Comparative Studies in Society and History 2015;57(4):912–941.
0010-4175/15 © Society for the Comparative Study of Society and History 2015
doi:10.1017/S0010417515000390

Questions of Modernization: Coding Speech, Regulating Attitude in Survey Research

BEGÜM ADALET

New York University

One might even speculate that *ordinary* men … have become more enlightened and scientific in their approach to social problems and their understanding of their fellow men as a result of surveys being widely disseminated in newspapers, mass magazines, and on nationwide television. They have become less parochial, more knowledgeable about their fellows and the variety of beliefs and the reasons for the differences, and more cognizant of the wider and varied moral standards by which they might guide their own conduct.[1]

———Herbert Hyman, 1979

At the National Library in Ankara sit two sample survey reports from studies conducted on Turkish students in 1959. The first study was undertaken by political scientist Frederick Frey, then of MIT, in collaboration with the staff at the Test and Research Bureau of the Turkish Board of Education and Discipline, as a means to discern the values high school students assigned to occupational groups.[2] The instruction sheet enclosed in this survey appears proverbial for

Acknowledgments: I am grateful to the staff at the MIT Institute Archives and Special Collections, Ankara National Library, and the Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Columbia University for their generous assistance with research. Earlier versions of this article were presented at the University of Pennsylvania and Cornell Political Theory Workshops, and the Middle East History and Theory Conference at the University of Chicago. Writing was supported by an ACLS/Mellon Fellowship. I benefited from extensive feedback from Jon Argaman, David Bateman, Richard Bensel, Ian Hartshorn, Tim Mitchell, Anne Norton, Thea Riofrancos, Sid Rothstein, Anand Vaidya, and Bob Vitalis. I would especially like to thank the anonymous reviewers at *CSSH*, and David Akin and Andrew Shryock for their excellent editorial assistance. All translations from Turkish are mine and I am responsible for the remaining errors.

[1] Herbert Hyman, "The Sample Survey: Its Nature, History, Utilization and Effects. A Preliminary Report to the National Science Board, February 1979," Herbert H. Hyman Papers (hereafter "Hyman Papers"), box 9, fol. 16, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, City of New York.

[2] Frederick Frey, George Angell, and Abdurrahman Sanay, *Lise Seviyesindeki Öğrencilerin Değer Sistemleri: Öğrencilerin Meslek Gruplarına Bağladıkları Değerler* (The value systems of high school students: the values students ascribe to occupational groups) (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Talim ve Terbiye Dairesi Eğitim Araştırmaları ve Değerlendirme Merkezi, 1962).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

those accustomed to the design and dictates of the questionnaire setting. In a context where the imperatives of survey research were not altogether familiar, however, these instructions took special care to explicate the premises (and promises) of this particular mode of inquiry. They insisted on the value of asking questions directly and the necessity for candor in the students' articulation of their own opinions. Though their opinions were unlikely to find verbatim counterparts among the orderly questionnaire boxes, open to inscription with "X"s, the instructions insisted that propinquity would have to supplement for sameness, being preferable to the silences likely to interfere with the classificatory thrust of survey research.

The second survey, conducted by Nermin Abadan of the Political Science Faculty at Ankara University, inquired after the spare-time activities of university students.[3] Abadan's questionnaire included an exhaustive description of the precautions taken to preserve anonymity in order to allay the students' suspicions and anxieties, which might otherwise obfuscate the findings of scrupulous research conducted in a scientific manner. In the more credibly anonymous setting of the National Library, a patron had scribbled their own answer in response to the question, "Where do you live?" in the bound and otherwise vacant copy of the questionnaire. Though the range of options was constricted ("with one's parents, friends, or spouse"), the appurtenant respondent drew in their own box and wrote "under the bridge." Despite detailed safeguards against negligent behavior, it seems, omissions and substitutions remained part and parcel of the survey landscape, long after its intended function had been fulfilled.

The coding systems of both surveys drew on a cascade of similar studies that Turkish and American social scientists conducted throughout the 1950s and 1960s targeting students and current and future administrators, as well as the masses of peasants residing in the country.[4] The broader milieu for these studies was the concurrent emergence of modernization theory and an interest in attitudinal research in non-Western areas in the aftermath of World War II. Surveys inquiring after value orientation and behavioral patterns accompanied the interest in Turkey as an object of inquiry and model of modernization in the

[3] Nermin Abadan, *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Serbest Zaman Faaliyetleri: Ankara Yüksek Öğrenim Gençliği Üzerinde Bir* Araştırma (The spare-time activities of university students: a study of Ankara higher education youth) (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Yayınları, 1962).

[4] See, among others, A.T.J. Matthews, *Emergent Turkish Administrators: A Study of the Vocational and Social Attitudes of Junior and Potential Administrators* (Ankara: Ankara Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1955); Fahir H. Armaoğlu and Guthrie G. Birkhead, *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi 1946–55 Mezunları Hakkında bir Araştırma* (A study of the 1946–1955 graduates of the political science faculty) (Ankara 1956: TODAIE); Committee of the Ankara University Faculty of Political Science, *Economic and Social Aspects of Farm Mechanization in Turkey* (Ankara: SBF Yayınları, 1953); Committee of the Ankara University Faculty of Political Science and New York University Graduate School of Public Administration and Social Service, *Kaza ve Vilayet İdaresi Üzerinde bir Araştırma* (A study of the administration of provinces and districts) (Ankara: SBF Yayınları, 1957).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

American social sciences.[5] The demands and funding for these surveys came from organizations as diverse as the Mutual Security Agency, the Turkish State Planning Organization, the Ford Foundation, and the Voice of America (VOA), among others. The coding of the data, preparation of IBM punch cards, training of research teams, and crafting of reports took place in various institutions across either side of the Atlantic such as MIT, Columbia, and Ankara Universities, intimating the circuitous nature of survey research in this period.

Social science technologies such as public opinion polls and surveys have been alternately depicted as top-down, manipulative tools driven by market interests or insufficient devices of measurement that fail to capture particularized and local meanings attached to democratic speech and participation.[6] Such studies assign disciplinary functions to survey research, emphasizing the normalization of respondent behavior through the "highly articulated" nature of the interview setting.[7] Recent attempts to historicize these methodologies signal a renewed attention to the ways in which they not only measure and describe, but also produce the phenomena they seek to explain, such as public opinion or an "averaged" society.[8] This latter body of work cogently calls into question the success of the disciplinary aspects of survey research, and details unruly behavior on the part of respondents, the overall "messiness and indeterminacy of the research process itself," and tensions between the universalist implications of social science methods and their indigenization in non-Western settings.[9] The present article tracks the Cold War travels of sample

[5] Robert Ward and Dankwart Rustow, eds., *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); Daniel Lerner, *Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958). For an overview, see Nathan Citino, "The Ottoman Legacy in Cold War Modernization," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40, 4 (2008): 579–97.

[6] Pierre Bourdieu, "Public Opinion Does not Exist," in *Sociology in Question*, Richard Nice, trans. (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1993); Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Thomas Burger, trans. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991); Susan Herbst, *Numbered Voices: How Opinion Polling Has Shaped American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Frederick Schaffer, "Thin Descriptions: The Limits of Survey Research on the Meaning of Democracy," *Committee on Concepts and Methods Working Paper Series* 45 (2010). For a preliminary account of social scientific technologies, see Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Alan Sheridan, trans. (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).

[7] Lynn Sanders, "Democratic Politics and Survey Research," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 29, 248 (1999): 248–80, 225.

[8] Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, "Do the Social Sciences Create Phenomena? The Example of Public Opinion Research," *British Journal of Sociology* 50, 3 (1999): 367–96; John Law, "Seeing Like a Survey," *Cultural Sociology* 3, 2 (2009): 239–56; Sarah Igo, *The Averaged American: Surveys, Citizens, and the Making of a Mass Public* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); Michael Savage, *Identities and Social Change in Britain since 1940: The Politics of Method* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[9] Savage, *Identities*, ix. Also see Igo, *Averaged American*; Matthew Hull, "Democratic Technologies of Speech: From World War II America to Postcolonial Delhi," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20, 2 (2010): 257–82; and Tong Lam, *A Passion for Facts: Social Surveys and the*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

surveys between Turkey and the United States, and keeps taut the tension between the regulatory and productive powers of social scientific methodologies on one hand, and their failings and frailties on the other.

An examination of the intellectual and political life of the sample survey reveals an alignment between the ideal subject of modernization theory and the respondent who was expected to be familiar with the conditions of the survey setting: impersonal relationships, the promise of anonymity, and the capacity for having and voicing opinions regarding otherwise improbable situations. Deemed as technologies central to the routinization of modernization theory, interviews invoked particular kinds of social interactions and required a series of attitudinal and linguistic adjustments on the part of both the survey researcher and respondent.[10] In that sense, studies conducted to measure and record the attitudes of peasants, students, and administrators were intended to be performative, in Austin's sense: the interviews were designed to occasion the forms of subjectivity and interpersonal relations articulated and idealized by modernization theory.[11]

Despite researchers' interest in the very activity of survey-taking as a modernizing edifice, instances of reframing and refusals to answer by the predesignated categories prevailed, attesting to the capacity for each survey to outstrip the intentions of its coders, sponsors, and creators. The surveys' ability to generate modern subjectivities was thus undercut by the reflexive or metapragmatic activity of the participants, to use Silverstein's terminology. Over and again, respondents challenged both the meanings and the contexts of the survey settings that were presupposed by the interviewers.[12] The social scientists' reporting on the content and formal aspects of the interview, however, entailed the erasure of the participants' manipulation of interactional frames, and thereby contributed to the crystallization of survey research as both a tool and indicator of modernization across its sites of implementation. Rather than assign certitude to the interpellation of survey participants as modern or arrive at a foregone conclusion of resistance, my aim is to uncover the hesitations, reinterpretations, and ambiguities that were endemic to the travels and instantiations of survey methodology. The questionnaires and their specific

Construction of the Chinese Nation-State, 1900–1949 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

[10] On social, material, and literary technologies employed in the construction and dissemination of knowledge practices, see Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Airpump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

[11] On performative speech acts, see J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962).

