BOOKS IN REVIEW

THE STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT

BECOMING MODERN: INDIVIDUAL CHANGE IN SIX DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. By ALEX INKELES *and* DAVID H. SMITH. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974. Pp. 437. Cloth, $15.00.)

RETHINKING MODERNIZATION, ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES. By JOHN J. POGGIE JR. *and* ROBERT N. LYNCH (eds.). (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1974. Pp. 405. Cloth, $15.95.)

BEYOND THE SOCIOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT: ECONOMY AND SOCIETY IN LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA. By IVAR OXAAL, TONY BARNETT, *and* DAVID BOOTH. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975. Pp. 295. Cloth, $21.75; paperback, $12.25.)

The third of these books should have been more properly entitled, "Beyond the Sociology of Modernization," for it is not the problem of development but the particular perspective dominant in the English-speaking world during the last decades which it criticizes. Assuming this modified title, the relationship between the three volumes becomes clear. What they have in common is a concern for nations, communities, and individuals in the poorer regions of the world—those on the periphery of the industrialized West and not belonging to the Socialist sphere. Where they differ is in their approach to the problem: The Inkeles and Smith book represents a natural culmination of the psychocultural perspective on social change propounded by many U.S. theorists in the past; the Poggie and Lynch volume enters into a dialogue with this approach in the attempt to find the bearings of their discipline—anthropology—for dealing with macro-social "evolution"; the Oxaal et al. book rejects the modernism framework and moves on to deal with national and regional development within the neo-Marxist framework of external dependency and internal colonialism. I will respect conventions by dealing with each book in turn and reserving collective evaluations for the end. The standpoint from which each book approaches the problem of underdevelopment offers a fairly natural sequence for discussion.

Inkeles and Smith's *Becoming Modern* recounts a tale already familiar to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100026649 Published online by Cambridge University Press

students in this area. We are told of the introspective saga of discovering the characteristics of "modern man"; their translation into questionnaire items; and the massive research effort mounted in six countries to ascertain their empirical existence (Inkeles, 1969; Smith and Inkeles, 1966). A modernity "syndrome" is extracted in all six countries; degree of modernity is then found to vary systematically with education, urbanism, and especially, length of factory experience. Much discussion is dedicated to this "universality of modernity" both as evidence of the cross-national validity of psychosocial laws and as proof of the importance of individual modernity for national development.

The major merit of this book lies in bringing together, in compact form, the most massive effort to justify and empirically validate a view of underdevelopment dominant throughout U.S. social science for many years. However, methodologists are bound to find a great deal to criticize in Inkeles and Smith's empirical analysis of modernity. To do this they must bypass self-compliments in phrases such as "even following our strict standard" (p. 90), "with our rigorous cleaning operation" (p. 97), "a compliment to our original theory for being sharply honed" (p. 92). Despite the tone of these comments, the analysis of internal consistency of measures of modernity is not rigorous.

Item-to-total correlations (corrected for auto-correlation) are evaluated by their significance levels. High significance levels can be obtained with very small correlations, provided the samples are large. With the present samples, which range from 721 in Nigeria to 1300 in India, we are virtually assured that trivial coefficients will be statistically significant. The actual correlation matrices are nowhere reported, a major omission. Examining prior publications (Smith and Inkeles, 1966), we discover that most of the intercorrelations for every country are in fact very small.

To compensate for the prima facie evidence of inconsistency offered by the intercorrelations, the authors report aggregate coefficients of internal consistency, such as Spearman-Brown. As is well known, such coefficients are sensitive to the number of items in the scale. By adding together a large number of items—ranging from 78 to 167—the authors almost insure a high coefficient of consistency, despite large measurement errors. A more enlightening and rigorous procedure would have been to enter all eligible items into a principal components factor analysis. If modernity does in fact form a "coherent syndrome" we would expect a strong unrotated first factor with substantial loadings of most items in the predicted direction. The authors are aware of this procedure, for they report a factor analysis in connection with one of the scales. This is not, however, an analysis of items, but of previously developed and selected subscales.

Throughout these chapters, one gets the impression that the strong will to demonstrate the existence of a modernity syndrome leads to much selective sweeping under the rug. Omission of basic data, the all-positive findings, the self-compliments, and the failure to report major weaknesses and negative results suggest a less-than-detached approach to the data.

