12-1970

A Comparison of the Explanatory Utility of Theories of Social Change: Parsons and Other Selected Theorists

Joseph N. Muthiani
Western Michigan University

A COMPARISON OF THE EXPLANATORY UTILITY OF THEORIES OF SOCIAL CHANGE: PARSONS AND OTHER SELECTED THEORISTS

by

Joseph N. Muthiani

A Thesis
Submitted to The
Faculty of The Graduate College
In partial Fulfillment of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1970

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In my deliberation to have this thesis up to its final shape, I made contact with several helpful people to whom I owe great gratitude beyond expression. My thanks go to Dr. Chester Hunt and Dr. Richard MacDonald who, in their capacity as my advisors, helped me greatly with their enlightened ideas and advice.

Many thanks go to Dr. Lewis for his initial advisory capacity in the Supervised Research which led to the right beginning of my thesis. Throughout the research and preparation of my thesis, I received tremendous unofficial help from several people, namely, Western Michigan University's faculty members, Waldo library staff, and others who are so numerous that I can only thank them *en masse* for their cooperation enhancing my research.

Joseph N. Muthiani

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

What Social Phenomena Involve

A discussion of comparative theories of social change calls first for a definition and description of the essence of the phenomena that experience change, as the main units of analysis. This, in a way, commits one to begin by way of explaining what is meant by the phrase "social change." One way of doing this is by breaking down the phrase and dealing with each word separately. In order to do this successfully, we may have to use a little adumbrationism, which is defined by some social theorists as "the dedicated, deliberate search for...earlier versions of scientific or scholarly ideas."[1] It is therefore proper at this point to draw from classical sociologists to acquaint ourselves with what constitutes the word "social."

Durkheim once defined what could be considered as a "social fact" as a bundle of institutional norms toward which behavior is oriented.[2] His method was to seek a social fact in relationship with the one that preceded it.

---

[1]Merton, Robert K., On Theoretical Sociology. New York: The Free Press, 1967. P. 20.

[2]Durkheim, Emile, The Rules of Sociological Method. Paris: Felix Alcan, 1925. P. 45.

It is this relationship of social facts that Weber tried to point out. He asserted that a "social relationship (thus) consists entirely and exclusively in the existence of a probability that there will be in some meaningfully understandable sense, a cause of social action." He defined actions as social "only so far as they are oriented to the behavior of others."[3] This means that a social action essentially involves more than one individual -- the actor and the alter, or the individual (or individuals) who is the source of the action and the other one (or ones) for whom the action is intended, with an understanding that he will receive some kind of response which is the alter's reaction.

In other words, at any interacting level every person considers the on-going action and consequently orients his own action to the group, or part of it, because the social system has conditioned him to assume individual or collective responses from an array of preconceived possibilities.

The existence of a probability of a course of social actions and the probability of alternatives of responses imply a common understanding by the interacting individuals. In this respect the action of the individual is

---

[3]Weber, Max, The Theory of Social Economic Organization. Talcott Parsons (ed.), New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. P. 120.

shaped in such a way that its covert orientation is meaningful to the interacting members, again, by social conditioning. Furthermore, if a relationship is a statement of how variables concern each other; then a social fact, which is here referred to as a social action, is the sum total of social patterns and their relationship. Parsons' principal concern, according to Cicourel, was to study the emergence of a theory of social action in the works of such theorists like Durkheim and Weber and to develop a generalized theory of action. It is believed that he felt that Weber came closest to the formulating of an explicit theory of actions with a few limitations.[4] He confirms that each orientation of action "involves a set of objectives of orientation."

> These are objects which are relevant in a situation because they afford alternative possibilities and impose limitations on the modes of gratifying the needs and achieving the goals of the actor and actors.[5]

To speak of alternative possibilities and imposition of limitations is to imply that some particular social actions or relationships eventually become more standardized than others, simply because they happen to be

---

[4]Cicourel, Aaron V., Method and Measurement in Sociology. New York: The Free Press, 1967. P. 194.

[5]Parsons, Talcott and Edward Shils (eds.), Toward A General Theory of Action. New York: Harper & Row, Inc., 1962. P. 4.

practiced the most. They may be practiced more than others because they may be more gratifying than the others would be in normal situations. Therefore the interacting individuals who emit such actions usually encounter complementary responses. Consequently they maintain a consistency of observable or describable patterns, composing distinctive features we may call systems. "A system of interactive relationships of a plurality of individuals is a social system."[6] This is to say that whenever we analyze a social relationship, we refer to some kind of a social system or its unit thereof; otherwise there would be no describable phenomena. Or, to use Hunter's words:

> Social analysis, particularly when dignified with the name of social science, is always tempted to a deterministic view of human affairs since its business is to detect 'laws', or at least regularities, in social development.[7]

The regularities of social patterns and their relationships are the components of a social system described by Parsons:

> ...similar actions are said to be <u>institutionalized</u> if the actors expect them to occur and there are cultural sanctions opposing nonconformity with expectations...the position of

---

[6] <u>loc. cit.</u> P. 26.

[7] Hunter, Guy, <u>The New Societies of Tropical Africa</u>. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1964. P. 332.

> the actor is described by saying that he occupies a status. When he acts in this status, he is said to be acting out a role. Thus institutions are in another sense systems of roles. Institutions, or systems of roles, are grouped into larger systems called social systems.[8]

Social actions in a social system are characteristically social behaviors because they are predictable habitual phenomena in the general society. It is therefore proper to say that a social action in a social system must be distributed among the members of a given population. In other words, such a fact involves the cooperation of more than one individual.[9] That is to say, a pattern of social behavior involves a complementary relationship of living forms which pattern the actions of each cooperating individual. It is "...the life process of the group and not of the separate individuals alone."[10]

To expound the foregoing, let us take an example of the family institution. Every member in this institution occupies a definite status--father, mother, child, all of which have been standardized by the members of the society. When the father, in most societies, works for the economic provision and protection of the family he is performing

---

[8] op. cit. P. 40

[9] Stevens, Edward, "Society and Act in George Herbert Mead," Social Research. Vol. 30, No. 4, Winter 1967. P. 625.

[10] ibid.

what the society has come to expect of a father's role. When the mother cooks with the intention of feeding the family, she is performing her mother's role as a housewife. And, when the family's older child picks up the younger sibling to protect him from going out into the busy street, he is performing his role as a cooperative sibling.

We find in a few societies that the role of child care has been patterned for the men rather than for the women. Yet in some others, especially matriarchal ones, social relationships may take a different form since they must be patterned according to the most frequent form and most rewarding behavior of the participants. Benedict described the Zuni family social relation in this context. Among the Zuni, who are matrilineal (tracing family descent on the female side) and matrilocal (residing in the residence of the wife's closest relatives), the men carry the babies and fondle them.[11]

Parsons asserts:

> The most general and fundamental property of a system is the interdependence of parts or variables. Interdependence consists in the existence of determinate relationships...

---

[11]Benedict, Ruth, Patterns of Culture. New York: Mentor Books, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1960. P. 97.

> interdependence is order in the relationship among the components which enter into a system.[12]

By extension, Moore observes that the concept of "system" is applicable to any situation in which units are interrelated long enough or regularly enough to be observed. According to him, these units are: role players, persons whose interaction is governed by rules of conduct we call norms. When the systems are organized groups with collective goals, there is a structure (a pattern) in their interrelatedness.[13] "Structural phenomena are characteristics of a system of social relations and groups which cause differences in the way interactions among people affect these people."[14] Thus the concept of social system can be used to make explicable and intelligible the behavior involved in such spheres as familial, community, educational, religious, occupational and other institutions or organized groups.[15]

---

[12] op. cit. P. 107.

[13] Moore, Wilbert E., Social Change. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964. P. 6.

[14] Stinchcombe, Arthur L., Constructing Social Theories. New York: Brace and World, Inc., 1968. P. 149.

[15] McKinney, John, Constructive Typology and Social Theory. New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1966. P. 120.

In summary:

> Complete knowledge of a social system would require: knowledge of its form, its functioning, its derivation, and its potentialities. In terms of form, a social system "consists of:" (a) its social structure, i.e., the totality of social relations among individuals at any given moment, (b) the totality of all its social usages -- an observable mode of behavior usual among the individuals in the system, and (c) the special modes of thinking and feeling related with social usages and the social relations.[16]

It is proper, therefore, to state that the term social system implies the more commonly used term "society." "According to this perspective, a society is a system of norms, i.e., of patterns of behavior considered by most members of the given society to be desirable and therefore to be practiced; and the institutions of society are clusters or complexes of norms within the social system."[17] For further elaboration, Piddocke first defines "norm" both in the sense of expected behavior and in the sense of the most frequent pattern of behavior. He then states that social structure and social organization, the totality usually called society, may be correspondingly conceived as the networks

---

[16]Nadel, S. F., The Theory of Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

[17]Piddocke, Stuart, "Social Sanctions", Anthropologica. N.S. Vol. X, No. 2., 1968. P. 263.

and the types of relationships obtaining between them; so the maintenance of society is the maintenance of the expectations in question.[18] This only confirms Parsons' assertion which is the major theme of this paper: "The complete analysis of action would comprise description both of the state of the system at the given moment and of the changes in the relations of the constituent variables."[19]

The constituent social patterns and relationships of a society which are analyzed are its institutionalized values and practices, or usages. "When we say that a certain value or practice is institutionalized in a society, we mean that the powers of that society are distributed in such a way as to expect a continuous force in favor of the value or practice."[20] Piddocke summarized this situation of imminent change and insistence for continuity as follows:

> First, change and not conservation of status quo is primary and inevitable, and therefore the maintenance of a particular social order requires the constant suppression of tendencies to change and the constant attempt to return to the original state of affairs from the deviated states brought about by the ever-present pressures for change. Second, expectations are learned, not genetically inherited. The constant fight to maintain

---

[18] op. cit. P. 264.

[19] Parsons and Shils, loc. cit. P. 6.

[20] Stinchcombe, loc. cit. P. 153.

> society therefore requires that these expectations be replicated in, i.e., learned by the new members of society, and once learned these expectations must be constantly reinforced in the minds of societal members lest they be forgotten or deliberately abandoned.[21]

This is why an analysis of a societal social relations, whether static or changing, calls for consideration of social forces which maintain the patterns under analysis. Such forces are normally referred to by some social scientists as social sanctions. But Piddocke maintains that there are social sanctions and natural sanctions.[22] By definition social sanctions are provisions of rewards for compliance with the norms and of punishment for deviance therefrom. Natural sanctions are those consequences of an item of behavior which serve either to favor the survival of the actor causing a perpetuation of the behavior pattern or hindering the actor's survival and eventually causing the extinction of the behavior pattern. Put a little differently, social sanctions are mechanisms by which social integration is achieved.

It has already been established that a society is a type of social system, and Parsons maintains that it

---

[21] Piddocke, loc. cit. P. 264.

[22] op. cit. P. 266.

"...is relatively the most self-sufficient type of social system."[23] This notion tends to distinguish the kind of social system we are concerned with in this paper from others like schools, business firms, and kinship units, which are rather subsystems of the society. In this case the interchangeability of "action" and "behavior" by those who tend to analyze any social system is implied. Nevertheless, Parsons declares his use of one rather than the other:

> We prefer the term "action" to "behavior" because we are interested not in the physical events of behavior for their own sake but in their patterning, their patterned meaningful products...ranging from implements to works of art, and the mechanisms and processes that control such patternings.[24]

But for the sake of the comparative perspective of this paper the two terms will be used interchangeably. "Their" role in patterning, controlling, and maintaining the social system implies their essence in the self-sufficient social system -- the society.

"The core of a society," says Parsons, "as a system, is the patterned normative order through which the life of

---

[23] Parsons, Talcott, Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966. P. 2.

[24] op. cit. P. 5.

a population is collectively organized."[25] Thus, a society may be defined as a collectivity of a population. "We call this one entity of the society, in its collective aspect, the societal community."[26] Again, because of the comparative nature of this paper, the terms "society" and "community" may at times be used interchangeably. Parsons prefers "societal community"; but for our purposes we are not concerned with their difference but with their similarity in their sociologically analytical context. To solve the probable controversy on the self-sufficiency of a society or community we can turn to Parsons again where he remarks:

> Self-sufficiency by no means requires that all the role-involvements of all members be carried on with the society. However, a society does have to provide a repertoire of role-opportunities sufficient for individuals to meet their fundamental personal exigencies at all stages of the life cycle without going outside the society itself to meet its own exigencies.[27]

So far it is hoped that the point has been established that there is the on-going process of interactive behavior, whose persistent form we call social structure. "Social structure is the form that action takes, the

---

[25] *op. cit.* P. 10.