[12] Michael Silverstein, "Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description," in Keith Basso and Henry Selby, eds., *Meaning in Anthropology* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1976); and John Lucy, ed., *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1993).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stipulations surface, in this reading, as documents of a different order, as artifacts of knowledge practices that nonetheless remain "textual entities" "[overflowing] their makers."[13]

This article's first section contextualizes the increasing affinity between survey methodology and modernization theory in the postwar United States and chronicles the problems associated with research in "modernizing" settings and the remedies proposed to overcome such hindrances. I offer a detailed examination of sociologist Daniel Lerner's work in Turkey, since his theory of modernization viewed respondent behavior itself as a decisive signifier of modernity. Lerner's role as a Cold Warrior in the "development theory" of communications research provides the background for his seeming awareness of the necessity to stage modernization through the interactional aspects of survey research. I then inspect a series of surveys undertaken later by Herbert Hyman, Frederick Frey, Arif Payaslıoğlu, and Nermin Abadan. These projects explicitly followed Lerner's lead in the conduct of attitude research at the same time as they remade its central categories and are revealing instances of how translation nonetheless contributed to the consolidation of modernization theory along the survey trail. I conclude by examining the resilience of recipients—local social scientists, unruly respondents, and recalcitrant interviewers—to underscore both the attempted enactments of social scientific methodologies and their unintended consequences over the course of their travels. My analysis reveals instances of collision between success and failure, that is, epistemic engineering and resistant strategies, during the dissemination of social scientific theories to non-Western settings.

A MOST AMERICAN THING?

The lineage of survey methodology in the United States can be traced back to turn-of-the-century social surveys, the mail and voting polls popularized by the *Literary Digest*, and the large-scale sample surveys of George Gallup and Elmo Roper through the 1920s and 1930s. Surveys continued to be associated with market and media research, and failed to gain prestige among academic circles until the onset of World War II initiated a relocation of scholarly activity toward governmental research. It was at wartime survey centers such as the Surveys Division of the Office of War Information, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Research Branch of the War Department that the affinity between the social sciences and survey research began to crystallize. Under the leadership of Rensis Likert, Samuel Stouffer, and Paul Lazarsfeld,

[13] Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 85. On documents as knowledge practices, see Annelise Rise, ed., *Documents: Artifacts of Modern Knowledge* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006); and Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, Sheridan Smith, trans. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wartime research centers evolved into the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago, and the Bureau of Applied Social Research (BASR) at Columbia University. In 1945, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the National Research Council established a Joint Committee on the Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes, and Consumer Wants, further bolstering the scholarly reputation of survey methodology.[14]

In the decades following the war, the seeming need to move away from the foregoing "parochialism" of American social scientific endeavors occasioned the emergence of a "new breed of social scientist" for whom there was to be "no land too remote, no village too ordinary or too primitive, no governmental process too imposing or too esoteric" for the study of modernization.[15] Social scientists began to view the world as a laboratory at their disposal, and "knowing the world" and "knowing the enemy" came to be identified with "national interest" in the United States in light of decolonization and the perceived threat of the Soviet model of development.[16] Research agendas set by private foundations and governmental centers were aligned with U.S. initiatives to promote "development" through the extension of technical aid and know-how abroad, ranging from President Truman's Point Four Program to Kennedy's U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Such initiatives were means to consolidate a "brave new world—a liberal internationalist era" with the help of academic research centers that were to contribute to the production of area-specific knowledge and developmental projects alike.[17]

The expansion in the regional application of social scientific scholarship occasioned both a blurring of interdisciplinary boundaries under the purview of area studies and a reorientation in the objects of inquiry, approaches, and methods employed by each field. Political scientists, for instance, followed the lead of their peers in social psychology and sociology, who were exploring the tailored fit between personality scales and the aptitudes of survey research.[18] "The distinctive feature of non-Western politics as a field for

[14] Herbert Hyman, *Taking Society's Measure: A Personal History of Survey Research* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1991), 157–58. Though survey methodology consolidated its status as an intellectually rigorous endeavor in social scientific circles after the war, its ties with governmental and commercial research did not quite dissolve. The editorial board of *Public Opinion Quarterly*, for instance, was expanded to include figures from each industry. Jean Converse, *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 228.

[15] Lucian Pye, "The Developing Areas: Field Research in the Developing Areas," in Robert Ward, ed., *Studying Politics Abroad* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964), 5, 11.

[16] David Engerman, "Social Science in the Cold War," *Isis* 101, 2 (2010): 393–400, 397.

[17] Michael Latham, "Modernization," in Theodore Porter and Dorothy Ross, eds., *The Cambridge History of Social Science, Vol. 7: The Modern Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 727.

[18] The practice of survey methodology in political science was not just a postwar phenomenon: "pioneering survey work" was conducted in Charles Merriam's program at the University of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

study," according to modernization theorists, was "the basic cultural conflict taking place in these areas [and] the researcher must be especially sensitive to problems related to changing value patterns in the society."[19] Survey methods, which were already being employed to discern voting behavior and public opinion at home, could be rendered compatible with both the growing interest in the developing world and the tasks assigned to the new social scientist, among them to contribute "to the endeavor to modernize the lives of the people in developing countries."[20] Given their roots in reformist Progressive-era studies and their postwar employment in channeling psychological warfare into mass communications research through government monies, surveys were to aid the conscious, at times covert efforts to uplift and modernize the non-West.[21] The prowess of the methodology, as one researcher put it, stemmed from its utility in not merely capturing and measuring processes of change but *inducing* it: it was the widespread dissemination of surveys that led "*ordinary* men" to appear "more enlightened and scientific in their approach to social problems."[22]

The replicable, orderly, and standardized nature of survey research rendered it apposite for the task of measuring and recording social change. Survey methodology was rich with the attractions of "medium-range" analysis for those concerned with the study of modernization in particular. Longitudinal or panel studies enabled trend analysis over long periods of time, suggesting that once a survey was conducted targeting a particular sample of students, rural populations, or the elite then that data could be compared with a new set of findings three, five, or even ten years down the line. This would make it easier to capture processes of change for the social scientist "seeking general principles—even laws—of political modernization."[23]

Chicago in the 1920s. Its applications in the form of attitudinal studies in the "non-West," however, appear to have benefited from cross-disciplinary dialogue. On such collaborative work, see Lucian Pye, ed., *Communications and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

[19] George Mct. Kahin, Guy Pauker, and Lucian Pye, "Comparative Politics of Non-Western Countries," *American Political Science Review* 49, 4 (1955): 1022–41, 1035.

[20] Herbert Hyman, "Studying Expert Informants by Survey Methods: A Cross-National Inquiry," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 31, 1 (1967): 9–26, 9. The publication of two seminal texts in comparative politics, for instance, one spearheading the study of political systems in the "underdeveloped world" and the other undertaking a cross-national comparative survey on political attitudes, was set apart by three years. See Gabriel Almond and James Coleman, eds., *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960); Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

[21] Converse, *Survey Research*; and Christopher Simpson, *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945–1960* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[22] Hyman, "Sample Survey."

[23] Herbert Hyman, "Research Design," in Robert Ward, ed., *Studying Politics Abroad* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1964), 182.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This optimism regarding the seeming fit between the needs of modernization theory and survey methodology was only exceeded by the enthusiasm for the modernity of the technique itself. The expansion of the focus of research from national samples to cross-national or cross-cultural surveys seemed to proceed along an inexorable path, one researcher noted, a move along "what might imperialistically be termed the *manifest destiny* of survey research in an extensive sense."[24] Surveys, by gathering results more "tangible and practical" than the "abstract and theoretical" knowledge yielded by other methods, helped "promote the scientific study of politics by forcing improvements in the rigor of research procedures, the quality of measures, and the techniques for certifying facts."[25] Survey researchers' sanguine faith in the technological and scientific merits of their work, however, was undermined by their own reservations about the applicability of that methodology to foreign locales.[26] Skepticism regarding transportability surfaced in relation to a purported equivalence between the "modernity" of the technique and the "modernity" of settings amenable to being surveyed. If surveys proved capable of serving the "cause of social change," it was not clear if their application elsewhere necessitated some degree of change having already taken place there, since the method was "essentially a technique for the study of the 'alphabetized,' mobile, individualistic and market-oriented societies of the West."[27] For those who employed the survey in non-Western areas, then, it remained an approximation at best since it appeared to be "better adapted" to "modern society."[28]

Such reservations are a testament to the stakes involved for "the scientific imperialist eager to expand the realm of survey research."[29] On one hand, it seemed that there were preconditions for survey work, which for Stein Rokkan included centralization and bureaucratization, sufficient levels of literacy, and cross-local mobility, and this suggested a role for "survey

[24] Frederick Frey, "Cross-Cultural Survey Research in Political Science," in Robert Holt and John Turner, eds., *The Methodology of Comparative Research* (New York: The Free Press, 1970), 179 (his emphasis).

