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FORWARD

Let me assume that you are already interested in doing research on a small community and that is why you are leafing through this book. Right at the start I want to stimulate your interest a little further and leave you with a bit of a taste of what you might be getting into by asking you to look at some slides. These pictures were taken in two small towns in Western Washington that were both touched by history and then left behind. They are sleepy towns that have tried to capitalize on lost dreams; the past that past them by. For this reason, their history is rather more obvious than in most American towns and they are a lot more fun to photograph. These slides are to be enjoyed while at the same time they introduce you to some of the questions you will be asking if you undertake to study and understand a very small American town. The two towns are Port Townsend and South Bend.

After you are finished with the slides, and if you are still curious about what it means to design and carry out a community study research project, start reading again right here.

THREE WAYS TO USE THIS HANDBOOK

This handbook is designed to be a road map to and through a community study project. It will help you understand the need for a theoretical model, find a suitable model, select a broad research strategy, solve the logistical problems of getting the field work done, and present your discoveries persuasively and with polish. You will learn to do research using the case study method, a method that is especially suited to the investigation and understanding of whole communities that are small enough and manageable enough to be described and analyzed in their entirety. More popular with cultural anthropologists than with sociologists, it is, nevertheless, the most suitable method for the thorough study of a total community.

There are specific reading assignments for each chapter, along with check-sheets and worksheets to use during fieldwork. Additional readings are suggested from time to time along with concluding bibliographies in general sociology, research design, social change, social stratification, demography, and the litera-
ture of community study. This handbook is not meant to teach you either social survey research design or statistics, although some of the recommended books will.

Some of you may want help from this road map for a very limited study while others are planning a more ambitious quarter-long or even a year-long project. Here is the way to adapt this handbook to these three different kinds of requirements.

(1) A two-week project

If there are only a few of you and you must get your report done in one or two weeks then read and follow the instructions in: Chapters 1, 3, 5, and 7. The first chapter gives some reasons for studying a very small whole community rather than just one feature of a community. Even if your time is limited to a single week I will still insist on the special advantages of trying to comprehend, if only intuitively, the way the many elements, interrelations, and patterns that make up a small community form a whole system. I want you to discover for yourselves that the total is different from a simple sum of its parts.

The third chapter explains the curious way in which American social scientists divide up the terrain they study and will help you figure out where to go for help if a special question requiring specialized knowledge comes up. I do not want you wasting valuable time tracking down an economist if it is a psychologist you need.

You must read at least three books: Leonard Schatzman and Anselm L. Strauss, Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology; John Fetterman, Stinking Creek; and Joseph Aceves, Social Change in a Spanish Village. These are short books; if you do not have time to read them you do not have time to do even the quickest of community studies.

You will probably not have time for more than one visit so follow the suggestions in Chapter 5. Take that visit as a challenge to your powers of perception and see how much you can learn as silent visitors. Do not try to conduct systematic interviews but do take a lot of notes and do write a lot. Take lots of photographs and do not hesitate to present your report as a photographic essay or slide show. Emphasize impressions, hunches, and especially the many unanswered questions triggered off by your observations. No one in your group should have any questions about the educational validity of a short impressionistic project if you learn to see things you have never seen before, you read three or more good books, and you do a lot of writing about what you have seen and read.

However, do not pretend that you have carried out a real community study project. For that you will need at least eight to ten weeks.

(2) An eight to ten week project

If there are ten to twenty of you and you have eight to ten weeks to read, plan, carry out your research and prepare your reports, then use the entire handbook. This means that you will be doing a case study, using case study research methodology. Do not try to learn statistics and survey research. It takes too much time and you will have plenty to do as it is. Read all of the books assigned with each chapter, the tough theoretical ones as well as the novels.

I will emphasize this particular point again but let me be explicit now; this approach is intended to demonstrate the power of cooperative inquiry. This handbook is designed for a group of students who want to do a group project. It seeks to encourage cooperative learning. Do not divide up the work and go your separate specialized ways. That kind of fragmenting division of labor has left contemporary social scientists ignorant of each other's work, unable to understand each other, and unwilling to work across the boundaries of their disciplines. I do not want that to happen to you. The study of a whole community invites interdisciplinary cooperation and joint inquiry, so please do take advantage of that invitation. Resist the temptation to concentrate on one little piece of the puzzle. Look for interrelationships as you keep trying to pull the study together. When you get ready to tell the story of what you have found I think you will discover that a whole community deserves more than unrelated reports on bits and pieces.

(3) A year-long project

If there are lots of you and you have a lot of time, pick a larger community and plan on reading lots of the titles from the supplementary lists. Add titles of your own to the handbook bibliography as one problem leads to another. Incorporate statistics into your schedule and study social survey research design. Do survey research in addition to using the case study method. Learn to use the computer for handling large quantities of data. Put special emphasis on learning to write polished and professional monographs. You may have the resources to make a video tape or short motion picture as part of your presentation. Plan on doing something that your group will be proud to deposit in the collection of
The Evergreen State College library. Your chief problem will not be to find enough to do, but rather to keep the group project organized, moving, and manageable. Always keep it manageable.

Now that you have looked at the slides and decided whether you are signing on for the small, medium or extra large project, turn to Chapter one. And good luck.

Mervyl L. Cadwallader

CHAPTER 1

WHY STUDY A WHOLE COMMUNITY?

WHY SHOULD IT BE VERY SMALL?


Undertaking the study of even a very small community is like being asked to describe the universe and give two examples. Your first big problem is figuring out how to start, but once under way an even bigger problem is how to stop. This set of materials is designed to help with both those problems, as well as a host of questions that fall between them. Here is what this handbook, assigned titles, and worksheets are designed to do for you.

I hope this material will generate a whole lot of enthusiasm for studying very small communities in rural Washington. In Europe they would be called villages but because Americans do not like being called villagers we call them small towns. American social scientists have not been very interested in their own villages and villagers and this is too bad because we have turned our backs on a world that can teach us a lot about ourselves. The handbook will provide an explanation of why you will need to do some thinking about theory before and during your fieldwork. Furthermore, it will provide a quick introduction to three different theoretical models, any one of which will help you develop a specific strategy for investigating a small community. There will be suggestions about getting started, what to look for, how to get the feel of a community on your first visit, what to do on follow-up visits, how to analyze the information you gather, and how to present what you find to others.

The bibliographies are for those who get hooked and want to learn and do a lot more. There will be a checklist to help you get set up before you descend on your town, and worksheets to take with you. There will be a slide test to help you find out how much you can figure out about a place just from a few pictures.

But why bother, why study a small community, or any whole community? You probably can give at least one reason already, or you would not be reading this, but here are a few more to think about and to revive your courage when the going gets tough because your townspeople are uncooperative, or its been raining on every visit, or you cannot make heads or tails of the mountain of data you have collected.

(1) You may never live in a community as small as the one you are going to study but no matter how small it will be a whole social system very much like the one you grew up in, but in microcosm. By studying a whole community, its history, its culture, its social structure and its transformations, you will learn to understand your own community and yourself and how you grew up and became the person you are.

(2) You probably already know a great deal about your own society, about the way America works and the way you work, but your knowledge is not systematic. If you are like the rest of us you do not know how to analyze what you have seen all around you. Most of us simply take the facts of our social life for granted, they are just there, like billboards and street signs, used but not noticed or analyzed. A systematic study of a whole community will help you acquire some of the sensitivity, curiosity, and awareness that a good anthropologist takes to the field in some distant and exotic land; but you will be using that sensitivity and curiosity on your own world.

(3) There is probably no better way to learn something about all of the social science disciplines, what they are about, how they do or should relate to each other, what their practitioners actually work at, than to carry out a thorough study of a small town. You will want to write a history of the town, figure out its norms, values, and beliefs, map its social structure, describe and analyze its resources, economy, politics, schools, and churches. Someone will have to look at families, socialization, personality, and character. Some will ask about the military. Is the total system changing at all, and if so, rapidly or slowly? How old are the townspeople, how healthy? What kind of connections are there between this little town and the rest of the state, and the nation? Once you start, interconnected questions will multiply endlessly and you will be asking and talking history, anthropology, sociology, geography, economics, political science, social psychology, and demography. Instead of having to take eight introductory courses in the social sciences, a single community study project can tell you what all of these sciences are about and introduce you to their technical vocabularies and theoretical systems.

Community studies take many forms. Some are done by photographers, like Eugene Smith's photographic essays done in Spain; or by newspapermen, like John Fetterman's Stinking Creek: The Portrait of a Small Mountain Community, written in Appalachia; or by novelists like Ignazio Silone whose Fontamara is still one of the best. Sociologists write about Elmtown's Youth, or Middletown and Middle-
town in Transition. Some of the best community studies have been written by anthropologists, for instance Tepoztlan: Village in Mexico, by Oscar Lewis. They can be ambitious like the Middletown studies or quick, and fun. The quick studies usually do not get published but they can be extraordinarily revealing and useful to those who do them.

Let me give you some serious advice before you go one step further. I have used the phrase "small town" or "small community" very deliberately. **Pick a very small community for your project.** The smaller the better. Try to find a hamlet with a population of three or four hundred. A town of one thousand is too big unless there are one hundred of you and you have a whole year to study it. Each day tell yourself to keep your project manageable, to keep it small. By the time a team of ten or twenty has done an exhaustive study of a community of three hundred, everyone will be exhausted, and yet there will still be an endless universe of data to find, gather and tabulate. So pick a very small community. And, of course, do not disturb the community any more than seems friendly; do not poison it for someone else. You might want to go back like Robert Redfield returning to Chan Kom, the Maya village he had studied years earlier. You will want to be welcome.


Second Reading Assignment: James B. Conant, Science and Common Sense. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951. Those of you who are interested in the philosophy of science will find some additional titles in the bibliographies at the end of this Handbook.
WHY YOU WILL NEED SOME KIND OF THEORY

There is no way that any of us can observe, study, or participate in the life of a community without using some kind of theory. We all carry theoretical systems, models, or paradigms around in our heads and use them to make sense out of what we see, for none of us can understand or cope with any situation unless we have some descriptive and predictive knowledge about that situation. This knowledge and our theoretical schemes are usually common sense, acquired from our culture, and quite unexamined. The social sciences try to go beyond common sense by providing more sophisticated, general and powerful theoretical schemes so as to increase our fund of valid and reliable information about human behavior and social systems.¹

Let me illustrate why you will need to be self-conscious about theory while doing a community study. Imagine an investigator on your team who really believes in astrological causation. He will want to spend his research time and energy finding out the astrological sign of everyone in the town you are studying and will try to explain the behavior of everyone in the town in terms of the planetary influences operating at the moment of their birth. Another might assume ethnic causation and spend his time trying to explain all behavior as a consequence of genetic inheritance. A Marxist will look at the class structure of the town and will want to uncover the class membership of each member of the community. It does not help to eschew all theory and just record the bare facts because the fact collector will notice and record the facts that an unconscious paradigm calls to his attention. He may not even see the rest of the universe.

Let me state emphatically that some kind of theory will determine what you notice, record, and think about. Some kind of theory will shape the questions you ask and try to answer. It is important, therefore, to be conscious of the theory that you are using. This means that you must pick a theoretical model that intrigues you and that you would like to put to the test of research, or you must take your own common-sense paradigm and make it explicit.

Before you try to select or build a theoretical model to guide your research I want you to read an essay on the nature of scientific theory, and the way theory is built and evaluated. After you have read this short introduction to the philosophy of social science I will introduce you to the kind of work sociologists and other social scientists do, and to some of the concepts and analytical language sociologists and anthropologists use. After that I will describe and criticize three theoretical models that each have their own peculiar strengths and weaknesses. At that point you will be in a position to pick one or all of them to guide your community study project.

¹Actually, much of social science is common-sense descriptive and predictive knowledge translated into a specialized technical language that does little more than state the obvious. Nevertheless, there is some benefit to learning the languages of the social sciences. But be skeptical and never substitute a cumbersome bit of jargon for common-sense English unless there is considerable gain in accuracy of communication. There will be more about this in Chapter 7.
THINK OF SCIENTIFIC THEORY AS A MODEL OF SOMETHING:
AN ESSAY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Any consideration of the nature and role of theory in science, no matter how brief, must necessarily involve metaphysical and epistemological considerations. The most rudimentary conception of theory implies a metaphysic and an epistemology even if it is no more than an unexamined common sense assumption about the nature of reality and the process of knowing it.

The two most fundamental assumptions upon which western science is based are: (1) that there is an external real world of physical events, and (2) what we call scientific knowledge is communicable information from and about that physical world. But why assert the self-evident? The answer is simple enough. Once the scientist moves off the plane of common-sense thinking the nature of his "world" becomes anything but obvious. This is very much the case in the natural sciences when the analysis is of atomic and sub-atomic phenomena. The questions of just what culture really is, and just what society is, have been and still are stumbling blocks for numerous social scientists. Have you ever seen a culture? Where was it when you found it and what were its boundaries? When did it begin and when did it end? When did you last see a social class or a technology? What is a community and does a state college like Evergreen ever become one? The question of what is out there, external to the subjective experience of the natural or social scientist, is not an idle one. Unfortunately, a simple appeal to experience cannot solve the problem because the point at issue involves both what is, is not, and cannot be experienced. The reality of modern science consists of much that is inferential, though it is inference coupled with experience.

The metaphysical position that seems most appropriate for the modern scientist may be summarized as follows: (1) The world out there consists of physical events. (2) At least some of these events are distributed through space-time in a non-random way, i.e., they are structured. (3) In addition to the relationship of spatial and temporal contiguity there are casual relationships between some events. (4) These structures of physical events are knowable, in principle.

The crude, empirical universe is a complex affair, so complex that it is obvious that no part of it can be studied and understood without abstraction. This is as true of common sense as it is of scientific thinking. Abstraction is a process of substituting a simplified model for a selected region of complex reality. If this abstraction, or model, is to be useful, its structure must be both simpler than and similar to whatever it is that is being modeled. Such a model is usually a set of symbols or words with certain relations holding between them. These relations are determined by a set of rules. Taken together, these symbols and their relations constitute what are variously called either a grammar, a logic, a model, or a theory.\footnote{The words "theory" and "model" will be used interchangeably with some preference being given to the use of "model" as it has more of the connotation that I wish to stress.} What the scientist is doing is building abstract substitutes for the reality he wishes to study. I think that it will help to think of the theoretical scientist as a builder of models, or a map maker, or the creator of new metaphors. The research scientist then uses these models, maps or metaphors to find out things and in the process of using them finds their strengths and weaknesses.

If this structure, pattern or model is isomorphic to, or corresponds with a substantial segment of the outer world, then to that extent the outer world can be explained, predicted, or understood.\footnote{\textit{Isomorphic:} Having like or identical structure, or exhibiting similarity of structure. An accurate three dimensional topographic map is isomorphic with the land forms it is about; that is why you trust it on a backpacking trip.} Many different kinds of models are used in the sciences and they differ in respect to their relative abstractness, generality, heuristic and predictive power, complexity, operationality, and so on.

A distinction that it is useful to make in practice but that is not as fundamental as it might seem is the one between material and formal models. A material model is the concrete construction of a simple system which is assumed to represent some more complex phenomenon. Every material model requires a formal model. Formal models are structures of symbols rather than structures of glass, plastic, wire, or other hardware. Just as the material model is designed to correspond to certain relevant aspects with some factual system exterior to it, so the...
formal model is designed to correspond in certain relevant aspects with the structural features of something out there. While every material model requires at least an implicit formal model of symbols, not all formal models can be translated into material models (the techniques and materials may simply be non-existent). In addition to these considerations it is important to stress the fact that not all models, material or formal, are useful. A weak model will yield trivial results and if a model is more elaborate and difficult to understand than the original system it does not represent scientific progress. The history of science abounds with both weak and difficult theory but because any theory must eventually pay its way with results, the trivial and elaborate tend to be eliminated as a matter of course.

A survey of the history of scientific models, from those of ancient Egypt to the present, provides evidence of a close and significant relationship between the technology of any period in history and the thinking of its philosophers and scientists. Many of the images, metaphors, schemes, theories, or models, call them what you will, that have been devised to interpret and explain parts of the universe have been derived from the technology of the thinker's society. The tools, gadgets, and fabricated stuff in use around him have often stimulated the imagination of the model maker who abstracts new metaphors and symbols from what he sees. In Greece the knowledge of the wheel and weaver's spindle was combined with that of the life cycle of plants and animals to form a theory of social and cosmic processes that came to be known as the Idea of Cycles. A part of the agricultural technology of ancient Egypt served as a source for the invention of geometry and the building of royal Egyptian tombs gave birth to a model of social stratification that can be found in almost every elementary text in sociology. William Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood came after the development of the valved pump. The first satisfactory theory of the flight of birds followed the invention of the modern propeller-driven airplane. Engineering experience with ultrasonic sound and sonar preceded the discovery of how bats navigate by the process of echo-ranging. Examples could be multiplied endlessly.

The new techniques and tools found in European society, from the 13th century on, played an important role in the development of the classical theories of mechanism. The prototype of a great deal of scientific thinking in the modern age has been the mechanism of the clock. The model used by Newton to describe the celestial wonders of the universe, by Locke for society and government, and by La Mattrie for the human body, was that of a clock-like machine. The reciprocal relationship that exists today between the theory of cybernetics and the computer technology of the second industrial revolution is not something new under the sun, but rather is the continuation of a relationship that has proved to be most fruitful. Of course, an important qualification must be made to that last statement. The machines, tools, and techniques that have provided the scientist with many of his most important models have become more complex in recent times, and with this development science has become more complex. The wheel provided Claudius Ptolemaeus with an analogy which enabled him to create a model of the planetary system. The mechanics of Newton's day permitted the creation of a much more powerful and elegant model, only to be followed by that of Einstein. The succession of these models resulted in an increase in the isomorphism between the models and their subject matter, that is, the "fit" was progressively better. Ptolemaeus was not so much wrong as he was inadequate, by Newtonian and Einsteinian standards.

A theory is a structure, the phenomenon that it is about is a structure, and the closer the correspondence between these two structures, the better the theory. The degree of isomorphism is a measure of the scientist's knowledge of something, a measure of the truth of his theory. The greater the degree of isomorphism the more complete his knowledge, the more extensive and successful his predictions, the more accurate his measurements, and the more systematic his comprehension.

How does one know whether or not his models are more, or less, isomorphic with the region of the outer world under study? An examination of the model itself will reveal its logical consistency and elegance, or lack of these, but any estimation of the extent of correspondence must stem from a physical process of verification. Verification is a process of matching structures, that of the model against that of the outside thing. This matching may be either qualitative or quantitative, or both, but in any case it must involve a physical operation, the outcome of which depends upon the existence (or non-existence) of a critical degree of correspondence between the theory and the outside facts. This is what the scientist does when he compares his hypotheses with observations of one sort or another, i.e., he matches hypotheses and things or events, and if they "fit" the hypothesis is accepted, if not (if the structures do not correspond) the
hypothesis is rejected. If you use a U.S. Geodetic Survey map of Mt. Rainier for a climb of that mountain and you got there and back successfully, you will feel confident about the usefulness of the map. You might want to call the map accurate, or even true. If you had tried to use a map of Mount St. Helens, you would soon have found it useless, inaccurate, and false. You would have checked and rejected the map.

When structural constancy, correspondence, or isomorphism holds between a complex of events in the outer world and one in the inner world of the observer, the result is an accurate or "true" perception or concept. When this isomorphism extends from an event or complex of events in the outer world to the kind of symbolic structure we call a sentence or proposition the result is an accurate or true statement. The view adopted here concerning the nature of the real world and of perception leads to the so-called correspondence theory of truth.

There are, generally speaking, three main theories of truth: the Coherance theory, the Pragmatic theory, and the Correspondence theory. The first, with its emphasis on consistency, seems useful in a philosophy of science only when coupled with something else and that something is correspondence. The scientist insists that a statement is true, not because it is useful (the pragmatic theory) but because it is an accurate representation of the facts. Verification is an appeal to the facts through a process of matching the scientist's propositions with the physical events they are supposed to be about. This implies a correspondence theory of truth and it also means that truth is an aspect of propositions or sentences and not of the subject matter they are about. Belief has no bearing on the question of truth or falsehood. Whether or not a propositions or judgment will be true or false depends upon the existence and quality, or non-existence of the fact to which it refers.\(^1\)

\(^1\)Fact, as used here, has only an ostensive definition. Facts are both physical events outside of and inside of the observer. The sun is a fact and so is the word "sun" in this sentence. Facts are not dependent upon our existence, volitions, or sensations, although volitions and sensations are also facts. A lie is a fact but the referent is not. Facts are what make statements true or false. Scriptural truth, inner light, individual and idiosyncratic conviction, any truth held despite public facts has no place in science.

