CHAPTER II
THEORIES OF TRANSITION OF SOCIETIES

This chapter explores the basic typologies of societies postulated by Durkheim, Tonnies, Weber, Park, Redfield and Parsons. The postulation of typologies classifies the change in relationship of an individual with his social objects as it emerges through the instrumentality of change in technology of production. The author attempts to establish that the action choices of the individual are second level manifestations of role concept anchored in the role coordinates internalized by the individual during his primary socialization.
CHAPTER II

THEORIES OF TRANSITION OF SOCIETIES

Studies of transition of societies from the past into the present, and from present into the future has been a tradition of scholars from the ages past. In the Indian context, one can see its genesis in the derivative writings and development of one hundred and eight 'Smritis' from the 'Manu Smriti'. Similarly, in the Western context one can see among others the writings of Plato, Socrates, Plutarch, Aristotle, Cato around 175 B.C. and Machiavelli* (1459-1527). Political commentators and writers like Montague* to De Tocqueville* continued the tradition of these past masters.

Anthropologists, sociologists and historians reflect the tradition of trying to understand, document and systematise how societies and cultures change and evolve. The contribution of the anthropologists is more often focused on the study and change of culture, the life style and the overall contents of the culture.

Many anthropologists like (Malinowski 1944; Childe 1928, 1936; Steward 1949; White L. 1925, 1949; Mead M.

* See Bibliography.
1964; Radcliffe Brown 1952; Benedict 1961; Kroeber 1920, 1938, 1948; Kardiner 1939 and Firth 1936, 1951) among others can be given the credit for developing systematic theories to explain the process of change in culture. They have focused on the study of social environment of man and tried to answer questions as to how cultures emerge and change.

Toynbee*, Spengler* and Taggart* among other historians have presented systematic philosophies of history which help understand change and evolution of one era after another.

In Sociology theorists like Comte (1798-1957), Marx (1818-1883), Spencer (1820-1903), Durkheim (1858-1917), Tonnies (1855-1936), Weber (1864-1917), and Pareto (1848-1923) tried to analyse the changing societies. Similarly, a host of theorists like Merton (1949), Parsons (1951), Glazer (1961), Etzioni (1968), Benedix (1956), Blau (1964) and many others have studied and tried to answer questions as to what is society and how it changes.

* See Bibliography.
The sociological theories are concerned with the discovery of assumptions that define regularities in a given social structure. They also deal with the mutual relationships which exist in a particular society. Each major school of sociological theory is different from others as it focuses on some unique aspect of the social organization.

Martindale (1966) summarizes five major types of sociological theories which have evolved over the last hundred years:

1) Positivistic organization
2) Conflict theory
3) The formalistic school of sociological theory
4) Social behaviourism, and
5) Social functionalism

For the purpose of this present research which deals with the dynamics of transformation of the role coordinates and their evolution from the agrarian context to the technological context, it is more appropriate first to explore the concepts of the various typologies of the society that are available in the sociological literature.
The current chapter explores briefly the typologies of society of August Comte, Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Ferdinand Tonnies, Robert Park, Robert Redfield, Max Weber, and Talcott Parsons. In the following table Martindale (1966) summarizes the six typologies of the positivist organicists:

**Table 2.1**

**Societal Typologies of the Positivist Organicists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIOLOGIST</th>
<th>PRIMITIVE SOCIETY TYPE</th>
<th>CIVILIZED SOCIETY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comte</td>
<td>Theological Society</td>
<td>Positivistic society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Militaristic theologi-</td>
<td>Peaceable-industrial society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cal society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkheim</td>
<td>Society based on mecha-</td>
<td>Society based on organic solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nical solidarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnies</td>
<td>Gemeinschaft: society</td>
<td>Gessellschaft: Society based on rational will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on natural will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Sacred society</td>
<td>Secular society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfield</td>
<td>Folk society</td>
<td>Secular society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positivistic organization theory developed in the late Renaissance. Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was its earliest proponent. He was followed by August Comte (1798-1857), Herbert Spencer (1820-1917), and Ferdinand Tonnies (1835-1936).