[26] *ibid.*

[27] *op. cit.* P. 18.

actually existing network of social relations."[28] Or, to use Cartwright's example:

> All members of a group, whether their purposes are expoitive or cooperative, share a common need for being able to predict how other members will behave toward them. Out of this need for predictability come strong pressures on each member to assume certain stable relations with all other members.[29]

---

[28]Geertz, Clifford, "Ritual and Social Change: A Javanese Example", American Anthropologist. Vol. 59, February 1957. P. 33.

[29]Cartwright, Dorwin and Alvin Zander, Social Sciences 121: Social Interaction and Group Process. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963. P. 67.

What Social Change Involves

The persistence of social relations which we call social structure depends very much on their "conduciveness."[30] This implies that if the environmental conditions change, then they are no longer complementary to the established social structure unless it changed. This condition of structural conduciveness, for instance, is illustrated best where material or livestock wealth has been closely tied to kinship relations, which define rules of inheritance. Upon the introduction of money economy, it is the younger people who acquire the new type of wealth. Consequently, structural conduciveness begins weakening because of the lessening importance of age for wealth acquisition. To retain the social system new social relations and social structures or substructures begin to emerge centering around the young members of the society.

Some social scientists assert that the processes of human interaction which result in change are the same processes through which all social behavior is carried on.[31] For our purpose, says Coser in confirmation, it need only be noted that when a social structure is no longer

---

[30] Structural conduciveness is covered fully in Neil Smelser's Theory of Collective Behavior. Glencoe: The Free Press, Inc., 1963.

[31] Washburne, Norman F., Interpreting Social Change in America. New York: Random House, 1954. P. 31.

considered legitimate (social acceptable), individuals with similar objective positions will come to constitute themselves into self-conscious groups with common interests.[32] Such are the dynamics which make for social change about which Coser declares:

> We propose to talk of a change of system when all major structural relations, its basic institutions, and its prevailing value system* have been drastically altered...Change of system may be the result (or the sum total) of previous changes within the system.[33]

In this summation, institutional or structural change is social change; cognitive change, value system is social change; each can change with or independently of the other. Thus, in the study of social structure, the concrete reality with which we are concerned is the set of actually existing relations at a given moment of time which link together certain human beings. Thus, implicitly, "...the actual relations of persons and groups of persons change..."[34]

---

[32]Coser, Lewis, The Functions of Social Conflict. Glencoe: The Free Press, Inc., 1956. P. 38.

*Value system is used here to mean "a set of interrelated ideas, concepts, and practices, to which strong sentiments are attached." Ina C. Brown, Understanding Other Culture. Englewood Cliffs; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963. P. 95.

[33]op. cit. P. 28.

[34]Radcliffe-Brown, Structure and Function in Primitive Society. Glencoe: The Free Press, Inc., 1956. P. 192.

Accordingly, Barth heeded:

> To speak about change, one needs to be able to specify the nature of the continuity between the situations discussed under the rubic of change. Change implies a difference of a very particular kind: one that results from an alteration through time and is determined by constraints of what has been, or continues in a situation.[35]

It can be stipulated, in accordance with Barth, that this way of isolating the "underlying determinants of social forms," so as to see how changes in them generate changing social systems, implies a view of behavior and society -- it concerns "social change."

In view of the foregoing, a theoretical framework for the analysis of social change concerns largely what happens to social structures. But we are warned that structural change may not imply a high degree of coincidence between the new motivations of any large number of the members of the society. However, it does imply large-scale shift in pattern of their activities. This, says Firth, may mean a new common orientation, or it may involve only a greater dispersion of their goals. But, at least, the observer can recognize that a former basic relation has lost its magnitude, its force, or its frequence. He may be able to see a new relation substituted for it, or several new

---

[35]Barth, Fredrick, "On the Study of Social Change," American Anthropologist. Vol. 69, No. 6, December 1967. P. 664.

ones may have consequently risen.[36]

By definition, "social change" is the process by which alteration occurs in the structure and function of a social system.[37] In other words, when either the structure or function (or both) changes, it is a case of social change. We can break down the process of social change into three steps, according to Rogers: invention, diffusion, and consequence. Invention refers to the process by which new ideas are developed, either by creativity or by integrating a borrowed element to one's social system. It can also be by developing a new value system concerning new or old artifacts of behaviors. Diffusion is the process by which the new ideas are communicated throughout a given social system. Consequence refers to the effect which occurs within the system with relation to innovations or borrowed ideas. Through adoption (or rejection) of new ideas the structure and function of a given social system are altered.[38] In this context, "new ideas" involve norms, values, beliefs and teleology.

Structural change is a product of social interaction by which pressures are felt, advantages of particular

---

[36]Firth, Raymond, Elements of Social Organization. (Third ed.) Boston: Beacon Press, 1963. Pp. 83-84.

[37]Rogers, Everett M., Modernization Among Peasants. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969. P. 3.

[38]ibid.

relations realized, (practice of particular social relations produce desirable consequences), and new responsibilities organized and recognized. For a new pattern of behavior to be adopted, the values that govern the old patterns attain some degree of plasticity to cope with new social demands. The same old ends become possible to meet by alternative means. This implies that imperfections in the previous "means--ends" of a substantial number of members of the society have to be adjusted. Reactions of some members' change of behavior from an established pattern involve others in the system. "By imitation, by resentment, or by the need to repair the breach in their accustomed ways, they tend to modify their own conduct likewise."[39] All interacting members have to adjust their roles and statuses so that the total social structure is conducive to the new situation. That is to say, "...social structures involve social statuses and social roles, and where a structure is changing it is reasonable to expect some alteration in the status system."[40]

In short, social structure comprises the patterned arrangements of role-sets, status-sets, and status-

---

[39] loc. cit. P. 85.

[40] Maher, Robert F., New Men of Papua: A Study in Culture Change. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961. P. 100.

sequences.[41] This definition can be elaborated by a discussion of the three concepts: "(1) role-sets, meaning the actions and relationships that flow from a social status; (2) status-sets, meaning the probable congruence of various positions occupied by an individual; (3) status-sequences, meaning the probable succession of positions occupied by an individual through time."[42] This implies an important factor -- that when a social theorist is analyzing social change, he is not particularly interested in changing customs or traditions as such.

> His interest lies in the relationships which exist among people and which determine their generalized patterns of behavior. Social change is change in these relationships -- changes both in the form of relationship among people and in the number of relationships in which the individual participates.[43]

Theorists of social change have concerned themselves with both evolutionary and modernization types to point out a number of somewhat broad, long-range changes in social organization that are becoming evident. In analytical terms, in accordance with Olsen, these trends include

---

[41] Merton, Robert K., Social Theory & Social Structure. (revised ed.), Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957. P. 368.

[42] Moore, Wilbert, Order and Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967. P. 173.

[43] Lloyd, P. C., Africa In Social Change: West African Societies in Transition. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968. P. 161.

such phenomena as (a) increasing size of organizational units, in terms of population and geographic area; (b) growing (functional) interdependence among social organizations; (c) shifting of many social activities and responsibilities from small organizations such as families and neighborhoods to larger ones; (d) rising specialization for division of labor, among both individuals and organized groups; (e) emergence of formal and complex organizations, composed of many levels of interrelated subparts; (f) increasing centralized coordination and control in many types of organizations; (g) spreading cultural secularism and universalism; and (h) growing application of scientific knowledge and rational thought to the organizing social life.[44] These eight points will be eventually covered according to their utility in our comparative theoretical explanation.

What Constitutes An Explanation

With an explanation, one tends to explain why things are the way they are, or he may try to tell how come they came to be that way. It is a way of presenting a system of propositions and categorizing the concepts within the system making it possible for an empirical analysis.

---

[44] Olsen, Marvin, The Process of Social Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968. P. 263.

Therefore an explanation may be seen as "...a conceptual scheme which may be taken to mean a set of concepts standing in relation to one another, wherein each individual concept assumes meaning relative to the others."[45]

An expert of explanatory philosophy, Hempel substitutes the word hypothesis for proposition. So in our context here we may use the two terms interchangeably without any fear of misgivings, because he asserts that he uses the word 'hypothesis' "...to refer to whatever statement is under test, no matter whether it purports to describe some particular fact or event, or to express a general law or some other, more complex, proposition."[46] The test implications of an hypothesis or proposition are normally of a conditional character in that "...they tell us that under specified test conditions, an outcome of a certain kind will occur."[47] In Hempel's contention, statements of this kind can be put into the following conditional form: If conditions of 'C are realized, then an event of type 'E will occur. "Test conditions of this kind provide a basis for an experimental test, which amounts to bringing about the conditions C and checking whether E occurs as implied

---

[45]McKinney, John C., Constructive Typology and Social Theory. New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1966. P. 36.

[46]Hempel, Carl G., Philosophy of Natural Science. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966. P. 19.

[47]ibid.

in the hypothesis."[48] In keeping with this provision, we need a way of applying the selected theoretical models to empirical data for an evaluation of their utility.

If we are to test the propositions of the various theorists, we need a way to evaluate their acceptability or their rejection. According to Hempel, in appraising what may be called a scientific acceptability of a hypothesis or a proposition, one of the most important factors to consider is the extent and the character of the relevant evidence available and the resulting strength of the support it gives to the hypothesis. With Hempel's advice, for our purpose, we need more than just one empirical case for evaluating the propositions derived from our theoretical models. "Such explanations are sometimes expressed in the form 'E because of 'C, where 'E is the event to be explained and 'C is some antecedent or concomitant event or state of affairs."[49]

Hempel's stipulations reveal that, with an explanation, one could arrive at a law of correlation, to show how variables concern each other; or one could arrive at a causal law, to explain what caused the variable under study, or, in other words, what the antecedent conditions

---

[48] loc. cit. P. 20.

[49] loc. cit. P. 52.

were before the event occurred.[50] When an explanation is used this way, as a statement of proposition, it suggests a description of the variables in a systematic analysis of their cause-and-effect, an important factor in analysis of social change. In other words, a scientific model of explanation concerns particular occurrences and explains them by subsuming them under a general law. Hence:

> In technical sense, a model is a set of propositions, axioms, or fundamental premises which focuses the direction of subsequent research by pointing to immediately relevant aspects of the phenomena under scrutiny. The model itself is not a compost of statements of fact, hence cannot be directly validated or invalidated; from the model one deduces propositions regarding existing conditions and it is these that are subject to empirical verifications.[51]

In this case it is justifiable to analyze theoretical models in order to probe the implied propositions to better apply them to empirical cases to make it possible to reach a sound decision of the utility of Parsons' own model. Hempel's explanation schema will be utilized for our explanation:

---

[50] Willer, David, Scientific Sociology: Theory and Method. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967. P. 25.

[51] Reusch, E. A. (ed.), Contemporary Sociology. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. Pp. 163-164.

$$L_1 \ldots L_2 \ldots L_3 \ldots L_n$$

$$C_1 \ldots C_2 \ldots C_3 \ldots C_n$$

$$E$$

$L_1 \ldots L_2 \ldots L_3 \ldots L_n$ = propositions.

$C_1 \ldots C_2 \ldots C_3 \ldots C_n$ = antecedent conditions.

E = the event to be explained.

In summary, the schema makes it possible to explain the causality of the event by using propositions to go back and find out if there is a casual relationship between it and the antecedent conditions. The function of the more abstract propositions is to bring together the descriptive states suggested by the antecedent conditions and the event being explained.

PARSONS' THEORETICAL MODEL

The Model Analyzed

Evolution and differentiation are the two concepts that Parsons utilizes to explain social change. Parsons does not define the term evolution in his work, comparatively utilized here. However, he implies it by stating, "We are concerned with the sequence of changing structural patterns which characterize societies as social systems..."[52] Since social change is observed as a series of historical events so that an observer sees trends or series of structural alterations,[53] it may be proper to utilize the theory of evolution.

It is generally agreed that there are two types of social evolution -- general and specific. "The fundamental difference between specific and general evolution appears in this: The former is connected, historic sequence of forms, the latter a sequence of stages exemplified by forms of a given order of development."[54] There is a general consensus that cultural change is observed

---

[52] op. cit. P. 3.