Some Idealized Steps in the Construction of a Model. All scientific models should, by their formal nature, make certain sets of intellectual operations retraceable and repeatable. If this is the case, and a given model is used by a large number of scientists with identical results, that particular model generates cogency and belief. Repeated verifications (predictions that work) demonstrate the validity, utility, and power of the theory. This is what is usually meant by "proof" in scientific research. If a model is going to be amenable to repeated use by many different scientists in many different situations, it should be constructed in as formal a manner as possible.

(1) The universe of inquiry must be defined or delimited in the light of the most general frame of reference within which the scientist is working.

(2) The components, elements, or units which make up the theoretical structure must be selected and defined with as much precision as possible. Care must be taken to see that the appropriate kinds of words and symbols are defined in the appropriate manner at the different levels of abstraction covered by the theory.

(3) Statements about significant relationships between the elements of the model must be made. These are the laws of the theory and may be of several general kinds. A model of any dynamic system can only be as adequate as its laws concerning the interaction of its component parts. As a matter of fact, it might be said that the primary search of the scientist is for laws. Delimiting the universe, selecting and defining the units, are just so much necessary preparation for the task of trying to find, isolate, and state casual relationships between them.

(4) After defining the units and asserting certain relationships between them, the scientist's next task is to derive from this abstract formal model a set of hypotheses or predictions about that part of the world he is concerned with. The more logical his derivations the easier it will be for his fellow scientists to retrace his operations, and the more powerful and useful the theory.

(5) Given the model and a set of hypotheses, the scientist now has need of reliable and valid data. This requires the creation and use of refined research techniques. The process of verification (matching hypotheses and data) is only possible if the tools for isolating, identifying, and measuring facts are available or can be constructed. In other words, the model should be operational.
In some cases the tools already exist and in others the creation of the model precedes the development of techniques and processes of verification. This latter predicament was the case when Albert Einstein published his papers on Special Relativity Theory in 1905, and General Relativity Theory in 1916. The first attempt at confirmation did not come until 1919. While the Special Theory seems well confirmed by experiment, the same cannot be said for the General Theory, and more verification depends upon as yet undiscovered experimental techniques.

A theory may be organizing without being predictive. However, most schemes for the organization and classification of facts carry implicit predictions about other cases.

1. Good theory, a good model, performs an organizing function for the scientist. It orders and relates what would otherwise be disjointed data. It reveals similarities and unsuspected connections. This kind of theory is classificatory. If this organization of data is logical and readily comprehensible the theory is at least subjectively satisfying to the scientist and his colleagues.

2. In addition to organizing facts, good theory will perform a heuristic role by leading the scientist to the discovery of new facts, techniques, and ultimately the formulation of new theory. Mendeleef's Periodic Table provides a dramatic example of the heuristic function of a classificatory theory.

3. Throughout the history of modern science, the toughest test of what has come to be accepted as good theory is predictive power. A theory can organize vast bodies of data, and even perform a valuable heuristic function, without generating a satisfying number of verified predictions, especially about behavior and development. There are many different kinds of predictions extending from simple qualitative yes-no prediction at one extreme, to elaborate precise quantitative predictions of exactly when and how much at the other. The ultimate objective of every modern science is to maximize successful prediction at the quantitative end. The social scientist should not forget that physics was not built in a day and that the revolution in dynamics started with Galileo Galilei and some exceedingly crude observations and experiments with musket balls and inclined planes about 350 years ago. Quantitative predictions are not possible without measurement and this is another function of good theory.

4. When a model is isomorphic with the thing modeled, and connected to it by clearly understood processes and techniques, then the data obtained through the use of the model may be quantitative and the model exhibits a measurement function. Measures are not all of a kind and include simple rank orderings as well as systems as complex as ratio-scales. In the social sciences it is unusual to find theory with any advanced measurement function although many ingenious techniques for counting have been devised of late. Unfortunately, the more refined of these are more notable for their technical reliability than theoretical validity. Many social scientists see precise quantification as the hallmark of exact science. As a matter of fact, there are exact natural sciences that depend entirely on yes-no qualitative predictions; an example is qualitative chemical analysis.

5. Theory should always meet the test of Parsimony, hence the maxim expressed in Occam's Razor is the fifth criteria. William of Occam was a medieval philosopher much involved in the nominalist-realist controversy of the early 14th...
The maxim, which Occam actually did not write, reads: "Entities are not to be multiplied without necessity." Occam did write something similar: "It is vain to do with more what can be done with fewer." Bertrand Russell believes this principle to be extremely useful in science and restates it in these words:

"If everything in some science can be interpreted without assuming this or that hypothetical entity, there is no ground for assuming it."¹

This principle is essential for the construction and analysis of good scientific theory. It has even led some social scientists to reject the assertion that there are real cultures and societies --- outside of textbooks.

One point more. Newness should not be claimed without originality of some kind, and if something that is presented as new theory is to supplant an older explanation it should do so because it organizes more, leads to more, measures more, and does all of this more economically than the theory it supplants.

Not everyone has quick answers to questions like: What on earth do social scientists really do? What sets them apart from each other? If sociologists study the whole of human society, why do we need anthropologists or economists? If C.W. Mills was a sociologist, what was he doing writing about Cuba? If Walt Rostow is a political scientist, why has he written about economic growth? Is the comparative study of revolutions history or sociology? Is a physical anthropologist a natural or a social scientist? What does an experimental psychologist have in common with a humanistic psychologist? Was Karl Marx a philosopher, historian, economist or sociologist? Is the study of the family anthropology or social psychology, or sociology? Fortunately, you do not need to wait for answers to all such questions before you start to study a community, but a sketch of the overlapping territories of the social sciences may clear up some confusion and help you figure out where to go and who to go to if your survey leads to focused and specialized investigation. For instance, if one of your team becomes interested in population dynamics, does he turn to economics, political science, sociology, or biology? The answer: If it is a human population, look up those specialized sociologists who call themselves demographers; if the population is non-human, look for the biology department. You will notice in the bibliographies at the end of this handbook that the person studying a small American community is almost always a sociologist but if the study is of a European village by an American it is usually done by an anthropologist. Confusing isn't it? To help clear up some of the confusion, here is an anatomy that should help you as you start to get acquainted with the odd territorial divisions of the social scientists.

The personal territory of the psychologists.

If the investigator is studying the behavior of the individual as if culture and social organization need not be described and analyzed, then he is probably a psychologist. If he generalizes about the individual's behavior in very small groups he is probably a social psychologist. Inevitably, disciplinary boundaries overlap and you will find individual and social psychologists working each other's territory. Imagine that your field work raises questions about how infants acquire language, or young people go through an identity crisis; ordinarily you would look up books written by psychologists but sometimes anthropologists write about these matters. What about the link between mental illness and social class?

First look for help from a social psychologist, or just maybe from a sociologist. There is that overlapping boundary problem again.

The checkered fiefdom of anthropology.

If the social scientist is an American, trained in American universities, and is studying the culture and behavior of people in preliterate societies, for instance young Samoans growing up in Samoa, then that person is almost certain to be a cultural anthropologist. If he is studying the evolutionary development of Homo sapiens and the physical differences between the races of man, he is a physical anthropologist. If you find someone studying ruins, you have found an archaeologist, but his training may have been in classics. Those professors who teach courses about preliterature culture, or ancient bones and ruined stones are usually all found working together in a department of anthropology, at least in most American universities.

The shrinking empire of the sociologist.

But what about Mr. Zetterburg who wrote a book all about young Americans, Growing Up In America? He is a sociologist. Margaret Mead who wrote Growing Up In Samoa is a cultural anthropologist and not a social psychologist. Those who study the social structure of modern literate societies are usually sociologists doing sociology, but not always. Sociologists study informal and formal organization, social stratification (social class), institutions, social movements, race relations, population and growing up, working, and dying in contemporary literate, industrial societies. If the investigator places a lot of emphasis on social organization, and the individuals, groups or communities under study are in a modern industrial society, and the social scientist is American trained, you are probably watching a sociologist.1 American sociologists study all of the social institutions; the family, the economy, governments, education, religion, and the military. But so do other social scientists. While sociologists in this country kept the family, education, and religion pretty much to themselves, very specialized and powerful disciplines have emerged from the study of the production of wealth and the use of political power. These are the specialized disciplines of economics and political science.

---

1Notice that I have stressed American trained in these definitions because this map will not work very well for European or Russian universities.
The sovereign realm of the economist.

If you find a scientist working at the complex problems of the production and distribution of goods and services you will have found an economist, unless he happens to be studying the production and distribution of goods and services on an island in the Pacific in which case he is almost certainly a cultural anthropologist. There we have another of those pesky jurisdictional difficulties.\(^1\) In the course of your community study you may find yourself focusing on attitudes towards work among the townspeople you are talking to. Do most of them hate their jobs and feel alienated from their work? Get help from the sociologist or social psychologist. Suppose your town is a mill town and you want to analyze the impact of business cycles on the mill and the town. You will need to start thinking like an economist in order to understand business cycles so read some economics.

The principality of political science.

Political scientists usually study the formal structure of government and your group will only do that if your community has some kind of formal government. The chances are that it will be unincorporated and will lack formal government, especially if you have followed my firm advice to pick a very small town. Nevertheless, there will be an informal influence and power system of some kind. The study of informal organization and informal power structures has been the province of the younger sociologist and political scientists so do not expect much help in that direction from old fashioned books on government and voting behavior. The first study of informal influence I ever encountered was written by two sociologists about a rural Mexican community.

Court chronicles from the historians.

American sociologists tend to describe social systems as if they never change, or as if they have no history and so exist suspended mysteriously in a world unaffected by the passage of time and the rise and fall of civilizations. Your community, like all real communities, will have a past and future. You will be studying it at the knife edge of the present and so I hope you will want to write its history and forecast its future. Look to the more analytical historians to find out how to write about the significant past of your town. Unfortunately.

\(^1\)When you find yourself confused just ask the scientist what he calls himself.

---

most sociologists have not tried to develop theoretical models that make even tentative forecasts and predictions possible. This is because contemporary American sociologists have been much more interested in thinking about and explaining stability rather than change. Meanwhile the Marxists in Europe have taken exactly the opposite tack. I am going to help you overcome this bias in American sociology by including in the next chapter a lot of material on the analysis of social change. I am convinced that you cannot describe or understand the present nor predict the future unless you describe and analyze the past of the society you are studying.

Whenever these jurisdictional disputes or the fearsome jargon of academic social scientists becomes especially frustrating and confusing do not give up, instead go read a few good novels about small communities. Start with Ignazio Silone's Bread and Wine, and finish with Carlo Levi's Christ Stopped at Eboli. You may then agree that the best social scientists seem to be the great novelists. In addition there are good films to see by directors who understand the elusive rhythms and tempos of communities that are small and very old. Ask the college to order Federico Fellini's I Vitelloni and Amarcord; Vatroslav Mimica's, I'll Kill You Kaja; André Bresson's Diary of a Country Priest; Ingmar Bergman's Winter Light; Satyajit Ray's, Apu Trilogy; and Ivan Passer's, Intimate Lighting.
A SHORT GUIDE TO THE VOCABULARIES
OF SOME SOCIOLOGISTS

Every member of your community study team should read Alex Inkeles, What Is Sociology, and Reece McGee, Points of Departure: Basic Concepts in Sociology. Someone should read and report on the definitions of basic concepts in Kingsley Davis, Human Society. Pay careful attention to the specially defined concepts that constitute the unique language of these sociologists. Do this before you go on with your planning because you are going to need a common technical vocabulary, common tools, if you are to think theory and do research.

This short and free-wheeling glossary will help you understand the theoretical material in McGee and Davis as well as the next chapter. If you notice that definitions differ, do not panic, try to work out definitions that will be useful to you and logically coherent with the rest of your language. Variety, disagreement and lack of precision are all hallmarks of a young, developing, and inexact discipline. Sociology and the other social sciences are young and inexact disciplines.

(1) Culture
This is a big word that covers a lot of territory. When and if a group of people share a language, assumptions, attitudes, values, beliefs, technology, rituals, and memory in the form of myths, images, signs, and history then that group has a culture. That culture may be more or less coherent and more or less stable. When we talk about the culture of the Navaho or of the people of Stinking Creek we are talking about all of that shared stuff. The Navaho culture is the blueprint for their way of living, the program for their own social system. Cultural anthropologists have spent a lot of time and energy defining culture. It is what they like to study. Notice that if we can point to a set of assumptions, attitudes, and understandings, values, and beliefs, and if there is internal coherence between these elements, we can describe what we have found as a system, a value system. John Fetterman's book about Stinking Creek tells us a lot about that part of its culture. The Navaho culture is the blueprint for their way of living, the program for their own social system.

(2) Society
This is another very big word, and one that should always go with culture. The people who share a common culture live organized lives located within a social structure that we describe with words like status, role, class, caste, race, organization and institution. When we talk about Navaho society we are talking about structure and organization, about the ways the Navaho who share a common culture, blueprint, or program actually are organized, how they are related to each other, whether through a stratification system, or an institutional system, or both. Culture tells you what you should do to be good and beautiful. Society is the position you fill, the positions you are subordinate and superordinate to. All human societies are made possible by cultures which are learned, and so for human experience society and culture are inseparable. Social insects have societies but without culture. They do not need to learn their specialized positions and roles because their appropriate behavior is instinctive and is transmitted genetically. When you read or use the word culture, think learned and shared rules. When you use society, think structure, organization, tables of organization, and hierarchies. Always try to think of the way the two interact. If you need more help understanding the concept of society consult sociologists who have spent as much time defining society as the anthropologists have culture.

(3) Status
When sociologists use this word it means a defined position in a social system and is not to be confused with mere prestige. The position of father in a family is a status. Wife is also a status in a family and so is youngest son. Here are some other statuses: Student, teacher, policeman, lifeguard, actor, hobo, judge, brick layer, priest, chief, fisherman, and thief. It may help to think "identity" as well as "position" when sociologists are talking about status. "Who is she?" She is Mary Randall - that is Mr. and Mrs. Randall's daughter.
That is, unless she is Mr. Randall's wife, or Mr. Randall's mother.

(4) Stratification

Statuses require certain kinds of expected performance and carry certain customary rewards. Students are expected to study if they are going to deserve to be identified and treated as students. If they study enough they are rewarded with an academic degree. The President of Evergreen gets to use a free car. The President of the United States gets to use several free airplanes. In other words, the responsibilities, work, power, prestige, and other rewards that are tied to social statuses (identities or positions) are unequal and tend to fall into hierarchical patterns. Statuses with the most responsibility usually carry the most generous rewards and are the hardest to get into, or achieve. Statuses cluster into hierarchical ranks that are called classes and castes. If movement up and down the hierarchy is possible the stratification system is open and the strata are called classes. If movement up is impossible the system is closed and the strata are called castes. Traditional India was a society of closed castes. Modern China is very open and casteless, but it is not classless. An open system means lots of upward social mobility and a closed system means very little. Some statuses are ascribed, just handed to you by your society. For instance, the first born son of Bob Smith. Male, female, black, chican, daughter, grandfather, are all ascribed statuses, identities that are handed to one by society. Some positions have to be worked for, earned, or fought for. College graduate does not come automatically, nor does governor of the State of Washington. These are achieved statuses or acquired identities. A society with lots of statuses available for achievement is open. The more statuses that are ascribed, the more closed the society. Some positions have to be worked for, earned, or fought for. College graduate does not come automatically, nor does governor of the State of Washington. These are achieved statuses or acquired identities. A society with lots of statuses available for achievement is open. The more statuses that are ascribed, the more closed the society. In traditional India the status of priest (Brahmin) was ascribed; in Europe it has always been achieved.

Most sociologists seem to be very interested in social class and stratification systems. American sociologists have tended to argue that lots of social inequality is inevitable and that a healthy society is one with lots of achieved statuses and open classes. Marxists in Europe have taken the contrary position and argue that while class systems have served their historic purpose they are inhumane, counterproductive, and will most certainly disappear. It is ironic that open, mobile America has produced academic defenders of permanent stratification.

American research on social class has focused on revealing how much of our culture (values, attitudes, norms, behavior, rituals, beliefs, fashions, and fads) is class linked. For instance, sociologists have discovered that church membership and even mental illness are associated with change with class membership. European Marxists are much more interested in the economic organization of society, class conflict, revolution, and change. They are more interested in class and power than in class and mental illness.

(5) Institutions

There is another way to look at social positions and identities. Statuses can be seen as clustered or organized into institutions. The next chapter will define institutions and institutional sectors in more detail, but for the moment let me introduce you to this difficult but useful idea. An organized group with a culture, that is a society, must take care of certain essential metabolic requirements if that society is to exist and persist through time. I am talking about what the whole society as a social system must have, not the needs or desires of individual human beings. The society, or system, must; (1) insure its own continuity, (2) produce and distribute essential goods and services, (3) maintain order and resolve internal conflict, (4) provide internal cohesion, (5) protect its boundaries and itself from external danger, and (6) insure the preservation and transmission of its culture from one generation to the next. Out of their unconscious or deliberate efforts to satisfy these requirements societies have invented a class of specialized values, statuses, and organizations that we call institutions. The organized family insures procreation and continuity; economic organization produces and distributes goods and services; government is instituted to adjudicate conflict and maintain essential system-wide controls; religion evolves to temper the crises of the life cycle and to cement individuals together in a viable, coherent community; the military protects the society against external human enemies; and schools help preserve and transmit the heritage and culture from one generation to the next. These societal needs must be met if a society is to function; that is why there are often defined as the functional prerequisites of a modern social system.

How is all of this going to apply to your community in your community study project? These key concepts should help you keep some fundamental things separate and straight. You will want to be precise about culture (the blueprint) and society (structure). You will need to distinguish between the components of your
community's cultural system, its stratification system, and its institutional sys­
tem. Thinking this way will help you divide up your work and make sense of what
you find out when you start your looking, listening, reading, watching, and asking.

Could you, if you so desired, simply concentrate on the analysis of personality
and do nothing but psychology, or the production and distribution of goods and ser­
vice doing nothing but economics, or power and politics doing little else than
political science? You could, but you would not have studied a whole community.
I, for one, believe that every student and professional practitioner of any of
the social sciences needs to know how his special interest, his special subject
matter interacts with the subject matters of the other disciplines, and how those
disciplines interrelate and diverge. The thorough study of a small community is
one very powerful way of discovering and teaching those interrelationships. This
is another way of urging you to make your project wholistic and interdisciplinary.

CHAPTER 4

THREE THEORETICAL MODELS

The First Assignment for Chapter 4: Read these four books:
Read Reece McGee, Points of Departure: Basic Concepts in Sociology to find out
more about what sociologists do and an introduction to structural-functional theory.
For help with Marx's class-conflict theory read Frederick Engles, Socialism Utopian
Your introduction to institutional analysis will come from Snell Putney, The
Conquest of Society. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1972. It will help you
learn to start thinking about societies as self-correcting social systems made up
of institutional subsystems. You will not be ready for Chapter 4 until you have
finished these four books.

Final Reading Assignment for Chapter 4: Leonard Schutzman and Anselm L. Strauss,
Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice­
Hall, 1973. Read this after you have finished this chapter of the handbook.
This next chapter of the *Handbook* reviews and criticizes both the structural-functional and class-conflict models of human society. These critiques lay the groundwork for an institutional model developed by Snell Putney and myself in a series of seminars at San Jose State and in several papers presented before the Pacific Sociological Association. You may find much of this section quite technical but once you master it you will be in a position either to choose one of these three different theoretical models or draw on all three for an eclectic model of your own. When you finish the chapter try to derive several testable hypotheses from one or more of the models. Jot these down in the notebook that you will carry into the field.

These models and your hypotheses will expand your awareness and extend your powers of perception by giving you lots of new things to look for, data to seek out, questions to ask. Think of each model as a map. It will be up to you to find out which will prove to be the most useful for your project.

---

**THE STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL MODEL**

Most American sociologists use something called structural-functional analysis. It is a kind of theory or model of society that illuminates certain aspects of social life and leads the investigator to certain questions. Here is a quick review of the structural-functional model which should be familiar to you after reading Reece McGee's *Points of Departure*.

Society, culture, and personality are defined as systems of subjective mental events. A social system is made up of such subject matter as norms, values, ends, means, roles, and statuses. These determine and organize patterns of human action and interaction. Recurring patterns of these subjective units are the structural components of a society. Norms, values, roles, and statuses are usually subsumed under the general concept of the normative structure of society. Concepts such as institution and class are defined as clusters of norms. Isolating, describing, and classifying norms is the structural aspect of structural-functional analysis.

Specific structures, for instance religious norms, are said to serve a function, or solve a functional problem. It is assumed that any social system has certain needs which must be met if that system is to survive. These are needs for maintenance of population, division and specialization of labor among the population, cohesion and coordination of the group, and the perpetuation of the group. Various social structures meet these constant functional prerequisites. The functional aspect of the analysis is concerned with isolating and describing the structural alternatives for solving these problems.