Comte and Spencer's approach

Comte and Spencer follow the stream of strong conservatism in their theoretical approach. As an initiator of the study of social thought Comte suggested that with growth and development there was gradual reduction in the number of diverse supernatural elements influencing and controlling man's life. There was an emergence of a single supernatural being. Comte's approach emerged from the comparison of historical types of theological, metaphysical, and positivistic societies. Basically, Comte used a differentiation and integration model but in terms of the psychic and intellectual horizons of man.

As compared to Comte, Spencer attempted to present the analysis of society in terms of biological models of differentiation and integration. His approach was based
on an in-depth study of historical descriptions of social institutions. The emergence of the group and its proper role in man's life in order to humanise and democratise him was his thrust in pleading for industrialization.

Thus, though Comte compared historical types of theological society vis-a-vis metaphysical and positivistic society, Spencer compared the primitive war-like society with the industrial peaceable society. Both of them were social evolutionists implying movement through differentiation and integration toward higher and more complex human and social existence.

The tradition of Comte and Spencer was continued by many others in terms of studying the nature of society by establishing evolutionary typologies. As illustrated in Martindale's (1966) classification in Table 3.1 Durkheim contrasted the primitive society resting on mechanical solidarity, with a civilized society resting on the so-called organic solidarity. Tonnies compared the Gemeinschaft type of society with Gesselschaft. Park compared sacred society to secular society, and Redfield compared
folk society to secular society. Thus, all these
theories and their typologies focused primarily on
dichotomous contrast of primitive and civilized forms.

Durkheim's concept of mechanical solidarity versus
organic solidarity

Durkheim's concept of mechanical solidarity is based
on common societal values. He stressed the relation of
mechanical to the conscious collective. Mechanical soli-
darity is defined as beliefs and sentiments that are held
in common. By organic solidarity Durkheim suggests that
individual units agree on norms which are backed by values
which are held in common. However, there is allowance
for differences in the differentiated units. The problem
of solidarity in both rests in the area of motivational
aspects of commitment to the society and to the conformity
to the institutionalized expectations of the society.

The following table gives the summary of the ele-
ments that are included in the mechanical solidarity and
organic solidarity.
### Table 2.2
Elements of Mechanic Solidarity and Organic Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanic Solidarity</th>
<th>Organic Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Location of the mechanical solidarity lies in the structure of a society as a collective.</td>
<td>1. Location of the organic solidarity lies in the concept of government. There is possibility of independence in the units and the differentiation in form is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Values are not necessarily articulated except loyalty and responsibility to the collectivity. Normative standards are rigidly ritualized.</td>
<td>2. Values are stated and institutionalized. Scope for differentiated behaviour through consensus is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resource allocation is ascribed and frozen.</td>
<td>3. Negotiability and flexibility in resource allocation possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Specialised functions are non-transferable from one unit to another.</td>
<td>4. Labour is specialized and there is contract for the services of the labour. As such, transferable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Products are not sold. They are exchanged in barter or as ceremonial gifts.</td>
<td>5. There is buying and selling, barter, and market development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Occupational roles are filled on the basis of family lineage and kinship system.</td>
<td>6. Occupational roles made free of lineage and kinship through competitive labour markets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, Durkheim's concept of mechanical solidarity deals with the lack of differentiation of structure and hence with the similarity of roles which are personal expressions of the community and beliefs and sentiments. Durkheim's concept of organic solidarity deals with a whole set of complex institutionalized norms. These are seen as a condition of the stability of a functionally differentiated system.

Both these concepts of mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity suggest an evolutionary sequence. Durkheim suggests that the development of the patterns of organic solidarity are linked with an extensive division of labour. It presupposes a system of societal integration characterized by mechanical solidarity. The second significant point is that the economic division of labour and an elaborated differentiated governmental organization develop concomitantly. One system does not develop at the expense of the other.

Parsons (1967) suggests that Durkheim's association of mechanical solidarity with lack of structural differentiation inclined him toward identifying this association
with primitiveness in an evolutionary sense. This prevented him from making the essential connection between common values and the legitimization of political order and organization in a more differentiated modern type of society. The relation of modern political institutions to solidarity is very much similar to that of economic institutions of solidarity, was largely left untouched.

However, there is some meaning in mechanical solidarity preceding organic solidarity as there is always hierarchical ordering of function existing in any social systems. The political organization, within an institutionalized framework of order, must precede in the developmental sequence the emergence of highly differentiated market type of economy.