Even more important than the methodology of the study are its substantive implications. What do these results, based on large scale application of field techniques, really tell us? One thing that they do *not* convey is any important new

information about the countries in which the research took place. This is so because these countries were de facto defined as laboratories for testing a previously conceived idea. Neither their histories, nor their current political and economic situations are considered or discussed to any significant extent.

What the study attempts to do is demonstrate the cross-cultural applicability of an ideal-type and endow it with important consequences. This ideal-type is a product of U.S.-based introspection and, quite apparently, summarizes a series of features deemed desirable in this society. With serious methodological limitations, the study finds that there are individuals who more or less behave as expected by the original ideal-type. Note that this is *verbal* behavior, for the study says nothing about how individuals really act in everyday life or in new situations.

On the basis of this result, the authors predicate the "psychic unity of mankind." There are intimations of a return to an "independent origins" theory in which greater urbanization, literacy, industrialization, etc., separately produce in each country the same modernity syndrome. Such a conclusion could be no more absurd, for it entirely neglects the fact that these are countries on the periphery of the industrial West and, hence, subject to massive processes of diffusion. Cultural diffusion from the same source carries standardized messages to widely different world regions. These range from translated commercial ads to new fashions and intellectual products.

It is really not surprising that those in urban areas, those with greater education, and those in factories dependent from abroad for technology and resources know how to respond in accordance with a modernity blueprint, for they are the ones most exposed to external influences. Their verbal modernity does not require explanation in terms of mysterious processes repeated anew in each country but can be directly traced to common processes of exposure to the same foreign sources.

The second major conclusion of the study is, therefore, that those exposed to modernizing influences are more modern than those not so exposed; or, perhaps more accurately, that those exposed to Western culture tend to be more westernized than those unaware of these influences. Such demonstration does not strike one as particularly momentous. More dangerous perhaps is the attempt to convert individual modernity into a prescription for national development. In the flap of the book's dust jacket and supported by many statements in the text we read:

> Becoming modern, the battle lost by so many developing countries in the sixties, requires modern men to run the technical and political institutions of the modern nation state. Yet modern men are often scarce in the countries that need them most. Thus, while others concentrated on gross national product and per capita income, Alex Inkeles and his colleagues set about to identify the process whereby people shift from the traditionalism that restrains progress to the individual modernity that will help their state "move into the twentieth century."

Like McClelland before them, Inkeles and his colleagues have arrived at the magic formula for dealing with the tough problem of underdevelopment. The remedy lies in making more people modern. The more "moderns" there are, the faster the development, no matter what the conditions set by the external market for exports, the balance of payments, the internal distribution of income,

the political system and other such "trivial" considerations. Transnational corporations, the mass media, and the like, must accept the sacred task of stepping up their commercial propaganda and imported programming so as to reach more and more people, for herein lies the key to development.

There is no mention of the large percentages of highly educated, "modern" youth who cannot find employment in their own countries; of the substantial emigration of "modern" professional personnel from many underdeveloped nations where political and economic conditions make impossible their survival; of the fact that the problem of industrialization in these countries is not to find "moderns" to staff the factories, but to create enough factories to employ even a fraction of the willing and able population.

No mention is made of these factors, for this approach to development contains no real conception of social structure. The fact that there are external and internal economic barriers, established power arrangements, and functional uses by dominant groups of so-called "traditional" and "marginal" sectors is in no way comprehended by these theorists. Perhaps the same massive research staffs who gave us the modernity-syndrome, and then the modernity-prescription for development will introduce, à la McClelland, the Modernity Training Course "Short-Form 6" which, if taken by sufficient numbers, will produce Instant Development and hence happiness ever after. Discussion of modernity as an approach to national development can be safely abandoned at this point for detailed critiques already exist (cf. Gusfield, 1967; Gunder Frank, 1969; Portes, 1974). The reader is referred to them since the issues they raise apply equally well to this latest formulation.

Poggie and Lynch's *Rethinking Modernization* is an attempt to assess the state-of-the-field in anthropology with respect to the issue of development and to encourage the discipline to move decisively in this direction. The volume is a product of a conference held at the University of Rhode Island in conjunction with Margaret Mead's stay there as visiting distinguished professor.