[25] Arif Payaslıoğlu and Frederick Frey, "Babalarının Mensup Olduğu Meslekler Bakımından Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Öğrencileri Üzerinde Bir İnceleme" (A study of political science students in terms of their fathers' occupations), *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 13, 3 (1958): 225–43, 229; Herbert McClosky, *Political Inquiry: The Nature and Uses of Survey Research* (New York: MacMillan, 1969), 2.

[26] Stein Rokkan et al., eds., *Comparative Survey Analysis* (The Hague: Mouton, 1969); Stein Rokkan, ed., *Comparative Research across Cultures and Nations* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968); Ward, *Studying Politics Abroad*; Holt and Turner, *Methodology*; Frederick Frey, *Survey Research on Comparative Social Change: A Bibliography* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1969).

[27] Stein Rokkan, "Comparative Survey Analysis: Trends, Issues, Strategies," in Stein Rokkan et al., eds., *Comparative Survey Analysis* (The Hague: Mouton, 1969), 15.

[28] Frederick Frey, "Surveying Peasant Attitudes in Turkey," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 27, 3 (1963): 335–55, 335–36.

[29] Herbert Hyman, Arif Payaslıoğlu, and Frederick Frey, "The Values of Turkish College Youth," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 22, 3 (1958): 275–91, 276.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

organizations [as] 'nationalizing' agencies."[30] Yet, obstacles along the path seemed insurmountable. Frequently cited among the hindrances beleaguering the field researcher were problems in the standardization of procedures and questionnaires; the shortage of local facilities, trained native interviewers, and IBM equipment; unreliable census records that triggered sampling errors; and incomplete maps leading to difficulties in locating respondents. The single most trying predicament, though, appeared to be of the attitudinal sort: the persistence of "evasion, courtesy, fear, silence and outright lying" in respondent behavior demanded various measures for "verbosity, sophistication, credulity, conformity, extremism in responses, inability to differentiate, among other things."[31] While researchers attributed such unruly behavior to an overall lack of familiarity with the method, it also provided fruitful ground for further reflections upon the mindset of local respondents and assertions of difference along cultural lines.

In 1958, a special issue of the *Public Opinion Quarterly* was devoted to the problems of attitude research in the modernizing non-West, addressing areas as diverse as Indonesia and Iran, Uruguay and Chile, Turkey, and "Africa South of the Sahara." In his editorial introduction to the issue, Daniel Lerner noted the affinity between survey research and "participant societies," which he equated with modern societies, and presented the opinion-holder as akin to the "cash customer and the voter."[32] Susanne and Lloyd Rudolph described the problems they encountered during survey research in India and questioned the presuppositions of their method, noting the "flaws in the assumption that most people hold opinions on a broad range of issues and are capable of articulating them."[33] If the respondents they encountered were not acquainted with the premise of opinion-holding and articulation, they also seemed unfamiliar with the method itself: "The scholar engaged in survey research who presents himself to the American housewife can do so with considerable confidence of a friendly and understanding reception…. But the interviewer who faces an illiterate *Harijan* woman in village India is not likely to rouse any familiar images or ideas."[34] The image of the ubiquitous pollster at home was frequently evoked as evidence of American respondents' exceptional amenability to being surveyed.

[30] Rokkan, "Comparative Survey Analysis," 5–6, 19.

[31] Sidney Verba, "The Uses of Survey Research in the Study of Comparative Politics: Issues and Strategies," *Historical Social Research* 18, 2 (1966): 55–103; Myron Weiner, "Political Interviewing," in Robert Ward, ed., *Studying Politics Abroad* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964), 127–28; Robert E. Mitchell, "Survey Materials Collected in the Developing Countries," in Stein Rokkan, ed., *Comparative Research across Cultures and Nations* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), 224.

[32] Daniel Lerner, Introduction, "Attitude Research in Modernizing Areas," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 22, 3 (1958): 217–22, 221.

[33] Lloyd Rudolph and Susanne H. Rudolph, "Surveys in India: Field Experience in Madras State," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 22, 3: 235–44, 235.

[34] Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Elsewhere, Sidney Verba noted the specific characteristics of American society that made survey research an effective technique in that setting, such as impersonal relationships, an inquisitive mindset, and the ease with which respondents spoke to strangers, as well as a "greater understanding of scientific inquiry; greater comprehension of an 'opinion' (an individual statement of preference that cannot be considered right or wrong); greater ability to imagine oneself in hypothetical situations; and so forth."[35] Political scientist Frank Bonilla reiterated the limitations of survey research abroad: not only was it beset by the absence of articulate respondents, equipped with the necessary "social skills and intellectual capacities," but also conspicuous was the lack of "some experience with free and easy communication" with the interviewer, who was instead perceived as a "total stranger."[36] This preoccupation with the ease of communication reflected long-standing regulations regarding the interview setting, which had to "have all the warm and personality exchange of a conversation, with the clarity and guidelines of scientific searching."[37] In Bonilla's account of overseas research, by contrast, the interviewer emerges as an unsolicited guest who nevertheless finds in himself the prerogative to set the dictates of the dialogic interaction. His demands appear exacting, his questions "embarrassing, gratuitously aggressive, or even dangerous," and his very presence a nuisance at best.[38] Such interviews could be viewed more fruitfully as "sticky engagements," indicative of "the awkward, unequal, unstable, and creative qualities of interconnection across difference."[39]

For those who employed the survey method abroad, it seemed more suited to the American setting that fostered and perfected it, given the ambivalence in language, hitches in research design, and seeming hostility to interviewers encountered elsewhere. The question remained: if the task of the survey researcher was to measure and record attitudinal patterns, to what extent should respondent behavior vis-à-vis the interview setting be figured into indices of modernization? For Lerner, opinion holding itself could be factored into the analysis as a variable, thereby facilitating a reading of silences in the interview setting not as "the loss of data, but [itself] an important datum."[40]

[35] Verba, "Uses of Survey Research," 67–68.
[36] Frank Bonilla, "Survey Techniques," in Robert Ward, ed., *Studying Politics Abroad* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964), 140.
[37] William Goode and Paul Hatt, *Methods in Social Research* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952), 191.
[38] Bonilla, "Survey Techniques," 140.
[39] Anna Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005), 4.
[40] Verba, "Uses of Survey Research," 81.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

STICKY CONVERSATIONS

In May 1963, the Committee on Comparative Politics of the SSRC held a conference in New York on "Survey Research in Developing Areas." During that meeting, Lerner enumerated the methodological and administrative requirements underpinning the types of research that would help explicate processes of political modernization. Survey research, he explained, ought to be comparable and replicable insofar as it was particularly suited to the task of understanding *and* explaining the modernization process, which "is (or should be) relatively geography-free and even culture-free in its principal components."[41] Citing his own experience with the Middle East surveys conducted by BASR at Columbia University, Lerner insisted that it was the opportunity to test the "ideal types" against data from seven countries that "made it possible for us … to move from a theoretically-derived typology to empirically-determined generalizations—i.e., from what is merely plausible to what is highly probable."[42] If it was the comparative nature of the BASR data that helped generate a universally applicable, scientifically sound model of modernization, the explanatory prowess of the survey method was just as expedient for capturing the regularities intrinsic to that model.

While Lerner extolled survey research for its capacity to account for the "general effects" of modernization, divorced from both geography and culture, he was not entirely forthright about the origins of the Middle East survey data at the SSRC meeting.[43] Three years prior to the publication of the book, Lerner co-wrote an article with David Riesman and divulged:

> In the fall of 1950, three hundred long, exploratory interviews were conducted in Turkey by native interviewers trained by a researcher from Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research. The respondents were selected to overrepresent listeners and potential listeners to the Voice of America; thus, three men were interviewed for every woman, urbanites were over-chosen, as were upper income groups…. The interest of the Voice of America, which financed the original fieldwork and extensive analysis, in securing some feed-back from its broadcasts turned out to provide a record, as fascinating as it is complex, of a country in which old prisons of the self are in process of being shattered, while the existence of new prisons, products of liberations, is dimly recognized.[44]

Over the course of its journey between different institutions, the Middle East survey was thoroughly steeped in expectations and obligations. The study was motivated in part by State Department concerns about "Soviet jamming

[41] Daniel Lerner, *Survey Research on Political Modernization*, Center for International Studies, MIT, C 163-40A, 1963, Daniel Lerner Papers 1949–1976, Manuscript Collection-MC 336, MIT Institute Archives and Special Collections, box 13, fol. 1 (hereafter "Lerner Papers").

[42] Ibid.

[43] Lerner, *Passing*.

[44] Daniel Lerner and David Riesman, "Self and Society: Reflections on Some Turks in Transition," *Explorations* 5 (1955): 67–80, 68.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Voice of America radio signals," and the original questionnaires aimed to assess the direct influence mass media could have on Middle Eastern audiences.[45] Lerner was explicit about his concern that while "Middle Easterners more than ever want the modern package," they nonetheless "reject the label 'made in U.S.A.' (or, for that matter, 'made in USSR')."[46] He thus placed the countries under examination on a developmental spectrum, which reflected strategic interests and alliances in the region. Lerner's categorization contrasted the "modernizing" tendencies of pro-Western Turkey and Lebanon with the subversive elements of Nasserite Egypt. The performative aspirations of survey methodology came to reflect its origins in and compatibility with psychological warfare and propaganda work. The travels of the VOA survey—conceived in one setting, conducted in another by trained native interviewers, and coded and (re)analyzed along different research agendas—also reflected the changes *and* consistencies in the theoretical and methodological inclinations of Lerner, acquired during his tenures at various research institutions.

