continuum.

In the design of our sample we brought our theory and our test instrument into contact with empirical reality. Our theory states that men become modern through the particular life experiences they undergo. More specifically, it emphasizes the contribution of man's work experience to making him modern. We believed that employment in complex, rationalized, technocratic, and even bureaucratic organizations has particular capabilities to change men so that they move from the more traditional to the more modern pole in their attitudes, values, and behavior. Among such institutions, we gave prime emphasis to the factory as a school in modernity. We also thought that urban living and contact with the mass media would have comparable effects. While emphasizing such modes of experience as more characteristic of the modern world, we did not neglect to study education, which earlier research had shown to be a powerful predictor of individual modernity. We also measured other personal attributes such as age, religion, ethnic membership, and rural origin.

These and several dozen other variables which our theory, or other theories, identified as plausible explanations for individual modernity had to be taken into account in the design of our research. Interviewers trained by our project staff questioned almost 6,000 men from six developing countries: Argentina, Chile, India, Israel, Nigeria, and East Pakistan, now Bangladesh. Our goal was to reach 1,000 in each country, the sample to include peasants, industrial workers, and persons in more traditional pursuits in town, all selected to represent ethnic, religious, regional, residential, and other important social classifications. The material thus collected forms the main basis of our study.

In addition to the analysis, however, we have also presented a fairly