[53] op. cit. P. 264.

[54] Sahlins, Marshall and Elman Service, (eds.), Evolution and Culture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960. P. 32.

"...in general respect as well as a specific one."[55] For instance, when Parsons talks about three stages -- primitive, intermediate and modern,[56] he is concerned with general evolution of societies. When he talks about variation and differentiation from simple to progressively more complex forms, he is concerned with specific evolution. This is evidenced by his attack on the early concepts of evolution, and especially, by his assertion that society "...has not proceeded in a single neatly definable line..."[57] Social theorists who advocate the specific type of evolution tend to deal with specific cultures or societies as their unit of analysis. They maintain that the adaptive variations of life cause modifications which make for differences in modes of life during the historical stages of various societies. This is witnessed by Parsons' empirical examples, in their evolutionary as well as their comparative perspectives.[58]

The utility of the social evolution theory as employed by Parsons lies in his perspectives of differentiation, adaptation, and specialization rather than the traditional conception which overlooks modifications by adaptive variations accounts only for a linear development

---

[55] op. cit. P. 28.

[56] Parsons, op. cit. P. 3.

[57] loc. cit. P. 2.

[58] ibid.

toward higher level and overall complexity. For instance, in support of Parsons, the family structure of most tribal-level societies changes to a simple nuclear family from the complex extended one. Such a change is caused especially by modernization, and has been noticed in some societies while a few others retain the extended family structure for various reasons. It is a specific type of social evolution, applicable to specific societies and cannot be generalized for all societies.

Most of the critics of the theory of evolution tend to question its sociological validity. But some modern theorists subscribe to its analogous utility. Says Willer:

> The most valuable contribution of the evolutionary analogue is to be found in its concentration upon structures in process. Thinking in this analogue...then over a certain period of time we may expect certain definite social stages...characterized by certain structural changes.[59]

Willer's statement is in support of an earlier notion by Sorokin: "Despite an enormous amount of research (in this field), hardly any original theory has emerged, hardly any general principles of change have been formulated, and hardly any uniformity has been discovered that

---

[59]Willer, David, Scientific Sociology: Theory & Method. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967. P. 31.

is as comprehensive and impressive as the theories and laws of evolution...."[60]

Feldman bridges the gap between the proponents and critics of the evolution theory. He maintains that there is no single theory of evolution in either the biological or the social sciences, but rather there is a magnificent set of ideas and conceptions which have themselves experienced change, and that have been applied fruitfully to the study of a wide range of phenomena, including social change. Like him, we can conclude, "...there is no question but that societies change, and that social change is in some general sense evolutionary in character."[61] Evolutionary because it is expensive of time, it is a structural change, and it occurs as a process for adaptation. All this is in harmony with Parsons' declaration, "evolution (however) is a summary generalization standing for a type of change."[62] It is not the aim of this paper to judge whether certain theories are right or wrong, but rather to discuss their explanatory utility. Therefore at this point we can stand for Parsons' employment of the

---

[60]Sorokin, Pitirin, Sociological Theories of Today. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966. P. 594.

[61]Feldman, Arnold, in Herbert R. Barringer et al, Social Change in Developing Areas. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1965. P. 594.

[62]Parsons, loc. cit. P. 20.

theory of evolution in social change -- change that is structural and gradual, not necessarily linear, which will be clarified further along with that of differentiation in his paradigm.

Parsons defines differentiation as the process whereby "a unit, sub-system, or category of units or sub-systems having a single, relatively well-defined place in the society divides into units or systems...which differ in both structure and functional significance for the wider system."[63] One remembers that Parsons uses the term social system as some kind of equivalent of social organization in an abstract sense. Social organization in its brief definition is the ordered relations which the parts of a society have to each other.[64] Assuming that by function Parsons means the adaptation or adjustment aspect of a unit of a structure for the larger system, one can then go to his operational explanation of the process of differentiation. To illustrate this he takes an example of the kinship organization where household is predominantly the unit of residence, agriculture and production. In case of change by differentiation, several duties of production and even agriculture are taken up by specialized

---

[63] loc. cit. P. 22.

[64] Service, Elman, Primitive Social Organization: An Evolutionary Perspective. New York: Random House, 1964. P. 18.

units, which may use the same members but in a specialized, non-residential, non-kinship setting, as can be found in most Western societies. In this perspective Parsons gives a paradigm of "evolutionary" social change:[65]

Parsons' Paradigm of Social Change Analyzed*

1. "First is the process of differentiation.
2. For capacity to perform the differentiated primary functions there is the process of adaptive upgrading.
3. Differentiation processes pose new problems of integration for the system.
4. There is reliance upon more generalized resources that are independent of their ascriptive sources.

---

*Function is used here to mean the special responsibility which is the normal or characteristic action of a particular part of the entire structure. Adaptive upgrading refers to the capacity for a structure to be more effective after adapting novelty, which is necessary for its persistence. Integration is the process by which diverse and conflicting social units are harmonized or unified. Generalized resources refers to the situation in which the persons for the functioning of a various structure are not availed by ascription processes. A general type of social system would be that situation in which the generalization of resources is distributed over most of the entire social system. See Parsons, ibid.; Fairchild (1959).

[65] op. cit. P. 21-23.

5. A new value system of the society "establishes the desirability of a general type of social system."

From Parsons' paradigm, we may deduce the following propositions if we take differentiation as the starting point:

1. The greater the differentiation, the greater the quest for adaptation ("adaptive upgrading").
2. The greater the differentiation, the greater the problem of integration.
3. The greater the success of differentiation, the greater generalization of nonascription of roles and behavior.
4. The greater the new value system, the greater the desirability for a new generalized social system.

COMPARISON OF MODELS

Olsen's Hypotheses of Social Evolution Analyzed and Compared

Because of Parsons' evolutionary perspective, it is considered here in order to begin our comparison of his theoretical model with Olsen's. One reason for considering Olsen first is that he very much agrees with Parsons on the utility of social evolution. Like Parsons, he asserts that social evolution is seen as a kind of social change -- or more accurately, a theoretical perspective of social change.[66] In this case, like Parsons, he does not commit himself to social evolution as a "theory." Nor does he see it as a "one-dimension model" for explaining social change. He admits that different theoretical perspectives on social evolution prevail, each of which tried to explain the essential nature of the process in terms of a few key ideas or variables. Among the most common names for these perspectives he says "...are cultural accumulation, ecological development, structural and functional differentiation..."[67]

Again, like Parsons, Olsen does not define social

---

[66] Olsen, Mervin E., The Process of Social Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968. P. 264.

[67] ibid.

evolution, but unlike him, he does not provide a paradigm that we could use for our comparison. However, the purpose of this paper is a comparison of theoretical models. In this respect, we could as well utilize his four hypotheses concerning the evolutionary type of social change. The first hypothesis states:

> Social evolution occurs as material and social technology is accumulated through time and applied to organized social life.[68]

Empirically, in modern Africa new technology which facilitates modernization has been accumulated over a number of years and through its application social life has been affected. It can be assumed that the point Olsen tries to make with this hypothesis is that social evolution is accounted for after enough harmony between the material or technological and the new adaptable social structure has established an observable type of social system. To put this in Parsons' words, "Among change processes, the type most important to the evolutionary perspective is the enhancement of adaptive capacity, either with the society originating a new type of structure or, through cultural diffusion and in the involvement of other factors in combination with the new type of structure...."[69] In Africa,

---

[68] loc. cit. P. 265.

[69] Parsons, op. cit. P. 21.

again, time lapsed until the social system adjusted itself to the new technology introduced from outside, and when this adjustment was made, then social structural change was observable.

The second of Olsen's hypotheses states:

> Social evolution occurs as a society acting through its economy, effectively copes with the tasks of surviving in its environment and therefore acquires surplus resources for the population growth and organizational development.[70]

This is comparable to Parsons' process of adaptive upgrading, by which he draws an example of the efficiency of economic production in factories in comparison with that of households. In other words, "...the participating people, as well as the collectivity as a whole, must become more productive than before...."[71] The modernized population in Africa, for instance, has been steadily raising their adaptive level by continuous increase of specialization with differentiation over the years. In most cases this meant development of a new type of population, consequently producing new social patterns essential for coping with the new non-social systems for adaptation of the society. Most of the Western socio-cultural

---

[70] op. cit. P. 266.

[71] op. cit. P. 22.

traits presenting social change in Africa evidently concern the economic or technological aspects usually termed "industrialization." Therefore African social change to some extent, can be seen as emanating with the people's struggle (adaptive upgrading) to maintain that which they have acquired so that the society could better exist in the changing situation and sustain the growing population.

To elaborate the foregoing, let us take an example of the "cattle areas" of Africa. Traditionally it was the men's duty to tend the animals while the women tended the crops, in addition to housekeeping and a few other jobs. Upon introduction of the plow and cash crops, a new division of labor eventually evolved. Now that the men have taken to cash crop raising, their animals have to be reduced, usually by conversion to money, the value of which has crept in with cash crops. A combination of a desire for more production to adapt better to the new cash economy and a continuous attempt to sustain the increasing population facilitated by healthier ways of living (among other things) breeds commerce, new industries and urbanism. Almost the total environment has been changed and the given society, or part of society, has developed new social patterns both within the system and with the external environment. Smythe's summary on African social

change is to the point as he explains, "A major object... is the social organization of the African, for the life of the modern Africa as lived by his forefathers is being changed considerably."[72] He then elaborates:

> All this helps to review the change that has come about in the manpower picture where the African is, at varying pace in different parts of the continent, gradually changing from rustic resident to industrial worker and thus beginning to form a pool of industrial manpower to meet the needs of the present and future in his milieu that now differs considerably from the traditional...environment of his forefathers. This change has meant, on the part of some families, however, a definite severing of connections with the countryside and who, despite the severity of the conditions in the cities, must continue to live there since they have adapted to a money-wage economy and it is only in cities that one is able to find this kind of income.[73]

Parsons' "process of <u>differentiation</u>" which was defined before is further elaborated by Olsen's third hypothesis, which further elaborates the principle of <u>adaptive upgrading</u>.

> Social evolution occurs as a few original multi-purpose organizations become structurally differentiated into many...

---

[72] Smythe, Hugh H., "Social Change in Africa," <u>American Journal of Economic and Sociology</u>. Vol. 19., No. 2., January 1960. P. 194.

[73] <u>loc. cit.</u> P. 200.

> specialized organizations each of which effectively performs its particular activities as an institutionalized part of the total society.[74]

It seems right to assume that by organizations Olsen means what Parsons means by sub-systems or units or systems of interacting persons. To be an "institutionalized part of the total society," as Olsen states, is to involve the Parsons' problems of integration advanced by the process of differentiation as provided in his paradigm. Operationally Hodgkin explains this point with the same example of urbanization:

> By providing opportunities for a greater degree of specialization, towns enable men (and women) to acquire new skills and powers. By mixing men from a variety of social backgrounds they make possible the discovery of new points of contact and interest...Thus African towns have this two-fold aspect: seen from one standpoint, they lead to a degradation of African civilization and ethic; seen from another, they contain the germs of a new, more interesting and diversified, civilization...[75]

In the old and traditional African configuration the members are socially linked to one another by kinship

---

[74] op. cit. P. 267.

[75] Hodgkin, Thomas, Nationalism in Colonial Africa. London: Frederick Muller, Ltd., 1956. P. 63.

ties, and the family is an outstanding social structure for cohesion and stability. "It has the sacred obligation to impart to the child the social etiquette and elementary principles that govern tribal living..."[76] In the admixture of the urbanized population this social structure is no longer viable; other specialized units have taken over the duties which had been within the role of the parents.

> Today a child encounters the teachings of a missionary, the warnings of a policeman and the allurements of the city itself. These agencies have taken over the duties of the parent before the child gets the basic training at home.[77]

As the role of the child with relation to that of the father, and the father's with relation to that of the child are changing, so is the role of the woman both as a mother and as a housewife. As she leaves her customary social setting in which she occupied a certain position in the traditional kinship pattern, so must she and all others face up to the problems inherent in Africa. The social scene that presents and requires new and different

---

[76]Smythe, ibid.

[77]Njoroge, Ngethe, "Problems of African Urbanism," The African Newsletter, 4, February-March, 1958. P. 9.

relations with the new members within her contact enhances her adaptive capacity causing development of new social patterns for political, professional, or business environment that used to be foreign to her.