Born in Brooklyn in 1917 to Russian émigré parents, Lerner studied English literature at New York University until serving as the chief editor of the Intelligence Branch of the Psychological Warfare Division of the U.S. Army during World War II. His participation in survey studies that attempted to measure the effect of Allied propaganda on military and civilian populations in Germany would make him a suitable match for the Middle East study, whose "central rationale" was "psychological warfare."[47] Lerner was asked to analyze the VOA data upon his arrival in 1951 at BASR, which was then under the direction of Paul Lazarsfeld. Though he was one of the several rapporteurs who analyzed the data for VOA, Lerner was responsible for the sections on Turkey from the outset.[48] The answers to the survey were initially to be coded according to Lazarsfeld's theory of the two-step flow model of communication. But by the time Lerner moved to MIT as professor of sociology and senior research staff at the Center for International Studies (CENIS) in 1953, it was agreed to recode the data in accordance with an opinion-range index reflecting Lerner's three-fold typology of modern, transitional, and traditional societies.[49] The

[45] Hemant Shah, *The Production of Modernization: Daniel Lerner, Mass Media, and the Passing of Traditional Society* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011), 101.

[46] Lerner, *Passing*, 45.

[47] Lerner's dissertation, *Sykewar*, chronicles his military research. Between the war and his tenure at BASR Lerner worked with the Revolution and the Development of International Relations project at the Hoover Institution of Stanford University in the late 1940s. See Lerner Papers, box 1, fols. 3 and 5, "Biographical Material." It was Joseph Stycos, the Chief of the BASR project, who described the rationale of the project as psychological warfare. See American Association for Public Opinion Research Conference Proceedings, "Contributions of Opinion Research to Psychological Warfare," cited in Simpson, *Science of Coercion*, 66.

[48] Other rapporteurs included Elihu Katz, Siegfried Kracauer, and Mayone Stycos.

[49] See Shah, *Production*, chs. 4 and 5. Shah suggests that Lazarsfeld himself had reservations as to whether his two-step flow model of communication was transportable to non-Western settings.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Center, itself notoriously sponsored by the Central Intelligence Agency, thus financed the reanalysis of the data as well as follow-up fieldwork in 1954. The latter included Lerner's trip to Balgat, Ankara, which inspired his arresting depiction, to be discussed presently, of the Grocer and the Chief as "the symbolic protagonists of the drama of modernization."[50]

Lerner's early ruminations on the Turkey data came to inform his conceptualization of modernization, which appeared to be correlated with "socioeconomic status, urban residence, and media exposure," and also the capacity for "egoidentification" or "introjection," which "teaches us to know the roles of others and how to assume them on appropriate occasions."[51] While the surveys were employed to gather verifiable data about their respondents, they relied on the subjects' ability to generate a myriad of fictions. For Lerner, the prerequisite for modernity was a "great characterological transformation," traced through the psychic mobility of the individual and his or her acquisition of empathic skills that "spell modernity."[52] This tautological formulation held that the encounter between the actual self and the hypothetical self (be it the interviewer or the head of a radio station) was at once the condition and signifier of a modern mindset. Lerner thus constructed an "empathy index," for which he relied on a series of projective questions, ranging from the ability to imagine oneself as the editor of a newspaper, in charge of a radio station, or the head of a government to living in a different country from one's own. His index assigned 0's, 1's, and in rare cases, 2's ("chooses non-adjacent country in which one could live if not in native country") to the responses, at the expense of the rather detailed reasons provided by the respondents when prompted to imagine themselves assigned to improbable tasks or dwelling in foreign settings in the open-ended question and answer setting.[53]

Although these responses were lost in the reported form of condensed scores and continuums that provided an "opinion range," their presentation in numerical form attested to the character of the survey setting itself as an experiment in modernization. Lerner's very understanding of modernization, explicitly defined through the operationalization of an empathy index, conceived as the ability to imagine oneself outside of the self, suggested the inextricable link between the research method and that which it sought to explain. "The manner in which persons perceive the interview situation," Lerner insisted,

[50] Lerner and Riesman, "Self and Society," 74. On link between the Center for International Studies and the CIA, see Bruce Cummings, "Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies during and after the Cold War," in Christopher Simpson, ed., *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences during the Cold War* (New York: New Press, 1998).

[51] Daniel Lerner, "A Scale Pattern of Opinion Correlates: Communication Networks, Media Exposure, and Concomitant Response," *Sociometry* 16, 3 (1953): 266–71, 266.

[52] Lerner, *Passing*, 54.

[53] For Lerner's empathy index, see Table 8 in *Passing*, 144. For a list of the projective questions, see 69–70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"is a datum on their readiness and competence to participate personally in essentially impersonal social enterprises."[54] He thus believed that failure to abide by the interactional prerequisites of the survey indicated an inability to partake of the modern or empathetic mindset, since "the very nature of the interview requires a certain ability to identify with others."[55]

Lerner's investment in the performative dimensions of the interview situation suggests that his interest went beyond the textual artifact of the questionnaire, and took into account the productive capacities of the survey event itself. The surveys were conducted not merely to measure or describe, but to occasion the performance of the very categories, "modern," "transitional," and "traditional" that they sought to explain. The crafting of these typologies rested on a series of omissions and misreadings that allowed Lerner to identify the capacity for empathy (or lack thereof) as indicative of different attitudes, mindsets, and indeed "national characteristics" in different settings.

In a series of elite interviews he conducted in Europe shortly after the Middle East project, for example, Lerner found that the "French respondents were most troubled by projective questions—showing themselves *not unable but unwilling* to empathize on questions of public policy."[56] If the French found the "role-playing" questions frivolous or silly, it was at best a testament to their opinionated predispositions since, "There is a vast psychic difference between the illiterate and untutored traditionalism of Middle Eastern peasant and the traditionalism which prevails among the contemporary elite of France. The Frenchman has acquired his traditionalism as an intellectual discipline and an explicit psychic code…. Whereas the Arab peasant usually has no sense of possible alternatives to his traditional ways but simply 'does what comes naturally,' the Frenchman has a very sophisticated rationale for his conduct."[57] Lerner delineates two distinct mindsets in this passage: while both sets of respondents' aversion to the hypothetical questions elicit their labeling as traditional, the category itself remains variable, if not fraught, in its application across disparate contexts. Even though Lerner was aware of the imperative to devise and stage the categories of modernization theory, then, his assignation of different populations under its labels nonetheless relied on preconceptions that came at the expense of the particularities and nuances that otherwise characterized the interview setting.

Lerner's differential reading suggests that the survey method does more than report its findings; it expects, *demands* at every turn, that the interviewee

[54] *Passing*, 147.

[55] Lerner and Riesman, "Self and Society," 78.

[56] Daniel Lerner and Suzanne Keller, "Empathy in Cross-National and Occupational Perspective," July 1957, Center for International Studies, MIT (Lerner Papers, box 11, fol. 42), my emphasis.

[57] Lerner, "Interviewing Frenchmen," *American Journal of Sociology* 62, 2 (1956): 187–94, 191–92.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

transport himself or herself out of the "traditional" environment (be it a coffeehouse or the subject's own house) so as to be placed in the modern, "impersonal" setting of the interview. The imperative to answer questions, to hold and articulate opinions in a predesignated manner, is an implicit corollary of participation in that setting. In his evaluation of the Turkey data, Lerner insists that it is the traditional subjects, not yet sufficiently exposed to mass media or cultivated in the ways of the modern participant style, who find the question and answer situation "deadly earnest" and "can more easily imagine destroying the self than making the effort to project it beyond the familiar world into the strange."[58] Unaccustomed to the norms and rules dictated and regulated by the survey setting, these traditional Turks remain improper interview subjects. Their inability to imagine themselves in an alien context, in turn, tarnishes their modernity score, gauged strictly in quantitative terms. The survey aims to interpellate both its respondent and its subject matter: its claim at representation—necessarily condensed, seemingly disciplinary—is simultaneously a claim to its own legitimacy. Foreign to its locale of application, the survey demands answers that will have to be rendered proper to its object of inquiry. By the interactional standards of the interview setting, modern subjects are those who are willing for interlocution with strangers, but only in a manner predetermined by the expectations of those who set the terms of proper discourse.