If a given structure of norms does serve these requirements it is said to be functional for the system. If it does not it is dysfunctional. If the individuals involved know that particular norms are there to meet these needs, the function is manifest. If the sociologist is the only one who sees and understands this service to society, the function is latent.

The functional approach to sociology leads to the formulation of a typical question. The functional sociologist asks: "What does the normative structure X do to insure the stability of social system Y?" For example, what does a cluster of rules about sexual monogamy (X) do to insure the stability of the community?

---

1 You should be able to give several examples for each of these sociological concepts. If you still have trouble doing that, go back and look them up in both Inkeles and McGee.
of Port Townsend (Y)? He asserts that the persistence of a normative structure (X) in a social system (Y) can be explained by the fact that it is functional for that system. The position taken is that norms either contribute to or detract from the stability of a group or society. If the norms persist they must be supporting the system in some way or another, i.e., manifestly or latently. The cause of this persistence is the satisfaction of a societal need.

The primary role of such concepts as persistence, stability, and equilibrium in structural-functional analysis has been the focus of considerable criticism from those who hold that the theory is inherently static. Wayne Hield's Criticism is typical; that "the study of change has ... been obscured by the formulation of theoretical constructs stressing order and stability." When change is discussed the structural-functional school tends to describe it as the unanticipated and dysfunctional product of deviant behavior, or of mistakes in socialization. In other words, the strain toward equilibrium sometimes unexpectedly and unpredictably results in change.

Bernard Barber, a structural-functionalist, has answered this kind of criticism with the counter-charge that it is based on misunderstanding that is a consequence of the newness and unfamiliarity of structural-functional ideas. First he insists that structural-functional theory is not static, in principle, because one must describe structure at various points in time in order to know whether or not there has been any change at all. But then he admits that perhaps there has been concentration, in practice, on the isolation and description of static structure. The next step he ways is to move on to the analysis of processes of conflict and change. According to Barber there has been a good deal of dynamic analysis in structural-functional terms. One example is Neil Smelser's, Social Change in the Industrial Revolution. I agree with Wayne Hield that it is difficult to think of others.

Kingsley Davis is even more positive about the applicability of this kind of theory to change than Barber.

It is only in terms of equilibrium that most sociological concepts make sense. Either tacitly or explicitly, anyone who thinks about society tends to use the notion. The functional-structural approach to sociological analysis is basically equilibrium theory. It is usually phrased in static terms, but as soon as the element of time is added it alludes to a moving equilibrium. The central question, according to Davis, to be answered by a theory of social change is that of causation. He describes and rejects the causal theories that he calls 'determinisms', and the theory that he is most concerned to reject is Marx's dialectical materialism. For Davis the fallacy of determinism lies in the attempt to explain all change in a society as the result of one kind of causal factor. Davis treats a society as an approximation to an equilibrium that is self-restoring. Because every such society is a great complex of interdependent socio-cultural variables, interconnected in a moving equilibrium, the total change in a society can only be explained by considering all of "the main variables constituting the social equilibrium." By the equilibrium approach it does not make much difference which variable one starts with. Since the variables are mutually dependent, an examination of a change in one variable will inevitably lead to an examination of changes in other variables. The thing studied is a system in which everything is determined by everything else. Consequently it follows that the choice of a single factor such as the economic or geographic while partly true always represents a gross simplification and cannot really explain change.

In order to find causal relations between the main social variables (values, norms, roles, etc.), Davis looks at three things: (1) the forces impinging on the system, (2) the variables which respond to these forces, and (3) the processes by which the forces and variables are related. It is this last point that makes his sociology dynamic. He looks at the interplay of forces and the resulting changes in the social system.

---

4 "The simplicity they introduce is a false simplicity which does not explain but explains away this problem." Ibid., p. 635.
social system from without; (2) the stresses and strains within the whole system; and (3) the forces within the society that maintain the social equilibrium. In other words, pressures from without or stresses from within cause dislocations within the system that are adjusted by certain mechanisms that return the disturbed system to its original state, in-so-far as that is possible. When that is impossible, we have change. Or, mistakes made within the system while trying to insure equilibrium cause dislocations that are too severe and that results in change. In both cases change would seem to be unexpected, always a surprise to the social scientist.

Criticism of the Theory. Criticism of the structural-functional theory of change is especially difficult because there just is not very much of it to work with. Barber, Davis and others have promised this next step but until it is made I can do little more than comment on a few important limitations that seem to be inherent in this kind of an approach.

(1) Davis and others make the concept of equilibrium the king-pin of the theory. Is this the obstacle to the successful treatment of change that Held claims it is? Not necessarily so. The concept of equilibrium is not a simple one. There are different kinds of models of stable states and mechanisms. The older equilibrium concepts are the legacy of 19th century physics and are not appropriate for the analysis of social and biological systems while the more recent concepts of steady-state dynamics are useful to the social scientist. For the most part the sociologists who call themselves structural-functionalists have been guilty of using an inappropriate 19th century equilibrium concept. For instance, Davis acknowledges his debt to Talcott Parsons who in turn admits to having taken the idea from Vilfredo Pareto and Pareto's professional training was in engineering, in the 19th century! There is no reason why modern sociologists cannot shift to a more sophisticated and adequate treatment of stability. Until they do they will have difficulty in trying to eliminate the difficulties created by the use of the old equilibrium theory.

(2) Structural-functionalists hold that a society operates in such a way as to maintain or return to its original state. From this point of view the absence of change is normal while its presence is an abnormality caused by pressure from without or errors from within the system. What is needed is a theory that treats both persistence and change of social organization as normal. Long-run survival by biological species and social organizations is a product of both persistence and change. The more complex systems can survive (persist) only by changing. A comprehensive social theory must be able to deal with the whole of this phenomenon. Just as Marx ignores the problem of explaining the persistence of social systems, so functionalists err in the other direction and slight the problem of change.

(3) Davis criticizes what he calls deterministic theories on the grounds that they select just one factor with which to explain change. His argument is that there are many causes and they are all interdependent. But this places the social scientist in an impossibly difficult position. If he asserts that everything is a dependent part of an interconnected whole and that change can only be explained as a consequence of the simultaneous operation of all variables at once, then causal analysis is impossibly difficult. Evolution, life, knowledge, and science all depend upon the possibility and fact of relative independence between the parts of systems and the parts of their environments. We have to be able to isolate cause and effect and causal events. If everything is the cause of social change, and everything is effect, then a scientific theory of social change is beyond us.

(4) In my opinion, structural-functional sociology has not only run aground on the wrong kind of equilibrium concept, it has abandoned ship to an overly subjective theory and methodology that leads to a social psychology of behavior rather than a sociology of institutions and communities. Societies are not studied as supra-individual organizations with system properties of their own, but as the summation of an infinite number of interactions between individual actors. It is assumed that a social system must be seen and studied from within, in terms of the actor's ends-means scheme, and in terms of his values and feelings. My own position is that sometimes this may be more of a hindrance than a help. A social system can be studied and understood without the observer having to know what life in the system looks and feels like to any of its participants. The ethologist does not have to know what it feels like to be a slime mold or a honey bee, much less be one, in order to make progress toward an understanding of their respective systems, how they are organized, maintained, and changed. Galileo did not care about the feelings or attitudes of the pendulum he studied. He was not even interested in color or texture. He discovered that he needed to know one thing, the distance from a fixed point of attachment to the bob of the pendulum. While social systems are much more complex than mechanical systems, we can simplify as
we build models, and in the process look for causal variables.

(5) In addition to the flurry of criticism over the issue of change there has been some comment about the fact that structural-functional propositions are difficult to operationalize. While quantitative work has been done with values, norms, and similar concepts in survey research, it is not easy to isolate and measure a latent function. A good deal of qualitative research is being carried out within this theoretical framework but not in the area of social change. If we judge the theory in terms of what it has accomplished as a scientific theory of social change it does not measure up to the work of Karl Marx and his many followers in European sociology, economics and philosophy.

Let us turn then to an alternative model of society and to another guide. Perhaps Karl Marx and the Marxists will prove to be more helpful mapmakers than the structural-functionalists.

THE CLASS-CONFLICT MODEL: MARXIST THEORY

Marx and Engels wanted society to change and their social theory was first and foremost a theory of change. They explained social change as a product of the struggle between contending social classes, which in turn were the product of the economic conditions and development of society. In the words of Engels:

The materialist conception of history starts from the proposition that the production of the means to support human life and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure ... From this point of view the final causes of all changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in men's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange.¹

And from Marx's frequently quoted Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy:

In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their own will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society --- the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general.²

These two quotations summarize the Marxian point of view. The chief force which determines the structure and development of society is its method of procuring the means of life, the society's mode of production. The concept "mode of production" includes the forces of production and the relations of production. The former includes tools and labor skill, while the latter has to do with the social relations of the men using their skills and tools in the process of production. While it is the mode of production that determines the structure and development of society, changes in the mode of production are the results of changes in the forces or instruments of production.

The development of the relations of production is dependent upon the prior development of the forces of production. Any prolonged lag in the development of the relations of production results in a contradiction that is the basis of social revolution. From an overall point of view, the pattern of social development is constituted out of an accumulation of small quantitative changes in the forces of productions that eventually erupt in sudden revolutionary qualitative changes in the relations of production that spread throughout the whole of society. Furthermore, Marx believed that the pattern of change was dialectical and that the logical notion of contradiction was in fact manifest in the material world. Change was both inevitable and progressive. It was inevitable because of the inevitability of contradictions showing up between the forces of production (technology) and the relations of production (social structure). Change was progressive because the dialectical resolution of contraries, thesis and antithesis, always results in a higher and better synthesis. Though progressive, the history of social change was bound to be stormy and Marx did not hesitate to point to the liberating and creative role of violent revolution. Dialectical contradictions meant a build up of tension until a flashpoint was reached and then out of the revolutionary fire would emerge a more rational social order. Social classes come into the picture because Marx came to see that the growing contradiction between technology and society over a particular period of slow cumulative change took the form of growing class differentiation, increased class conflict, and changing class consciousness. Social classes, inevitably in opposition and fated to bloody conflict, were the necessary instruments of creative and progressive change.

Changes in the mode of production, and hence in the whole of the social structure, are not the result of conscious planning until the class-conscious proletariat arrives on the scene. The role of exceptional individuals is minimized. Ideas have their source in and are the product of social structure and its development. Ideas may slow down development, or speed it up, but in the main, Marx and the Marxists have agreed that ideas are secondary to the material conditions which they reflect.

Criticism of the Theory. There is no denying the results of the Russian and Chinese Revolutions nor escaping the irony that the ideas of Marx shaped those revolutions. Nevertheless, considerations of that kind should not blind one to the fact that both historical events and the advance of scientific knowledge during the past one hundred years has rendered much of Marx's thinking obsolete. The following points of criticism illustrate this.

(1) The question of the root cause of social change is begged through an appeal to the mysterious operation of contradictions that pervade all matter. The concept of dialectical change is a part of the legacy of Hegel. Marx boasted of having turned Hegel on his head; he should have abandoned him altogether. The Marxist explanation of what makes the forces of production change is as scientifically inadequate as it is mystical.

(2) Because planned change is reserved as a prerogative of the working class whose leaders happen to be familiar with dialectical materialism, Marxist theory simply fails to provide an adequate analysis of organizational change in general. Both the problem of the root cause of change in the forces of production and the problem of planned vs. spontaneous change are consequences of what I consider to be the most fundamental shortcoming in Marxian theory, that is, its equivocation on the nature and role of ideas in human society.

(3) Marx's rejection of idealism and espousal of materialism was praiseworthy, as far as it went. It did not go far enough. This is understandable because there was no satisfactory explanation for the physical basis of mental processes avail-

---

able to Marx. What he did was to claim to be a consistent materialist while solving the problem of the ubiquity of thought by treating it as a secondary reflection of the material world. It was still spiritual, but a product of and dependent upon the material world. In the last analysis, Marx remained a dualist and was faced with the problem of accounting for the interaction of body and mind, matter with ideas, and economic structure with ideological superstructure. In their early polemical writings, Marx and Engels seemed to have decided that interaction between the material and spiritual was all one way; matter was the cause and mind the reflection. It did not take long for the untenability of this position to become manifest and Engels attempted to set the record straight. His often quoted letters to Joseph Block (1890), and Conrad Schmidt (1890), and Heinrich Starkenburg (1894) insist that ideas do play a causal role in the development of social structure. Economic relations are only ultimately decisive. But Marx had written that:

It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. ¹

Contemporary Marxists still oscillate helplessly between these two poles. While Stalin's position was closer to Engels than to Marx, his interpretation did not solve the problem.

It does not follow from Marx's words, however, that social ideas, theories, political views and political institutions are of no significance in the life of society, that they do not reciprocally affect social being, (and) the development of the material conditions of the life of society.²

The root of the trouble lies in the unresolved issue of both the nature and relationship of mind and matter.

²Marx, loc. cit.
³Stalin, op. cit., p. 22.

(4) The Marxist selection of social class as the primary unit of analysis means that the theory is unsuitable for the study of formal social organizations, institutions, or social movements. This is especially so when an organization has only an indirect connection, if any, with a class.

(5) Why there must be a tendency toward consistency (equilibrium) between the forces of production (technology) and the relations of production (social structure) within the total society is a question that is not answered. When structural-functional sociology makes this a point of inquiry, instead of simply assuming it, the Marxist criticizes that theory as reactionary.

(6) The Marxist theory does meet the criteria for good theory on at least the following grounds: While it performs an organizing function and is heuristic, it fails in other respects because it has not been the source of a significant number of verified predictions about the structure and behavior of a wide range of social facts, nor has it exhibited a measurement function.

It must be criticized also for the unfortunate abundance of non-scientific value judgements, hopes, dreams, political programs, and prejudices which weaken its claims to being a science of society. In many respects, Marxism is a modern religion rather than a science. As a social movement it has had and continues to have enormous impact on the trajectory of modern history. While this makes it an interesting subject for study, it does not necessarily make it a source of useful scientific theory.

THE NEED FOR AN ALTERNATIVE THEORY

When these two models are assessed in terms of the extent to which they do or do not meet the issues which are a part of the problem of social change they prove to be inadequate. While something may be said in favor of this or that aspect of each of the theories, neither of them stand up as a whole. Neither provides the kind of overall direction good theory is expected to give scientific research. A quick comparative tally reveals the following:

(1) Only the structural-functional theory of Davis takes up the questions of structure and stability. But it does so at the expense of an analysis of change.

(2) Neither theory leads to hypothetical propositions about just when and under what conditions this or that specific factor will be the cause of a specified change. (The only contribution to the beginnings of a scientific analysis
of the rate of change comes from the neglected work of William F. Ogburn.)

(3) Too much faith and hope about the future of the human race has entered into the Marxist treatment of the direction of change.

(4) Neither structural-functional nor Marxist class conflict theory deals with purposeful, planned change by formal organizations or social movements.

(5) Marx provides a theory that stresses objective, public facts. Structural-functionalists include subjective facts. Neither has solved the problem of the exact causal connections between the objective and subjective worlds.

(6) These theories have not been responsible for much empirical research, or for very many tested or testable forecasts or predictions. While they do not permit precise measurement, they do provide some means for classifying and organizing social data.

If structural-functional theory posits mostly stability and only occasional accidental almost imperceptible changes, and if Marxist class-conflict theory posits lots of technology-determined slow quantitative change with occasional qualitative transformations called revolutions, then we have every right to be dissatisfied. We are bound to experience a nagging doubt about the coverage and adequacy of the two models. These and other doubts led me to propose a new three-fold classification of social organization and social change. Taking some ideas I had been introduced to by Kenneth Boulding and Karl Deutsch, I developed an institutional input-output model that I hoped would provide a new perspective on social structure and social change as well as some new research strategies. Snell Putney joined me in this work although eventually his interest shifted away from input-output research strategies toward the analysis of self-correcting auto systems.¹

Small communities in the United States of America do not simply drift on the broad and sluggish currents of evolutionary change. South Bend and Port Townsend changed radically when the railroad failed to materialize; but that was neither an example of inefficient socialization nor of class warfare. To understand the communities of South Bend and Port Townsend we need to look at something more than values, norms, technology, and social class. I hope you will find something more in the following theoretical papers especially edited for this handbook. My repeated invitations in the next few pages to read critically and test imaginatively and rigorously are meant very seriously. This institutional approach is frankly tentative. I will never know whether it has any merit as theory until someone tries it out in the field. To that end the more trails by critical users the better.

THREE KINDS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

One source of the difficulty and confusion that has beset the study of social and cultural change has been the failure to differentiate between significantly different types of social change. The major theorists have all treated social change as a unitary phenomenon. For the Marxist, all change is lumped into the dialectical struggle between classes resulting from the dialectical change of the forces of production. William F. Ogburn interprets all change as the accumulation of inventions, adjustment to inventions, and the diffusion of inventions. Structural-functionalists explain social change as the result of the imperfect socialization of the future members of the society. The defenders of these various points of view argue as if there were only one correct answer to the entire problem of change. All change is regarded as either one kind of process of another; the process they happen to be focused on is a consequence of the model they are using. But what if there are several different processes of change, each requiring analysis with its own appropriate theory? I believe that there are and I am going to suggest that there are at least three basic and fundamentally different kinds of social change and that each requires a specific theoretical model. Furthermore, I am going to argue that these three types of change are found to be characteristic of three distinct types of social organization.

The three types of social organization are: First, those that reproduce similar organizations over a sequence of generations; second, those that do not reproduce; and third, those that are built up out of reproducing and non-reproducing organizations. At the risk of inventing some new jargon I will refer to these three classes of systems as reproducing, non-reproducing, and mixed systems.

Each of the systems displays a characteristic process of change. A large number of reproducing organizations change through an evolutionary-like process of drift. The non-reproducing organizations increase their complexity, or reach their goals, through learnings and innovating. The mixed system changes by a combination of drift, learning and innovation, but the process is not the simple sum of the changes in its reproducing and non-reproducing components. When reproducing and non-reproducing types of subsystems are coupled to form a mixed system the whole exhibits its own emergent properties and process of change. I will refer to these three types of processes of change as evolutionary, innovating, and compound.

Type 1. Reproducing Systems and the Evolutionary Process of Change.

By a reproducing system I mean any social system that replaces itself by producing one or more copies of itself, these copies replacing themselves in a like manner. Biological reproduction is a similar phenomenon, and individual organisms are examples of reproducing systems. Sub-human social systems such as those of the termite and honey bee are reproducing social units. A part of the activity of each colony or hive is devoted to the production of a new and similar social entity. Not only does the queen bee produce bees but the entire organized group cooperates in the production of several similar groups. In a modern society one finds some systems that are reproducing and some that are not. The family is the most familiar and clear-cut case of a human social system that is self-reproducing. A particular family has several children. Those that survive and marry establish new families that are more or less like the original. This is repeated down through a sequence of generations. Unlike the Hudson Bay Company, the Catholic Church, or the United States of America, a single family is an organization with a relatively short life span. And unlike a corporation, church or national state, the family is most occupied with the task of establishing copies of itself. If a corporation such as General Electric establishes a new division, the new unit remains an integral part of General Electric. On the other hand, while a new family may retain an old name it frequently achieves considerable autonomy, especially in the case of what we call the nuclear family. A new and independent unit has emerged. For example, your nuclear family, the one you were born into and raised in is probably quite independent of your grandparents’ families.

The significance of the property of reproduction for the problem of social and cultural change is as follows. Any open system, whether biological or social, that has a relatively short life span and replicates itself in substantial numbers will show an evolutionary change over a series of generations. This is the case because open systems, systems that exchange energy and information with their
environment, by their very nature cannot produce exact copies of themselves. Environmental selection will always favor some kinds of variation and not others. Hence, over a long period of time the structure and behavior of the individual members of this class of reproducing systems will be different from that of their forebears. There will have been a change that was not planned or anticipated by the organization concerned. In societies this is change by imperfect socialization, much alluded to by structural-functionalists.

Important aspects of the structure and behavior of human organizations of the reproducing type do change over long periods of time as the result of the environmental selection of variations. Nevertheless, this is not to assert that all social and cultural change can be represented as an evolutionary drift through a long sequence of generations. The two other types of organizations exhibit rather different patterns of change and must be mapped and interpreted with different theories.

The truth of the assertion that some social change is of this evolutionary variety would seem to hinge on two questions. First, are there social organizations at the human level which do reproduce themselves over a sequence of generations; and, second, is there variation? These are empirical questions and affirmative answers seem safe enough. If the process of replication is imperfect, the environment being what it is, the class of systems will evolve, in one direction or another. Indeed, the social scientist may well marvel at the fact there is so much social and cultural persistence from one generation to the next as there is. The problem of persistence is at the center of academic sociology and is one of the primary problems to which structural functionalists address themselves. They are correct in pointing to imperfect socialization of the new generation by the family as a source of social change. Imperfect socialization is the source of at least some of the variation which, when subjected to environmental selection, emerges as long-run social and cultural change. However, such an explanation is appropriate only for a specific kind of organization, a specific process of change.