Taking the two points of Parsons' paradigm -- reliance upon more generalized resources that are independent of their own ascriptive resources, and establishment of desirability of a general type of social system, the fourth of Olsen's hypotheses can be discussed here. He hypothesizes:

> Social evolution occurs as social actors... expand existing organizations and activities or create new ones to achieve goals through collective action.[78]

The expansion of organizations and activities of a social system implies Parsons' desirability of a general type of social system, advanced by a reliance upon generalized resources. Collective action is normally achieved when the newly created social activities and organizations are understandably distributed over the general system.

Taking the case of industrialization, the general population concerned has to be aware that in employment -- occupational systems, the father of a household can no longer supervise production in the capacity of his role

---

[78]Olsen, op. cit. P. 268

in his kinship. If this awareness were not well-distributed over the general society, the created role of the supervisor, usually young in Africa, would present social tension in the power structure. Social evolution here takes place from the particular (ascribed) to the general (wide variety of choice). In African traditional societies an individual's position was ascribed at birth. Social relations largely revolved around kinship or ethnic considerations. This changed greatly to cope with the changing social environment as witnessed by Spiro:

> In modern societies more stress is laid upon a man's achievement and his potential than his ethnic background...occupational differences, while relatively simple and stable in traditional societies, becomes far more marked in modern societies, with the specialization of labor and the development of complex (bureaucratized) organizations. In social sphere, accordingly, modernization involves shifts from ascription to achievement, from ethnic groups to association...[79]

This change from ascribed roles to achieved ones in African social change is typical of any place undergoing modernization (Westernization). Today modernization is accompanied by industrialization, and sometimes there is

---

[79]Spiro, Herbert J. (ed.), Patterns of African Development, Englewood Cliffs; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967. Pp. 64-65.

no difference between the two. Eisenstadt asserts that the prime social trait of modern industrial enterprise is that -- ideally, and to a considerable extent, empirically -- the individual obtains a position on the basis of his achievement, relative to the demands of the job. Instead of measuring his achievement by the roles and statuses he was ascribed to undergo through his lifetime, his achievement is measured universalistically. That is to say, the same standards apply to all jobholders of the same status, and the enterprise may not dictate his behavior except insofar as it is directly relevant to getting the job done.[80]

In comparison with Parsons, let us deduce some implied propositions from Olsen's hypotheses before including more models.

(1) The greater the accumulation and application of material and technology, the greater the social change.

(2) The greater the adaptation, the greater the social change.

(3) The greater the specialization, the greater the differentiation and the greater the institutionalization of differentiated units.

(4) The greater the function of the new social organizations and activities through collective action the greater the social change.

---

[80] Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.), Comparative Perspectives on Social Change, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968. P. 50.

Marshall Sahlins' and Elman Service's Model of Evolution

The theoretical model of Sahlins and Service is that of drawing an analogy between organimistic (life) and social or cultural evolution. The utility of their work for comparison in this paper is on the same grounds that essentially there is not much difference between cultural and social evolution or change. It can be assumed here that the major benefit deriving from this analogous approach is the realization of the distinction between the classical linear evolution and the more recent notion of either linear or non-linear, depending on what is being described. This is the distinction between specific and general evolution, mentioned earlier. In summary, Sahlins and Service state:

> ...specific evolution is "descent with modification," the adaptive variation of life "along its many lines;" general evolution is the progressive emergence of higher life "stage by stage." The advance of improvement we see in specific evolution is relative to the adaptive problem; it is progress in the sense of progression along a line from one point to another, from less to more adjusted to a given habitat. The progress of general evolution is in contrast, absolute; it is passage from less to greater energy exploitation, lower to higher levels of integration, and less to greater all-round adaptability.[81]

---

[81] Sahlins, Marshall and Elman Service (eds.), Evolution and Culture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961. P. 22.

They have broken down the notion of "level of integration" by embracing it with that of "greater", "higher" or "more complicated" organization, in organimistic evolution. "An organism is a higher level of integration than another when it has more parts and sub-parts (a higher order of segmentation); when its parts are more specialized; and when the whole is effectively integrated."[82]

The idea of higher or more complicated level by gaining more parts and sub-parts is comparable to the theory of differentiation utilized by Parsons and Olsen. They both subscribe to the proposition of "the greater the differentiation the greater the problem of integration." Like Sahlins and Service, they do not define the concept of integration. But, if we equate it with the concept of co-ordination, we may assume that they all agree that a development of more parts calls for a development of a greater level of integration.

Turning to cultural evolution, Sahlins and Service show the meaning of "all-round adaptability," which they do not directly define in their analogy of organimistic evolution. Equating "over-all" with "all-round" adaptability, we could arrive at the notion that while there are variations in life or organimistic changes, because of

---

[82] *ibid.*

adaptive variations yielding general rules of the trend of evolution of specific species, there are some general rules applicable to total life process towards higher level of life. For this reason Sahlins and Service, in their analogy, point out that culture, like life, undergoes specific as well as general evolution. "There are myriads of culture types, that is, of the culture characteristic of an ethnic group or region, and an even greater variety of cultures proper..."[83]

"The fundamental differences stem from the fact that cultural variation, unlike biological, can be transmitted between different lines by diffusion."[84] Cultures that had quite different traditions may converge and their assimilation produce different types from the original ones. Traits of a more advanced or better adapted culture may be borrowed by the less adapted ones in order to adjust to comparable problems even without undergoing all intermediate stages. Diffusion could also take place by acculturation which entails the replacement of lower traits of cultures by more highly developed ones from dominating cultural groups. These various ways are possible because culture has a wide range of adaptation potentiality.

---

[83] ibid.

[84] loc. cit. P. 27.

Unlike Parsons and Olsen, Sahlins and Service provide a definition for the concept of adaptation -- the securing and conserving of control over environment.[85] The potentiality of cultural adaptation involves the conception of culture as an open system. If adaptation applies both to nature and to various cultural systems, then the variations of the levels of development, either specifically or generally, will be distributed over both social and technological aspects of a culture.

Although Sahlins and Service do not explicitly give us propositions for comparison, we can deduce some of them from their implications:

(1) The greater the adaptation, the greater the integration of technology, social structure, and philosophy.

(2) The greater the technological change, the greater the social adaptation.

OR: The greater the coordination and deployment of technology, the greater the adaptation.

(3) The greater the technological innovation, the greater the change in the social order.

Comparatively, these propositions would be found very close to those deduced from Olsen's four hypotheses.

Sahlins and Service explain what could be meant by

---

[85] *loc. cit.* P. 45.

social or cultural evolution, while Olsen hypothesizes it. They all agree with Parsons on the theory of differentiation. If, as pointed out already, social evolution is a theoretical perspective of social change, a different kind of perspective may help in clarifying the major concepts for comparison -- specialization and differentiation, adaptation, and integration in the model of modernization. This suggests a theorist like Eisenstadt as will be seen below.

Eisenstadt's Theory of Modernization

The foregoing theorists were picked for comparison with Parsons basically because of their evolutionary perspective. On the contrary, Eisenstadt's contribution to our comparison is essentially on the basis of the theory of differentiation. He takes this theory to explain social change in the perspective of modernization. From the historical point of view, "...modernization is the process of change towards those types of social, economic, and political systems that have developed in Western Europe and North America..."[86]

The utility for comparison with the other theorists lies in Eisenstadt's statement, "Perhaps the most important aspect of (this) differentiation and specialization of roles in all the major institutional spheres is the separation between the different roles held by an individual - especially among the occupational and political roles, and between them and the family kinship roles."[87] Here Eisenstadt tries to implicitly point out that modernization essentially involves differentiation, since the

---

[86]Eisenstadt, Shamuel A. (ed. by Moore and Smelser), Modernization, Protest and Change. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966. P. 1.

[87]loc. cit. P. 3.

main feature of modernization is bureaucratization which means segmentation of specialized functional units of major organizations. For instance, the organization of production may be seen as broken into two major units of production *per se* and distribution. Each of these can be broken down further into units of management, line staff, client and so forth.

The validity of bureaucratization depends on the validity of its process of socialization. Eisenstadt tells us that modernization is impossible without some degree of social mobilization and structural differentiation. For differentiation, he points out the fact that it is impossible to invisage a modern economy without the development of markets, labor, capital and industry. For socialization, he borrows from Deutsch the concept of "social mobilization,"[88] which is defined as "'...the process in which major clusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded and broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behavior.'"[89]

When Eisenstadt refers to social, economic and political change in his definition of modernization, he comes

---

[88]Deutsch, Karl W., "Social Mobilization and Political Development," *American Political Science Review*, 55 (September 1961), Pp. 494-495.

[89]*op. cit.* P. 2.

to agreement with Parsons. The latter stated that social change is associated with specialization of roles in the institutions like markets in economic life, voting and party activities in politics, and instrumentally recruited bureaucratic organizations and mechanisms in most institutional spheres.[90] In addition to differentiation in economic systems, Eisenstadt comments on social and political differentiations, which completes his agreement with Parsons:

> Similarly, one can scarcely envisage a modern political system without some administrative centralization, and without the tendency of wider groups and strata to participate in the political process and of the rules to influence or control this participation. Also the extension of criteria of universalism and achievement, and of growing specialization, into strategic parts of the social structure -- especially in the sphere of social stratification and the legal system -- constitute a crucial precondition of any process of modernization.[91]

From Eisenstadt's description of the process of change by the modernization model, we may formulate the following propositions:

> (a) The greater the modernization the greater the change in allocation and regulation of roles.

---

[90]Parsons, Talcott, Structure and Process in Modern Societies. New York: Free Press, Inc., 1959.

[91]op. cit. P. 146.

(b) The greater the modernization the greater the specialization and differentiation.

(c) The greater the modernization the greater the transition towards large-scale bureaucratic administrations.

(d) The greater the modernization the greater the demographic change (for adaptation to the consequences of industrialization).

Like the rest of the theorists, Eisenstadt's implicit propositions basically refer to the same concepts advanced by Parsons -- specialization and differentiation; adaptation; and integration. The major difference (not a deviation) is that Eisenstadt describes social change by focusing on a particular kind of its agent. By picking modernization as an agent of change, he dwells on macro-change like those who focus on the change in broad social systems. Another advantage by utilizing Eisenstadt's theoretical perspective is that we are going to see how the propositions of these theorists apply to African social change, which is of course by modernization. Spiro made this point clear when he explained that all African leaders subscribe to the idea of progress,modernity, industrial growth and territorial integration. Territorial integration is sustained by nationalism (the modern type) which Spiro maintains is a kind of social value, a feeling of solidarity among diverse groups.[92]

---

[92]Spiro, op. cit. P. 75.

Modernization implies intrusion of change from foreign social-cultural systems. Even when change is introduced from outside the system, it is not always necessary that the given society change all its social structure. Some of the original structures may be found functional for the new developments and a few modifications in specialization is enough for adaptation to the new situation. This is another validity of the theoretical model of modernization.

Africa becomes a good place for application of the preceding models of social change, because there we find both changes by differentiation and changes by specialization of indigenous patterns of social structure. The case of the Sidamo of Southern Ethiopia illustrates how specialization of indigenous patterns of social structure can suffice adaptation to patterns of modernization. The combining of the new with the old in voluntary associations provided a means by which individuals could effectively learn new behavioral techniques for coping with changes brought by cash crop economy. "A form of individual leadership evolved in Sidamo associations which is different from the traditional directed by old men, because the intricacies of a cash economy call for individual responsibility in making policy..." But at the same time, "The voluntary association does duplicate social ties which are a part of the traditional system while at

the same time relating them to new social roles in a composite structure."[93]

Demographically, in modernization, the pattern of residence adapts itself to the changes. Neolocality becomes the rule of the pattern, because people have to live near their jobs. Since neolocality involves the younger generation, in the case of social change in Africa, age gradually lost its authority when the experience of one generation becomes irrelevant to the next.[94] The social structure was thereby modified for adaptation to the social patterns experienced in modern industrialization -- nonascriptive social mobility.

---

[93]Hamer, John A., "Voluntary Associations as Structure of Change Among the Sidamo of Southern Ethiopia," Anthropological Quarterly. Vol. 40, No. 2, April 1967. P. 90.

[94]Morris, Peter, Family and Social Change in an African City: A Study of Rehousing in Lagos. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1962. Pp. 136, 142.