The main issue, as seen by the editors, is the reluctance of anthropologists to abandon their classically delimited field of micro-structural studies. Anthropological monographs of primitive and even relatively modern communities fall short on the issue of generalizability, since they cannot be taken as representative of processes occurring at the regional and especially the national levels. Thus, the conference and volume constitute an attempt to assess what anthropology has to offer with respect to the larger issues of societal change. If we are to judge by the contents of the book, the answer must be "not much." A dominant trait is the absence of a thematic focus, a shared frame of reference into which substantive contributions can be integrated. Chapters span the width and length of the field with little in common, in substantive terms, beyond those characteristics which have traditionally identified anthropological work. There is an absence of convincing insights on which to base the anthropological quest for a unique developmental perspective. Editors are thus forced to fall back on classic concerns of social evolution and on outdated theories of individual modernization and empathy. The essay by Margaret Mead contains a number of bright general points and suggestive observations. It makes enjoyable reading, but provides no guidance as

to how systematic anthropological analyses of national and regional underdevelopment can be conducted.

The chapter by Richard Adams escapes most of the above criticisms. It does offer a series of innovative propositions which link progressive technological development with progressive chances of self-destruction in the advanced nations and progressive obstacles to change in underdeveloped ones. It is a bold step to bring together domestic problems of pollution, waste, and resource exhaustion with international problems of underdevelopment and increasing social marginalization. The waste of physical resources and of human populations by blind technological development offers a most important parallel. Still, the observations on which propositions are based evince no profound grasp of the articulation of economic and political structures through which exploitation of physical and human resources occurs. More recent work by the same author has gone further in integrating the theoretical concepts and empirical evidence of this mode of analysis (Adams, 1975).

The overall impression which *Rethinking Modernization* conveys, however, is that anthropology has little new to contribute to the study of development. This is in fact not the case. Not only have anthropologists pioneered in the empirically based attack on ideologies of irrationality among the poor (Peattie, 1974), but they are found, at present, at the forefront of research based on new theoretical perspectives. Empirical results have questioned, for example, the absence of economic dynamism and political initiative in local and regional "peripheries," as portrayed by the theory of internal colonialism. They have also cast doubt on the automatic destruction of subsistence economies when coming into contact with capitalism, as argued by earlier theories of dependency (Frank, 1967). This line of research, of which the recent works of Roberts (1975) in England, Brownrigg (1974) in the United States, and the French economic anthropologists (below) are examples, offers a more refined account of interactions between national and international "centers" and local peripheries and the many forms in which their articulation facilitates persistence of the existing order.

The introductory chapter of the Oxaal et al. *Beyond the Sociology of Development* begins with the following statement:

> The implication of our rather provocative title for this collection of new research papers can be simply stated: we believe that as a consequence of their extreme economic naivete and implicit metropolitan bias many of the studies and theories presented under the rubric of "the sociology of development" in the 1950s and 1960s were misconceived, intellectually abortive, and in some instances downright pernicious in their influence. . . . In no other field of sociological investigation have the disastrous consequences of the economic illiteracy of professional sociologists been so starkly revealed as in the "sociology of development."

One cannot but agree with this "unavoidably harsh judgement," for the fruits of two decades of "modernization," "political development," "achievement syndromes," and the like, have been sparse indeed.

In a sense, this is a book of reviews exposing the English-speaking public to intellectual material with which relatively few scholars are closely familiar. Any competent review of Latin American theories of dependency and of French writings on economic anthropology should be welcome, since the literature in English on these topics is still scarce. Contributors, for the most part British

economists and sociologists, place the theories in their historical contexts and outline the manner in which recent findings and ideas have accumulated.