1Such a population, to borrow the very descriptive phrase used by Edward Sapir, is involved in "a current of its own making. It has a drift." Edward Sapir, Language, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921, p. 150.

and only some of the changes that we are interested in.

My classification scheme provides at least a partial explanation of why one finds a high degree of similarity between genetic and linguistic evolution. However, this similarity does not hold between genetic change and the changes taking place in modern corporations or national states. A folk language, as distinct from technical languages, is a part of culture that is transmitted to a substantial degree from generation to generation in the families of a society. Because English is learned in and taught by the family, it evolved from Old English through unplanned modification, selection and migration. Dictionaries and standardized schooling slowed that drift to what it is today. I would predict that a technical language, for example the binomial system of nomenclature in biology, would exhibit a different pattern of change because it is learned and taught in standardized science courses. During the Middle Ages, Church Latin followed a quite different trajectory of change than did the Vulgar Latin spoken in the families of Aquitaine, Burgundy and Italy. If this view is correct, and it is open to empirical verification, the representation and explanation of change in the specialized cultures of non-reproducing social systems like universities and churches will require a model substantially different from the genetic type.

Let me emphasize that the applicability of this genetic model of drift depends upon the existence of a substantial population of the systems concerned and a long sequence of generations. It is a theory that can represent change as a continuous process because of the effect of a statistically large universe. In this connection it would be interesting to study the relationships between population size, increase, and decrease, and the rate of evolutionary change of reproducing systems. Does the rate of drift increase with an increase in the numbers and degree of independence of the families in a society? These and similar considerations suggest a host of problems for the scientist interested in social and cultural change in very large social systems. What about the small community that you are going to study, should you look for drift? If a very small community is independent, in some respects, of the large society in which it is embedded then socio-cultural drift will figure in the history of that community if it can be traced back for a good many generations. I estimate a minimum of five or six generations which means only Native American communities should be analyzed with an evolutionary model.
Type II. Non-reproducing Systems and the Innovating Process of Change.

A non-reproducing system refers to any social system that does not create copies of itself as a part of its normal behavior in its normal life span. Industrial corporations, armies, navies, universities, and The Evergreen State College are examples of non-reproducing social organizations. Sociologists usually refer to these kinds of systems as formal organizations. This type of social system comes into existence as a result of the activities of an organizing individual or group. Its founding may be marked by a compact, a formal blueprint. It can have a very long life during which it is much concerned with its own survival. It stores information about its past, it pursues goals, and it plans for the future. If it changes markedly it is not the consequence of an unconscious long-run selection of variations in a sequence of many such organizations. The changes take place within the single lifetime of the one organization and are determined by the system’s goals, successful and unsuccessful attempts to reach those goals, stored information that is both reportorial and operational, the structure of the network, negative feedback mechanisms, and so on. Because the change takes place within the life span of a single system it is a learning and innovating process of self-transformation. The structure and behavior of the system is modified by events that have occurred in both the immediate and remote past of the lifetime of the system. For examples think of the Catholic Church, the Benedictine Order, and the Hudson Bay Company.

I am assuming that self-regulating, self-organizing open systems are guided in their goal-seeking behavior by trial and error process. Trials may be random in the early history of a system, or in certain situations for the mature system, but a biased organization of trials, tests, or experiments always emerges in a system that stores information, that is, a system that can remember. Correct trials are reinforced by their success. A negative feedback of information about successes for a number of trials introduces a bias into the operation of the system so that the probabilities of various outputs change as a result of experience. However, if trials were organized solely in terms of the statistics of past successes eventually the system would try nothing new. This was the mentality of André Maginot whose fortified trenches did not stop the Nazi armies. The freezing of successful trials must be countermanded to at least a limited extent. The loss of information (forgetting) probably accomplishes this to some extent in open systems complex enough to learn. If specific instructions (norms) are introduced into the program (culture) of the system that favor the synthesis of new patterns then the problem-solving trials of the system will include some novelty. If the novel output is successful, negative feedback will reinforce the use of that particular novel pattern and support a pattern of novel synthesis. The system will have learned to innovate; and the capacity to innovate will enable it to circumvent unexpected obstacles, reach its goals, and change its goals. We all hope that The Evergreen State College is one such example. Another is the General Electric Company which underwent a vast reorganization (innovating change) in 1951. The heads of the one hundred operating departments no longer received detailed job descriptions. The list of regulations was shortened and left unstructured and open-ended. While this left the executive decision makers organizing the trials of the operating departments greater latitude for error, it also changed the statistical bias away from probable (old solutions) so as to increase novel trials. General Electric changed the rules governing decisions at the operating level in order to step up the overall innovative capacity of the corporation. The company wanted to be sure that it could change rapidly enough to meet the expansive and highly competitive markets of the 1960s and 1970s. Evidently it did. Most U.S. railways are good examples for formal, non-reproducing systems that have failed to become innovative enough to remain viable. This illustrates the important fact that formal organizations may make fatal mistakes, decline, and disappear.

In contrast to the evolutionary process of change which lends itself to analysis with a genetic model, the innovating process of change displayed by formal non-reproducing social systems requires a quite different model. The absence of a long series of generations and of a large population precludes the possibility of using a genetic model. It just will not work.

Type III. Mixed Systems and the Compound Processes of Change.

A social system that is made up of coupled subsystems, some of which are reproducing, is a mixed system. Urban communities such as towns, cities, metropolitan areas, and national states are examples of mixed systems. Each is a system whose parts include reproducing organizations such as families, and formal non-reproducing organizations such as businesses, industrial corporations, colleges, service
The couplings between reproducing and non-reproducing organizations in a mixed system are both one-way and two-way for interaction between systems may be unilateral or reciprocal. When systems are related by a two-way coupling they provide some of each other’s input. Part of the input of the one is the output of the other. This is especially important for the study of mixed systems and their compound processes of change because of the peculiar constraint such interaction places upon the trajectory of the whole system as it attempts to maintain a steady state. Social organizations connected by two-way couplings exercise a power of veto over each other’s states. It is this phenomenon that gives rise to a process of change that can be distinguished from the two already discussed.

Consider an imaginary town composed of 1,000 families and one large industrial corporation, ignoring the other non-reproducing organizations for the sake of simplicity. Call the whole thing a mixed system. Four hundred of the families are coupled directly to the corporation because at least one member of each family is employed by it. This means that a significant part of the input to those families comes from the corporation, and because these are two-way couplings a part of the total input to the corporation comes from the families. Neither has complete freedom of action in so far as the other is concerned. The state of each family is under a partial veto from the corporation. The same is true for the corporation vis-a-vis the families. Using your imagination, introduce a strong labor union into the system. How does that change things? Or imagine an old-fashioned company town in which the general store, tavern, and all housing is owned by the company which is an individual proprietorship that has been held by the same family for two generations. What is the balance of veto power? Usually such systems appear to be much more complex than either the reproducing or non-reproducing systems, although this may or may not be the case. It is clear that a complex social system such as a town or a city, whose change from one state to another is determined by the complex interaction of vetos and partial vetos, displays a pattern of development that is neither evolutionary drift nor innovating. Some kind of a different model is needed for the effective description, analysis, and prediction of this type of change.

If social scientists concerned with the problem of social and cultural change are willing to take the general system perspective, as I have been doing here, we may be able to make some progress. A variety of qualitative, mathematical, and even mechanical models already available in such fields as genetics, economics, and cybernetics offer points of departure for the formulation and elaboration of dynamic theory. This would make possible the derivation and verification of hypotheses about different classes of social organization, their structures, behaviors, and the dynamics of their transformation from one state to another.

Sociologists have long busied themselves with the construction of polar typologies designed to dichotomize social systems into two ideal types. Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, sacred and secular, or folk and urban are among the familiar categories of this sort. Those types of societies have been discussed at length in terms of institutions, social relationships, role and status configurations, and kinds of social groups. When change is mentioned it is usually in terms of rate of change with the observation that folk societies change slowly and urban societies change rapidly. The point that I have emphasized is that just as social systems differ so do the processes of social change. Moreover, certain kinds of social change go together with certain kinds of social organization. Folk societies change more slowly than urban societies because folk societies change through a process of genetic-like drift that takes a long time, several generations in fact. Urban societies change more rapidly because of the casual exercise of power of veto over each other’s states. It is this phenomenon that gives rise to a process of change that can be distinguished from the two already discussed.

The approach to social systems, conceptualized as decision-making communication nets, utilized here is derived from general systems theory as developed in the work of L. von Bertalanffy, General Systems Yearbook, 1956, pp. 1-10; K.K. Boulding, "Toward a General Theory of Growth", ibid., pp. 66-75; D. Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication, New York: Wiley, 1953; R.L. Maier, A Communication Theory of Urban Growth, Cambridge: M.I.T. Tech. Press, 1962; A. Tustin, The Mechanism of Economic Systems, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953, and others. It also stems from that branch of general systems theory which is known as cybernetics, especially as developed by W.R. Ashby, An Introduction to Cybernetics, New York: John Wiley, 1956. General systems is concerned with the development of principles designed to describe and explain those characteristics which are common to all organized open systems. The system is taken as the abstract unit of analysis, hence certain properties are singled out which hold for a great variety of subject matters, e.g., ultrastability. Cybernetics is specifically oriented to the analysis of those open systems which are decision-making, e.g., computers, organisms, and formal social organizations.
role of purposive, formal, non-reproducing organizations coupled to the reproducing families of those societies. Of course, viable societies are stable; they are ulcerstable thanks to the innovative capacities of some formal organizations.

How does this apply to a community study in Washington? The search for socio-cultural drift would be appropriate if you were studying the Kwakiutl or Colville Indians, but probably not in a mixed system where we would expect to look at the interaction between a railroad, certain lumber mills, a few banks, and several hundred families, in order to chart its social change since the 1880s. But what about the conflict between capitalists and workers the Marxist would ask? What about changes in the instruments and relations of production? The way to answer these questions scientifically is to derive operational hypotheses from a Marxist model and check them against data from the history of South Bend.

Here is how you can use my three-way classification of social systems and kinds of change.

1. If you want to study the changing culture and society of the Kwakiutl before substantial contact with Europeans, then use an evolutionary model.

2. If you want to study the history of the Crown-Zellerbach Corporation and try to forecast its future behavior, then use an innovating model.

3. If you want to study Port Townsend or South Bend as dynamic social systems, then use what I have been calling a compound model.

Although they have cropped up like weeks in the last few pages, I never have liked awkward phrases like --- "mixed systems" and "compound processes of change". The theoretical model that I am proposing as alternative to structural-functionalism and Marxism places unusual emphasis on institutions and social movements rather than norms and classes. It seems appropriate then to simply call it institutional theory.
While sociology was emerging as an autonomous discipline in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, social change was its central problem and major concern. The task that the first sociologists set for themselves was an exciting and challenging one for they proposed nothing less than to develop an explanation of where western civilization had been, where it was going, what was driving it there, by what route and at what tempo. Whatever else men like Herbert Spencer, P.A. Sorokin and Brooks Adams have been charged with, it has never been said that they were concerned with trivial problems, or with the elaboration of the obvious.

In the 1930s and 1940s American sociologists abandoned those early all-encompassing theories of social change in a burst of healthy skepticism directed against what they contemptuously called armchair theory and cosmic system building. Unhappily this left sociologists of the 1950s and 1960s watching the world prepare its own thermo-nuclear funeral pyre and the United States corrupting its idealism in Viet Nam while they fiddled away the falling years dabbling in a trivial social psychology. Today there are a few signs of efforts to revive interest in the dynamic analysis of large societies, institutions, and communities. New models are clearly needed and it is to this end that I offer the following.

I believe that analysis of social change would be facilitated if certain concepts --- notably institutions and social movements --- were clarified and elaborated, and certain others --- such as social class --- were de-emphasized.

(1) Institutional Sectors.

Within large societies characterized by extensive formal structure there are institutions, or what might more accurately be designated as institutional sectors. The latter puts emphasis upon the fact that institutions are not generally single discrete organizations but rather a category of informal and formal organizations which satisfy specific functional prerequisites of society. Here is one way of defining six institutional sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institutional Sector</th>
<th>The Functional Prerequisites</th>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familial Sector</td>
<td>Insure continuity of the society through maintenance of the population.</td>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Sector</td>
<td>Produce and distribute goods and services and provide an effective division and specialization of labor.</td>
<td>Economic units of all kinds; manufacturing and distributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Sector</td>
<td>Maintain order, resolve internal conflict, and provide coordination and control throughout the society.</td>
<td>Public Governments: Federal, State, County and Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Sector</td>
<td>Provide internal cohesion and unity and a rationale for the value system of the society.</td>
<td>Churches, Denominations, Sects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Sector</td>
<td>Protect the boundaries of the society from external attack and so insure perpetuation of territoriality.</td>
<td>Armed Forces, National Guard, Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Sector</td>
<td>Insure preservation and transmission of the culture.</td>
<td>Schools: Public and Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each of the institutional sectors of a complex society there are levels of institutionalization which are determined by the extent or degree of integration and centralization. This should be thought of as a continuum ranging from a low level of institutionalization to a high one according to the degree of integration and centralization of the formal or informal organizations that make up the sector. By integration is meant the degree to which a change in one element of a system results in a change in the others. If the elements that make up a
social system are so related or intercoupled that a change in one causes a change in most of the others, and in the properties of the entire system as a whole, then the system is highly integrated. If even a relatively small change in one subsystem characteristically plays a dominant role in the changes that reverberate throughout the intercoupled system, then that subsystem may be said to be dominant and the total system to be centralized. An analysis of the dominant or leading subsystem should therefore play a major role in the interpretation, understanding, and prediction of changes in the total system. Sequential changes in dominance occur as the entire system changes and develops. This is true both within a single institutional sector and the total society.

The family is an example of an institutional sector at the lowest level of institutionalization in modern industrial society. It is made up of a vast number of tiny informal structures which are largely independent of each other, although not necessarily of other elements within the society. Within the family sector there is virtually no integration, centralization, or dominance whatsoever. No one, or even a few of the 50 to 60 million families in the United States dominate the institutional sector of the family. The situation was quite different in Medici Florence when a few large families controlled the entire Republic.

In the case of the political sector the situation is very different; here one finds a high level of institutionalization in the modern national state. There are only about 38,000 governments (Federal, state, and local) in the United States of America. Integration and centralization are high with the Federal government clearly dominant within the entire political sector. There is even more integration and centralization in the U.S.S.R.

An intermediate case can be observed in the religious sector. There are approximately 200,000 church congregations distributed among 260 independent denominations within the American religious structure. No one of these dominates the total sector. Integration of the denominations and in some cases even congregations within a denomination is low. The situation in Catholic Spain, of course, is quite different.

The educational sector in the United States, with approximately 136,000 schools would be another example of an institutional sector at the intermediate level of institutionalization. A process of integration and centralization within the educational sector is under way within some states, especially in California and New York, although little of this can yet be discerned at the interstate level.

The formal and informal organizations within each institutional sector, whether few or numerous, are self-organizing, purposeful, and decision making. They have objective structures and boundaries with inputs and outputs to and from the environment which are regulated by feedback of information. They are open systems which maintain themselves by exchanging both materials and information with their environment.

(2) Steady States and Ultrastability. Like all open systems they must maintain a certain internal balance which is called a steady state. In order for the organizations within an institutional sector to survive, adapt, learn, or grow, specific internal conditions must be kept within certain limits. A state of evolutionary adaptation is by definition a steady state. But there is more than simple stability involved. Adjustment to radical environmental changes, or to quantitative internal changes deriving from the process of internal growth may preclude maintenance of the original steady state. The systems must, under such circumstances, either disintegrate or else so alter their internal structure that they can operate within new ranges and interrelations of their own crucial "metabolic" variables.

This capacity to adapt has been called ultrastability by W.R. Ashby. Ultrastability is the capacity on the part of a system to hunt a new steady state which will work under changed internal or external conditions, and to do all of this under its own internal mechanism of control. In large societies the most important two such mechanisms of evolutionary and revolutionary change are the decision-making apparatus of the controlling formal organizations that make up the dominant institutional sectors, and the major social movements on the scene. These give the larger societies their capacity for self-correcting and learning adaptations through conscious innovations. At this point let me emphasize that the dominant institutional sector is not always the economic or the political; it may be religious or military.

(3) Three Kinds of Social Change. Levels of institutionalization have some very critical implications for rates of change exhibited within institutional sectors and by the entire society. When there is a high level of institutionalization in a given sector so that it forms in effect a single integrated subsystem, change can be rapid. When the institutional sector is highly centralized institutional change can also be deliberate, the consequences of innovation by a dominant formal organization as, for example, a program of Federal reform. This is an example of the kind of innovating change in non-reproducing organizations discussed earlier.

At the other extreme, where there is a very low degree of institutionalization, change is slow, the result of evolutionary drift on the part of a large number of relatively independent elements. Deliberate innovation on the part of one element can have no immediate effect on the entire system. The family sector in American society, being neither integrated nor centralized, can hardly innovate; it can only evolve gradually unless pushed hard by changes from other institutional sectors. This is an example of evolutionary change in reproducing organizations. Such evolutionary change is the result of common pressures on the multiplicity of tiny units as a result of their individual couplings to the other institutional sectors of the larger social system, especially to the leading sector or sectors. Such changes necessarily proceed quite slowly.

In the case of mixed systems with compound change the total system will show both a drift-like evolutionary change, with environmental selection determining the direction of the drift, as well as a more rapid and deliberate process of change that will be the result of innovations on the part of the leading subsystems within the institutional sector. This is an example of compound change in a mixed system.

(4) The Leading Sector. In an institutionally differentiated society one institutional sector, or a coalition of sectors, will more or less dominate the entire society. The trajectory of change characteristic of the entire society will be a consequence to a very great degree of the properties and changes of this leading institutional sector or sectors. This is what past writers have been getting at in their classifications of societies as industrial, military, or religious. Here are three examples: The United States during the period of rapid industrialization during the 19th century; 3rd century Imperial Rome under the control of the military; and Medieval Europe, especially during the 12th and 13th centuries. I suggest further that the more highly institutionalized a sector is, that is both integrated and centralized, the more likely that it will be a dominant sector within the society.

At this point it is well to note the bearing of all this on Marx's conception of economic determinism. Part of the debate over the validity of economic determinism has resulted from the fact that Marx really dealt with two kinds of economic influence, but lumped them together because his conceptual system did not invite their differentiation. With this conceptual scheme differentiation becomes relatively simple.

One source of economic influence is seen to be cultural, that is to say, it is manifested through the habits, values, and ideas of individuals. This is what Marx had in mind when he discusses the fact that the petit bourgeoisie quite naturally generalized from their economic experience and assumed a petit bourgeois attitude toward life in general. In this sense there is an economic influence on the individual members of a society even though there may not be a highly institutionalized economy. This form of economic influence simply consists of individuals being influenced by their daily economic activities, and thereby conducting their other activities in a way that reflects these experiences. Failure to see that this type of economic influence is essentially cultural has given a metaphysical character to much of the Marxists' claim for economic determinism, since the Marxists seem to be claiming that organized economic forces dominated past historical epochs in which there was very little formal and centralized economic organization at all. The way medieval men and women worked, whether serfs, freemen or fighters, did influence their values and beliefs, but medieval economic organizations (mostly agricultural manors) did not dominate the society, the church did.

The second type of economic influence is the impact an organized institutional sector has on the other institutional sectors. Here, when we speak of economic influence, we are speaking not of the cultural impact of economic experience on the beliefs and actions of individuals, but of the economic organizations exeriencing a direct effect upon the other organizations of the society. This form of economic influence becomes dominant only when the economic sector is differentiated from the others and is sufficiently institutionalized, that is, integrated and centralized, so as to be able to determine directly much of the internal functioning of the other sectors, and hence of the whole society. United States industrial corporations
were able to and did dominate the economy and most of the nation between 1900 and the Great Depression.

When the question is raised of whether or not economic determinism is valid, of whether or not it is true to say that economic factors are the most influential in society, the answer depends in part on what type of influence is being considered. In modern industrial societies the cultural influence of the economy is on the decline because people spend less of their lives acting within the strictly economic sector. In the affluent society of the future (if industrial society survives to develop it) where economic needs and wishes may be satisfied without much productive effort, other aspects of life, such as education, might take on the leading cultural role formerly occupied by economic activity and the family. However, in the past the cultural impact of economic experience has generally been a decisive influence on the modal personality type, the pattern of culture, and on the general nature of the social system, if for no other reason than because economic activities preempted most of people's time and energy.

Regarding the second type of economic influence, the claim of economic determinism is that the economic institution has always dominated other institutions in all societies. This claim would seem clearly to be false since the economic sector has by no means always been sufficiently differentiated, integrated, and centralized to exert a predominant direct influence on the other institutional sectors. In our own civilization other institutional sectors, for example the religious during the Middle Ages, have rather clearly been dominant at different points in history.