In their initial assessment of the Middle East surveys, Lerner and Riesman elaborate on the ideal survey respondent by way of illustrating what they are *not*. Citing a part of the interview with the Chief of Balgat, who answers a question about whether or not he gives advice to fellow villagers ("Yes, that is my main duty, to give advice.… About all that I or you could imagine, even about their wives and how to handle them, and how to cure their sick cow"), Lerner and Riesman immediately comment: "It would seem from this exchange that the Chief could not project himself into the interviewer's place (conceivably, he aggressively did not care to), else he would quickly have realized that the latter *could* imagine advice on other matters than the cure and care of females."[59] Lerner and Riesman insist that it is the task of the respondent to offer unconditional cooperation by putting himself in the place of the interviewer, revealing, in the process, a profound misreading of the Chief's willingness to anticipate, perhaps even empathize with his interlocutor's expectations regarding the requirements of his job. In the authors' account, by contrast, the Chief's refusal to abide by the terms of the proper interview exchange arrests him in traditional time, a time encapsulated with hierarchies, obsolete conceit, and an inability to "compare, equate or differentiate" personal and public problems.[60]

[58] Lerner, *Passing*, 148.
[59] Lerner and Riesman, "Self and Society," 70.
[60] Ibid., 77.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The respondent's attitudinal shortcomings are also linked to his cognitive and linguistic abilities in this account. Following their depiction of the episode with the Chief who ostensibly could not imagine anything but the "cure and care of females," Lerner and Riesman comment on the centrality of sufficient skills of communication in a footnote that cites an assessment of interviews conducted in Arkansas in the aftermath of a tornado.[61] In that example, they observe that the "lower-class hillbilly respondents," who, like their Turkish counterparts proved incapable of putting themselves in the interviewer's place, "would plunge him *in medias res* without telling him so, shift place or pronoun without realizing that he could not follow, and so on."[62] Seemingly surprised to find parallels between the "hillbilly" respondents of Arkansas and the traditional Chief of Balgat in Ankara, the authors nevertheless make a gesture toward recognizing the potential subversion and tactical prevarication that the survey unwittingly produces:

> To be sure, we realize that one must be wary of comparisons between the lower class and the less enlightened in a modern 'mass society' like our own and the tradition-oriented, the leaders and followers alike, in a pre-industrial culture. We realize, too, that the disaster-study material is susceptible of varying interpretations; for example, the possibility that the lower-class respondents were resentfully and at least semiconsciously making fools of the interviewers while pretending co-operation…. Nevertheless, there would appear to be some similarity in the lacunae of self-other awareness in these historically quite separate settings—a similarity reflected in analogous metaphoric patterns.[63]

In this turn of events, it is no longer the Chief preoccupied with cows or the lower-class witnesses of the Arkansas tornado, barely capable of keeping their pronouns straight, who are prone to ridicule. In the absence of interlocutors who will abide by their discursive and imaginary dictates, it is the interviewers themselves who are thrown into unfamiliar terrain. Still, Lerner finds it easier to equate the Ankarans' and Arkansans' reframing strategies than to assign the same sense of traditionalism to the French elite and Arab peasants. In both cases, a more nuanced account of the variations, as well as the overlaps, between the different respondent populations is purposefully extracted from the textual account, lest it undermine the certitude of the archetypes that are carefully crafted and staged through the interview process.

The questionnaires used in the Turkey surveys, some of which are catalogued along with Lerner's private papers at the Special Collections at MIT, reveal a variety of resilient responses that did not make it into his musings on modernization in published form.[64] These refusals to engage with the

[61] See Leonard Schatzman and Anselm Strauss, "Social Class and Modes of Communication," *American Journal of Sociology* 60 (1955): 329–38.

[62] Lerner and Riesman, "Self and Society," 70.

[63] Ibid.

[64] The questionnaires retained in the MIT archives include less than a third of the three hundred interviews conducted in Turkey. In this article I draw on a range of the qualitative responses that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

survey questions automatically disqualified the respondents from being categorized as modern subjects, capable of empathy in general, or of conversing with the interviewer in a proper manner in particular. Oftentimes, however, their refusals indicated less a lack of capacity for imagination than a realistic assessment of their standing or interests in life. Some said they lacked the education or credentials for running a newspaper, others that they were not interested in that line of work. Another replied that he would resign immediately from the post of president since he considered himself unqualified for the job.

One particularly unruly respondent objected to the wording of the survey questions and the limited categories imposed by the answer range. Asked to provide two defining characteristics on five different nations, the respondent demanded: "If I am to respond that the Americans are industrious and the British intelligent, would I be saying that it is not possible for the British to be industrious and the Americans to be intelligent?" He added, "I do not think questions of such importance and complexities should be answered in a condensed manner, like vitamin pills."[65] In fact, a lack of imagination in numerical terms, guaranteed to earn low scores on the Lerner modernity index, was a commonplace occurrence among those interviewed. "I am against statistics in general," another respondent insisted, but his aversion was directed toward the survey in particular: "The questions aren't judicious enough. In life, all is not black and white than is grey. And grey is a 'nuance.'"[66] In addition to being restrictive, the questions seemed demeaning to some. Told that he could ask about anything he wanted to find out about America, one respondent, otherwise reluctant to adopt the quantitative terminology of the survey, inquired: "What is the height of the Empire State Building? How many cars the Ford produces a year? [*sic*]" "Sarcastically, resents the question," added the interviewer in parentheses.[67]

Such occurrences suggest that the interviews were far from proceeding along the impersonal and cordial lines envisioned by the researcher. No matter how hard the survey tried to produce a particular kind of verbal exchange and social interaction based on civility, tolerance, and empathy, such regulations were broken in the moment of survey enactment. The retorts,

were left out of Lerner's book, as well as the two questions that bookend the 117 comprising the questionnaire. These questions prompt the interviewers' "psychological description of the respondent," and the respondent's assessment of the survey.

[65] Lerner Papers, box 9, fol. 7, Ist-35-City. The same respondent refused to quantify and rank his newspaper reading experience: "I am not accustomed to make reckonings by figures even in material matters. I leave it to you to derive the answers of these questions, from the [descriptive] answers I gave concerning movies, newspapers, and radios." Asked about his opinion of the interview as a whole, he deplored, "Human nature is not to be treated, in my opinion, as a calculating machine which is the case with regards the majority of the questions involved in this questionnaire."

[66] Lerner Papers, box 9, fol. 2, Ist-13-City.

[67] Ibid., box 12, fol. 13, Ank-71-City.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

silences, refusals to think in numbers and condense all into statistically communicable "vitamin pills" remained antithetical to the categories proclaimed by the survey. That is why they were rendered inferior to the coded categories, erased from the narrative, and expelled from what Lerner believed to be his rigorous means of highly probable, empirically determined generalizations. The sample survey's claim at representation was precisely achieved through such exclusions and attenuations. For all the emphasis on empathy in Lerner's communicative theory of modernization, not voicing opinions in the interview setting was presumed to amount to having no opinion at all.

What Lerner neglects to include in his scientific report is what the social scientist resorts to, albeit in selective manner, as "qualitative support," or, as Lerner does quite elegantly in his own work, as narrative device. Yet these partial inclusions, which surface as mere plot devices and intermittent depictions of the protagonists involved, only underscore that which is expunged from the condensed, mediated, and codified account. Why else, we want to know, are people unlikely to want to move to the United States, indeed wishing they would die instead, aside from a putative lack of capacity for imagining themselves elsewhere? Responded one, "I am convinced that living a mechanized life is far from agreeable."[68] Inquired another, "Why is it that while acquiring wealth [Americans] didn't acquire the necessary culture to go with this wealth? Why do they still insist on segregation while claiming to be the best democratic country?"[69] What else did these survey researchers sacrifice by their endless cataloguing and (re)coding?

It would be inaccurate to suggest that Lerner neglected all mention of the verbatim answers recorded by the interviewers. A student of literature before the war, Lerner was no stranger to the narrative category and he masterfully employed literary devices, evident in particular in his parable of the modernizing Grocer and the traditional Chief, which serves as the introduction to his *Passing of Traditional Society.* This story intrigued Lerner more than any other while working through hundreds of interviews, and led him to proclaim that the "personal meaning of modernization in underdeveloped lands can be traced, in miniature, through the lives of Balgati—The Grocer and The Chief."[70]

A "prophet" ahead of his time, Balgat's Grocer "lives in a different world, an expansive world, populated more actively with imaginings and fantasies." He "'sees' things the others do not see, 'lives' in a world populated by imaginings alien to the constrictive world of the others."[71] In contrast to the Chief who held the only radio in Balgat in 1950 and tuned in only for news from Korea, Lerner cites the Grocer's aesthetic preferences approvingly: "It was in

[68] Ibid., box 9, fol. 2, Ist-13-City.
[69] Ibid., box 9, fol. 3, Izmir-47-cit.
[70] Lerner, *Passing*, 19.
[71] Ibid., 41, 23, 72.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a movie that he had first glimpsed what a *real* grocery store could be like—'with walls made of iron sheets, top to floor and side to side, and on them standing myriads of round boxes, clean and all the same dressed, like soldiers in a great parade.' This fleeting glimpse of what sounds like the Campbell Soup section of an A&P supermarket had provided the Grocer with an abiding image of how his fantasy world might look."[72]

In addition to providing an elaborate description of the supermarket shelves the Grocer pined for, the passage captures and confirms, for Lerner, the crucial link between a distinctly modern(izing) capacity for empathy and the ability to imagine otherwise foreign places, lifestyles, and indeed, arrays of soup cans. Furthermore, the Grocer's fantasy world is facilitated by the corresponding prerequisite for the modernity index—the ability for psychic mobility, *mediated* through the means of mass communication. Thus disposed toward the orderly display of Campbell soup cans, the Grocer's fantasy world not only accommodates that vision, but is readily articulated in the interview setting.

The Grocer thus surfaces as the paragon of the proper interview subject. His wide range of imagination is accompanied by a capacity for anticipating *and* providing the responses that are expected of him. Asked how he would rule, the Grocer responds, "He would make roads for the villagers to come to towns to see the world and would not let them stay in their holes all their life."[73] His capacity for psychic mobility accommodates the physical mobility of his fellow Balgati—hence his position as a vanguard in both the interview setting and the modernization process. Unlike the Chief who cannot imagine leaving the place where he was born, the Grocer can readily imagine himself living in America: "Indeed he seemed fully prepared, as a man does when he has already posed the question to himself many times."[74] These instances, cited profusely and admiringly by Lerner, are indications of the survey method succeeding at its task, which is not merely to procure data (and delineate its structure, content, and contours), but also to occasion the performance of modernizing subjectivities.