Tonnies’ concept of Gemeinschaft and Gesselschaft

The next broad typology of society is Tonnies’ (1940) concept of society. He categorizes society as Gemeinschaft, a community which is based on natural will, and Gesselschaft, a society which is based on rational will. Tonnies introduced this concept and used this dichotomy as the basis for classification of social relationships.
Gemeinschaft and Gesselschaft are sometimes referred to as positive types of social relationships. In both, there exist modes in which individuals are bound together. Both are supposed to exclude conflict elements. Tonnies' conception and analysis bring out the distinction between industrial and feudal society, city and village, business and friendship, impersonal market and kinship, complex and simple division of labour, and impersonal and personal encounters with people. One is conceived as an imaginary and mechanical structure, that is the society of the Gesselschaft, while the other is conceived as a real and organic structure, that is the community of the Gemeinschaft.

The table below gives a summary of the elements that are included in the concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesselschaft:

Table 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Gemeinschaft and Gesselschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gemeinschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Concept of Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All intimate, private &amp; exclusive living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Actions of basic life-forces or urges
   a) Universal feelings
3. Natural process of maintenance and continuation of society
4. Primary group dominance
5. Man bound by birth to family.
6. Life of common language folkways, morals and beliefs
7. Belief in the existence of single community excludes other communities
8. Is old, other people are strangers; community more alive - genuine form of living together.

2. Action based on deliberation and conscious choice.
   a) Arbitrary will
3. Artificial process (man designed)
4. Secondary group dominance
5. Man free to move and live in a strange country
6. Life influenced by Realm of business, travel and sciences
7. Accepts co-existence of people independent of each other
8. Is new - exists through urbanization, people live a superficial and transitory life.

Tonnies' (1887) also incorporated the institutional elements in his idea of Gemeinschaft and Gessellschaft.
The following chart summarises the institutional elements of the concept of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft:

### Table 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gemeinschaft</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gesellschaft</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The individual acts out of consensus and tradition</td>
<td>1. The individual makes deliberate choices, planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Very little scope for direct confrontation</td>
<td>2. Segmental encounters possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obligations are unspecified and unlimited.</td>
<td>4. Obligations are defined by contract and clear boundaries are specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relationship is formal though organic</td>
<td>5. Relationship is for a specific act or complex actions - mechanistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involuntary associations</td>
<td>6. Voluntary associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cohesiveness is valued. Relation among people is through authority</td>
<td>7. Rational pursuit of self interest is valued. Relation is based on equality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tonnies (1940) believed both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft to be ideal relations. He compared the Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft in terms of the dominant
types of relations which, he believed, existed in each typology.

Martindale (1966) summarizes Tonnies' contrast of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>GEMEINSCHAFT</th>
<th>GESSELLSCHAFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant social relation</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Dominance-submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinship</td>
<td>contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to institutional order</td>
<td>Family and clan</td>
<td>Market and state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in the individual</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major form of property</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant type of law</td>
<td>Family law</td>
<td>Legislation and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of social bond</td>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>Public opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folkways</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tonnies conceptualizes both Gemeinschaft and Geaeellschaft as an integral whole. He considers them as an ideal form of relations. However, somehow Tonnies leaves an impression that Gemeinschaft is to be preferred. Durkheim also seems to have preferred organic solidarity. However, he called the primitive society as mechanical solidarity (Martindale 1966).

Both Tonnies and Durkheim are concerned with consensus. They are also concerned with regulative principles through which a variety of disparate persons come to produce the regularities among their acts that are not explicable on the basis either of their biological constitutions or purely economic considerations (Parsons, et al 1961).

Weber's Concept of Communal and Associative Relationship

Weber (1947) very closely follows Durkheim and Tonnies. He suggests some fundamental proposals concerning the categories necessary for sociological analysis. Durkheim and Tonnies have attempted to deal with the social acts, social systems and societies in a logical manner. Weber raises several issues about the phenomenology of relationships. In comparing the relationship
with a friend and a business associate he raises four issues:

1. How can we distinguish the norms that govern these two relations?
2. In what might be 'one' set of distinctions state the difference between these relations?
3. Of what import is it to be able to distinguish friendship from business?
4. What 'elements' of social relations can be used for a classification?