(5) Social Movements - Not Social Classes, Bring About Massive Change.

Social movements are formal organizations, and thus are part of the total social system; but they exist in a certain sense outside of the institutional system. As a matter of fact in many instances the social movement may be a kind of "shadow" institution which contains within it the seeds of an alternative institutional organization. It may start out as a despised shadow government and become the government. Christianity began as an obscure mystery cult and by the 4th century was the only official and legal religion of the Roman Empire. Tito formed his shadow government in a cave on the island of Vis and eventually moved it as the official government of all Yugoslavia to Belgrade. The social movement, unlike the other

formal organizations within the various institutional sectors, has as a specific goal the more or less radical transformation of some aspect of the society. Its purpose or goal is social change. Christianity sought to change Rome radically. The Benedictines sought to change the church, and so did the Franciscans, the Lutherans, and the Quakers. The goal of Lenin's Bolsheviks was to accelerate the pace of all change so as to transform Russia radically and progressively. Mao's shadowy movement has changed China.

Social change, when it is merely quantitative or additive can proceed within the institutional structure. Drift and innovation do occur, although within certain defined limits set by the internal structure and culture of the total system. I suggest, however, that when there is qualitative or structural change there will generally, if not always, be a social movement acting as the decisive agent of change. It is the means by which the qualitative leap is achieved. The existing institutional structure is resistant to change because as a functioning open system it must maintain a certain equilibrium, and the social movement is thus the only means by which one institutional system of organization can be organized to replace another. As an example, recall the whole history of the Protestant Reformation and the response of the church through the Counter Reformation and the Jesuit movement. If in the process of this qualitative or structural transformation the society maintains its identity and continuity it would be called ultra-stable. The English maintained their unity and identity through both the civil war of Cromwell and the Glorious Revolution. That is ultra-stability.

To see more clearly the role of social movements in institutional change, let me again refer to Marx. The fashionable denunciations of Marxist theory generally stress the fact that Marxist class analysis is simply not true for modern industrial society. It is perhaps unfortunate that Marx, and above all the Marxists, laid such great emphasis on the idea that the sine qua non of a Marxist approach is the analysis of social change in terms of the conflict of social classes. One thinks there of the parallel situation within Freudianism wherein

a last ditch defense of instinct theory, mistakenly viewed as Freud's greatest contribution, nearly led to the abandonment of the entire system of thought.

In the case of Marxism it is obvious to the contemporary observer not blinded by a religious commitment to Marxian ideology that classes and class conflict are not the modus operandi of social change. The concept of social movement as the agent of change is far more useful because it fits the facts of history. When classes have directly influenced history, it has always seemed to be the case that the class influence came to be manifested through a social movement. In such a case members of the class, or some portion of it, became organized into a movement that effected social change, but it is the movement and not the class that is the decisive agent of change. Similarly social conflict occurs between a social movement and the organizations within one or more institutional sectors, or between rival social movements, not between classes as such. This explains why often, in spite of objective class interests, there is no organized resistance to exploitation. Social conditions simply may not be propitious for the organization of some members of a class into a social movement. The differences in the recent history of Bolivia and Paraguay, Spain and Portugal, illustrate the point.

CONCLUSION

This institutional model lends itself rather well to the graphic representation of social systems through input-output tables. Using these tables, the organizations of a small community or an entire society can be mapped into definable sectors. When this is done over a period of time, different kinds of social change can be pinpointed. Moreover, they seem to fit both small communities and large societies over short and long periods of their history. One of the greatest appeals of the Marxist system has been its heuristic utility. Whatever its shortcomings, Marxism nevertheless provided a holistic view of society and turned our attention to a host of important facts. The present system has the same utility but without two of the principal conceptual difficulties inherent in Marxism.

In the long run, however, this is insufficient justification for any approach, for without supporting research heuristic utility may only indicate consistency with unexamined preconceptions. Research applications must determine the full scientific value of any theoretical system and I hope that some of you will try to utilize the concepts of institutional sector, dominance, and social movement in your research on the history of your community.

As I have said earlier, the invitation to apply, test, modify, or discard the institutional model is meant very seriously. Before I sketch a few research strategies, and I expect my readers to invent many more, let me summarize the principle argument of this chapter.

If, you take nothing but a structural-functional model into the field for your community study project, then you will notice, describe, and analyze many of the mechanisms that tend to stabilize your community. You will find out a lot about how the present system maintains its present shape. You will not be directed by your guiding model to notice, describe, and analyze the way in which the community got to be what it is and you will not be able to predict the type, direction, or rate of future change. You will ignore history and be puzzled by class conflict.

If, you take nothing but a Marxian class-conflict model to your community, then you will pay a lot of attention to technological change, changes in the relations of production (i.e., ownership and control), and class conflict. You will be sensitized to conflict between capitalists and workers but will be puzzled by stability, and by resistance to change on the part of non-capitalists. More importantly, there may not be any capitalists or workers, as defined by Marxists, within a hundred miles of your community. How many capitalists or industrial workers are there in Stinking Creek? The class-conflict model may be useful in helping you think about the past history of your nation but not of much help with its future. It will not help with Stinking Creek or Fontamara at all.

If, you take the institutional model into the field then you will notice, describe, and analyze stabilizing mechanism, sources of change other than technology and class conflict, and various kinds of dominance other than economic, if
such exist, or did so in the past. You should be able to discriminate between different kinds of social change and hazard forecasts and predictions about the future of the community.

Clearly one does not have to become the exclusive partisan of one or the other of these theoretical systems. These are scientific tools, not ideologies. Use them all, tentatively, until you begin to get results that tell you something about the relative explanatory, heuristic, and predictive usefulness of these models.

To test your new-won grasp of a lot of social theory I want you to read and discuss a little story about recent events in the village of Neuflize, France. As you read and discuss it you will find yourself understanding it, making sense of it, tying it to old and new ideas as an example of this or that. Now ask yourself just what particular metaphors and ideas, concepts and models are you using to figure out the story of Neuflize.

Are you thinking about or noticing, changes in technology, social relations, class, and ideology? Are you thinking like a Marxist? Are you intrigued by the stability of the social arrangements that make up a village like Neuflize? Did you catch yourself figuring out how that stability was maintained for so long? Are you thinking like a functionalist? Did you find yourself thinking about the self-conscious way the community undertook to do some new and non-traditional things in an effort to survive through change? Are you thinking like an institutionalist? How many of the concepts and ideas that you have just learned helped you see more and understand more than you could before your project began?

WHAT 145 WORKERS DID WHEN THE MILL CLOSED

Since 1870, three wars have been fought around the southern Ardennes village of Neuflize, 120 miles northeast of Paris, but none has changed the community's life as deeply as the closure of the only industry, a textile mill, in January.

1Those of you who would like to do more theoretical reading along the lines Snell Putney and I have developed in these last pages should read the titles listed in the Cumulative Bibliography by W.R. Ashby, L. von Bertalanffy, K.E. Boulding, K. Deutsch, W.M. Leontief, and R.L. Meier.

2International Herald Tribune

For more than a hundred years the villagers had been fed and clothed in an atmosphere of paternalism by mill owners whose ideas had remained in the 19th century. Since trade union membership resulted in dismissal, the 145 workers had little to say about their future.

Now, eight months after the closure, the workers have taken a lead in a 20th century industrial revolution, buying the bankrupt mill and putting it back into production as worker-shareholders.

"It feels like we have just caught up with 1789," the administrative director, Michel Lammens, said. "Before January my ambitions were limited to my wife, my house, and my dog. The nearest I got to making myself felt around here was to tell the mill owner that I was going to vote Socialist in the presidential elections. He was an arch-Gaullist and that was sacrilege."

Mr. Lammens, an accountant under the old regime, is now a member of the four-man board running a 24-million-franc-a-year industry which accounts for 1 per cent of France's textile production. But this time his "boss" is the shareholders' committee representing every family in this village of 540 along with the mayor, the priest, the shopkeepers and farmers.

All together there are about 350 shareholders, with an average stake of about 2,000 francs in the company's capital of 700,000 francs. All of it was collected at fund-raising meetings and door-to-door campaigns while the 145 workers put in between two and three months of their severence pay.

The only man in the village who is not welcome is the former owner, Emile Lepoutre, a member of one of France's most famous textile families, who took over the factory just after World War II.

The parish priest, the Abbé Leblanc, who runs a parish only 10 miles from where he was born 62 years ago, had a running battle with Mr. Lepoutre for 11 years in an attempt to persuade him to modify his paternalism.

"There were many things to admire in Mr. Lepotre," the abbé said. "It was just that he could not live in his time. He paid his workers over the usual scale and financed the building of their houses but used to tremble with anger if I suggested he should allow them some say in their own affairs. A government inspector had to order him to agree to setting up a workers' factory committee just before the place went bankrupt and even then he found men to vote against it."
"As far as Mr. Lepoutre was concerned, there was only one ruler in Neuflize and he thought he could command even in church," the priest said. "He was an extremely pious man and brought up his children with rigid views -- not least that they were predestined to run the mill where his eldest son was already second in command."

"Once he told me during mass to expel a boy with medium-length hair whom I had chosen to read the Epistle. He walked out of mass that time with his nine children and, eventually, after a few more rows in public, went to mass in another parish."

The priest, a peasant's son who has rebuilt his 17th-century church by hand, preached a mild form of socialism from his pulpit. One effect was that Neuflize is the only village in the southern Ardennes, one of the bastions of Gaullism, which votes for the Socialist party.

When the blow came in January and the mill shut down 7 million francs in debt, the priest was one of several persons who gradually led the village toward a solution.

In all, about 200 French factories are occupied by their workers -- 100,000 according to union estimates -- following bankruptcies and large-scale dismissal programs. Some of them have been set on their feet following government assistance but usually only after militant action by Communist and Socialist-led trade unions.

At Neuflize, isolated and surrounded by beet and corn fields for 10 miles, union and political activity is at a low level. The paternalistic mill ownership led to faith in both government and history -- justified by such events as the Liberation in 1944.

Both Communist-led trade unions and idealistic political organizations descended on Neuflize, judging it as a perfect test case for worker-management or cooperative plans. The fact that nearly every family in the village has a worker at the mill, that most were middle-aged and unlikely to go elsewhere, and that there were no immigrant workers, provided the base for solidarity.

But the abbé, despite his socialist leanings, preached strongly against the violence implicit in some of the campaigns being planned and his influence was strong enough in the village to rout the militants.
workers in their door-to-door campaign to raise funds.

He is now the company vice-chairman and by far the most authoritative voice in the casual management meetings, with interested staff members drifting in and out to throw in a word.

The local Gaullist deputy, Lucien Meunier, another shareholder, also played a key role. The French government, trying to cope with nearly 900,000 unemployed, gave the Neuflize factory short shrift when it first asked for aid.

But Mr. Meunier is a very close associate of Prime Minister Jacques Chirac and warned him in June that the patient workers were ready to turn to violence. After collecting the 700,000 francs capital which the government had set as a target for loans, the workers found that state funds and banks refused to help.

Only help at the highest level assured that the company could start production this month.

Many of the Neuflize workers are not yet sure of what they have done. Some may feel that they have just bought their jobs back while others must feel they have been out shopping for new bosses. Many of the villagers, including an old widow who gave a month's pension, probably saw the take-over collection as another form of charity.

Even Abbé Leblanc, who contributed about 10,000 francs, the money that he had saved for a new car, said that he did not expect to get anything back.

Mr. Semkow, who feels under moral obligation to make the mill profitable, is certain that the experiment will work.

"The community is too tight to tolerate slackers," he said. "I'm sure everyone knows whose money is really at stake. If nothing else makes this thing go, we can always fall back on that final motivation --- greed."

RESEARCH STRATEGIES

Earlier I suggested that the abandonment of the study of whole societies and their transformations constituted the abandonment of the original task of sociology itself. For those who agree with me the task at hand is one of re-establishing sociology, if not all of the social sciences, as a study directly relevant to the understanding of the rise and fall, the development and transformation of communities, institutions, entire societies, and civilizations. It is a question of whether sociology is to be capable of dealing with the central issues and interests of modern man, or whether it is to continue its present retreat into theoretical obfuscation and empirical trivialities. I have sketched the rough outlines of a theory of society, seen as a changing, open system as an initial contribution to this task. But there still remains the work of determining the general usefulness of this approach through the study of actual communities and societies. That being the case, how rigorous and mathematical should your research be? That depends. If you are doing the short two week project you will not have time to do any exact social science. Even those with ten full weeks to do a thorough case study should probably not try to master many of the details of social survey research, quantitative methods, and mathematical models. But if you are using this handbook as a guide for a year long effort then some of you should give the mathematical branches and quantitative methods of the social sciences a whirl.

The sensitizing utility of a conceptual system is of prime importance to academic sociology, yet despite this fact it is rarely considered legitimate. Much of what the poet says is founded on systematic observations of the human experience and almost no actual research could actually be said to fulfill all criteria of the scientific method. Quite evidently, there is a large middle range. Significantly, the sociological research which has been most read by other sociologists as well as by laymen falls in this range. The works of C. Wright Mills and David Riesman are cases in point. The Power Elite and The Lonely Crowd are among the few sociological works which one sociologist can safely assume another sociologist will know and recognize (and may even have read!). They are among the few serious sociological studies ever to achieve wide circulation among laymen since the great defection from sociology in the 1930s. Yet these books are clearly neither poetry nor science in any rigorous sense of either term. They embody research findings, and an effort at conceptual parsimony and rigor; but they also generalize beyond their data, or more properly, extend their generalizations into regions where their data are exceedingly thin. Somewhere between poetry and science, they are appropriate milestones for a discipline in sociology's present stage of development.

My plea, which is directed to professional social scientists, is for recognition, legitimatization, and systematic exploration of this intermediate range of scientific method. Far too little attention has been paid to the problem of
how to be creative, sensible and objective when the requirements of the scientific method are partially but not wholly fulfilled. Most of the research called for in this handbook must necessarily fall in this middle area for some time to come. To be more specific, here is a list of research strategies that indicate a few of the kinds of things that might be done.

(1) The case study method. Research proceeds from one case to another. Each effort is interdisciplinary because it strives to be a complete investigation of all the many interrelated aspects of the whole. After several cases have been described and analyzed a comparative study of comparable cases becomes possible. Because of its broad focus on the whole system this research strategy appeals to those who seek some unifying principle, a kind of "field" theory to help order and explain the variety of actions and actors that make up a human community. This is the method urged most frequently throughout this handbook. It is an unabashedly qualitative approach but the institutional model I have explained can be used in either qualitative or quantitative research. Some of the suggestions I make in the next few pages would lead to mathematical statements of theory and the collection of numerical data. For those of you who are spending eight to ten weeks with a very small community my firm advice is to study your one case without worrying your head about mathematical and statistical finesse.

However, a year-long project will give you more scope so here are some additional research strategies. Parts of some of them can be incorporated into a ten-week case study so I want each of you to read this entire section.

(2) Comparative institutional studies. We need descriptive and analytical studies of specific institutional sectors. Here again some excellent work has already been done but with the exception of the family and religion most institutional studies have been carried out by non-sociologists. Comparative political systems, comparative economic systems, and comparative military systems are studied by political scientists, economists and historians, respectively.

Obviously, there is a jurisdictional problem here. Nevertheless, if there is to be a broad sociological analysis of institutions the sociologist is going to have to trace their history and their interrelations, and he is going to have to delineate and compare institutional systems. Someday soon I hope to see many studies of comparative economic systems published by sociologists, but these will need to be richer than those that have appeared to date. A wholistic perspective is essential to an understanding of the full range of critical differences and similarities in the development and functioning of two economies, or two communities, or two societies. You can make your contribution by paying special attention to the institutional dimensions of your small community.

(3) Cultural value analysis by institutional sector. Another broad research strategy for an institutional approach to social change is the analysis of cultural values and ideology. Social change is partially a function of the ideological elements of the culture that either support or inhibit change. Each institutional sector has its own value system, its own general program (culture) that is more or less integrated into the ideological system of the whole society. The rate of change specific to any one institutional sector will be a function of the interaction of these two systems of values. An analysis of institutional value systems must precede any attempt to forecast the direction of structural differentiation for individual sectors and the total society.

A fine example of this kind of research is The American Business Creed, by Francis X. Sutton, Seymour E. Harris, Carl Kaysen, and James Tobin. What is needed is a spate of similar studies covering the ideological or value systems of American military men, American politicians, members of the American clergy, and America's educators. In addition there should be similar research on the institutional value systems of small communities within the United States. Content analysis is a promising research tool that too often has been used on problems of limited interest and theoretical significance. Think about using it on the newspaper published in or near the community you are going to study.

(4) Mapping structure and flow. Graphic representations of institutional sectors and their interconnecting flows of messages, material, and services will help you notice and interpret events and relationships heretofore ignored. If the community or society is diagrammed as a system, the direct and indirect consequences of any given input may be traced throughout the entire community or society and the relative impact of a particular event may be weighed in a gross sort of way. This type of analysis assists the investigator in determining institutional dominance and the sources and sinks of influence and power. If the response of the total system to external events, as revealed by tracing the manifold consequences of such inputs, is found to be determined by a single institution, or a coalition of two or more institutions, then that institution or coalition is
dominant. The difficulty with the diagrammatic approach to institutional inter- 
action is that it becomes hopelessly unwieldy and cluttered with the introduction 
of any detail at all. This difficulty can be circumvented if institutional inter-
action is presented in the form of an input-output table.

(5) Input-output analysis. Some of the disadvantages of graphic representa-
tion can be overcome if the inputs and outputs of the institutional sectors are 
entered in an input-output table.\(^1\) The horizontal rows of figures designate the 
output of goods and services from each institutional sector to every other sector. 
The vertical columns show in turn what each sector receives from the others. The 
more integration the fewer the empty cells, until the limiting case is reached 
in which the output of each institutional sector is found to be an input to some 
other sector. This kind of table reveals the structure of a society integrated 
by flows of all kinds of goods and services from automobiles and hymnals to na-
tional security and the adjudication of civil disputes. It should also reveal 
clues about the vetoes each unit or sector exercises over others in the system.

1 I am indebted here to the pioneering work of W.W. Leontief (1951) in developing 
input-output analysis. However, the much cruder picture which would be provided 
by an institutional input-output table may be closer to what the economist calls 
aggregate analysis. Input-output analysis, whether quantitative or qualitative, 
is a tool which, by focusing on the information and materials flows between sub-
systems, gives a demonstration of the degree of integration.

The construction of such tables by sociologists, for both interinstitutional 
and intrastitutional analysis, raises a very difficult problem; that of obtaining 
the necessary kind of data. The values entered in the cells of an input-output 
table must be fully comparable if any kind of mathematical computations are to be 
carried out. How does the investigator obtain a value for the out-put of religious 
services to the familial sector of the social system? American families pay lots 
of dollars each year for religious services. Is this the value one is to use? 
The only answer at present is to proceed experimentally with the construction of 
such tables and the search for appropriate data so as to test, first their heuris-
tic value, and then their analytical power, and ultimately their measurement func-
tion.

If successful, such input-output tables would reveal both indirect and direct 
relationships between interdependent institutional subsystems and would anchor 
our analysis in the gross organizational structure of the total society. I am 
sure that even now changes throughout the total system could be predicted as the 
direct and indirect consequences of a change in the dominant institutional sector. 
If we had comparable data to work with this kind of analysis could be carried out 
from any starting point in the institutional matrix with the relationships them-
selves expressed as ratios or coefficients of inputs to outputs. Such ratios are 
determined by technology, culture and institutional factors, and as such they are 
subject to changes in technology, culture and institutional arrangements. In the 
short run, however, these determinants should remain relatively stable thus allow-
ing short run extrapolations. The development of dynamic input-output analysis 
employing systems of linear differential equations is under way in economics. 
Similar experimental work in sociology, though promising, will have to wait upon 
the solution of the problem of comparable data. If carried out, these experi-
ments in input-output analysis could provide sociologists with a new approach to 
the concept of structural integration. Perhaps the place to start is with the 
study and analysis of small communities.

(6) Short run and long run prediction. If social systems change both quan-
titatively and qualitatively, and if periodic qualitative reorganization is essen-
tial to long run growth and survival, then these facts carry certain fundamental 
implications for the prediction of the rate and direction of social change. Short
run extrapolations within a period of predominantly quantitative change should prove to be relatively easy. Both rates of change and the direction of change, within an institutional sector, and for the society as a whole, should not be utterly beyond the powers of contemporary analysis. It is true that on occasion such efforts have proved disastrous, as in the case of the demographic projections of Warren S. Thompson and P.K. Whelpton in 1943.¹ On the other hand, the very ambitious projections of Fortune made in 1958 and 1959 were not to be too wide of the mark by 1970 because, and this is a critical qualification, the assumptions of structural stability made by the writers of Fortune in 1958 were not disastrously upset. However, the aftermath of Viet Nam and recent changes in the politics of the mid-Eastern oil producing states are likely to upset predictions for 1980.