APPLICATIONS OF THE MODELS TO THREE CASES IN AFRICA

Since the theme of this paper is a comparative explanatory utility of Parsons' theories of social change and the few other selected theorists, in order to establish a better perspective we will see how the four models apply to some kinds of social change in Africa. Three different cases from East, Central, and West Africa have been chosen for this purpose. Since change in one aspect of social order influences changes in other related aspects, it will be realized that each case involves various other changes in the social system. Likewise, a cause of a particular change need not be directly associated with the particular social patterns under analysis. Therefore in some cases a causal rule will be established while in other cases it is the trend of change that will be analyzed. Either case will serve our purpose in this paper.

Uganda -- Change by Adaptation to Managerial and Bureaucratic Social Organization

Our sample will be the Basoga people who represent the various political entities of chieftains in traditional Uganda. The Basoga live generally in a part of Uganda known as Busoga. A study made by Fallers yields

a good outline for the change of the role of the traditional chief in Busoga when the society was undergoing social change by adapting to the British-type of administration, commercial management, and bureaucracy.

> Politically, Busoga was divided among some fifteen small kingdom-states, which varied widely in size but which shared a fundamental similarity in structure. The elements of this common political structure may be seen in three key institutions: patrilineal kinship, rulership, and clientship.[95]

All kinsmen sharing common patrilineal descent formed a kind of corporate group which was important in the social structure for handling local problems and sacred interests. The focus on a patrilineal cult reinforced the corporate economic and legal interests of lineage members. Patrilineal kinship relations radiated from the homestead of an extended family to complementary exogamous clans. "Through the institution of rulership, members of many patrilineal groups were bound together to form kingdom-states in which membership was defined, not in terms of kinship, but in terms of territorial boundaries and common allegiance to the ruler."[96] By hereditary procedure within one's clan, the ruler was the overlord of the other holders of authority as well as the chief priest. "The

---

[95] Fallers, Lloyd A., "The Predicament of the Modern African Chief," American Anthropologist, Vol. 57, No. 2, Pp. 295-296.

[96] loc. cit. P. 296.

institution of clientship, through which commoners of administrative and military ability were raised by the ruler to positions of authority and thus were bound to him as personal followers, provided an administrative staff which could be trusted with power."[97] In summarizing the traditional Soga social system, Fallers states:

> Traditional Soga society thus took the form of a hierarchy. At the top was the hereditary ruler - the paramount holder of authority and the central symbol of the kingdom's unity. At intermediate levels were the princes administering villages or clusters of villages, and, counterbalancing them, the ruler's administrative staff client-chiefs administering other villages or village clusters in the name of the ruler. Forming the broad base of the society were the communities of commoner agriculturists organized into corporate patrilineal groups.[98]

The period of the British establishment of a protectorate in Uganda saw a radical reconstruction of the traditional political system, to a great extent, as a consequence of explicit planning by the British administration for modernization. "In the political sphere modernization has been characterized, first, by growing extension of the territorial scope and especially by the intensification of the power of the central, legal, administrative, and political agencies of the society."[99] A second characteristic is the continual spread of potential power to wider groups

---

[97] loc. cit. P. 297.

[98] ibid.

[99] Eisenstadt, op. cit. P. 4.

in the society. In addition, political modernization is characterized by the decline of traditional legitimation of the ruler's roles.

"The new policy of the administration came to be one of remolding the traditional political system in the direction of European-style civil service bureaucracy and electoral democracy,"[100] says Fallers. When tribute to the chiefs was abolished by the British administration and a fixed salary was established, it meant a removal of the chief's symbol for power and prestige. Eventually, Soga political structure was altered by introduction of such institutional forms applying to all the Basoga. Consequently, appointment to the civil service, including the position of the chief, came to be regarded as a highly desirable goal for ambitious men, and the new civil servant chief started to gain great respect.

Fallers utilizes Parsons' terms, particularism and specificity, to explain the patterns of change which reduced the role of the chief among the Basoga. "Relations were particularistic in that they emphasized personal loyalty between individuals who stood in particular status relations with one another, for example, as kinsman to kinsman, patron to client, or royal to commoner."[101] There were also universally applicable rules which

---

[100] op. cit. P. 299.

[101] loc. cit. P. 300.

ascribed one's social status. With modernization, relations in Busoga became functionally specific in that they related to specific contexts and not to the whole of individuals' lives.[102] In other words, the Basoga chief's role diminished with the acquisition of the value system associated with bureaucratic association.

Bureaucratic values in the foregoing example took hold with the development of new types of mechanisms of regulation and allocation of social roles and activities, in Eisenstadt's perspective of modernization.

> As for the first, one can distinguish between ascriptive and non-ascriptive allocation or regulation. Ascriptive allocators or regulators are those who perform such roles by virtue of their "given", usually hereditary, position in some groups, such as kinship, territorial, or estate groups. The non-ascriptive regulators are characterized by the fact that they occupy their positions by virtue of some achieved position...[103]

To mention achievement is to imply specialization for the roles performed in public life. And, it was proposed in our theoretical models that specialization results into differentiation. The merit of this proposition is clearly demonstrated in the Soga social change. Traditionally, leadership was fused in the chief who functioned as a judge, an administrator, a military leader, and as

---

[102] ibid.

[103] Eisenstadt, op. cit. P. 8.

the chief priest.[104] Even though one is aware that the British government utilized the indigenous paramount ruler wherever he was available, in Busoga, as elsewhere in the continent, change in the relations between the native ruler and his people came when the colonial government introduced a new system of public administration. The new system produced specialized personnel which took over most of the roles performed by the traditional chief. Thus, differentiation of his roles minimized his role sets by the constraint of the bureaucratic social system.[105]

In the process of differentiation of rulership roles in Busoga by adaptation to the European bureaucratic managerial and political systems, one wonders how chaos was avoided. The developments were closely related to the expansion of the media of communication, the growing permeation of such central media into major groups of the society, and the wider participation of these groups in the cultural activities and organizations in the changed situation. For a social system to change with a minimum of tension, there must be a balance between the instrumental and the expressive roles. Instrumental roles are those

---

[104]Fallers, Lloyd A., Bantu Bureaucracy: A Century of Political Evolution Among the Basoga of Uganda. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. P. 197.

[105]Fortes, M. and Evans-Pritchard (eds.), African Political Systems. London: Oxford University Press, 1966. P. 15.

which are related to the external environment such as work and political tasks. Expressive ones deal with internal system for harmonization and reduction of conflict. Such a balance serves as a mechanism for social integration.

For Parsons the integrative mechanism is the "...symbolic constitutive symbolism, which gives members of the society their own self definition, or collective identity, so that the conception, 'we, the...' is meaningful."[106] This sense of solidarity suffices in the explanation of social integration by any of the foregoing theoretical models. Because of the differentiation process of social change, most theorists have found it proper to differentiate between two types of solidarity, "mechanical" and "organic." "The first type depends upon common heritage, norms and activities, while the latter depends upon complementary roles and activities."[107] That is to say, mechanical solidarity is based upon homogeneity of the members of a group, while organic solidarity is based upon the complementary relation among differentiated social units. In African social change there seems to be a movement from mechanical to organic solidarity as production means and social activities are taken up by specialized

---

[106]Parsons, Societies, op. cit. P. 33.

[107]Eisenstadt, Comparative Perspectives of Social Change, 1968. op. cit. P. 120.

agencies. This factor is exemplified by the Uganda case.

The chief had to adapt to the kind of social relations that came with the British type of administration. He became subjected to the same disciplinary procedures for corruption and nepotism like any other civil servant. His traditional client was segmented into several specialized units, independent of his rulership with enough autonomy to present a problem in integration. New chiefs were appointed by bureaucratic procedures which required that one be qualified for the role by achievement of the required skills rather than by birth, which brought the traditional chief into predicament by not fitting in the new British civil service hierarchy. This predicament of the traditional Soga chief could be easily analyzed by an explanation schema:

$$\frac{L_1 \ldots L_2 \ldots L_3 \ldots L_4 \ldots L_5}{C_1 \ldots C_2 \ldots C_3 \ldots C_4 \ldots C_5}$$

$$E$$

Where: L_1 -- L_5 stand for propositions concerning:

(1) adaptation to modernization

(2) specialization for the new roles and statuses

(3) differentiation of roles formally fused in the status of the traditional chief and his rulership hierarchy

(4) bureaucracy in the managerial and administrative British type of civil service

(5) the problem of integration of the differentiated autonomous units of the modernized social system; and E stands for the event to be analyzed (= the loss of the power and prestige of the traditional chief).

Since L_1 -- L_5 are all concepts and concepts cannot be understood in isolation, it is necessary to extract the propositions they stand for in the Uganda situation. In this case these extracted propositions will be as follows:

(1) The greater the adaptation to modernization the greater the deterioration of traditional institutions. Thus, if modernization is being adapted by the society, its institutions are likely to require "adaptive upgrading" which cannot be achieved by the traditional structure. In other words, so long as adaptation to modernization is taking place, through the process of differentiation for the new roles in the new institutions, the traditional institutions become irrelevant to the required functions.

(2) In the same process of "adaptive upgrading," the greater the modernization, the greater the specialization for the new roles. This means that since an individual in the modernized system in a given status does not perform his role the same way as he would in the same status in his traditional system, it is demanded of him that he specialize for his new role for a successful functioning.

(3) In keeping with proposition (1), the greater the variety of the new roles the greater the differentiation of the traditional role sets in a given status. In the modernization process the various roles accompanying the modernization institutions do not correspond to the traditional statuses, because their role sets are different from those of the statuses of the new situation.

(4) The greater the bureaucratization, the greater the autonomy of the new specialized units, and therefore, the less the functioning (or contribution) of a traditional status in a modern social system.

(5) Given the above case, the greater the autonomy of units of a modernized social system, the greater the problem of integration. Thus, the new roles and statuses call for new means for integration of the new social system.

The above explanation schema and propositions fit the situation when one considers the conditions (C_1 -- C_5) as discussed in the Uganda case above. Thus, considering the aspect of modernization, which meant a growing extension of the powers of the central, legal, administrative and political agencies, one can understand the proposition of adaptation. By adapting to the British type of social and economic system, the Ugandans made a transition from their traditional hierarchy of patrilineal kinship, clientship, and rulership. Another transition was made from kinship-bound units to potential power, spreading continually to wider groups of the society disregarding their kinship affiliation. Transition from ascribed statuses (which

people were born into) to the non-ascribed made for the decline of the legitimation of the status and role of the traditional chief.

Here one realizes that the articulation of traditional village life with urban-type structures was fathered through development of new leadership positions, the integration of smaller into larger autonomous and more effective social units. As a consequence establishment of new bases for socialization and achievement of such positions, a new norm for judging those in offices was developed to bear on Ugandans as a whole, not just those in the newly formed social units. The traditional chief was thus put on the spot where it was demanded of him to pull in opposite directions trying to avoid falling afoul of sanctions on such things as nepotism, embezzlement and several such corruption charges, any of which was not considered wrong before, nor could it make him lose his position. On "the other side of the coin" was the traditional norm he was raised with, complicated by his lack of socialization for the new administration. Thus his authority was minimized because most people expected him to act in terms of the particularistic civil service norms.

This same transition made for adaptation to electoral democracy for political positions. The respect that went for appointment to civil service positions enhanced the transition from kinship corporate units to large auton-

omous organizations (bureaucratic groups) thereby depriving the traditional chief his legitimate power over all political, social and economic patterns. Thus, there was very little integration of the role of the traditional chief and the new roles created by modernization, including the appointed chief.

The system of communication added to the predicament of the traditional chief existing within the new social system. With relatively widespread primary education and mass communication media, Fallers relates, a situation was developed in which there were at least two sets of symbols and two views of the nature of the world current in the society. In the first place, this means that even school children and other people outside the new social, economic, and civil service units could tell when the chief was "sidetracking." In the traditional situation, when things seemed to get out of hand, the chief could embark on his role as a religious leader and save his fact by unquestionable divine reference. In the new situation he had to operate against the bureaucratized leadership in which one can be represented in communicating with other structures in the system. His traditional ritual leaders and assemblies of elders oriented toward subordination of other units fell into disuse, and he had no way of providing other appropriate structural means for coping with the problems of the new social system. When the tradi-

tional chief lost his roles which were so fused that it was traditionally possible for him to perform, he lost also his power as a chief.