The chapter by Philip J. O'Brien, an economist, is one of the finest reviews of dependency theories that I have seen in English. Going beyond usual undifferentiated descriptions, O'Brien identifies major cleavages within dependency writings, as between the "structuralist" economic analyses of Furtado and Sunkel, the unorthodox Marxist views of Frank and Dos Santos, and the relative "eclectic" position of Quijano and Cardoso. For the reader schooled in the principles of scientific positivism, the chapter performs the service of explaining the intellectual strategy implicit in these writings. Dependency is not a "theory" in the sense of a logically articulated set of propositions; it is rather a "vision" (Sunkel and Paz, 1970), " a higher level or general hypothesis the objective of which is to define the problem or area of interest and to try to show how lower level, more specific *ad hoc* hypotheses fit within this framework" (p. 11). For those willing to discard this approach as ideology wrapped up in a scientific garb, one should point out that *all* theories of development, from classics in the nineteenth century to the present, have pursued a similar methodology.

O'Brien's chapter, as well as Booth's essay on Gunder Frank, preface their main topic with an outline of the historical setting in which these theories emerged. Here the role of ECLA in encouraging the shift from *desarrollo hacia afuera* to *desarrollo hacia adentro*, and the subsequent failure of import-substitution industrialization are crucial themes. By recounting ECLA's role, these chapters provide a natural link to Hirschman's (1961) well known but dated account of ideologies and strategies in Latin American development.

While sympathetic to the dependency viewpoint, these chapters are not uncritical. The authors point to the scantiness of data on which certain assertions have been based and the tendency to make of dependency a deus-ex-machina explanation for every evil which befalls Latin America. In later chapters, critiques and modifications of earlier writings become more abundant. The paper by John Clammer rejects Gunder Frank's assertion that the penetration of capitalism in dependent countries has obliterated all other forms of production. The basic error here lies in an exclusive concentration on final commodity exchanges rather than on actual modes of production. As an alternative, Clammer reviews the recent writings of French economic anthropologists, especially Dupre and Rey and Mellaissoux.

Clearly influenced by Althusser, the French anthropologists have focused on the problem of modes of production and their articulation. They call attention to the fact that subsistence economic systems are not necessarily destroyed by capitalist penetration which often preserves them for its own uses. Tribal economies, for example, can function as sources of cheap labor and as providers of raw materials and even finished commodities.

These capitalist-controlled exchanges are permeated by the tension between the profitability attendant upon preservation of subsistence communities and the expansive needs of the dominant system. By rejecting the notion of a uniform productive system throughout the underdeveloped world, this approach sets the stage for analysis of the multitude of forms of exchange between centers

and peripheries and the many different ways in which exploitation of subordinate groups can take place.

There are two aspects on which the book can be faulted. The first is the excessive emphasis on the writings of Andre Gunder Frank, to the detriment of perhaps less rhetorical but equally important authors. One suspects that this is due, at least in part, to the fact that Frank writes in English, while others have only been partially translated from Spanish, Portuguese, and French. Still, the almost exclusive focus on Frank's theories is unjustified. For quite some time, economists like Furtado have provided insightful analyses of the international economy; and sociologists like Cardoso have produced studies of greater intellectual caliber, both in the subtleness of the argument and its empirical justification. The views of a quasi-automatic one-way flow of power from the center and opposite-way flow of surplus from the periphery cannot be equated with the more complex and better documented studies by Latin American writers.

Second, there is the peculiar attachment of European Marxists and neo-Marxists to an elaborate style in which relatively known theories are retold in relatively obscure language and all intellectual forefathers are paid necessary dues before proceeding with the argument. Many pages, often over half of a paper, are spent on this exercise until we come to the significant idea or original observation. One is reminded of Juan Linz's metaphor of a construction project: The massive structure is covered with scaffolding. Materials are brought and cranes swing them aloft to be integrated into the building. Eventually, cranes are removed and the scaffolding comes down. At that point one discovers that only a tiny bungalow is there. Hamilton (1975), who quotes Linz, notes this "fetishism of academic commodities" where expressions in recondite language—be they distilled Parsonian or neo-Hegelian—are equated with important contributions to knowledge.

Despite these shortcomings, *Beyond the Sociology of Development* is a must for future courses in this area. Unlike many disheartening collections, the papers assembled in this book possess a unifying focus. The topics reviewed and ideas advanced are at the forefront of research on national and regional development and should have a significant impact on its future.

The three books reviewed represent fairly accurately the current transition in the study of underdeveloped societies. In a sense, the shift has to do with a de-emphasis on cultural and psychological determinants of underdevelopment and a corresponding stress on structural arrangements of interests and power. More basically, it represents the change from fictional issues—rising out of the needs of a particular theory—to more real ones bearing relationship to the experiences of these societies.