What sociologists seem to be up against is a fundamental difficulty in the prediction of change rates and direction across and beyond a significant qualitative shift in the structure of society. The structural changes of the New Deal and the war years invalidated the predictions of the demographers and just about every other scholar who had ventured projections about the 1950s based upon the trends of the 1930s. How much more difficult is the task of predicting the tempo and trajectory of social development beyond such transformations of structure and ideology as those that follow real social revolutions. What was there in the Cuban system of the 1940s and 1950s that would enable the sociologist to predict Fidel Castro's social movement and the Cuban society of the 1960s and 1970s? Crane Brinton lists the symptoms of revolution, and Hornell Hart has plotted what he calls logistic surges in growth rates; but what lies beyond the revolution? The Marxists have an answer based in religious faith that allows them to interpolate a series of stages from any point in history to the end product of evolutionary development. Their critics have little difficulty in pointing to the discrepancy between all revolutionary prophecies and the end results, Christianity and Communism not excepted. Marx's predictions were almost always wrong and his followers have not done much better.

¹Their prediction, that the population of the United States would stabilize at 170 million around 1970.
(3) A system which is growing, but which is not undergoing radical, qualitative change in its internal structure, will show a nonproportional growth rate in its existing control components, for example, in all the "governments" within all of the institutional sectors of a community. This proposition was derived from the following corollaries of the propositions already enumerated: First, growth always requires compensatory nonproportional change in the relative magnitudes of its component parts; and second, the growth of any structure runs into limits set by the requirements of effective control.

Is the "administration" or the governmental component of your community increasing in size at a more rapid rate than the other components? Look for and measure bureaucratic growth. Is it proportional or nonproportional?

(4) As a society becomes increasingly affluent, the cultural impact of economic experiences on personality will diminish relative to other influences.

In your very small community, how important is formal education in shaping personality? How will you measure affluence? Is your community affluent? Will it ever be affluent enough for this process to become manifest?

(5) All instances of the influence of social classes upon social systems will be found to be one of two types: (a) cultural influences manifested through the tendency of economic position to program individuals and thereby influence their actions in the statuses which they occupy, or (b) the organization of members of the class into a social movement which becomes a formal organization seeking new objectives. These propositions suggest tests of two aspects of the nature of economic and class influences on culture, personality, and society.

First ask how the job, how a person's work, influences his or her attitudes, values, and beliefs. You should also ask whether or not there was or is any class conflict in your community. How does it manifest itself?

(6) Radical and rapid structural change in a social institution may occur through the organizations of the sector manifesting the capacity for ultrastability or through the destruction and replacement of those organizations, but in either case an attack by a social movement will play a critical role in initiating the change. This hypothesis is derived from my assumptions concerning the role of social movements in institutional and social transformations.

You should ask about organized labor and especially the I.W.W. Has any movement like the I.W.W. ever been active in the community? What about religious cults in the history of the community?

(7) The higher the level of institutionalization the more probable it becomes that social movements will induce qualitative change in the institutional structure. This follows from the assumption that more integration and centralization of control makes possible goal oriented change, whether through reform or revolution.

These general propositions are meant to be illustrative and suggestive. No attempt will be made here to derive operational statements, that is, testable hypotheses, for use in your community study project. That is up to each of you. But I would like to repeat that what is needed is a great deal of critical and creative work on the part of many social scientists and their students who I hope will become intrigued by the prospects and difficulties of the analysis of social change. In the long run this must be a cooperative venture exploiting a variety of theoretical models and research strategies. The outcome will be especially dependent upon the individual labors of hard working, imaginative students. It is in their hands that the future course of American social science properly rests.

You have finished the theoretical section of this Handbook. The final chapters are designed to help you get out into the field and back again. I do not want you to drive to your little community, get out of the car, look at each other and ask, "Now what do we do?" Think of what follows as a host of helpful hints about the logistics of getting in touch with a community, probing, pulling, following good leads, and finally getting a feel for the whole warp and woof of it. Finally, there will be suggestions on how to present a complete picture of a complete social system.
CHAPTER 5

THE FUN STARTS: THE FIRST VISIT

The first visit you make to the community you have selected for your project is a visit to get the feel of the place. You are going to catch a first glimpse of your town, soak up first impressions of its character, and try to sense its unique ambience. Do not interview anyone in the community on your first visit. I do not mean that you are to be surly and impolite; I do mean no formal interviews. I know that must sound like an odd first rule so let me explain why it really is important. Most of us do not know how to use our eyes and most of us have no way of knowing how much we could figure out about a place just using our eyes. So I want you to learn by roaming the streets of the town with your eyes open. Be aware and stretch all of your senses. Look at and think about things, little things that ordinarily you would ignore, or not ask about. Take pictures, lots of them, but discreetly of course. Jot impressions down in your notebook and sketch it. Above all else, look about you. Be curious about everything without being embarrassed by your curiosity or the fun you are having trying to figure things out.

Make a list of things that attract your attention from the big obvious stuff to the unexpected, unobtrusive little bits of things that escape the ordinary observer; road signs, architectural details, the barber pole, beer signs, gutters, old men, dogs, children, shoes, socks, cars, the size of the Pentecostal Church, power lines, a flag pole, the dump, and rusting car bodies. Start making lists of questions that you are sure you cannot possibly answer just by looking. Here, to get you started, is a check list of some of the important things you should cover. Remember, this is to get you started thinking and listening. You will want to add lots of questions, some derived from the theoretical scheme that appeals to you, and some that will suggest themselves to you during the excitement of your first visit.
Checksheet for the First Visit

Have you
1. Found or made a map?
2. Walked the entire community with your camera?
3. Visited the cemetery?
4. Checked county records at the county courthouse?
5. Located the newspaper that covers your community?
6. Described the natural environment, i.e., soil and vegetation, mineral or timber resources?
7. Identified the architectural style of the buildings?
8. Looked for historical cues such as dated cornerstones?
9. Figured out the ethnic composition of the community?
10. Developed a tentative demographic history from the dates on gravestones?
11. Estimated class membership?
12. Counted and classified businesses that are open and those that are closed?
13. Found the places people work?
14. Looked for evidence of some kind of formal government?
15. Watched for evidence of informal power and influence?
16. Counted and classified the churches?
17. Watched for religious activity?
18. Located the school and watched the children and teachers?
19. Looked for evidence of stability and change?
20. Written lots in your notebook?

You Must Start Writing

The study of a community requires three kinds of hard intellectual work; reading, fieldwork, and writing --- lots of writing. Unless you are willing to write continuously throughout the project you cannot expect to put much into it or learn much from it.

There is a simple reason for a heavy emphasis on writing. Neither you, nor your team can sift your impressions, articulate your insights, or present your conclusions in any clear and orderly way unless you do a lot of writing. You simply cannot do the kind of thinking required by a systematic case study without writing. You are going to have to write to organize your own mind and to do creative research. All of you will have to write clearly and effectively to keep in touch with each other and to pool your queries, hunches, and discoveries. Finally, I want you to get ready to work hard at writing a final report that will evoke clear images of your community in the minds of your readers and persuade and convince those who have never been there of the truth of your discoveries.

Do the drivers, photographers, talkers, and listeners on your team have to write a lot too? Yes, everyone needs to write; teachers too! I do not think anyone who is a member of a literate society knows anything well if they cannot say and write it well. How many people have you known who can figure out anything complex and difficult and communicate it without writing? Reading, talking, and writing are all integral parts of the thinking process of any literate person once he moves away from the superficial and banal in order to attack something tough and complicated. When I say get to work writing early in your project I am simply saying start thinking early, get committed early.

Silone, Orwell, Fetterman, Conant, Marx and Levi will fill your minds and conversations with new and conflicting ideas; your first eyes-wide, ears-open visit to a tiny community should flood your senses with new images and impressions. You will want to absorb a lot fast, and then start working your way through the confusion as soon as possible, so do not put off writing until the last week. Start reacting and thinking on paper during the first week of the project. Those doing the short version should start writing the first day and write every succeeding day thereafter.
Some of you are frightened of writing. Writing has always been distasteful to you, and hard work. Blank paper congeals your mind, blocks your hand, and remains blank. Or if you have forced yourself to do the English teacher's assignments, your best writing was usually returned marked in red, "forced and awkward". But do not panic if you have not written much, or are afraid of writing. Use this project to learn how to write more easily and to discover how to get your own voice down on paper. Take this opportunity to learn to think clearly on paper.

So here as a bonus is a writing program built right into your community study project. It has three parts: (1) two books that you will read and use; (2) a notebook that will become a part of your life for the duration of the project; and, (3) a grand report, whether a short study, play, magazine article, illustrated lecture, or a research paper. I will discuss the first two parts here --- Chapter 7 is all about the final report.

(1) The Two Books

First read Peter Elbow's *Writing Without Teachers*, saving Sheridan Baker, *The Practical Stylist* for the moment you start rewriting and editing. Use the Elbow book selectively, but use it, and that means that you must organize yourselves into reaction groups in which you will read some of the stuff you have written while insisting on totally honest gut-level responses. The group is absolutely essential because you must learn to write for a real audience and you must find out what your writing really does to people. If your writing confuses, or bores, or irritates beyond endurance, you have got to find that out and try to figure out why, and then figure out what you want to do about it. Writing for real people, listening to what your writing actually does to their minds, and then getting your writing to do what you want it to do is hard work and while there is no easy short-cut you can learn to do it by writing regularly. That is all there is to the how of it --- write experimentally and seriously; write regularly for real readers; listen to their candid reactions; and, then write again until they react the way that you intend them to. Elbow's book, plus regular writing and regular listening in a teacherless writing group pledged to candor will get you past blocks and hangups and well on the way to the hammer and anvil process of editing your writing.

I do not think that you have to do through all of Elbow's pointing, summarizing, telling and showing routines every time you meet. Try them all at least once and then settle on the kind of reading that seems to generate the most heat and light for your particular group. Remember that your objective as a listener is to give uninhibited subjective reactions to what you heard read. Your objective as a writer is to listen to your own voice reading what you have written and then to listen to reactions.

There is another kind of help, not much stressed by Elbow (for reasons that he gives in the Appendix Essay), that you must learn to give as the weeks go by and you will draw closer to the writing of a final report. You must help each other to start sorting things out, to eliminate the illogical, and to build arguments. Help each other to distinguish between sense and nonsense, to weigh anything that purports to be evidence, and to track and check the interrelated axioms and propositions of an argument. This shift will occur quite naturally as you begin to impose some order on the data you have collected in the field. The moment this shift takes place start reading and using Baker's, *The Practical Stylist*.

(2) The Notebook

You must write every week for the duration of your community study project. While the faculty working with you will have their own specific advice about format and the number of pages you should complete each week, I have some suggestions of my own.

Write at least ten pages in your notebook each week for the duration of the project. This means writing even if you do not have anything to write about. Write on standard punched 8½ x 11 notepaper and keep it in a three-ring binder. This will prove to be a big advantage when you cut, paste and rewrite.

I have told you how many pages to write each week and on what size paper, but what are you going to write about, especially during the first few days or weeks of your project? That is easy because you can write responses to the books you are reading, reactions to the discussions in your writing group, and observations on your field trips. jot down short bursts of argument with the authors you are getting acquainted with. Keep track of ideas, bits of propositions, or a scrap of a thesis. Draw maps, do sketches, and write epigrams in your notebook. Diagrams, poems, character sketches, half-baked ideas, objections, and counter-arguments are all grist so pack them into those ten pages each week. Keep a daily log, write
letters back home about what you have seen. It does not matter — just as long as you write, and develop the habit of regular writing and a regular minimum of production.

Elbow writes about how to do honest freewriting and I think you ought to do some of that every week as a part of your habitual ten pages. Use freewriting to discover things about yourself as you are discovering things about a community. Be candid about your emotional reactions to the things about a community. Be candid about your emotional reactions to the community and its people. Does the whole scene make you uneasy? Are you amused, angry, appalled or afraid? Have you fallen in love with the place or do you love the people but can’t understand why they insist on living in such a God-forsaken spot? Find out how you feel about the people you are studying by writing. The more truthful you are the better your writing will be. George Orwell said, “The great enemy of clear language is insincerity.” You may be wondering at this point whether this handbook is about self study or community study. I want it to be useful for both. It should help you find out a lot about the social sciences, sociology, and a community. It could help you find out a lot of new things about yourself, your identity, your past, and your future. It could even force you to think a lot about your relationship to the United States of America and your future in America. I want your project to be both personal and political. It should be personal enough to get into the inner you and require you to confront and clarify your own core values and it should be political enough to get you to learn about and think about your political obligation to the society that you are living in.

Worksheets for Your Fieldtrips.

Ten pages a week may still seem formidable so here are three sets of questions and an input-output worksheet that will help you fill your notebook with ten pages a week over and over again. Any theoretical scheme should generate a host of questions that will start you writing. The better you understand the scheme or model the easier it will be to derive questions from it. Those questions will point you in a direction, sharpen your perceptions, start you thinking, and at that point you should start writing. Here are some questions to help you get started asking questions, writing questions, and writing down hunches, observations, and tentative answers. Or if not answers, plans for getting the information that might make answers possible.

WORKSHEET FOR THE STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL MODEL

If you have already selected the structural-functional model, or if you are still at the weighing stage, try answering questions like these. Try to figure out the kinds of data you would have to have to give reliable answers to these kinds of questions. Think up some of your own structural-functional questions.

(1) What are the norms that govern the behavior of the individuals who make up the community?

(2) How are these norms organized? How do they cluster? Do they fall into patterns related to the functional prerequisites of a social system?

(3) How do patterns or clusters of norms act to create, regulate, and maintain the various organizations, strata, and institutions that make up your community?

(4) How is stability maintained within each organization, strata, and institution that is a part of the community?

(5) How is stability maintained within the total system? How is conflict contained?

(6) How are the individual members of the community socialized?

(7) Is there a single or are there several modal personality types within the community?

(8) What are the mechanisms for controlling deviant behavior? How successful are they?

(9) What is the reward system and how does it operate to maximize proper performance of role expectations?

(10) How open or closed is the stratification system? Which statuses are achieved and which are open?

(11) Does imperfect socialization seem to be a cause of social change for your community?

(12) How does the community accommodate to external forces that impinge upon it? What are those forces?
WORKSHEET FOR THE CLASS-CONFLICT MODEL

You may choose to be a bit of a Marxist for the duration of your community study project. If you do, start with questions like these:

(1) Who owns the instruments of production?
(2) Is there a class division within the community? What are the classes?
(3) Are the members of the classes you identify class conscious?
(4) Can you detect alienation?
(5) Is there evidence of class conflict?
(6) Has the process of social change (throughout the history of your community) been dialectical?
(7) Has change been quantitative or qualitative, or both?
(8) What are the relationships between means of production, relations of production, law, politics, and social consciousness?
(9) What ideology dominates the social, political, and intellectual life of the community?
(10) Can you detect contradictions within the mode of production, the relations of production, and ideology?
(11) Is there a strain toward consistency between the means of production and the relations of production within the community that you are studying?
(12) How does the class structure and ideology of your community tie into that of the nation?

WORKSHEET FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL MODEL

If you fancy yourself a bit of an institutionalist then try writing down tentative answers to these questions. After each answer, try to figure out what kinds of data, what facts, you would need in order to be able to give answers to the questions.

(1) What are the degrees of integration and centralization within each sector?
(2) What is the dominant institutional sector within the community?
(3) What is the dominant organization --- within each sector?
(4) How does the community maintain equilibrium?
(5) Is the community, or any part of it, ultrastable?
(6) Has there been, is there, any innovative change?
(7) What about evolutionary change?
(8) Is it possible to isolate, describe and analyze compound change in your community?
(9) Have there been shifts in the leading sectors?
(10) Can you describe the cultural influence of economic activity on typical character or personality?
(11) What has been the impact of specific economic organizations on the community?
(12) Can you write the history of the social movements, if any, that have impinged upon the history and destiny of the community you are studying?
WORKSHEET FOR INPUT-OUTPUT ANALYSIS

Here is an input-output worksheet. Take a few of these on your field trips and to every brainstorming session. Use them to collect data, to think about relationships, and to just plain doodle on. Keep thinking about transactions between the units, components, or elements of each institutional sector, and especially look for transactions between sectors. What does the economic sector get from the political, the military, the religious, the educational, and the familial sectors? What flows from the economy, the military, the churches, schools, and families, to the government(s) of your community? Go right on down the list, thinking demand. Go back up the list, thinking production. Think in terms of comparable units, even rough units that defy precise measurement, or any measurement. Think about dollar values, man hours, bodies, goods, services, tangible stuff and intangible stuff. Use a different worksheet for each attempt to ferret out interactions and interrelationships. Do not hesitate to try out the most outrageous categories. You may have to throw it all away, but you may discover some very important causal relationships between the institutional building blocks of your community.
Armed with good resolutions and lots of instructions, a camera, and your notebook you are as ready for your first visit as you will ever be. Go on out there and have fun, be curious, use your eyes, keep your ears open, look and listen for the odd and unobtrusive, and of course never overlook the obtrusive. When you get back from your first fieldtrip continue with Chapter 6 of this handbook.

Those of you whose group is small and for whom time is short; those with only one or two weeks to do a mini-project should turn to Chapter 7 for some ideas on how to present data, impressions, and conclusions.


Glance through this little book, you will find it unusual and it may give you some "mapping" ideas.


Final Reading Assignment for Chapter 6:
Let me remind you again that this Handbook has been designed for students interested in a cooperative group project. I want you to learn the many benefits of helping each other carry out a complex piece of intellectual work and so I have assumed that there are at least ten, more likely twenty of you and that you are going to spend several weeks doing the field research part of your community study project. Furthermore, I am assuming that this is a joint effort to understand the totality of a social system. You will learn more if you plan together and discuss the books together. Even though you will undoubtedly divide up much of the actual field work between individuals or small teams of two or three, you should all plan on meeting together after each field trip and at each stage in the completion of the project. Make out a schedule of joint planning sessions, seminars, field visits, brainstorming and reporting sessions. Unexpected problems will come up and consequently, new questions. You will want to exchange impressions, questions, hunches, data, and new insights. Do this at regularly scheduled meetings back at the campus as well as spontaneously when something urgent needs to be discussed. Share your ideas and your enthusiasm and the excitement of it all will be quite contagious. Try it and see.

Now for a word of warning. Everyone does need to keep track of the entire effort, so do not let too much specialization fragment you into isolated individuals working on unrelated questions. Somewhere between extreme fragmentation and the impossible chaos of everyone trying to do everything is the balance that you are looking for. Divide up the work, yes, but keep track of each other's work so that the pieces will all come together both in your individual consciousness and in the final presentation of the group.

There are eleven big topics that you will need to farm out to individuals and small teams within your project group. There is so much diversity here that each of you ought to be able to go to work on something that you are really curious about. You will want to work on these same topics whatever the theoretical model you have selected or constructed.

1. The Physical and Natural Environment
2. Historical Background
3. Demography
4. Stratification
5. The Economy
6. Political Organization
7. Religion and the Churches
8. Education and the Schools
9. The Military (if relevant)
10. The Family
11. Change and the Future of the Community

The next few pages will tell you how to get started in your community and how to get going on each of those topics. Once you do, the biggest problem will be knowing when to stop. Remember, to keep your project manageable pick a very small community, plan carefully, and keep to a tight schedule.

Fieldwork Method

If you and your group are planning a limited project, a small study of a small town for no more than ten weeks, the short duration of your visits will not allow you to use very many, if any, elaborate sociological techniques such as questionnaires, schedules, or random samples. Survey research will only be appropriate for a year-long project. Instead, you should use your eyes and ears and base your report mainly on your own direct observations and your own informal conversations with townpeople.

(1) People and Conversations. A sharp observer can learn an extraordinary amount about a community by just watching people and listening to scraps of conversations. Learn to look at shoes, clothing, behavior, body language, gestures, physical appearance, and hair styles. How do people react and relate to each other? Watch street manners and reactions to you. Memorize faces. Jot your observations down in your notebook. See how much of the culture and social structure you can figure out without talking to anyone, just by looking at clothing, bodies, and behavior. Then do a lot of discreet listening, recording bits of conversation in your ever-ready notebook. Eventually you will want to get into some of the conversations and as you find yourself accepted some of you casual conversations could become rather thorough interviews. Start seeking out a wide range of people. The number and types of people you can and should talk to will depend on the size of your team, the size
of the town, and the scope of your project.

It will usually be best to start with the "leaders", those who make up the informal power structure. One way to find out who these are is to ask a number of people in your first conversations whom they think the ten or twenty most important people in the town are. Drop several stock questions into your casual conversations. (1) "Who are the most important people in the community?" (2) "Who would you go to to get help?" (3) "Who can get things done around here?"