Most people understand very well that one man can have different roles. But the number of roles may differ and more important is the morals attached to them. In any case, like in Uganda, the new circumstances introduce alteration in the traditional arrangements to accommodate the new roles of managers, councillors, civil servants, trade unionists and so forth. The Africans who grasped these new opportunities could not utilize the old set of rules and their behavior was in conflict with what seemed to be the primary demands of the new roles. Since they were living in this new situation, it can be summarized that they had to adapt its rules. The "rules" are based on technical skill, experience and seniority in employment and nonascriptive allocation and regulation of roles, as opposed to one's age, lineage, or tribal history. To them it was a "strange world" that they were forced by circumstances to live with; to the traditional chief it was a foreign world. One side had to lose to the other -- that was the chief's side.

Taking the event of social change in Uganda as some kind of equivalent to Olsen's "new social organization and activities," and Sahlin's "higher level of integration" (according to his definition of 'higher level of

integration' given before), the two models are applicable for explanation of how the traditional chief lost his power. But, they leave out the aspects of non-ascription of roles and the problem of integration, which are covered by Parsons and Eisenstadt (taking 'new allocation and regulation of roles' as implying non-ascription). Therefore, by comparison, Eisenstadt's and Parsons' models and schemas explain the situation best.

Ghana -- Specialization of Women's Role In Adaptation To Modernized Economic System

The study of the Akan society in Ghana (formerly Gold Coast) by Dr. McCall, of the African Research and Studies Program at Boston, reveals the meaning of "change within and change of the system." Parsons and Smelser, who advanced this typology, defined "change of the system" as the one which alters the basic structure of the system, and "change within the system" as the one which does not alter the system's basic structure.[108] It also confirms the assertion that if a structure within a system is functional (i.e., it contributes either to the existence -- adaptation or adjustment of the system), it is highly probable that it will change.

---

[108] Parsons, Talcott and Neil Smelser, Economy and Society. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956. Pp. 247-248.

The Akan's division of labor was traditionally by sex. Most of the work on the farm, except clearing the fields, was allotted to the women. According to McCall's study,[109] the provision for offspring followed the system of matrilineal societies to which the Akan belong. Since the mother and the children belonged to the same lineage, which is important for heritage rules, it was the role of the women to provide for the offspring. Transportation of foodstuff for storage or marketing was a woman's work, and, this made her almost the sole marketer of farm crops, because of so much association with farm products.

Besides clearing fields for farming and supervision of wives' duties and behavior, the men had their separate role of trading with big commodities which did not come from the farm. They mined gold and used it both as a trade commodity and as an exchange medium. In their competition to amass wealth, the various kingdoms of Ashanti, which controlled gold trade, used their chiefs and other subordinates to collect tribute from commoners who sought permission to trade with gold. As gold became too important for tributes, the chief's subordinates developed a

---

[109]McCall, D., "Trade and the Role of Wife in a Modern West African Town," in Aidan Southal (ed.), Social Change in Modern Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1959. Pp. 286-298.

free porter system to the interior of the country to make enough gold to split with the chiefs, if they also had to make a profit.

Now things have changed. The change is attributed to commerce and the socio-economic patterns associated with it. "One quickly perceives here that the size of the market and the number of women traders is a function of the size of the town."[110] The town has grown so large that it encompasses some of the lineages' land, or the land may be too far to get to from the town, where the woman is living with her working husband. But still the town has some kind of goods which need a system of distribution, which the women can do. The early accounts which describe markets in Ghana, scarcely mention the presence of women. "Now the women sell all types of goods, the change is a remarkable one."[111]

"Several factors contributed to the decline of masculine participation in trade."[112] The men's role in gold trade has been displaced by the modern European type of industry and control of the resources. Other exchange goods such as monkey fur and ivory, which utilized free porter services, are already extinct. The social condi-

---

[110] *loc. cit.* P. 288.

[111] *loc. cit.* P. 289.

[112] *ibid.*

tions of trade are now different from the old ones where traders had to pay tribute to the kings. The role of the remaining chiefs is different from what it used to be. All these changes were brought about by industrialization and other patterns of modernization.

The Ghanians had to adapt to the changed situation just as was the case of the Ugandans. In the process, the attention of men was diverted to other occupational opportunities presented to them. It was the men who were lucky for a headstart in education which made for specialization for the new roles as clerks, store and firm managers, lawyers, and medicinal doctors among others. Because the modern roles that the men took required the specialization which women did not have, their competition with men was eliminated. In their participation in trading, which the men had left for them in their novelty adaptation, "...they knew the process of exchange, and were familiar with the medium of exchange."[113] Their role in trade was further stabilized when their men found it easier in the new economy to lend them a hand by money help to extend their trade.

A new value system was developed to bear on the new specialization and extension on roles, which worked well

---

[113] *loc. cit.* P. 290.

for the integration problem. For the men, the prestige that formerly went to military and commercial success was gradually replaced by that of the new roles that accompanied modernization. For the women, it came to be felt that they were the right ones for most of the trading roles. "...the fact is that the majority of women in the towns engage in trade and for the most part do so as a full-time occupation -- to the exclusion of farming."[114] When McCall took his sample in on one market day, he counted the number of women sellers and came up with an estimate of 10% of the total town population of 30,000 being represented by women traders.[115] In his calculation, this was 40% of the total adult female population.

The ecology theory holds that if the local environment is to be exploited by means of culturally-derived techniques, there is need for consideration of the size and social composition of the participants. From the sample of 78 women that McCall took from the market at Koforidua, 41 were local women, 35 were strangers and 2 had no information on their origin. In urbanism, we are told that strong kinship ties get decimated and new social ties are made by personal preference. The theory of

---

[114] *ibid.*

[115] *loc. cit.* Pp. 292-297.

change from mechanical to organic solidarity is implied in Koforidua women.

"There is an expectation that women will support themselves even after marriage and that they will contribute to the support of the children."[116] This statement suggests that there is more feeling of economic security in trading than farm work at the time that people have taken to money economy. From the same sample of 78 women, 57 married women were successfully supporting 191 dependent children; two deserted women had 11 dependent children; 10 unmarried women had 12 dependent children; and the two "no-information" ones had 3 dependent children. If the sample is representative, it could be assumed that women in this society enter trading in need of economic support of their dependents. (Adaptation to the modernized social-economic system). And if this is so, it could be assumed that their definition of the situation eventually formed new norms and attitudes concerning the role of trading, which caused the problem of integration in that system, on the part of the males.

Educated women in Ghana have an opportunity for other types of employment, as teachers or telephone operators,

---

[116] op. cit. P. 291.

and a small number of women are completely supported by their husbands who prefer that they do not trade, but the greatest number of women are engaged in trade as a profession. Nevertheless, McCall maintains that if his count on the market day included the women who were selling their wares at various crossroads and streets it could be estimated that 70% of the adult women population in the entire country are engaged in the trading business. The change in their case was more of patterns of specialization within the same structure of social system, while the men represented change by modification of the social system by their specialization for adaptation to the modern economic system.

To make the explanation of the process by which the women of Ghana became so specialized for the trading role, it has been seen, one has to analyze the whole process of Ghanians' adaptation to modernized social-economic system. Since this process has been discussed above, we can make an explanation schema for our comparison.

$$\begin{array}{c} L_1 \ldots L_2 \ldots L_3 \ldots L_4 \ldots L_5 \\ C_1 \ldots C_2 \ldots C_3 \ldots C_4 \ldots C_5 \\ \hline E \end{array}$$

L_1 -- L_5 stand for the following concepts of propositions: (1) adaptation, (2) differentiation, (3) specialization,

(4) bureaucratization of patterns of occupational system, and (5) the integration problem. E, is the event to be explained -- i.e., the process by which women in Ghana become specialized in trading.

In keeping with the explanation schema for the Ghanian case, one could extract such propositions as follows:

(1) The greater the variety of modern patterns of economic system, the greater the intensity of adaptation. That is to say, if the new economic system opens up a great variety of roles and there are qualified people for filling up these roles, adaptation to the patterns of the new social system is accelerated.

(2) The greater the variety of patterns of differentiation for adaptation to a modernized economic system, the greater the drainage of people (personnel) from some roles in the traditional society.

(3) The greater the differentiation for a modern economic system, the greater the need for specialization. In other words, since the new roles are not filled up by ascription, it is inevitable that there be a process of specialization by which people's achievements can be realized and measured.

(4) The greater the bureaucratization of occupational patterns, the greater the autonomy of the bureaucratized units. This means, the process of bureaucratization requires that each unit has less instrumental (or managerial) relationship with other units in the social system.

(5) The greater the autonomy of bureaucratized units of the system, the greater the problem of integration of these new units with the old ones. That is to say, the individuals in the new units of economic system will have a problem in trying to perform the roles they used to perform in the traditional social system.

If one considers the antecedent conditions of the process by which women in Ghana came to dominate the trading role, the propositions above become explainable. First, was the condition of adaptation to the modern, British-type patterns of economic system. Second, was the process of differentiation for the newly created roles which required new patterns of social structure. With differentiation was the need for specialization, for which men qualified better because of their educational advantage.

In the process of the men's adaptation to the modern occupations, which meant acquisition of money in the new money economy, one can see the impact that made women specialize more and more with trade. McCall's report says that formerly markets used to be held every fourth day -- the only time most women could leave their farm work to sell whatever foodstuffs they had surplus of. If the foodstuff came from a husband's land, the income would be used for supplying the family larder. The only time a woman had a sole responsibility over the income is when the produce came from her own land (acquired matrilineally).

With the introduction of money and a few other items that came with it the intensity of marketing and trading increased. By way of illustration, of the 78 women in McCall's sample, excluding one who declined to respond, the breakdown of the time spent in the market is represented in the tables below.*

Table A. Hours per day spent in market.

Hours per day	12	11	10½	10	9	9	8½	8	7	7	6	6
Number of women	2	7	2	5	3	10	8	11	7	16	3	3

Table B. Marketing Behavior.

70 never sold in any other markets
7 sometimes sold elsewhere
1 came there for the first time

Table C. Days per week spent in market.

Number of days per week	Number of Women
7	9
6	56
5	5
4	3
3	1
2	1
1	2
First time in market	1

Along with the impact of adaptation to the patterns of the money economy, urbanization contributed to the intensity and specialization of women's trading in Ghana.

---

*Tables made from McCall's report.

With the men living in town with their families in order to be near their jobs, the women, having no access to the new jobs because of their lack of new specialization, had enough time to intensify the trading pattern in which they traditionally had a background. Furthermore, the city needed more variety of goods for distribution (not only farm products). The seasonal changes had very little effect in their socialization in their unique type of economic system of urban life. Much more was the fact that modern transportation made it easy to move goods from town to town, or from rural areas to town without requiring women's participation. Their possibility to stay in town and concentrate on the trading activities they had access to was a great contribution to their specialization.

For men, there was the condition of the bureaucratization patterns of the occupational system which meant different kinds of control over the few indigenous resources. This factor was again boosted by modern transportation and lack of ivory and monkey fur which diminished the men's role as porters for, or traders with these commodities. Eventually the men became distributed over the variety of new occupations which, after all, seemed to give them more prestige. The occupations of the 78 husbands in the sample, according to McCall's report were as follows:

18 government workers
11 artisans
15 in commercial or clerical positions
16 farmers
4 native authorities
4 drivers
10 in different professional jobs

This helps to speculate the trend in which the men left the trading patterns of economy to the women.

Given the condition that integration of the new roles with that of trading, on the part of the men, was a problem after development of a new value system that the new roles were good for men, women eventually developed their value system for their comprehensive role of trading. This, of course, was not without the contribution of other factors like lack of land, men's financial help for their trading wives, etc., as discussed before.

It is generally agreed that there is a nigh correlation between normative change and behavioral change since situations are usually characterized by consensus of norms. In this Ghanian situation, traditional norms changed with the whole social-economic situation. Traditionally a husband controlled the product of his wife's labor. It was he who decided on the dispensing of food from the supplies that his wife had harvested and stored. This caused husbands to extend their control over their wives' behavior, supplemented by the men's mothers-in-law or adult brothers-in-law. This was possible and acceptable in the traditional patterns of residence. In the modern urban

patterns of residence it became impossible for a woman to work in company with her relatives to make sure her behavior was presentable to her husband. Eventually this factor contributed to sexual independence and, since they had no more control over where to go for buying or selling, they became experts in the field of trade. In summary, all the above factors, at least, must be taken into account in an analysis of the process by which the women in Ghana, as well as several other parts of West Africa, became specialized in trade.