Relating to these four issues, Weber (1947) suggests that social relations are either "communal" or "associative". The relationship is "communal" if the individual's orientation to social action is based on subjective feeling of the parties, whether affectual or traditional, that they belong together. The relationship is "associative" if the orientation of the social action within it rests on a) a traditionally motivated adjustment of interests, b) similarly motivated agreements, or c) rational judgement as based on absolute values, d) reasons of expediency. It is essential for the associative type of relationships to rest on rationality and by mutual agreement.
The following table summarizes the elements of purest aspects of both communal and associative relationship:

### Table 2.6
Elements of Communal relationship and Associative Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNAL RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>ASSOCIATIVE RELATIONSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. May rest on various types of affectual, emotional or traditional basis.</td>
<td>1. May rest on rational, free market exchange, which constitutes a compromise opposed by complementary interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Include a very heterogeneous group of phenomenon.</td>
<td>2. Pure voluntary association based on self interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. May involve action which is to an important degree oriented to consideration of expediency.</td>
<td>3. Voluntary association of individuals motivated by an adherence to a common set of absolute values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social relations may be conflicting or based on solidarity. They may be open or closed. Weber states that social relationship is deemed to be "open" if outsiders are accepted into it. It is closed if the participation of certain persons is excluded, limited, or subjected to conditions.
To summarise:

a) Examples of communal relationships which tend to be closed on a traditional basis, are those memberships which are determined by family relationship.

b) Personal and emotional relationships are affectually closed.

c) Closure on the basis of rational commitment to values is usually in groups, sharing in common, a system of explicit religious beliefs.

d) Typical cases of rational closure on grounds of expediency are economic associations of a monopolistic or plutocratic character.

Weber (1947) suggests that there are sources and there is need for closure of relationships. They are:

a) The maintenance of quality

b) Orientation to the scarcity of advantages in their bearing on consumption needs.

c) Orientation to the scarcity of opportunities for acquisition.
Similar to Weber in the category of social action theory is Chapin (1935). The following table gives Chapin's comparison of the family, Church, Government and business in terms of the four type parts:

Table 2.7
Chapin's Comparison of the Family, Church, Government and Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUR TYPE PARTS</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Attitude &amp; behaviour patterns</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Reverence</td>
<td>Subordination</td>
<td>Workmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Thrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Co-operativeness</td>
<td>Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Devotion</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Obedience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Symbolic culture traits</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>Flag</td>
<td>Trademark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;symbols&quot;</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>Ikon</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>Patent sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>Shrine</td>
<td>Emblem</td>
<td>Emblem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coat of arms</td>
<td>Alter</td>
<td>Anthem</td>
<td>Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Utilitarian culture traits (real property)</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Edifice</td>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>works</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Code of oral or written specifications</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>Creed</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>licence</td>
<td>Doctrine</td>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>Licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>Treaties</td>
<td>Franchises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Laws</td>
<td>Articles of incorporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mores</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chapin (1938) p. 16.
In spite of different focii and unit of analysis, all the typologies discussed above in terms of social relations have a communality. Accordingly, the social relations always have a past and future reference. They involve the notion of obligation in various ways. The emergence of secondary socialization and dominance of voluntary relations change the nature of obligation toward the primary social organization. The move from primary to secondary organization involves replacing the kind of obligations which were part and parcel of feudal or close systems to modes of mutual concern mediated through arrangements within and among large groups and often protected by legal arrangements. As societies change the attitudes and behaviour patterns, the symbols and codes of the social organization begin to be transformed.

It is these transformations and permanent juxtapositions in changing proposition of the ascriptive coherence, and individual autonomy, commercial bonds and urban anonymity within the same social relations that constitute the elements of similarities of Comte, Durkheim and Weber's theoretical social concepts.
Park and Redfield's concepts of Sacred, Folk and Secular Society

Park (1952) and Redfield (1968) also deal with the historical process of change and patterns of social relationships. They propose a typology of sacred society to secular society and folk society to secular society respectively. Their typology is related to Durkheim's and Tonnies' typology but makes a departure in terms of highlighting the dynamics of observed patterns of social relationship. The concepts of sacred and folk society to secular society take off from those of Durkheim's concept of mechanical and organic solidarity and Tonnies' concept of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Though they are not similar, they are bipolar distinctions making the personal and impersonal components in social life a dichotomy of social reciprocity.