The sort of people you ask for this information should include the minister or ministers, schoolteachers, any professionals such as physicians, the local police officer, the nearest newspaper editor, and any apparently important businessmen.

In addition, ask your questions at such useful news gathering places as barbershops, bars, and restaurants, as long as this is done discreetly. Remember, you are trying to find out who are perceived as the effective leaders of the community. Having established who the leaders are, you should, before you interview any of these people, decide what sort of questions you are going to ask. It will generally be best not to follow a set questionnaire. Your theoretical scheme should help you figure out what you want to know. In order to be sure to get at what you want to find out make a checklist but do not use it during your "interview". Be conversational. In interviewing, you should explain your purpose briefly but try to divert conversation away from yourself and listen more than you talk. Usually it is best to avoid direct questions. Try to lead conversation along useful lines. At the outset you should avoid controversial subjects, at least until you have established a good relationship with the person you are interviewing. You may have to allow for suspicion of outsiders and even a little hostility. Whatever your personal views are, try to be unobtrusive and to keep these views to yourself, reminding yourself that your main aim is to gather information. You should try to dress and act in a way that will gain trust. You want these people to like you and believe in you enough to tell you the truth.

These "interviews" should cover a wide range of people, which means that they should extend beyond the leaders of the town. There is sometimes a danger of being trapped in the social and economic elite of a small town, and of finding it difficult to escape and to reach people in other social classes. It will be essential to remain mobile yourself and to retain access to all social groups if you are to reach some understanding of the whole town. Let me remind you again that if you want these people to like you and believe in you enough to tell you the truth, you must love to listen a lot.

In planning your interviews, do not forget the children and adolescents of your community. In many societies, adolescents sometimes form a remarkably rich source of information for anthropologists and sociologists. Young boys and girls from seven to fourteen are often sharp and shrewd in their observations and incisive in their comments; in addition they will give you a different picture of the town from the one presented by the town's adults. This brings up the matter of the differential perspectives and perceptions of observers and participants in any society. You may want to explore and delineate at least three different communities in any society.

There is one further complication; your presence and especially that of a team of investigators will have impact on and will change the community you are studying while you are studying it. This is a kind of social Heisenberg effect that can be quite troublesome.

You will always find it useful to check statements of one informant or one category of information against another. Use your notebook to keep track of your different sources of information. Having been told one fact, you should try to find out from others whether there is agreement on this. Usually you will find considerable disagreement even about such apparently factual matters as the date of the town's founding.

(2) Documents. If there is any kind of newspaper in your community, it will be essential to spend some time going through the files of back issues to find out some of the past newsworthy topics, particularly as this will help you in your interviews. You will find that the more you know about the history of the county and community, the more knowledgeable will be your interviews and the more useful the results. Each succeeding interview should become more valuable as you will be able to ask more and more relevant questions. Besides newspapers there might be some kind of a short account of the town written by an oldtimer, or if your town is big enough to have a Chamber of Commerce, or some such group, it may have produced a history of the town. The newspaper of a larger neighboring town may carry the secret of the kind of casual conversation that is a useful interview is to listen a lot.
and file news about your community. Do not forget to check records at the county courthouse.

(3) Photographs and Audio Tapes: Do not sneak around taking photographs surreptitiously. Be open, get acquainted, build trust, and explain what you are doing. It is often useful to enlist the help of a young boy or girl to go around with you when you are taking photographs, give your little helper something to do, this allays suspicion and he might even select particular subjects which you have overlooked. Be especially thoughtful and careful if you feel that it is necessary to tape record conversations or interviews. My advice is to use your notebook instead. A photographic essay should be a part of your final presentation and report. You may wish to consider the use of slide-tape presentations and even movies or video. But remember, keep the total project manageable. Elaborate plans, elaborate research, and dazzling presentations require a lot of time, energy, and commitment.

(4) Maps and Graphs: Your observations should include all physical aspects of your community, the shape and location of things. Find as many ready-made maps, charts, and graphs as you can and use them as well as making your own specialized stuff. The county courthouse may be able and willing to help with aerial photographs and a variety of maps and graphs featuring property lines and values, natural resources, economic, and demographic data. Be as creative as you can in putting as much information as you can into many, many different kinds of maps, grids, graphs, and charts. Start doing this in a sketchy way in your notebook on your very first visit.

The Eleven Big Topics

(1) Physical Environment: Someone must write a description of the topography, the climate, and the availability of natural resources. It is important that you have a good understanding of geographic factors and the influence of the physical environment on the economic history of the town.

Think maps. Make lots of maps by using Metzger’s maps of Washington’s counties and U.S. Geodetic Survey maps. Look for old maps showing the oldest roads and the first railroads. You may wish to make resource maps, soil maps, political maps, transportation maps, and ethnic maps. You could map economic and political gradients showing where the wealth and power was, and now is. Make a series of maps showing changes over time. The possibilities are only going to be limited by your imagination and the time you have available.

(2) Historical Background: You will want to know when the town was founded and the main changes in the social composition of the town. Find out how people see the past and what they regard as key events. Find out the ethnic backgrounds of the people, where they came from, when they came, what have been the big changes over the years. Visit the graveyards. Talk to old people. Find the oldtimers who have kept clippings and pictures. Make time-lines and chronological bar charts showing sequences of important events in the history of the community. Make a chart or time-line for each institutional sector and for any other important variable that you are interested in. Chart changes in dominance within the economy. What happens when the oysters or trees are all gone? Chart business cycles. Finally, make composite time-lines summing up the history of your community.

(3) Demography: Make a division by all the ethnic groups: Blacks, Chicanos, Scandinavians, and other minorities. What are the significant European minorities? What has been the change in population over the last few years? What are the main ethnic groups and how do they relate to each other? Has ethnic dominance changed over the years? What are the causes of death? Did children die young? You can learn a lot from graveyards and the kinds of ethnic names listed in the telephone directory, if your town has one. Remember, however, very poor people do not have telephones.

The best way to understand population dynamics is through charts and graphs so you will want to make lots and lots of population graphs showing rates of increase, changes in total population over time, changes in ethnic composition of the population, age distribution, and changes in the causes of mortality.

(4) Social Relationships, Class and Caste: Note the importance of hierarchy for different classes of people; length of residence of various people; living and working conditions. What social stratification is there in the town? How are the people divided by ethnic groups, by residence, by occupation, income and wealth, education, religion, and number of children? Be as specific as you can about this important area. Ask people what they think. Ask them questions like: "Are there social classes in the town?" "What are they?" "Who belongs to them?" "Which class do you belong to?" Get as much detail as you can. Do the people of your town feel that their community is stratified into a hierarchical system of power, privilege, and opportunity? Does their perception of hierarchy conform to the facts that you are gathering?
Find out if there are any "old families" in the town and what their position is, that is, their political, economic, and social position. Who has influence and power? Is the class system stable? Is there, or has there ever been, class conflict? Is the class system open or closed? How many important positions and identities (statuses) are ascribed, how many achieved? The data you gather on social class should be organized and presented in tables, charts and graphs, showing changes in class composition, class membership, upward and downward mobility over time. If you are using a class-conflict theoretical model, this and the next section will be the most important parts of your data-gathering effort.

(5) Economy: This is important, whatever theoretical model you have chosen, so you should get as much detail as you can. What are the sizes of land holdings? What are land prices? Who owns what? What are the crops and is there any industry? What is the labor situation? Who does the work? How much do the workers get paid? Are the workers migrants or regular workers? Check on commerce in the town. If there is a Chamber of Commerce it will be able to give you some information. Make a quick checklist of the numbers and types of retail businesses and services which are available and who owns and works in them? What has closed down and gone out of business? Make a chronological chart showing the economic history of the community. Is it cyclical?

As you visit people, make some notes on their housing, furniture, appliances, automobiles, and clothing. What is the standard of living? How is that linked to ownership and social class? Who is satisfied and who is dissatisfied?

If there are any industries in the town, find out who owns them, what the labor force is, and how they relate to the town, and to the economic system of the Pacific Northwest, and the United States as a whole.

Look for specific connections with larger economic systems. Can you figure out the economic input-output transactions between the larger systems and the community that you are studying? Use input-output worksheets for this part of your study. Remember to try and chart the flow of cash, credit, raw materials, tools, consumer goods, and services, including the most intangible services. Do not forget to chart the flow of people between the economic sector and the other institutional sectors of your community. Chart exchanges between the whole community and the outside world.

(6) Political Organization: Find out what the local town government structure is, if any. If your community is incorporated, what is the composition of the council, what kind of officials? If there is some kind of town clerk he will be one of your key informants and should be able to give you much valuable information which you could follow up.

Find out what issues, if any, have divided the town. Has there been any question of school unification? Have there been special levy campaigns? Has there been controversy over water or sewage or any other amenities which involve the town's leaders in community decision-making and action? Is there any indication of pressure being exerted to settle current controversy? How are the big decisions really made in the community? Who provides and controls the following services: education, health, roads, water, gas, electricity, sewage, garbage, police and fire protection? Spend some time with the local law officer, if there is one. He should be a key informant, even if he is a little suspicious at first. You may have to get acquainted with the county sheriff.

Very small communities may not have any formal government at all, but there will be an informal system. Use some kind of a sociometric technique to map the informal power structure of the community. You will want to ferret out as much of the informal influence and decision-making system as you can. It will help to make influence maps or sociograms. You can find out how to do this by reading the research design section of Floyd Hunter's Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers. The technique which is relatively simple uses questions about who goes to whom for help, advice, influence and to get decisions made, in order to find which members of the community are seen as influential. Ask who your informants go to for help to get something difficult and important taken care of. The answers will give you a picture of the informal influence structure of the community.

(7) Religion: Visit the church or churches in the town. This is extremely revealing. Attend several services and really try to be as sensitive and sharp a participant observer as possible. Try to get inside the emotional experience of the church goers. Listen to the sermon, sing along with the congregation, and above all use your eyes. After each service put lots of observations down in your notebook. Look for the relationship between church membership, ethnicity, and social class. Is there a permanent minister or priest? Are religious leaders a part of the informal influence system?
What are the explicit and implicit social functions of religious belief, ritual, and church membership in the community? What are the connections between economic power, political power, and the church? Find out the religious history of the town and the region. Has the influence of religion or the church declined? What age groups are active? How? Why? If you take pictures or use your tape recorder, be sure to get permission from the entire congregation. Always dress and act in a way that will keep the church goers comfortable.

(8) Education: How are the young educated? Is there a local school? Who controls the schools? How important is the educational institution in the town that you are studying? How important is the teacher or the teachers? What are the implicit functions of the schools? Study the entire educational system carefully and trace the typical careers of young people who are born, raised, and educated in the community.

What was it like to grow up in the community that you are studying - fifty years ago? One hundred years ago? What is it like now? Is it anything like growing up in Stinking Creek, or Olympia, or Seattle? Part of your report should be a section on growing up in that particular community. Do the young stay or do they leave? If they leave, does the school have anything to do with their restlessness and their decisions to leave? What do they want to become and where do they want to go?

(9) The Military: There are at least two ways in which the military institutional sector might show up as a significant aspect of the social system that you are investigating. There may have been a fort or some kind of military installation actually in or within the vicinity of the community at some time in the past. This would be true even if you were studying a community as small as Ironside. Or the military may be nearby now. Short of that kind of obvious presence, the military may exert influence through the presence of veterans in your population or families with sons or daughters currently in the armed forces. If your community is within commuting distance of a major military base such as Fort Lewis then the impact will be very significant indeed. But impact how, and where? There will be a lot to find out.

(10) The Family: You should investigate the typical life cycle of those who are born and die within the community. How are they born and nurtured? How married and how buried? In order to describe and understand a typical life cycle you will have to describe and understand the institution of the family in your chosen community and try to comprehend it against the background of what is happening to marriage and the family in the region and the nation. A host of questions will come to mind immediately. What are the courtship practices of the young? When do they get married and how stable are those marriages? What are the romantic and religious ideals still cherished and what is the reality of domestic life? What happens to those who step out of line? When do the children arrive, how many are there to a typical family, how many survive, and how are they socialized? Is there anything like an extended family left in this particular community? Talk to grandparents, parents, and newly marrieds. What is changing and why? I am sure I do not have to stress the sensitivity of these issues and how careful you will have to be if you are going to both keep friends in the community and get trustworthy information for your project. Be thoughtful, be kind, and take your time.

In the traditional rural European society of the middle ages virtually all norms and values were taught by the family and in the family. Over the past few centuries the family has steadily lost ground to organizations in the other institutional sectors. How central is the family as the agent of socialization in the community you are studying? Who has a share in shaping the character of the children growing up there today? Old people never retired in traditional societies. The oldest grandmother lived in the family, helped out, and was taken care of. What happens to the old folk in the families you are investigating? When do they move out? Where do they go? Why? A typical life cycle could be the point of departure for your final presentation and report.

(11) Change and the Future of the Community: The history of a community describes the past. A functional analysis tells us a lot about the present. But what about the future of the community? How stable is the community? What factors maintain the system in a steady state? Have there been periods of rapid change? Has that change been continuous or discontinuous? What factors have been responsible for that change? Which of the three theoretical models seems most useful in understanding the history of the community and which would you use to forecast the future? Even
though this will be the most difficult intellectual task of all, you should include speculative forecasts of the community's future in your final report. Here is a list of questions that you might consider:

1. Is the value system biased toward conservation and maintenance of the total system?
2. Is the chief source of change value conflict or class conflict? Do different parts of the system change at different rates, producing lag, conflict, and friction?
3. Has change been evolutionary, a case of drift, or is it planned; or is it a complex combination of drift and planning?
4. Has any kind of social movement, religious or political, played a role in the history of the community?
5. Has there been a change in the institutional system and especially a change in institutional dominance?
6. Is the community autonomous and if so what is the extent and degree of autonomy?
7. Has this changed over the years? Is change in the community you are studying exclusively determined by the outside world, that is, by the Pacific Northwest, or the United States, or by world markets?

Use checksheets at all stages of your research from the earliest planning sessions to the final wrap-up just before the last trip into the field. This handbook has provided you with sample checksheets. You should use them, add to them, or make up one or more of your own. The theoretical scheme that you use will slant your work in specific ways and that slant should show up in your lists of work to do, things to look for, and data to gather. Put someone in charge of keeping the whole project organized and moving on a nice tight schedule. You will not want to run out of time just as you get to the really fascinating questions.

CHECKSHEET FOR THE FIELD RESEARCH TEAM

Are you sure that someone has agreed to do the following:
1. Find and make a lot of maps.
2. Locate birth and death records.
3. Collect and analyze all of the data held on file by the county that is relevant to your project.
4. Locate and read back issues of the town's own newspapers, or those in the county that covered your town.
5. Contact the State Department of Natural Resources for maps, studies, and records.
6. Gather data on the buildings.
7. Write the history of the town (this will require a sub-team).
8. Pull together all available population statistics.
9. Do a class analysis of the community from the perspective of structural-functional theory.
10. Do a class analysis from the perspective of the Marxist class-conflict theory.
11. Describe, dissect, and analyze the economic system.
12. Check out the economic history of the region with special emphasis on aspects that have influenced your community.
13. Do an analysis of power, political life and government; especially the informal influence system.
14. Study religious life and the churches (this will require especially sensitive investigators).
15. Cover education and the schools.
16. Check to see if the military plans any role in the community.
17. Investigate family life, courtship, marriage, child rearing, and the whole life cycle of a typical member.
18. Do an institutional input-output analysis to see if Cadwallader and Putney make any sense at all.
19. Pull together all the data that illuminates the issue of stability and change.
20. Has someone agreed to do the graphics? You will need lots of charts, graphs, and tables.
A complete community study project, like a good essay, has a beginning, a middle, and an end. You are not finished until the writing is finished and you make the whole adventure memorable for yourself by telling your public what you have found out. Your work, weeks of reading, planning, argument, travelling, watching and interviewing will remain murky and unresolved, a bit like the prim­eval chaos that existed before the word brought light, until you write a report. Weeks of conscientious research will remain a mess of loose ends until you write and edit, rewrite and polish a final account of what you did and what you dis­covered.

There are many different ways to tell the story of a community and I will suggest as many as I can think of. The faculty involved in your project will have ideas of their own and may give you very specific instructions to follow. I am going to assume that they will join me in encouraging you to consider many dif­ferent conventional and unconventional ways of making your statement and arguing your thesis. I want you to be creative, to tell the truth about significant things, and to avoid insincerity.

If you are going to write something for someone, if you are going to ask any­one to read what you have written, then you should try to be clear. You should want to write prose that is convincing and pleasing rather than confusing and tedious. Above all else you should resolve not to write like most social scien­tists write. The articles in the social science journals and especially graduate dissertations in sociology have set new standards in awkward usage, tiresome cir­cumlocution and a fearsome jargon that defies decoding.

We are all used to politicians and generals butchering the English language, but that kind of awful prose is too easy a mark for academic criticism. It is important to recognize that the modern university with its departments and disci­plines must share much of the blame for the rapid decay of our language. Many of the new bad habits spreading through the land are due to the especially ugly lan­guage of engineering, technology, and the social sciences. Social scientists are bad writers because they believe they must invent and use a technical language to describe the familiar and commonplace. Too often they use a special language of clumsy euphemisms when English would do. Encumbered with an elaborate jargon, they end up using an awkward syntax that is the dispair of their most sympathetic read­ers. They did not invent this awful prose to confuse or insult us, ironically they...
created it in an attempt to be scientific, exact, accurate, and precise. Nevertheless, instead of clarity and precision they now find themselves saddled with linguistic conventions that do little more than identify them as members of this or that little group of specialized scholars. It seems a little too much like 19th century provincial Russian aristocrats speaking bad French in front of servants and serfs.

Let me say frankly that I do not want you to write like most social scientists write. But can anyone do social science without butchering the English language? Yes, but it is very difficult as I have discovered while writing this Handbook. First resolve not to submit to the bad conventions of the social science journals, textbooks, and dissertation writing. If one must use the technical terminology of the sciences, and sometimes it is both essential and useful, then do so judiciously. We can learn to avoid inappropriate jargon, pretentious phrases, and the passive voice. It can be done and here are a few suggestions that will help.

(1) Read C. Wright Mills', The Sociological Imagination to find good reasons for never writing or thinking like Talcott Parsons, but do not try to write like C. Wright Mills either. Read as much good writing and as little bad as possible. It is possible to write about difficult technical matters in good English and to find out how it is done read something by Bertrand Russell or James B. Conant. If you do have to read bad writing, read it critically, condemn it as you read it and be ruthless with your criticism so you do not run the risk of being infected by it. Then read lots of good English immediately as an antidote, perhaps something by Henry Miller, Aldous Huxley, or the King James Bible.

(2) Keep a notebook and keep writing in it. The only way to learn to write is to write regularly and to become acutely self conscious about what you are doing when you write. Two things will help in addition to writing a lot regularly; first, read what you write aloud and I mean loudly so you write for your ear as well as your eye; secondly, write for a real audience. This second point deserves some amplification. Personal revelations confided privately to a diary will probably always remain basal confidences to a "dear diary". If you want to learn to get a message across you must write to real readers and demand candid reactions. When those reactions come, listen to them, all of them, telling yourself over and over again that readers are always right and their failure to get your point is never their fault. Find real readers, fellow student, friends, family, almost anyone besides an English teacher. The reactions that you want to learn from should be the reactions of those you want to inform and convince, not those who practice the vocation of correcting punctuation. Find intelligent readers, importune them, and then listen to them.

It is only after you discipline yourself to read good writing regularly, and write a lot regularly, that the suggestions and rules in a book like Sheridan Baker's The Practical Stylist will make any sense at all. None of us can cure ourselves of bad writing just by reading about bad paragraphs and punctuation; nor can we cure ourselves by writing occasionally for English teachers. We all need to write regularly for a real audience. That audience can be provided easily enough by the members of a community research team that follows Peter Elbow's instructions on forming a teacherless writing group. Try it, or some variation of it. Your writing will start to improve the moment you begin to write aloud in an attempt to convince a real audience. Your writing will start to improve, if you try for some of the lightness, wit, clarity, candor and virility of essayists like Russell and Miller, Huxley and Orwell.

George Orwell said

"A scrupulous writer, in every sentence he writes, will ask himself at least four questions, thus:

What am I trying to say?
What words will express it?
What image or idiom will make it clearer?
Is this image fresh enough to have an effect?

and he will probably ask himself two more:

Could I put it more shortly?
Have I said anything that is avoidably ugly?"

Ask those questions of yourself and each other at every critique session, be relentless, and your writing will improve. By that I mean that it will start to express rather than to conceal your meaning.

The sooner you decide on the form of your final report, the sooner you can start packing your notebook with the raw material that you will need. You should try to make at least a tentative decision just after your first visit. Do it earlier if you can.