The modernization paradigm projected on the problem of contemporary underdevelopment all the weight of its classic origins on theories of the European transition to an urban-industrial order. The extrapolation carried with it the authority of forefathers and of major theorists who stressed the themes of evolution in stages, change through natural processes of differentiation, and the role of cultural and ideological factors in the process. Until very recently, as exemplified by the first of the books reviewed, the topics of research in underdeveloped nations were inspired less by their actual problems and histories than by specula-

tive reflection on these themes. The contrived nature of problems, hypotheses, and findings stems directly from this effort to accommodate the non- and semi-industrial world to the self-image of the industrial one.

Dependency and other new paradigms are neither final nor objective. They have the significant advantage, however, of having evolved at close range to the problems that they discuss. Neo-Marxist theories of dependency and internal colonialism do not exhaust by any means relevant contemporary perspectives on underdevelopment. Recent research on the authoritarian state and vertically integrated structure (Pike, 1975) and on the articulation of regional and national elites (Balan, 1976) are examples of entirely different, but equally relevant viewpoints.

Still, imperfections and ignorance outweigh advances in the "sociology of development." Many writers in the dependency tradition are to be faulted for a casual attitude toward hard empirical evidence and a willingness to engage in premature generalizations. While plausible, many of the assertions in this literature remain at the level of unsupported hypotheses. Empirical challenges to earlier formulations and continuous testing and modification of theoretical positions are necessary components of any future research agenda. While the shift in paradigms away from that imposed by the European experience constitutes a promising development, it remains for the future to see if its actual payoff exceeds the pitfalls in the new perspectives.

ALEJANDRO PORTES
Duke University

REFERENCES

ADAMS, RICHARD N.
1975 *Energy and Structure, A Theory of Social Power.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

BALAN, JORGE
1976 "Regional Urbanization under Primary Sector Expansion in Neo-Colonial Societies." In Alejandro Portes and Harley L. Browning (eds.), *Current Perspectives in Latin American Urban Research*. Austin: Special Publications Series of the Institute of Latin American Studies (forthcoming).

BROWNRIGG, LESLIE ANN
1974 "The Role of Secondary Cities in Andean Urbanism: A Bibliographic Essay Exploring Urban Process." Northwestern University: Center for Urban Affairs, Comparative Studies Program. Mimeographed.

FRANK, ANDRE G.
1969 "The Development of Underdevelopment." In Andre G. Frank, *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution.* New York: Monthly Review Press.
1967 *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

GUSFIELD, JOSEPH R.
1967 "Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced Polarities in the Study of Social Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 72 (January): 351–62.

HAMILTON, RICHARD
1975 *Restraining Myths, Critical Studies of U.S. Social Structure and Politics.* New York: Halsted Press.

HIRSCHMAN, ALBERT O.
1961 "Ideologies of Economic Development in Latin America." In A. O. Hirschman (ed.), *Latin American Issues.* New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

INKELES, ALEX
1969 "Making Men Modern: On the Causes and Consequences of Individual Change in Six Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 75 (September): 208–25.

PEATTIE, LISA R.
1974 "The Concept of 'Marginality' as Applied to Squatter Settlements." In Wayne A. Cornelius and Felicity M. Trueblood (eds.), *Latin American Urban Research IV*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

PIKE, FREDERICK
1975 *The New Corporatism*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.

PORTES, ALEJANDRO
1974 "Modernity and Development: A Critique." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 9 (Spring): 247–79.

ROBERTS, BRYAN R.
1975 "The Provincial Urban System and the Process of Dependency." In Alejandro Portes and Harley L. Browning (eds.), *Current Perspectives in Latin American Urban Research.* Austin: Special Publications Series of the Institute of Latin American Studies.

SMITH, DAVID H., AND INKELES, ALEX
1966 "The OM Scale: A Comparative Socio-Psychological Measure of Individual Modernity." *Sociometry* 29 (December): 353–77.

SUNKEL, OSVALDO, AND PAZ, PEDRO
1970 *El subdesarrollo latinoamericano y la teoria del desarrollo.* México, D. F.: Siglo XXI.