

1

IRAN
USIA

METRON

P. O. Box 294
Princeton, New Jersey
WAlnut 4-4681

"the proper use of men and measures"

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

TO: The United States Information Agency
Washington, D. C.
Attn: Drs. Leo Crespi and Ralph White

FROM: Metron, Inc.
P. O. Box 294
Princeton, N. J.
c/o Dr. Alfred de Grazia

SUBJECT OF PROPOSAL: "Testing the Validity and Efficiency
of Alternative Methods of Elite Assessment in Iran."

- I. Origins of Research. The proposed research is an evolution of an initial research project completed by Dr. Alfred de Grazia on behalf of Stanford University and the USIA in 1954, in association with Dr. Floyd Hunter and Dr. Paul Deutschmann. That report "Elites Targets Analysis" was distributed to various offices of government and is since gone out of print. It called for the setting up in each country of a "set of accounts", standardized and mechanized, concerning the ramified elements of the leadership, their characteristics, and their habits. The present project would carry out in a practical way part of the recommended objectives of the original report, in one country, Iran.
- II. The problem of elites enters the scope of USIA Operations because:
 - A. The elites are those who command the most influence in a society and therefore are priority targets of U. S. information campaigns. They also include those who are capable of becoming influential but are not presently obvious.
 - B. The efficiency of campaigns directed at the influential depends upon valid and systematic means of knowing who the elites are and how they may be reached.
- III. The mission of the proposed research is to evaluate three important methods of finding the elite. These three methods are:
 1. Informed observation
 2. Documentary analysis
 3. Sociometric survey ("snowball" technique)

The criteria of evaluation are:

- A. Efficacy
- B. Completeness
- C. Economy
- D. Usability

IV. Explanation of Methods to be Tested:

1. Informed Observation. I. O. is the usual reliance of field workers in learning about leadership networks and status. Here the worker, without systematic and regular effort, stores in memory or notes what he sees and hears about who is running a country.
2. Documentary Analysis. D. A. Consists of extracting information about elites from books, articles, newspapers and documents, and storing it in an accessible form. It is the standard technique used to supplement informed observation.
3. Sociometric Survey. S. S., often called the "snowball" technique, uses informants to lead to other informants who together supply answers to questions such as "Who makes decisions of an X type in this city?" and "To whom would you go to arrange a meeting on the China question?"

V. Explanation of Criteria: The methods of elites analysis are to be judged by four criteria, scores on which give the Use-Profile of the method of USIA operations.

- A. Efficacy. Can all the potentially useful questions that USIA wants answered about the elites be answered by the method? What combination of the methods gives a full range of the influential class?
- B. Completeness. Does one or a combination of the methods discover a high proportion of all potential and actual elites in the areas of policy being searched?
- C. Economy. What is the cost of "setting up Accounts" on the three methods? At what point does the cost factor in each become excessive, suggesting a resort to other methods?
- D. Usability. The techniques used in the testing should be those employable afterwards by ordinary field personnel of the USIA. Each method would be evaluated therefore on the basis of its potential employment in normal operations.

Concreteness, specificity and operationalism is sought for so far as possible in the development of the methods and criteria.

VI. Procedure

- A. Phases of the Research consist of the following:
 1. Discussions in Washington, New York, London and Paris with officials and experts on the structure and extent of the Iranian influentials. Aim: to perfect design of study and assess extent to which information on elites is discoverable outside of the country.

2. Setting up forms and questionnaires
3. Field work in Iran (July to November): to perfect forms and questionnaires; to train research assistant; to lay groundwork for cooperation; to begin gathering of information (approximately August 1): to complete field work by October 30.
4. Writing of report: November 1 to January 15, 1964. (Metron, inc., warrants delivery of completed report on or before January 31, 1964)

B. Techniques:

1. I. O. Confidential interviews with 8 U. S. and possibly other foreign officials in Iran (e. g. English, French, Italian, German, etc.) to determine extent and depth of their knowledge about the Iranian elites, following check lists and standards questionnaire. Includes, besides names, location, scope of power, level of power (aiming at 2 top levels to limit study).
2. D. A. Preparation of lists of names and basic data on two top levels of influentials from books, articles, and documents.
3. S. S. Interviews via standard sociometric questionnaire of a sample of fifty informants chosen from the major areas of Iranian decision-making related to USIA policy.
4. Code and punch each name with its corresponding data on cards and perform the following operations:
 - a) Summarize and tabulate traits of the top levels of the Iranian elites.
 - b) Compare the names made available by each method on the criterion of completeness.
 - c) Compare the efficacy of the methods in obtaining critical data on the influentials.
 - d) Compare the costs of obtaining data by each of the methods. This process consists of separate time-and-motion accounts on each method, combined with a productivity score into an economy ratio.
5. Preparation of report on the applicability of the techniques and on methods of installing them as part of USIA routine operations.