Comparing the applicability of the four models in explaining this situation of Ghana, one finds that the weakness of Olsen's and Sahlins-Service's is much less than in the explanation of the Uganda case. Non-ascription in roles and statuses, here, seems an insignificant factor; so their models can be sufficiently utilized. But, unless one means that "integration problem" is implied in their models, they will be less comprehensive, again, than those of Parsons and Eisenstadt. The evidence for this is in the comparison of each one's propositions with that one derived from the work of McCall.

Rhodesia -- Restratification of Social Relations in Adaptation to Western Patterns of Urban Social Economic Ranking.

Our sample for Rhodesia is Gwelo -- the fourth largest town in the country, whose African population is a cross-section of heterogeneous ethnic backgrounds. When Dr. Schwab did his study there, the composition of the African population showed a representation of members of the Shona tribe -- 60.5%; the Ndembele -- 13.6%; and the other 25.9% were made up of members of diverse tribal groups from Portuguese East and West Africa, Northern Rhodesia (Zambia), South Africa and Nyasaland. Over 50% of the population fall into the working-age group of 20-40 years of age, according to the study.[117]

In his paper, Schwab was concerned with analyzing the aspect of the emerging social system in accordance with his study of the system by which persons are ranked differentially according to the values attached to their various roles and activities. This means the way social relations are restructured in Gwelo indicates a sharp change from the traditional system, which was on the basis

---

[117] Schwab, W. B., "Social Stratification in Gwelo," in Southall, op. cit. Pp. 126-243.

of kinship relations and position in political hierarchy. "In Gwelo, the people are housed without regard to tribal background and a man's neighbors and co-workers may often differ from him in tongue and cultural traditions."[118] Therefore, to a large extent his position in society and his economic and social relations are determined by what he does. In the process of restructuring relations new values develop in response to the new alternatives and incentives which have no basis in accustomed ways.

Restructuring social relations works against pressure toward conformity by (a) specific social norms related to strong sanctions which are supposed to be applied with consistency; (b) presence or absence of very few conflicts between these norms; and (c) presence of strong hindrances for social participation in the old social order.[119] The development of new values and attitudes ennance the development of new norms, essential for social control. Social control implies structuring relations between persons or groups of persons in such a way as to make any unconventional behavior undesirable by causing participants to feel that conformity is more gratifying than deviation

---

[118] loc. cit. P. 131.

[119] Ishwaran, K. (ed.), Politics and Social Change. Netherlands: Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1966. P. 1.

from established norms and acquired values.[120]

Robert Marsh has told us that since the concept of differentiation is abstract and formal, it can be used to classify and characterize the most culturally diverse societies. The main utility of the theory is that knowledge of the degree of differentiation of societies would provide a key to the search for causes.[121] Even though most emphases on differentiation concerns either roles and statuses or activities, Schwab holds that in Gwelo, for instance, there are several other systems of social differentiation which are related, but not identical, to differentiation by the roles held in the industrial economy.[122] Parsons suggests that the most common case concerns systems which have been divided into superior and inferior classes which, in Africa, are evinced by employment of professional rankings that come with industrialization for modernization.[123] The following table made by Schwab indicates the occupational stratification in Gwelo's African population:

---

[120]Goodenough, Ward Hunt, Cooperation in Change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963. P. 350.

[121]Marsh, Robert (ed.), Comparative Sociology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967. P. 32.

[122]Schwab, op. cit. P. 130.

[123]Smith, Wilfred Cantwell, Modernization of Tropical Society. London: Asia Publishing House, 1965. P. 20.

Occupation	Percentage
White-collar, professional and commercial	6.0
Supervisory	2.1
Skilled	12.9
Domestic	3.0
Unskilled	73.6
Student	1.5
Unemployed	0.9
Total	100.0

The above table reveals the applicability of the concepts of adaptation and specialization to the functional roles of the industrial urban life. Even though a good number of Africans in Gwelo may still cling to traditional bases to resist urban patterns of status fixing, Schwab claims that it is possible to establish some bases for analyzing the new social differentiation in Gwelo. "These include verbal evaluations, patterns of association, and the various social activities and possessions that are held to be symbolic of social status."[124] Says he:

> One of the most common sociological uses of verbal evaluation, relevant to social stratification, has been the ranking of

---

[124] op. cit. P. 134.

> different occupational roles. The investigations have been based on the assumption that occupational role is one of the simplest and most accessible indicators of stratificational positions.[125]

To measure the role of occupational ranking in the lives of the people of Gwelo, Schwab rated occupational aspirations of two groups -- adults and children. In the survey the adults in the sample were asked, 'What would you like your children to become?' The children, who were taken from Grades V and VI in Gwelo Primary Schools were asked, 'When you grow up, what would you like to be?' With the responses, Schwab made tables of broad occupational categories showing a considerable agreement in both groups as shown below. Such a ranking of occupations establishes a link to the general prestige patterns in which the European way of life serves as a model to which the Africans would adapt.

Schoolchildren's Occupational Aspirations

Category	Percentage
Professional and white-collar	65.7
Agricultural	16.4
Skilled and Supervisory	12.3
Commercial	4.1
Miscellaneous	1.1
Unskilled	0.0

---

[125] *ibid.*

Parental Aspirations for Children

Category	Percentage
Professional and white-collar	76.3
Agricultural	0.0
Skilled and Supervisory	11.7
Commercial	5.6
Miscellaneous	6.1
Unskilled	0.0

Voluntary associations are thought of revealing a basis for self-evaluation.

> Social intimacy is often an expression of social equality and the absence or presence of close associations may in some situations provide a fairly reliable guide to a system of social stratification. Although relations between individuals in an urban community tend to be seen as relations between categories, in Gwelo people do have lasting personal relationships based on varying degrees of intimacy.[126]

In day-by-day activities, intimacy may take various other forms like mutual visiting, eating together, and common participations in leisure activities. Although the questionnaire provided responses which showed that traditional differentials of kin relationships and tribal affiliation still persist, Schwab maintains that there was significant indication of intimacy by occupational categories. 64% of the people had closest friends in the same

---

[126] *loc. cit.* P. 137.

occupational categories and virtually all closest friends had fairly the same education. This shows a change from ascribed to non-ascribed behavior, reflecting the Western social relations in accordance with socio-economic ranking, to which they had to adapt.

The third indicator of status in Gwelo is symbolic activities and possessions. Usually such behavior patterns do not occur singly, but are manifested in groups to indicate a way of life.

> In Gwelo, the symbols of status have a common measure; higher status is accorded to those who have possessions or patterns of behavior that more closely approximate to European standards. The more of these activities and possessions a person has, the higher his prestige.[127]

The style and quality of clothing, house furnishings, language (English), leisure activities and favorite recreational activities were found stratified according to occupational categories.

Although there certainly are regional differences, Dr. Schwab concludes that there are basic characteristics of the prestige and social stratification emerging in Gwelo that could be generalized for most of urban Africa.

---

[127] *loc. cit.* P. 139.

"It is perhaps to be concluded that whenever Africans enter a wage-earning industrialized economy, a generalized status sytem closely related to that in the West usually results."[128] In other words, the general forms of social differentiation inherent in the Western industrial system occur in changing Africa wherever these economic patterns prevail. Since these patterns are foreign, then there is a problem of integrating the emerging patterns in order for them to persist. This mechanism was implied in the verbal and symbolic evaluations. It meant an adaption of a common value system for differential evaluation. The common value system implies a general appreciation of the new status system thus eliminating or minimizing conflict in the heterogeneity and fluidity of norms and social behavior. According to Schwab's study, this is true of the African population in Gwelo, which is typical of social change elsewhere in African urban life.

The Gwelo case may be put in our explanation schema as follows:

---

[128] loc. cit. P. 141.

$$L_1 \ldots L_2 \ldots L_3 \ldots L_4 \ldots L_5$$
$$C_1 \ldots C_2 \ldots C_3 \ldots C_4 \ldots C_5$$

E

As before, L_1 -- L_5 = concepts of propositions for social change, and C_1 -- C_5 = antecedent conditions which, in Gwelo, gave rise to E (the event) = the restructuring of social relations. "Social relations" means a mode of behavior which is usual (and therefore predictable) among the individuals in the system.

The propositions for the Gwelo case if extracted from the case above would therefore be as follows:

(1) The greater the adaptation to a modern social-economic system, the greater the chances for restructuring of social relations.

(2) The greater the new specialization and differentiation for functional roles, the greater the change in social relations. e.g., occupational categories affect the mode of political and religious behavior.

(3) The greater the upward social-economic mobility (with the co-variation of aspirations), the greater the change in social relations.

(4) The greater the nonascription the greater the change in social relations (because, the greater the autonomy in an individual's definition of the situation).

(5) The greater the diversity of the new differential evaluations the greater the problem of integration of the old with the new structure, and therefore, the greater the likelihood for stabilizing the newly-restructured categories of social relations.

In relation to these propositions, the antecedent conditions to the restructuring of social relations in Gwelo were as follows:

(1) There was a great adaptation to the modern social-economic system. Africans in Gwelo adapted the European-type of urban life wherein an individual's social status correlates to his status in the urban economic system.

(2) There occurred a great differentiation for the patterns of the modernized economic system, which were different from the ones these Africans were accustomed to, and which required a new specialization.

(3) A transition was experienced from the traditional kinship-bound special economic mobility to a great individualistic upward mobility, which was correlated to an individual's occupational position.

(4) There occurred a breakdown of the traditional norms of social relations. A transition to nonascription in social relations was accelerated by the culturally diverse background of co-workers and that of neighbors in the new non-kinship bound residential pattern.

(5) The new patterns of social relations in Gwelo operated against pressure for conformity to the traditional ones. The value system of the old way of life became no longer relevant to the new situation, and new norms were developed to accompany the new social-economic roles and statuses.

(6) Age and position in one's kinship group lost relativity. New diverse differential evaluations were adapted; new incentive and occupational ranking were carried over to non-occupational relations; patterns of spending leisure time reflected one's social-economic status. Thus, intimacy in the new situation depended on the commonality of role and status sets in the new categories of people.

The combination of the above conditions not only contributed to a new definition of the situation, but also to the restructuring of social relations. Enhancing the institutionization of these new relations, as already said, was the new value system by which new norms were developed. The autonomous social categories became coordinated enough to give rise to an observable social system, or sub-system, for the Africans resident in Gwelo.

So long as the restructuring of social relations in Gwelo is one of the patterns of adjustment to a foreign type of socio-economic system, it is an aspect of social change to which the four models could be applied for explanation. Parsons' specialization and differentiation propositions could be applicable here by analyzing the process by which Africans in Gwelo make the transition for new allocation of roles. Specialization at Gwelo is

for different kinds of occupational roles, ranked in diverse categories instead of the traditional categories of sex, age, and position in kinship groups. The theory of differentiation becomes feasible because a person's position in the new occupational ranking and categories is reflected in his daily life. The greater the adaptation to the ranking system, the greater the person's change in social relations.

The non-ascription proposition is apparent because of the heterogeneity of the population and aspirations for higher social ranks, which makes it impossible for an individual to establish social relations with a particular group determined by birth. At the same time, the continuous aspiration in the new differential evaluation supports the concept of adaptive upgrading. Because of the problem of integration of the new patterns with the accustomed ones a new value system enhances the restructuring of social relations for a new general type of social system. Thus, Parsons' model is applicable for analyzing social change in Gwelo.

Olsen's model is in agreement with the theory of differentiation and the propositions of adaptation and specialization advanced by Parsons. Even though Schwab made no mention of adaptation to material and technological factors, it could be agreed that they played a great part in the social economic system of industrial Gwelo.

Olsen's hypothesis of social change by the society's struggle for acquisition of surplus resources for population growth is applicable here, given the economic incentive which, in the first place, draws the African population from the various areas. Thus, if the notion of the problem of integration of the heterogeneous population were taken as implied in Olsen's new social "organization and activities" for the goals of the society, his model could help explain the change in Gwelo.

Like Olsen's, the Sahlins-Service model could be used in explaining the changing social relations in Gwelo, if it could be accepted that the variable of integration problem is implied in their definition of higher level of integration as the situation where the system acquires a great number of units, and these units are specialized. Their notion of integration covers much because it proposes that change depends on the integration of technology, social structure, and philosophy, all of which are evidenced in Gwelo. Consequently their model could be useful to explain the new social order as a pattern of maintaining a higher level of integration. This would tie with their concept of adaptation which would mean that Africans in Gwelo are restructuring their social relations as a process of securing and conserving control over their environment. In this case the Sahlins-Service is better than Parsons' and Olsen's, because it can explain the

change two ways -- as a consequence and as a process.