While the Grocer, a proxy for all transitional Turks in Lerner's scheme, comes closest to embodying the ideal respondent in the village of Balgat, "He is not yet capable of the Modern Turk's *introjective* technique;" though he is "learning to project imaginatively, [he is] not yet stretching his imagination too far."[75] It is for this reason that the modernized native interviewer, Tosun, is perplexed by the effective means of communication on the part of the Grocer, who otherwise seems "a very unimpressive type," and "even wore some sort of a necktie."[76] This detectable tone of distaste is telling for

[72] Ibid., 27–28.
[73] Ibid., 24.
[74] Ibid., 25.
[75] Lerner, "A Scale Pattern," 269–70.
[76] Lerner, *Passing*, 22.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lerner: Tosun's contempt for the Grocer must have stemmed from the latter's ability to "see himself as the interviewer saw him."[77] Lerner interprets the tension between the two characters as an indication of the throes and pangs of modernization. The Grocer is threatening to the interviewer precisely because he is in the midst of passing onto modernity, thereby providing an image of Tosun's own transitional (once, presumably, traditional) past in flesh.

It is noteworthy that Lerner includes a member of the survey team in his array of protagonists inhabiting the "modernizing landscape," which "involves many Tosuns and shepherds, many grocers and chiefs, many sons of chiefs."[78] The interviewer emerges as a full-fledged character in this account of the otherwise anonymous landscape, the Grocer and the Chief being the only titles granted to the respondents, with the rest reduced to their number, location, and rural/city distinction on their questionnaires' front page.[79] In fact, the members of the survey team were asked to attach lengthy descriptions of the respondents at the beginning of the questionnaire forms, and did not hesitate to comment on their physical appearance, education, eating habits, and seeming level of intelligence. At times, such observations gave the interviewers license to skip certain questions, especially if they were acquainted with their subjects beforehand, in one case as a close friend and in another a domestic employee. Some interviewers were flattering—if curiously—in their aesthetic assessments of the respondents: "He reminds me of a dignified silkworm inside his cocoon." Others were even more ruthless than Tosun: "He always gave me the impression of a jelly-fish, physically.… When he speaks his mouth is wet. When he pronounces his 'th's, 'sh's and 'ch's he spits in the air."[80]

In addition to physical depictions of their respondents, the interviewers frequently recorded what they perceived to be attitudes of fear and intimidation. Some noted that this initial state of trepidation was gradually relaxed once they explained that the project had nothing to do with politics. Yet the survey's motives were so clarified only rarely, and most rural respondents continued to believe that the interviewers came from newspapers, aid agencies, or the government, and that their responses would facilitate the arrival of roads, radios, and movies not unlike those they were being interrogated about.

[77] Lerner and Riesman, "Self and Society," 72.

[78] Lerner, *Passing*, 77, 43.

[79] Lerner also provides descriptions of two additional interviewers who accompanied him on his follow-up visit to Balgat. One was Tahir S., who received an accolade from Lerner for his composed deportment in the question and answer setting: "Always the American trained interviewer." The other was Zilla K., who fits the profile of the female interviewer Lerner had "ordered 'by the numbers': in her thirties, semi-trained, alert, compliant with instructions, not sexy enough to impede our relations with the men of Balgat but chic enough to provoke the women" (*Passing*, 34 and 29). Lerner's meticulous instructions suggest the amount of work that went into obtaining the kind of interlocutor who would occasion the interview process emblematic of the stage for modernity itself.

[80] Lerner Papers, box 9, fol. 8, Ist-40-city; fol. 13, Ank-70-city.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some suggested that the questionnaire was unlikely to help and that American experts should come and see the situation for themselves, though one thought this had been done before, "with no result."[81]

Not only the interviewers communicated their judgments about the survey setting since, once the questionnaires had been filled out, each respondent was asked what they thought about the interview. Though these often detailed answers did not make it into Lerner's reported opinion range or empathy index, they do reveal yet another instance of the unexpected results of the survey setting. Many found the questionnaire "silly," "lengthy," "superfluous yet lacking," and for one it seemed "funny, queer … a most American thing."[82] Such respondents attempted to meta-pragmatically reframe the survey in both its meanings and context: no longer did it measure progress along an abstract, placeless continuum of modernization; it was, rather, a practice tethered to its place of origin—the United States. Other respondents questioned the lack of transparency intrinsic to the survey setting, and one suggested, "If sincerity is the rule between interviewer and respondent … it would be very interesting for those interviewed to know the results."[83] Still others seemed, like the Grocer, highly receptive to and appreciative of the interview process, and suggested that they would have "loved to be able to ask questions too."[84] The catalogue of reactions to the interview comprises the range of reflective activity unfolding in real-time attitudes toward the discursive interaction. In the case of survey research, both recipients and practitioners negotiated interpretive frames as they tried to make sense of their communicative encounter. That Lerner erased the instances of respondents reframing from his narrative of modernization speaks to his awareness of the necessity to write the script, cast the interviewers, and direct the performance of modern, traditional, and transitional subjectivities in overtly theatrical and staged terms.

In the context of Lerner's seminal work on modernization in the Middle East, the task of the survey is manifold. In his writing, replete with a preoccupation with models, literary imagery, and narrative structures, the imperative to survey is linked as crucially to sight as to cataloguing and numerical reduction. In his account, plot twists, "passings," and crossroads provide the "landscape" the modernization narrative requires. But although Lerner masterfully performs the task of narrative chronicler, his discerning eye is principally that of the forecaster: "There are villages to which, willy-nilly, the city comes—either via a new concrete road as in Turkey, or via road as in Egypt, or via adventurous young villagers who shuttle to and fro as in Lebanon. By whatever method

[81] Ibid., box 9, fol. 2, Istanbul-18-rural. Also see box 8, fol. 15, Ank-110-city; fol. 13, Izmir-51-rural, Izmir-49-city.
[82] Ibid., box 9, fol. 5, Izmir-31-city.
[83] Ibid., box 8, fol. 12, Ist-27-city.
[84] Ibid., box 9, fol. 3, Ist-42-rural; fol. 7, Ist-35-city.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the city invades the village…. The poignancy is heightened for the modern observer, who knows that in some sense the city will always 'win,' by the great human cost added to these dramas because the actors are unaware that a rough draft of the third act is already written."[85]

The surveyor remains the ultimate "modern observer," at once responsible for delineating the categories that will inform the coding process, and already knowing how the next chapter of modernization will play out. The end-point for this cluster of positive changes is an identifiable destination, since as Lerner famously claimed, the West, and in particular America, is precisely what the "Middle East seeks to become."[86] In that process, the survey takes on a facilitating task, as evinced by the large-scale sample surveys conducted in Turkey throughout the 1950s and 1960s, which employed qualified versions of Lerner's procedures and his categories of tradition, transition, and modernity.

AN EDUCATION IN TRANSLATION

The two surveys that served as a preamble to this article share a lineage that suggests an affinity in terms both of content and methodology. These and subsequent studies converged in their efforts to set the stage for the performance of modernization, by occasioning the production of proper interviewers who were conceived as modernizing agents. They also relied on earlier criteria laid out by works such as Lerner's, and their translation and adaptation of the original categories nonetheless contributed to the crystallization of modernization theory. As we will see, even growing skepticism towards the political implications of large-scale surveys did not impede the increasing prevalence and popularity of this method in Turkey's social scientific landscape over the following decades.

Frey's survey on high school students, for instance, commenced with a functionalist account of value systems: the prevalence, depth, and the speed of change within these systems were deemed as amenable to measurement by scientific methods as the evolution of biological organisms.[87] He argued elsewhere that the high school students retained "an immoderate amount of authoritarianism," but their "growing ideological commitment to democratic forms" attested to the crucial role of education in processes of modernization.[88] While his questionnaire was of a reiterative nature, Frey manufactured a new coding system for determining personal achievement categories, which were discerned through notions of future aspirations, assessments of the self and the material world, and conceptions of intellectual and cultural development.[89]

[85] Lerner, *Passing*, 76.
[86] Ibid., 47, 79.
[87] Frey, Angell, and Sanay, *Lise Seviyesi*, 3.
[88] Frederick Frey, "Education," in *Political Modernization in Turkey and Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), 224, 225, 230.
[89] On the commitment to democratic forms, Frey's questionnaire repeated verbatim the questions from a previous, cross-national survey: "Democracy is often defined in the words of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nermin Abadan was more forthcoming in the disclosure of her intellectual predecessors, and her three-fold typology not only mapped onto the three Ankara universities whose students she investigated, but also to those proclaimed by Lerner and Riesman: "The outer-oriented, materialist manager; the idealist, prospective administrative-leader; and the traditional, static implementer."[90] Abadan, however, chastised the Middle East Technical University students (who fell under Riesman's outer-oriented and Lerner's modern categories) for being too steeped in the Anglo-American tradition: if these students could imagine themselves as the President of Turkey or citizens of another country, this was a testament to their "materialism," "the influence of the thought patterns of a society that has already tackled its trial of modernization."[91] She insisted that Turkey was, "as Daniel Lerner has correctly pointed out, 'not yet a modern society by our standards, but is no longer quite traditional either,'" and she did not hesitate to enroll Lerner's categories of attitude formation. Yet her interjections translated, that is, remade the categories by rallying them for purposes beyond their initial intent, at the same time as they contributed to their "routinization" in survey research.[92] While Abadan became renowned for her surveys of Turkish guest workers in West Germany, she remained critical of her earlier study on the spare-time activities of university students, and, in particular, her method of sampling, which, due to lack of funding and assistant personnel, did not entail a process of random selection and thus proceeded in an "incomplete and faulty" manner.[93]

The norms for selecting a representative population by which Abadan appraised her own study came from the lecture notes of a course on social scientific methodology, offered during the 1957–1958 academic year at the Faculty of Political Science at Ankara University, where Abadan taught at the time. That course, which Frederick Frey also attended during his time in Turkey as a Ford Foundation grant recipient, was co-taught by Arif Payaslıoğlu and

Abraham Lincoln as 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people.' If you were forced to do so, would you personally give greater emphasis to the conception 'by the people' or 'for the people'?" James Gillespie and Gordon Allport, *Youth's Outlook on the Future* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1955), 51. On Frey's recoding of the questionnaire, see "Democratic Potential/Values Study (Turkey)," Hyman Papers, box 2, fol. 5.