VII. Principal Investigator. Dr. Myron Nalbandian is a sociologist specialized in political sociology and demography. He was associated with Metron and The Mediterranean Industrial Development Corporation prior to returning to Providence, R. I., to take his Ph.D. and work for the Civil Defense Agency as Research Director in Providence. Dr. Nalbandian is fluent in French and Armenian, and fair in Arabic.

Project Supervisor. Dr. Alfred de Grazia is Professor of Government at New York University and Editor of the American Behavioral Scientist, a monthly magazine of theory and research in the social sciences. He is author of Public and Republic: Ideas of Representation in America; Human Relations in Public Administration; Target Analysis and Media in Propaganda to Audiences Abroad; Elite Analysis: Methods of Studying Leadership Abroad; World Politics (co-author); Politics and Government (2 vols.), and other books and articles. His numerous articles and special studies include research reports of the U. S. Information Agency and the Operations Research Office of Johns Hopkins University. He made a visit to the Near East countries in 1954 to check some of the materials then being prepared for the USIA general manual of elites methodology. He was a Captain in Psychological Warfare in World War II, a member of the U. S. Delegation to the 1960 General Conference of UNESCO at Paris; he is a member of the Executive Council of the American Political Science Association, and of the International Committee for Documentation in the Social Sciences. At New York University, he lectures on "The Scope and Method of Political Science," "Psychological Factors in International Relations," "Principles of Political Power," and "Social Invention."

VIII. Costs

1. Personnel: Supervisor (Dr. Alfred de Grazia); Principal Investigator (Dr. Myron Malbandian) 1 Research Assistant (Iranian); Consultants and Informants	TOTAL . . . \$ 7,700.00
2. Travel (including per diem)	2,500.00
3. Overhead	1,300.00
	\$11,500.00

(Metron, inc. warrants the personal supervision of this project by Dr. de Grazia and the services of an experienced professional sociologist. USIA is to assume the costs of any participation and cooperation in the project by USIA personnel).

Schedule of payments: \$3500.00 - June 1, 1963
\$3500.00 - August 1, 1963
\$2000.00 - October 15, 1963
\$2500.00 - February 1, 1964 (upon receipt of report)

IX. Use of Results: It is expected that the results of this study will be useful in:

- Providing a body of materials for use in operations in Iran.
- Providing standard elites analysis procedures for recommending practices to field officers and for education and training in USIA work.
- Laying the foundations for fuller development of "Leader-accounting systems" in the various field offices of USIA and other USA overseas offices.

CONFIDENTIAL

February 23rd, 1955

TO: Chief, Psychological Warfare Branch, United States Army

FROM: Dr. Alfred de Grazia, 772 Santa Ynez St., Stanford, California.

SUBJECT: Proposal to contract for research entitled "A PSYWAR FACT-PROCEDURES MANUAL FOR EGYPT."

I. SUMMARY OF MISSION:

To set up a system of procedures, with built-in information and emergency fact-obtaining procedures for pre-D-day, D-day, and post-D-day propaganda operations in Egypt. The system will be geared to the immediate necessities of operations. It is proposed to study Egypt, but the method can be accommodated to Syria, Lebanon, Italy, Spain, France, Portugal, Turkey, Algeria, or Morocco. Should Burma or Thailand be of high priority, further inquiries would have to be made before offering to research them.

II. BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH:

A. Operations background: Some material is available in the U.S.A. on the country to be studied. This needs processing and translating. Little of it is directly relevant to Psywar. Inquiries reveal that field interviews and systematic observations are required to obtain the optimum materials.

The latest studies by the proposer of these researches, conducted for the United States Information Agency, lay down a large variety of techniques that can be applied now to the country being considered. In brief, the time is ripe for a new form of survey analysis to supply the potential needs of Psywar operations in the country concerned, and for other countries as well, perhaps at a later time.

B. Distinguished from HRAF: The method being proposed for these researches is the reverse of the method being used in the HRAF studies; it moves from procedures to facts (and from immediate facts to background facts) whereas the HRAF method moves from general facts to specific facts. Also, the present study is to be a field investigation in major part. Despite the differences, however, the present study is designed to produce materials that can later also be fitted to the outline code of the HRAF.