There cannot be much doubt about the comprehensiveness of Eisenstadt's model in analyzing the change of social relations in Gwelo. The model is based on the theory of differentiation in the modernization perspective. It therefore, as already seen, utilizes the concepts of specialization, new allocation and regulation of roles, and the problem of integration which are apparent in the Schwab's study. Comparatively, it could be equally powerful as the Sahlins-Service, but it excels theirs by its detail and by its explicity. Like theirs, it can be used to explain the change both as a consequence of modernization and as a process -- a transition toward getting more and more like the Western cultures (Eisenstadt's definition of modernization). However, it covers more by its proposition about demographic change in the process of urbanization. Bureaucratization and industrialization, which Eisenstadt proposes as some of the necessary conditions for modernization have already been found as some of the influencing factors of restructuring social relations in Gwelo. Thus, this model is applicable to all phases of social change, so long as it is observed that society has availed itself for new patterns of socialization and behavior.

CONCLUSIONS

The utility of the Parsons' model of social change depends mainly on the fact that differentiation can be treated as a general term to explain most patterns of social change. Parsons asserts that differentiation as a process usually requires the inclusion in a status of full membership in the relevant general community system of previously excluded groups which come to develop legitimate capacities for contributing to the functioning of the larger, or part of the larger social system.[129] Agreeing with Olsen and Eisenstadt, he maintains that this is most evident in economic, political, and other instrumentally recruited bureaucratic organizations and mechanisms in most institutional spheres.[130] To talk of bureaucratization is to imply modernization and industrialization, and this, in turn, is to imply more deployment of science and technology (in accordance with Sahlins and Service). In the process, the indigenous social structure is disturbed by this application of science to avail the power and the knowledge which is necessary in order

---

[129] Parsons, op. cit. P. 22.

[130] Eisenstadt, op. cit. P. 3.

to be effectual, to determine results and to control change, says Smith.[131]

For Parsons, in order for adaptation to such forces of change to persist, it is necessary that it continue acceleration -- the situation he calls "adaptive upgrading" (where differentiated units become more effective than the former undifferentiated ones). Sahlins and Service add to Parsons' utility of the notion of adaptation to technological change when they assert that a given technological development may generate a new organization of society, and also the society may operate to preserve the technology that gave rise to it.[132]

Specialization goes together with the process of differentiation and adaptation, in relation to environment and technology. Olsen and Eisenstadt confirm this necessity for specialization. Olsen hypothesizes that social change is accounted for when multipurpose structures become differentiated into many more specialized ones, each of which performs its particular activities. Eisenstadt agrees with this when he implicitly maintains that differentiation is essentially the segmentation of specialized units of organization. This was proven by

---

[131]Smith, Wilfred Cantwell, Modernization of Tropical Society. London: Asia Publishing House, 1965. P. 20.

[132]Parsons, op. cit., (1966). P. 22.

the three African cases.

It has been noted that when differentiation occurs, the roles which are created in the process are no longer filled by ascription, which is usually the customary procedure. So long as this changes the patterns of socialization there is bound to rise a problem of integration. Eisenstadt's model shows that this problem is inevitable because the differentiated units gain autonomy and tend to break away from the traditional socialization media. This strengthens Parsons' model because as a third point in his paradigm of social change he states, "Differentiation processes also pose new problems of integration for the system."[133] This was witnessed in the three cases where individuals filling up the roles in the new units had their role sets altered, specialization putting them into particular autonomous or semi-autonomous groups, and the statuses they hold altering their social relations, all of which make the old mechanism of integration unsatisfactory.

Another strong point of Parsons' model is its recognition of intrusion of change to a society which he notes that could be "...either within the society originating a new type of structure or, through cultural

---

[133] Parsons, ibid.

diffusion..."[134] The Sahlins-Service model suggests that both innovation and diffusion are possible causes of social change. Whereas Eisenstadt does not exhaust the possibility of innovation, his model of modernization obviously implied diffusion. Parsons' accounting for change from within or from without is important because:

> Although every culture produces inventors and discoverers who are the alternate causes of change, no group would progress rapidly if change would come about only through the ingenuity of its own members. If the opportunity for change were so limited, we should still all be in the stone age.[135]

There may be semantic differences in models of the various theorists in their reference to social change; social evolution; or modernization. In this paper these terms have been used interchangeably just as in Parsons' works of social change. On the same grounds, the selection of both sociologists and "culturalogists" was made. This flexibility of Parsons' model is the first credit we could give for its utility. The second credit goes for its comprehensiveness, as can be seen on the comparison table. Parsons, therefore, is adequate for analyzing social change, but he can be supplemented by the other

---

[134] *ibid.*

[135] *loc. cit.* P. 21.

theorists although they may use different nomenclature. Another observation that can be made here is that, because of the comprehensiveness of Parsons' model, the other theorists do not offer anything that he does not offer as far as his concepts and propositions go. This can be illustrated by the table below:

I. Comparison of Parsons' Concepts with Those of Others

Concepts	Parsons	Olsen	Sahlins-Service	Eisenstadt
Adaptation	X	X	X	Comp.
Specialization	X	X	X	X
Differentiation	X	Comp.	Comp.	X
Nonascription	X	--	Comp.	X
Integration	X	--	--	X
Problem (6)		Material/ Technology	Technology	

The table shows that all the other theorists have at least comparable concepts or propositions to those of Parsons, or they may be implied in their discussion of their respective theoretical analysis. Only Eisenstadt appears to be as comprehensive as Parsons. Two of the other theorists, Olsen and Sahlins-Service, have an extra concept marked '(6)' on the table. These are 'material and technology' for Olsen, and 'technology' for Sahlins-Service model. Strictly speaking, these are not "extra" concepts, because, in the discussion of Parsons' model

above it was found that either these concepts were implied, or they were treated as parts of other concepts.

For Parsons' comprehensiveness in application of his model to the three cases of social change in Africa, the table below would show how the five concepts apply in each case.

II. Applicability of Parsons' model to three cases.

Concepts	Parsons	Uganda	Ghana	Gwelo
Adaptation	X	X	X	X
Specialization	X	X	X	X
Differentiation	X	X	X	Comp.
Nonascription	X	Comp.	Comp.	X
Integration	X	X	X	X

The above table shows that all the concepts from which Parsons' propositions were constructed were found applicable in every case without exception. It can therefore be summarized with considerable confidence that there is a great utility in Parsons' model of social change. It can be used sufficiently to analyze change in the social system (roles and statuses), and change in the cultural system (institutional change). However, it also ignores the problem of disorganization - anomie', conflict, and other cases of maladaptive downgrading.

For future study three things are recommended. First, one may try the inclusion of other patterns of social change in other parts of Africa. Second, one may try to

compare the same models for the same types of social change in other parts of the world. Third, it may be good to select other theorists, or these same ones, and choose a different one (not Parsons) as the base line.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Don and Robert Bjork, Education in Developing Areas. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1969.

Barth, Fredrick, "On the Study of Social Change," American Anthropologist, Vol. 69, No. 6, December 1967, pp. 661-669.

Benedict, Ruth, Patterns of Culture. New York: Mentor Books, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1960.

Cancion, Francesca, "Functional Analysis of Change," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, No. 6, December 1960.

Cartwright, Dorwin and Alvin Zander, Social Sciences 121: Social Interaction and Group Process. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, September 1963.

Christensen, Harold T. (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964.

Cocourel, Aaron V., Method & Measurement in Sociology. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Coser, Lewis A., The Function of Social Conflict. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956.

Deutsch, Karl W., "Social Mobilization and Political Development," American Political Science Review, LV, No. 3, 1961, pp. 493-506.

Durkheim, Emile, The Rules of Sociological Method. Paris: Felix Alcon, 1925.

Eisenstadt, Shamuel Noah (ed.), Comparative Perspectives on Social Change. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968.

Eisenstadt, Shamuel Noah, Modernization, Protest and Change, edited by Moore and Smelser. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Etzioni, Amitai and Eva Etzioni (eds.), Social Change. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Etzioni, Amitai, "The Epigenesis of Political Communities at the International Level," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 68, No. 4, 1963, pp. 407-421.

Fallers, Lloyd A., Bantu Bureaucracy: A Century of Political Evolution Among the Basoga of Uganda. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Fallers, Lloyd A., "The Predicament of the Modern African Chief," American Anthropologist, Vol. 57, No. 2, 1965, pp. 290-305.

Firth, Raymond, Elements of Social Organization, Third Edition. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Fortes, M., and Evans-Pritchard (eds.), African Political Systems. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Foster, George M., Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Geertz, Clifford, "Ritual and Social Change: A Javanese Example," American Anthropologist, Vol. 59, February 1957, pp. 32-53.

Goodenough, Ward, Hunt, Cooperation in Change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963.

Hamer, John A., "Voluntary Associations as Structures of Change Among the Sidamo of Southern Ethiopia," Anthropological Quarterly, Vol. 40, No. 2, April 1967, pp. 73-91.

Hatch, John, Africa Today and Tomorrow. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962.

Hempel, Carl G., Philosophy of Natural Science. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Hodgkin, Thomas, Nationalism in Colonial Africa. London: Frederick Muller Ltd., 1956.

Ishwaran, K. (ed.), Politics and Social Change. Netherlands: Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1966.

Lloyd, R. C., Africa in Social Change: West African Societies in Transition. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.

MacIver, R. M., Social Causation. New York: Ginn and Company, 1942.

Maher, Robert F., New Men of Papua: A Study of Culture Change. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.

Marsh, Robert M., Comparative Sociology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

McKinney, John, Constructive Typology and Social Theory. New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1966.

Merton, Robert K., On Theoretical Sociology. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure. London: The MacMillan Company, 1957.

Moore, Wilbert, Order and Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Moore, Wilbert E., Social Change. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Moore, Wilbert and Robert Cook, Readings on Social Change. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Morris, Peter, Family and Social Change in an African City: A Study of Rehousing in Lagos. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1962.

Nadel, S. F., The Theory of Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

Njorage, Ng'etne, "Problems of African Urbanism," The African Newsletter, 4, February-March, 1958.

Olsen, Marvin E., The Process of Social Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Parsons, Talcott, Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc,, 1966.

Parsons, Talcott, Structure and Process in Modern Societies. New York: Free Press, Inc., 1959.

Parsons, Talcott, and Edward Snils (eds.), Toward A General Theory of Action. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Piddocke, Stuart, "Social Sanctions," Anthropoligica, N.S. Vol. X, No. 2, 1968.

Radcliffs-Brown, Structure and Function in Primitive Society. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956.

Rogers, Everett M., Modernization Among Peasants. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Sahlins, Marshall and Elman Service (eds.), Evolution and Culture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960.

Scipio, (pseudonym) with Forward by Phillip Mosely, Emergent Africa. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Service, Elman, Primitive Social Organization: An Evolutionary Perspective. New York: Random House, 1964.

Smelser, Neil J., Social Change in Industrial Revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell, Modernization of Traditional Society. London: Asia Publishing House, 1965.

Smythe, Hugh H., "Social Change in Africa," American Journal of Economic and Sociology. Vol. 19, No. 2, January 1960.

Sorokin, Pitirin A., Sociological Theories of Today. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Southall, Aiden (ed.), Social Change in Modern Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Spencer, Herbert (ed.), Patterns of African Development. Selections from Herbert Spencer's Principles of Sociology, (ed.) by Robert Camoro, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Spiro, Herbert J. (ed.), Patterns of African Development. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Stevens, Edward, "Society and Act in George Herbert Mead," Social Research, Vol. 30, No. 4, Winter, 1967.

Steward, Julian H., Theory of Cultural Change. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L., Constructing Social Theories. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.

Wallterstein, Immanuel, Social Change: The Colonial Situation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Washburne, Norman F., Interpreting Social Change in America. New York: Random House, 1954.

Weber, Max (ed. & trans. by Garth and Wright Mills), Essays in Sociology. London: Oxford University Press, 1946.

White, Leslie A., The Science of Culture. Farrar Straus and Cudahy Co., 1949.

Willer, David, Scientific Sociology: Theory and Method. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.