The research paper is one way, but certainly not the only way, to write a report. I want you to cut your imagination loose, to be as creative as you can be in planning the ways in which you and the others in your research group are going to tell the story of your investigation. Many teachers at most colleges and universities would demand little more than a conventional research paper and send you to either the MLA Style Sheet or the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association for meticulous instruction in correct margins and documentation, along with induction into the mysteries of opera citato and loco citato. Actually the conventional research paper is easy to write because there is an easy formula to follow and in the world of social science monographs, literary standards are low or nonexistent. I am going to demand a lot more than that so here are some alternatives to the research paper that you should consider.

(1) Consider the informal or personal essay as one possibility, but be cautious. The personal essay will be a real literary challenge because when you put yourself personally and unabashedly in the center of the story the quality of your writing had better be outstanding. There will be no impersonal scholarly conventions to fall back on and hide behind, and no ducking behind soft mushy phrases like, "the writer randomized his subjects." When you dare to write a personal essay you accept the searching spotlight of the first person singular and you tacitly agree to be candid and truthful. Under that kind of spotlight you have no alternative but to hone and polish every image, phrase, and sentence. Why invite the extra challenge, that kind of extra work? In many cases the personal essay would be inappropriate, but if something important happened to you, as you pushed your way into that little way station of American life if you made a significant discovery about yourself, your inner core, and that is what you want to explore and explain, then go to work. Read some good essays to get acquainted with the form. Take George Orwell as a teacher and start with "Shooting an Elephant" which is not about the official duties of a sub-divisional police officer in Lower Burma during the 1930s. It is about a moment of revelation, a tiny incident that was personally enlightening to George Orwell. But the essay is not simply the story of Orwell's discovery of the awful power of laughter, it is also an argument about the nature of imperialism. "Narrabeh" and "Looking Back on the Spanish War" will both reveal a lot more of the flexibility, utility, and power of the personal essay. It will help you to read other essayists, Muntaigne, Henry Miller, Mary McCarthy, and Joseph Wood Krutch; pick the best of guides, and write regularly in your notebook. Those are the essential first steps you must take if you are going to present your thesis in the form of a personal essay.

(2) A straightforward narrative is a common and powerful way to build an argument and tell a story about someone else's experiences, someone else's world. It can be written in the first person, if that seems to fit. While it can be passionate or dispassionate in tone, it should be as concrete, accurate, and clear as you can possibly write it. The way to get your meaning straight is through weeks of writing in your notebook and through repeated trials before the members of your writing group. You must be able to convince those reading and listening to your first drafts. So build and rebuild your argument and then winnow the words that you want to use to make your meaning clearer. The quality of your thoughts and the quality of your writing are tightly linked so improvement in one will improve the other. You will not be able to convince us that your thoughts are fresh if your words are stale, for here again there are no tired old scholarly traditions or the humbug of social science jargon to use as a blind. Straightforward writing is naked writing and that is why it is so powerful when it is good.

(3) Why not write your report as fiction, in the form of a short story or a very short novel? Think about it and if you like the idea, screw up your courage and do it. But it will take more than a lot of guts; it will take an enormous creative effort to build an imaginary community of imagined people and conversations so much like the community you studied that it will seem just right, quite true. You will want your reader to feel surprise, shock even, at the universal authenticity of the incidents, faces, and voices that you conjure. Your thesis, characters, events, and conversations should fit more than the one community you studied.
they should be about many such communities. Writing good fiction is a challenge, learning the craft is time-consuming, so use it because you have something of universal import to say and because you are determined to underscore that universality. The villages that Silone and Devi wrote about were Italian, but they were also so peasant that they turn out to be about Spanish and Yugoslav and Polish villages too. A few years ago I found myself eating heavy peasant bread and drinking red wine so dark it was almost black in the tiny Dalmatian village of Ivan-Dolac and reflecting on how well Ignazio Silone had prepared me for a part of the world he had never visited. If you are tempted to write your report as fiction think of your task this way: The short story you write has to catch and pass on something universal, some universal truth about living, working, eating, drinking and dying in a tiny American town. Once your decision is made, start reading and rereading good fiction about peasant or small town life. Fill your notebook with character sketches, whole casts of characters drawn from life during your visits. Start sketching with words, paint local colour with words, catch the lilt, rhythm and tempo of local conversation on paper in words. Look for the universal in local particularity.

Dialogue is difficult. It takes an ear with close to perfect pitch if it is to sound right. Listen, listen, listen to conversation, take it down --- aloud, read it as you write it --- aloud. Scratch it if it does not sound right on key, even if you love the look of the words. It must not sound wooden, improbable, or faked. Absorb scraps of talk until the voices of the town seep out of your pores, until you dream them, until you can write that kind of talk automatically.

Character delineation is difficult too. Write thumbnail descriptions of real characters and read those to your writing group. At first they may only see and hear you but keep writing until they see and hear your characters. If they can actually recognize and distinguish the looks and voices of concrete individuals from your town then you are writing well enough to try creating your cast of imaginary characters. Try creating sets of persons that your readers are ready to believe in.

Finding a plot should be easy. While your plot does not have to be newly minted, your characters and conversations must be absolutely fresh, and very real. That is where you are the creative writer. In draft, after draft, bend your effort to putting real conversations in the mouths of real characters. If you have listened a lot in the local tavern or cafe you will have heard a hundred plots. If you still cannot think of one, borrow from Shakespeare or Boccaccio.

(4) Perhaps you have an ear for dialogue. You may have just discovered this and are wondering whether you should venture a dramatic rendering of your thesis. Why not? Read some Henrik Ibsen, Anton Chekhov, George Bernard Shaw, John Osborne, and Arthur Miller. Follow the advice I have just written for fiction writers but twist your reading and writing towards dramatists and the dramatic. I think you ought to get the best help available and that means reading Shakespeare. Look for some kind of telling action that you can compress into dialogue, a climatic event in the life of a small community. This may take considerable imagination and a lot of searching through the archival recollections of old timers. For a climax in the kind of world that is noteworthy for its lack of dramatic climax I would listen for stories of over-weening pride and fall; but I would expect the action to be comic rather than tragic. Proud kings may never walk the streets of McCleary or Eatonville but there should be no shortage of fools and stories of their adventures to listen to.

It is alright to jest, to search for the comic, to write a report filled with drollery, as long as you work hard at making your writing feather light. None of it, whether an essay, narrative novel, drama or journal should be sober sided to the point of dulness. Do not let any of your writing become tedious because that is not the way to write about serious matters.

Whether you are writing a short story or a play, whether it is a bit grim or filled with jest, you are constructing a vehicle for a thesis, the means for a report. Everything you are writing no matter how embellished or in what form you finally cast it is an argument about something you discovered perhaps for the first time, perhaps more vividly than the last time, while immersed in your research.

(5) Keep the right kind of notebook and with a lot of editing and rewriting you can turn it into a journal that will be an unusual and effective report. I am not talking about a diary filled with an unpolished, rambling record of your day in Port Townsend. I am talking about carefully sifted, organized, and polished reflections that elucidate your thesis. The journal that you submit as your report will not be the same thing as the notebook you filled on your fieldtrips, far from it. The notebook will be transmuted by art into a sequence of entries that accumulate and come together as discovery and argument. The whole thing has to have
weight, a center of gravity, a direction. The reader must feel led from one discovery to the next until the lessons learned seem to unfold artlessly. That is the art of the journal.

To find out how good journals are written read those of André Gide and Albert Camus. Although some may quarrel with my classification of Rebecca West's Black Lamb and Gray Falcon as a journal I urge you to read it and devour it greedily because it is one of the most extraordinary examples of what daily jottings can become under the hand of a great artist. Two chapters of the book are about her two visits to the small town of Korcula on an island in the Adriatic by that name. Rebecca West is a great artist and just those two chapters alone are a perfect demonstration of her unusual gift of sight and hearing, an uncanny sensibility, and a way with words that recreates in our imaginations the important things that she noticed. The impressions and observations she wrote down in her notebooks during those two visits were mixed with later historical research and transmuted into personal history, a poetic report on a small organic community with its roots deep in Slavic and Venetian tradition. To read it is to be profoundly moved by a handful of strangers on a distant island and by a way of life now dying after forty years of progress.

(6) A biography of anyone, a man or a woman, who has spent his or her life in your community, and who will take the time to tell you about it, should be one form for a report. A short biography of someone shaped by the community, sustained by it, and in turn influenced their community for better or for worse is one way of telling the story of the community, and presenting us with an argument about it. Before you get too excited about the heady prospects of becoming a biographer and overlook the difficulties of doing it properly, read from three books by Lytton Strachey, Eminent Victorians, Portraits in Miniature, and Biographical Essays. It is the short biography that you want to get acquainted with and Lytton Strachey was the best ever at writing about complex periods of history by writing short biographies. Strachey had a thesis about the Victorian era. He believed that its leaders, who made much of their sense of humanity, were actually crippled by an excess of righteousness and that the age was flawed by moral arrogance. He argues this thesis in four short biographies of Eminent Victorians, any one of which you would do well to take as a model. I particularly like the shortest, the biography of Dr. Thomas Arnold.

(7) History can be written as mythology, poetry, ideology, chronology, or science. Think about the many forms and uses of history for you may want to write your report as history. But first read Jacques Barquin's The Modern Researcher; he will tell you how historians work and the differences that make good and bad history. If you write a history I want you to warn you against writing a mere chronology and writing bad prose. I do want you to be analytical and theoretical, to present an argument and argue a thesis as you write your history. Most run-of-the-mill historians are content to establish a reliable chronology of events, they want to know and they want to tell exactly what happened on a limited stage during a short span of years. The more theoretical and the more poetic historians want to know why civilizations rise and fall, and especially why they decline and fall. They love to range across the centuries and their cast of mind is frankly apocalyptic. These are the historians I prefer and I think their example can be followed, even if you focus your attention on a tiny community, just as long as your theoretical scheme defines that community as microcosm.

Unfortunately, many of the more scientific historians have allowed the jargon of the social sciences to corrupt their language. Read William A. Williams to find out how an unorthodox historian, influenced by Marxism, uses the social sciences to inform his work, but I would rather that you not copy his very personal writing style. Crane Brinton carried out a comparative analysis of the histories of four different but similar revolutions in The Anatomy of Revolution and so provided us with another example of scientific history, and this one well written.

Unfortunately, the great historians have been too preoccupied with decline and fall of 5th century Athens, Imperial Rome, Republican Florence, or the Heavenly City of the 18th century philosophers to leave us examples to follow in writing the history of small communities. Fortunately, we have Rebecca West's two chapters on Korcula; and that is example enough.

A biography or autobiography does not have to span an entire lifetime, it can be the story of an important segment in the trajectory of a single life. James W. Houston and Joanne D. Houston wrote that kind of an autobiography when they explored Jeanne's memories of a childhood spent in a United States relocation camp for the Japanese during the Second World War. Read their Farewell to Manzanar as an example of a limited autobiography, as an example of good writing, and as an example of a community study.
The technology of tape recording has given birth to a new technique of making history, something called oral history. It is a new way of working, not a fancy short cut. The man with the tape recorder will soon find himself hopelessly swamped with recorded reflections and memories that meander through many introspective worlds, unless he is armed with a theory that screens, a model that helps him edit a mountain of material. An accumulation of tapes is not a history, an intelligently edited transcript may be. Read Studs Terkel, On Working, to catch a glimpse of how much hard and careful work goes into the writing of oral history or oral sociology.

(8) The photographic essay is not simply a portfolio of beautifully composed and processed pictures. It is above all else an essay, and that means it is a statement of a thesis. It has a beginning, a middle, and an end. The pictures must have a trajectory and a logic that will convince the viewer of the human and social truth of the picture maker's thesis. Think of the sequence of images as a pictorial argument. A good photographic essay will tell a truth about something the photographer has noticed, been puzzled by, tried to figure out, and come to some conclusion about. It should be a provocative, spare, straightforward narrative in pictures built out of the perceptions and insights of an artist with an unusual eye.

Some of you will be good listeners and some of you will be good watchers; if you have an eye for the moment that traps time, the detail that stores history, the gesture that reveals a life, learn to use a camera. The Time-Life publications Documentary Photography and Photojournalism will give you lots of ideas once you have mastered the business of operating a 35 mm single lens reflex camera. Take pictures, lots of them, in cheap black and white and put them in your notebook along with a lot of writing. Let me emphasize again, taking pictures is not a short cut to an easy report. You will not be able to see the things you should photograph unless you are thinking clearly and analytically about the society you are investigating and you cannot do that without reading and writing a lot.\(^1\)

\(^1\)Let me remind you of the notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci and Edward Weston to make the point that pictures and words do play complementary roles in the creative process.

Submit rough drafts of your writing and picture proofs to your writing group. Ask the members of the team to react to your photographs and especially the sequence of your photographs in the same spontaneous way that they react to your writing. Edit and winnow your photographs until each seems an essential element in a dialectical quest for some judgment about the life of your community. Can they stand alone without commentary or clever titles? Do they convince or confuse? A good photographic essay in the context of this kind of a community study project must clarify and illuminate the work of others. Essays, biographies, short stories, monographs, charts and graphs all will benefit from the inclusion of indelible images, pictures that invent and haunt mind and memory.

(9) Under most of the circumstances I can imagine the production of a full length, high quality 16 mm documentary film would be too time consuming and much too expensive a report for the usual project. However, do not rule out the use of film altogether. Documentary segments filmed in super 8 might be within the technical and financial reach of your group. I do worry though about the seductive glitter of cameras, lights, microphones, and editing machines. Someone may suggest doing something short, quick and cheap; but that should not mean sloppy. Those tempted to talk about making a film should get candid estimates of the time it would take and then double those estimates. There is no way that you can pretend an unfinished film is a finished report.

(10) Think about presenting your results as a radio report, remembering that a script and performance for broadcast on KAOS-FM by members of your group will take a lot of careful planning and good writing. The equipment is there waiting to be used and any college station's programming certainly needs the variety that intelligent documentaries bring to it.

(11) John Fetterman's portrait of Stinking Creek, written by a newspaperman with a good eye and ear, is a good model of how to write an illustrated feature story for a newspaper or magazine. Offer your story to the school paper or try to sell it to a real newspaper.

(12) Some of you may wish to write, record, and produce a multi-media presentation using audio tapes, slides, and film segments. If you do anything like this, set yourself a tight schedule that ends two weeks before the report is due, or you will run out of time.
Design a program of illustrated lectures, panel presentations, slide and tape shows, film and video segments, plus exhibits of photographs, drawings, notebooks, essays, and monographs. Stage it as a festival and make sure your guests join in the celebration. This will give you a chance to end your project with ritual and good fellowship.

I am not going to stop handing out advice and suggestions until I say something about the ubiquitous research paper. Most of you will want to and should learn to write a good one. While most are written according to formula in labored prose, that unhappy outcome is not necessary and I urge you to do better. Resolve then to write a research paper that will be easy to read and understand because its ideas and language are clear and its organization and argument logical.

Here are three important assumptions:

1. I assume that you have been using Writing Without Teachers for several weeks, that your notebook contains at least ten pages of writing for each week, and that you have been reading your writing, and listening to responses, in some kind of a regular teacherless writing group. If you have, you should be past old writing blocks, you should be experimenting with words, images, and arguments, and you should have a great mass of raw material with at least one center of gravity. If you are not this far along then go back and reread the first four chapters of Elbow's book and put them to use. Once you are writing, reading and listening, and rewriting regularly, you are ready to start using Sheridan Baker's The Practical Stylist.

2. There is a general research paper form, a kind of standard skeleton that is used with slight variations by social scientists and their students all over the country. It looks something like this:

1. Statement of the problem.
2. Review of the professional literature on the problem.
3. Research method used, specific design if experimental and/or statistical.
4. The data, often in the form of tables.
5. Interpretation of the data.
6. Findings and consequences for the state of the field as revealed in the review of the literature.

Please do not use the formula slavishly; instead, superimpose Baker's lively and helpful ideas on "structure" and "paragraphs" right over the Procrustean bed of that standard formula. The social science term paper formula usually calls for six parts but I join Baker and Aristotle in urging you to build your paper in three parts. Keep reminding yourself that it is an essay you are writing and that you want it to feel like an essay with as much of the language as possible to have some style, your best style. So make the statement of the problem feel like a real beginning. The findings and consequences conclusion should feel like a real end with an emphatic restatement of your thesis, now buttressed by the logical argument and reliable evidence marshalled throughout the middle.

What then properly belongs in the middle? The argument of course, but with a slightly different set of elements than those described in Chapter 9 of The Practical Stylist. The formula calls for a review of the professional literature and you should do this along with a description of the theoretical model that has guided your research. It will be up to you to decide how theoretical your essay is going to be and that will determine the length of your description of and your emphasis on the theoretical literature. A more empirical essay will review and refer to similar research reports, stressing findings rather than the adequacy or inadequacy of a theoretical system. Sheridan Baker tells you how to research the literature, set up a 3x5 card file bibliography, take notes, canvass your notes, and work your references into your first draft. His instructions on documenting your sources, footnoting, abbreviations, and matching footnotes and bibliography are consistent with the MLA Style Sheet. I prefer the Modern Language Association's conventions to those used in the scientific journals but adapt my style to my audience. The important thing is to select a single system of documentation and footnoting and then follow it consistently throughout the essay.

You have already stated your thesis in the beginning section of the paper, but once past the review of the literature and the description of the theory to be used, it is time to write out as precisely as you can the questions you are asking and answering --- the hypotheses you are determined to test. Be as logical, schematic, or mathematical as is appropriate and then describe the research method or design that you used to answer these questions. Through all of this try to avoid social science jargon but do use technical terms if they state your meaning more accurately than any other words you can use. The description of how you did your research needs to be clear enough so that someone else can retrace
your footsteps and actually duplicate your work. If your readers have the feeling that your research can be repeated they will have a lot more confidence in your conclusions.

The heart of a research paper is the evidence the writer lines up in support of his or her thesis. In the case of field research, the bulk of that evidence will have been dug out of newspaper files, conversations, county records, interviews, and your own observations. Most of it will be primary rather than secondary and a critical reader will always ask two very big questions about that kind of evidence: is it reliable, and is it valid? The first question is concerned with repeatability --- would I get the same results if I asked the same questions? The second asks whether or not the data really speaks to the point you say it does --- if an Irondale junk dealer calls himself middle class, is there actually a middle class and is he really a member of it? Let me illustrate these two problems this way. Five members of your team accidentally administer the same questionnaire in the tiny community of Irondale. The local junk dealer answers "middle class" each time. So far things seem reliable enough. Another five looking for class membership ask him if he owns stocks and bonds, or any of the agents of production. He answers "no", and they each write down "proletariate", or "lower class worker". You have just uncovered the problem of validity, and raised the question of what is a valid indicator of class membership. The validity of your evidence is a theoretical problem; the reliability of your data is a question of the sophistication and workmanship that goes into collecting and evaluating information.

Numerical and statistical data always looks like hard evidence, sometimes it is, and often it is not. You really can lie with statistics, and many research reports do, but of course yours will not. If your model and research design calls for numerical evidence then explain exactly how you got it (the reliability problem) and what you think you got (the validity question). Put the important numerical data right into your essay in the form of statistical tables, pie charts, bar charts, simple and multiple line graphs, logarithmic scales, pictographs, or statistical maps so your readers can see and study the critical evidence for themselves. But of course, do not clutter up your essay with every numerical fact that you collected in the course of the project. Present the evidence that bears on your contention, whether favorable or unfavorable, remembering that the search for truth advances on both unfavorable and favorable results. Results unfavorable to Ptolemy led to the advances of Galileo, Newton, and Einstein.

With the evidence on display and incorporated into the argument of your middle section, you should turn to an analysis and interpretation of how well or poorly the facts fit the model. Does the data you collected so laboriously make it possible to answer the questions that intrigued and perplexed you in the first place? Does the model bring rational order to the chaos of random facts, figures, myths, opinions, laws, customs, habits and facts? Did your theory help you organize, measure or predict anything at all? Did it make you more sensitive to some facts, and less so to others? Can you make more or less sense of the community you studied, the giant social system we call the United States, or your own life? This could be written as the end of your essay, or as the last of the middle. I would be inclined to give it a rather full treatment as part of the middle and then summarize the entire paper, the entire argument in the end paragraphs, with an especial effort at emphatic closure in the very last paragraph of all. Distill the whole of it and put that essence into the end of your essay.

Here is my own final paragraph for this final chapter. Consider as many conventional and unconventional ways of making a report as you can think of. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the personal essay, a straight narrative, fiction, drama, an edited journal, biography, history, oral history, a photographic essay, film, a radio program, newspaper stories, a multi-media show, in addition to the conventional research paper. Be creative. Cultivate your intuition and do not be afraid to make your report a work of art. Whatever it is, make it exciting to read, watch, or listen to.
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