[90] Abadan, *Üniversite Öğrencileri*, 6, 44, 124. See David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).

[91] Abadan, *Üniversite Öğrencileri*, 87. Abadan's hypothetical questions drew from Lerner's: "What do you dream about becoming?" The options ranged from excelling at one's job, to becoming a millionaire or a great artist, to acting as the president or the prime minister, and living as the citizen of another state (p. 147).

[92] Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 43.

[93] Abadan, *Üniversite Öğrencileri*, 8–10. For Abadan's work on West Germany, where she also relied on Lerner-esque formulations of "rising expectations and frustrations," see *Batı Almanya'daki Türk İşçileri ve Sorunları* (Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 1964).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Herbert Hyman, within the purview of an exchange program between New York University and Ankara University, under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration (ICA). Though the lecture notes addressed other modes of data collection such as content analysis, the attention devoted to survey design exceeded all other methodological approaches.[94]

In many respects, the trajectory of Hyman's career was intertwined with the proliferation of survey methodology in the social scientific circles of the United States. During the war, Hyman participated in the Division of Program Surveys of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the bombing surveys in Germany and Japan, and he later recalled that it was this experience that "led us to train survey researchers and help conduct the first postwar surveys in Japan, Turkey, Norway, and elsewhere against the frequent objections that the method would not work."[95] While Hyman espoused the superiority of the survey method over data collected through observation, especially given its ability to contribute to the "endeavor to modernize the lives of the people in developing countries," he cautioned against conducting it on subjects who might be "*unwilling* or *incompetent* to provide reliable answers."[96] Luckily for Hyman, the academic year he spent in Turkey presented two opportunities for conducting surveys on purportedly willing and competent subjects in the university setting, studies that both Abadan and Frey cited profusely.

The first of these works was a comparison between the values of the students of Robert College and the Faculty of Political Sciences at Ankara University, in which the former, not unlike the Middle East Technical University student in Abadan's study, was found to "resemble his American counterpart more than the Ankara student."[97] Hyman and his collaborators added that most of the university students could be considered modern given the behavioral indices of Lerner's study, but they did not refrain from introducing additional "historical and logical criteria" in their appraisal of Turkey as "presumably partaking both of traditional Middle Eastern culture and of modernized or Westernized culture."[98] The "historical" criteria allowed the authors to compare the Turkish college youth with both the "traditional" past of Turkey and the "modern" youth in neighboring Europe: "At the level of symbols and practices of daily living, they are clear representatives of modern civilization. This is revealed, for example, in their dress, hygiene, health practices, possessions, and media behavior. Unlike an earlier educated generation, very few can use Arabic."[99]

[94] Hyman, "Sosyal Bilimler Metodolojisine Giriş Ders Notları" (Introduction to the methodology of the social sciences), Hyman Papers, box 1, fol. 2.
[95] Hyman, *Taking Society's Measure*, 128–29.
[96] Ibid., 157–58; and Hyman, "Sosyal" (his emphasis).
[97] Hyman, Payaslıoğlu, and Frey, "Values," 278–79.
[98] Ibid., 280.
[99] Ibid., 281. The basis for comparison with European students was once again the Gillespie and Allport questionnaire. Elsewhere, Hyman was critical of the pitfalls of "pseudo-cross national

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This blend of modernity and tradition confirmed, for the authors, a reading of Turkey vis-à-vis Lerner's transitional framework. Reverberating across their account were categories of transition espoused in earlier work across the Middle East, the replication of questionnaires conducted on students of the West, and a confirmation of conjectures and motivations that guided survey research in the first place. Hyman and his collaborators emphasized, additionally, the edifying character of their project, seeing as how it was conducted by "a group of Turkish students in the course of receiving training in social research."[100]

Hyman's course on methodology also produced a panel study that relied on two previous surveys targeting the graduates of Ankara University.[101] Since this method was "new" to Turkey, the academic setting was necessarily its first venue of practice: the students of political science, indeed, the future administrators of Turkey, were designated as simultaneously the subjects and employers of this survey, thereby suggesting its double-fold benefits in terms of both content and training.[102] Because the students learned of the sample survey method not only by carrying it out but also by virtue of being interviewed, the meta-methodological concerns of this study would familiarize them with the "realities of survey research," such as the scarcity of available sources, the need to accomplish certain tasks in a designated time period, and the imperative to cooperate with others in a rational manner.[103]

The basis for the trend analysis was a comparison of the occupational patterns of the fathers of the university students, though such questions had not been the primary concern for the previous surveys under examination. The discrepancies in the occupational categories employed by each survey presented yet another educational opportunity for the future survey methodologists. Noting the need for adjustment given these discrepancies, Payaslıoğlu and

research" and faulted Lerner's empathy index with leading the reader to "somehow *contrast [the empathy index] mentally* with a Western, modern society, of which we have no empirical example." Hyman continued: "Wouldn't it be ironic if he subsequently found a lot of immobile personalities, non-participant types in the United States or Great Britain?" The irony seems to have eluded Hyman and his collaborators when they presumed Arabic-speaking youth to be imbued with a traditional mindset. "Strategies in Comparative Survey Research," presented at the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, 1963, Hyman Papers, box 1, fol. 11.

[100] Hyman, Payaslıoğlu, and Frey, "Values," 275.

[101] Matthews, *Emergent Turkish Administrators*; Armaoğlu and Birkhead, *Siyasal Bilgiler*.

[102] The novelty of the method was overstated: throughout the 1940s, a group of faculty working on rural sociology and social psychology at Ankara University also employed small-scale surveys targeting villages and towns in the vicinity of Ankara. See Niyazi Berkes, *Bazı Ankara Köyleri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma* (A study of some Ankara villages) (Ankara: Uzluk, 1942); Muzaffer Şerif, *An Outline of Social Psychology* (New York: Harper, 1956 [1944]); Behice Boran, *Toplumsal Yapı Araştırmaları: İki Köy Çeşidinin Mukayeseli Tetkiki* (Studies in social structure: a comparative analysis of two village types) (Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1945); İbrahim Yasa, *Hasanoğlan: Socio-Economic Structure of a Turkish Village* (Ankara: Yeni Matbaa, 1957 [1945]).

[103] Payaslıoğlu and Frey, "Babalarının Mensup," 229.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Frey condensed, combined, and recategorized the answers offered by the students in each survey, thereby providing another instance of the shrinking of particularities under the pretense of recoding. The remaking of recorded categories ostensibly bolstered an analysis of change by discarding problems of incommensurability that otherwise prevailed. As the substantive categories from the earlier surveys were tampered with, indeed flattened out, their modification would abet the survey researchers-in-training in their quest for cycles and regularities. The task of the survey novice was procuring and presenting raw data, and tweaking information, redefining occupational categories, and disposing of irregularities and outliers.[104]

In 1962 came another opportunity to train "native interviewers" through a large-scale survey targeting a sample of eight thousand rural residents. Christened as the Rural Development Research Project, the survey, mostly funded by USAID, listed a familiar roster of consultants: Daniel Lerner, Herbert Hyman, Ithiel de Sola Pool, and Sloan Wayland, with Frederick Frey acting as the main rapporteur. Frey's various accounts of this project reveal the ways in which survey methodology continued to be fraught with suspicions, alliances, and frailties when undertaken in foreign settings. Given the "sensitive and possibly volatile character of the investigation," he disclosed, the Turkish State Planning Organization was enlisted as an "official liaison" to assist in "dealing with delicate political situations," thus "leaving our nascent survey organization generally free to concentrate on the demanding technical tasks of the research."[105]

The "technical" and ostensibly apolitical aspects of the survey pertained to the training of native interviewers. They were carefully chosen from among those with rural backgrounds—literate and "reasonably sophisticated" ones—and took a course that included "familiarization with the instruments and sampling plan, lectures and discussions on interviewing techniques, model interviews, role playing, coding practice, and pre-test field work."[106] Given the strenuous conditions for conducting research in mostly remote villages across Anatolia, supervisors paid regular visits to research sites to further ensure that team leaders abided by norms of randomness in selecting respondents. At the end of this extensive training process Frey could self-assuredly declare, "One of the oft-cited side benefits of the project was that we would bequeath to Turkey a sizable group of well-trained and experienced village interviewers who would be of great use to the government in future work with the peasantry."[107] There were unforeseen circumstances though,

[104] Ibid., 241–43.
[105] Frey "Surveying Peasant Attitudes," 338–39.
[106] Ibid., 350. Also see Herbert Hyman, "Checks on the Accuracy of the Survey Findings," in Frederick Frey and Herbert Hyman, *Rural Development Research Project Report 1: General Description and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Center for International Studies, MIT, 1967).
[107] Frey, "Surveying Peasant Attitudes," 348.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

such as the persistence of an unwritten language (Kurdish) that necessitated the employment of bilingual interviewers, "inevitably sacrificing, thereby, some control over interviewer performance."[108]

Though the USAID reports found it "difficult to eliminate any item as being generally irrelevant" to the "villager's propensity to innovate," they concluded that the male, literate, young adults with higher degrees of exposure to mass media seemed more likely to be innovative, thus suggesting that those already considered "modern" by the standards of the survey were most likely to modernize.[109] Further evoking Lerner's tautological standards for psychic mobility and empathy, the capacity for having an "open, imaginative mind," as well as degrees of "external mistrust"—discerned through interviewer evaluations cataloguing respondents' suspicion, sincerity and cooperativeness—figured into indices of modernization.[110] High scores on the innovation index indicated a "relatively flexible cognitive structure": "Innovators appear to be people … who can project their thoughts and stretch their imaginations, who are not distrustful of strangers coming into the village environment, and who are not restricted by parochial loyalties."[111] Once again, behavior in the interview setting came to connote exposure to and proclivity for modernization. Openness to a new cultural form (the survey situation), readiness to talk to a stranger (regardless of suspicions that might be validated by disclosure of the agencies involved), and willingness to identify with hypothetical situations were treated as both evidence and raw data. They at once confirmed and factored into the crafting of the categories of modern and traditional.

As social scientific surveys obtained greater visibility in Turkey, the work of Hyman, Abadan, Frey, Payaslıoğlu, and others enlisted the categories proclaimed by Lerner's seminal study at the same time as they introduced caveats to some of its formulations. While the concepts were "transformed in translation," and thus retained a mutable quality over the course of their travels, they nonetheless aided the popularization of survey methodology.[112] Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the survey methodology was further spread by a series of novel academic and governmental institutions such as the Institute of Public Administration for Turkey and the Middle East (1952), the State Planning Organization (1960), and the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (1963). The popularization of social scientific surveys came to its fruition by the 1969 elections when the daily newspaper *Milliyet* commissioned a group of Istanbul University professors to prepare a

[108] Ibid., 353.
[109] Frederick Frey and Leslie Roos, *Report No. 7: The Propensity to Innovate among Turkish Peasants* (Cambridge: Center for International Studies, MIT, 1967), 5.
[110] Frederick Frey, Allan Kessler, and Joan Rothchild. *Report No. 2: Index Construction and Validation* (Cambridge: Center for International Studies, MIT, 1967).
[111] Ibid., 8, 16.
[112] Tsing, *Friction*, 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

survey of workers' voting behaviors. Surveys were so prevalent by 1970 that at a conference about the development of the social sciences in Turkey psychologist Şefik Uysal explained, "When one thinks of social research in our country, the method of data-gathering that comes to mind is the survey."[113]

CONCLUSION

In the midst of the proliferation of social scientific surveys in 1968, a group of Turkish agencies collaborated on one that measured the propensity for modernization among 5,244 villagers. USAID's Rural Development Research Project provided not only the guidelines for sampling methods, but also a basis for comparison, since half of its questionnaire was replicated in this later study. Some of the original questions were omitted because they seemed too laden with connotations of prestige.[114] Others remained inquiring into the peasants' spare-time activities, levels of education, literacy, and attitudes toward the future. Although the answers were evaluated through tropes of open society, mastery over nature, and technological change, the conception of modernization as a mentality and attitude was undercut by the tampering with the original categories.[115]

The replication of the Rural Development Research Project, however partial, may suggest a level of success in the conduct of its safeguards, such as the close monitoring of interviewers and the enlistment of Turkish agencies in the likelihood of "delicate political situations." By 1968, however, Frey had only published two articles divulging the findings of the research, and the reasons for this scarcity remained a point of contention. Though the publication of the Turkish replication presumably helped dispel some of this aggravation, one scholar went so far as to censure the unavailability of the original research as a hindrance to the "development of social sciences in our country. Unless this is done, I have to express with sadness, this study can be deemed a form of 'intellectual neo-colonialism.'"[116] Edwin Cohn, who acted as economic adviser to Turkey under both the Mutual Security Agency and AID missions, suggested that the project, though originally deemed attractive, now gave "the impression that they regard the Turks as guinea pigs to be studied and analyzed for the benefit of the external scholarly community." This fostered the view that

[113] Şefik Uysal, "Metodoloji Açısından Türkiye'de Yapılan Sosyolojik Araştırmalar" (Sociological research in Turkey in terms of methodology), in *Türkiye'de Sosyal Araştırmaların Gelişmesi* (The development of social research in Turkey) (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1971), 151.

[114] The researchers refrained from inquiring directly after the ownership of land and radios, for instance. *Türk Köyünde Modernleşme Eğilimleri Araştırması* (Research on the propensity to modernize in the Turkish village) (Ankara: T. C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 1970), 8.

[115] On the report's different coding of peasant innovation, see 209–10, 253.

[116] Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı, "Sosyal İlim Metodolojisi: Köy ve Nüfus Araştırmaları" (Social science methodology: rural and demographic studies), in *Türkiye'de Sosyal Araştırmaların Gelişmesi* (The development of social research in Turkey) (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1971), 178.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Turkey is being exploited by foreign scholars for their own exclusive advantage [which] is somewhat analogous to the attitude widely held by Turkish intellectuals … toward foreign enterprises in general and mining companies in particular."[117] Cohn's contextualization of the reception of the project within a broader atmosphere of suspicion is apt, given growing anti-Americanism among university students during this period, including the "violent disruption" of a lecture Daniel Lerner was to give at the University of Istanbul in 1969.[118]

The preceding account is not meant to detract from the import of Lerner's work in the propagation of survey methodology and modernization theory, wherein the coding of speech and regulation of attitudes suggested a tailored fit between survey research and that school of thought. The partial disclosure of research aims, through interviewer negligence, the concealment of VOA interests, or the enlistment of local agencies such as the Turkish State Planning Organization, was in fact central to the efforts to conceive of the survey setting as part of a modernizing edifice. Its practitioners viewed the technique as capable of producing modern interviewers and respondents alike. Sample surveys, growing out of collaborative enterprises between governmental agencies, research centers, and universities, were deployed as technologies through which American developmental schemes and attendant social scientific practices would be promulgated across the world. Yet, there was not a wholesale acceptance of the premises and dictates of those practices, nor were they imbued with the ability to cultivate new subjectivities for their recipients. While Foucauldian analyses and studies in the sociology of knowledge have provided vibrant accounts of the "effects" and "lives" of knowledge practices, they have been less attuned to their unexpected consequences upon reception in disparate settings.[119] The simultaneous success and frailty of modernization theory can be discerned in its reliance on survey research for the crafting and dissemination of its categories. This knowledge practice crystallized despite and through the substitutions, translations, and failures that were endemic to practitioners' efforts to fix its categories' metapragmatic framings.

In the work of Lerner and later practitioners, we find a perseverance of hostile receptions of initially welcome projects, questionnaires overflowing their original intent, and disorderly interviewer behavior. The interviewees' responses entailed instances of reframing and subversion through refusals to respond in the designated ways, prevarication of opinions, and skepticism toward categories proclaimed by the survey. While those responses were misread or omitted in final accounts, the reported form of the surveys also

[117] Edwin J. Cohn, "The Climate for Research in the Social Sciences in Turkey," *Middle East Journal* 22, 2 (1968): 203–12, 205.

[118] Lerner Papers, box 13, fol. 27, untitled, n.d.

[119] Herbst, *Numbered Voices*; Osborne and Rose, "Do the Social Sciences Create Phenomena?" Also see "Special Issue on the Social Life of Methods," Evelyn Ruppert, John Law, and Mike Savage, eds., *Theory, Culture and Society* 30, 4 (2013).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

remade questionnaires and coding procedures, denoting mutability in processes of translation, reiteration, and circulation. The survey route was thus derailed, albeit only intermittently, with ambivalence and disbelief, not unlike the following interview exchange about the United Nations:

> Do you know what the UN is?
> Vaguely.
> Why do you say vaguely?
> Because I don't believe in it.[120]

Abstract: Foucauldian analyses and studies in the sociology of knowledge have provided vibrant accounts of the effects and lives of knowledge practices, yet they have been less attuned to their unexpected consequences upon reception in disparate settings. This article examines the employment of survey methodology as a means to enact modernization theory in non-Western areas during the early phases of the Cold War. An examination of the original questionnaires employed in sociologist Daniel Lerner's seminal text, *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*, reveals an alignment between the ideal subject of modernization theory and the expectations placed upon the respondent. These expectations included familiarity with the conditions of the survey setting, impersonal relationships, the promise of anonymity, and the capacity for having and voicing opinions regarding otherwise improbable situations. Lerner's work and the studies it spawned did not merely measure and describe the attitudes of peasants, students, and administrators; they were intended to be performative: the interviews were designed to occasion the forms of subjectivity and interpersonal relations articulated and idealized by modernization theory. However, the researchers' interest in the very activity of survey-taking as a modernizing edifice was undercut by skeptical respondents, disorderly interviewer behavior, and the relentless remaking of coding procedures. In this reading, the questionnaires and their specific stipulations surface as artifacts of knowledge practices that nonetheless overflow the intentions of their coders, sponsors, and creators.

[120] Lerner Papers, box 9, fol. 7, Ist-35-City.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press