Park (1952) views the primitive society as a 'group' of groups' where the relationship of each group to every other is one of war and plunder, except so far as agreements have modified it. Under these circumstances the extent of comradery and peace in one group and that of hostility and war towards the rest of the groups are
correlative to each other. "The loyalties that bind together the members of the little world - the world of the family, the clan and the tribe - are in direct proportion to the intensity of fears and hatreds with which they view their enemies and rivals in the larger - inter-tribal and international world outside."

pp. 944-945. Park's above concept seems to have links with the concept of group and the concept of territorial imperative and fight for resource control. His concept perhaps presents the attitudes and normative behaviour of the emergent formalised primal groups.

Redfield (1968) on the other hand used the communities in the middle culture range for his analysis. These communities were not unique or primitive. They were units of a larger whole. These units were in contact with markets and towns, and were also characterized with literacy. Redfield (1934) calls folk-culture that emergent pattern of living where the culture of non-literate people commonly and universally display. Each non-literate culture develops a pattern of living. The patterns of these various cultures of non-literature people have common elements as well as elements which are different. The
Universal differences and communalities across these constituted into a pattern of living is the hypothetical folk culture. The folk culture, according to Redfield (1968) will, in some respect, differ from the modes of life to be found in cities everywhere.

The following table summarizes the elements of folk and secular culture according to Redfield.

Table 2.8 Elements of Folk Society and Secular Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLK SOCIETY</th>
<th>SECULAR SOCIETY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Localised community with homogenous cultures and very few institutions.</td>
<td>1. A regional society with multiple institutions and widely differentiated customs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Routine and well defined patterns of living for members. Their experiences are also in the same mode.</td>
<td>2. Mobile living and differentiated patterns of living for member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A community of closely inter-woven parts.</td>
<td>3. A society of loosely joined and spread out units existing separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities anchored in religious and traditional rituals.</td>
<td>4. Activities as instruments to achieve practical ends. Not bound to religion and rituals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task as duty and obligations.</td>
<td>5. Task tied to monetary valuation and linked with choice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contd...
Table 3.8 contd...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FOLK SOCIETY</strong></th>
<th><strong>SECULAR SOCIETY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Local community is a world separate, complete and distinct. Rest of the communities are excluded from the world view.</td>
<td>6. The world view includes many other societies and their existence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Loyalty is to the community which is homeland and father land.</td>
<td>7. Loyalty is perhaps to the nation, secular life begins to emerge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Integration of religious, tradition, social living, aesthetic and recreation.</td>
<td>9. Personal and irrational considerations gain significance. Individual chooses his work and play.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Redfield (1968) defines folk society as a small, isolated, non-literate and homogenous characterized with a strong sense of group solidarity. The technology is simple and there is no division of labour. The group is economically independent of all others. The folk society is a little world by itself in which the recurrent problems are traditional and are met by all its members in much the same way. According to Redfield (1968) the transition from folk society to secular society is not
evolutionary. There appears to be a breakdown of traditions and rituals. There are pulls from the secular societies which hasten the process of breakdown.

Similar studies with similar and somewhat differential findings have been done by (Sumner 1907; Goldenweiser 1922; Kroeber 1925; Radin 1927; Radcliffe-Brown 1933; Benedict 1937, 1946; Becker 1940; Redfield 1941, 1962; Morgan 1942; Firth 1951; Park 1952, and Mead M 1953).

Redfield (1953) extends the concept of folk culture and secular culture to folk culture and city culture. The folk society and modern society seen in contrast with each other seem to be two distinct polarities. However, for Redfield they represent a continuum with discrete patterns evolving in between.

Simultaneously, with the emerging sociological and anthropological studies a systematic study of personality began to emerge during the turn of the century in European Continent. Nietzsche,* William James,* Freud,

* See Bibliography.
and many others attempted a historic view of personality, emphasizing the capacity for massive transformation. Personality studies became a concern in the context of slow and sudden change and the shift in values. These studies became the part of studies of the cultural continuities and discontinuities.

Parsons (1953) in developing a theory of society synthesizes the multiple approaches of anthropologists, sociologists, and the personality theorists. He also developed the general theory of action. To Parsons (1953) whether one deals with personality, society or culture, the unit of the analysis is the system. Below, Parsons's theoretical approach is briefly examined.

Parsons' approach of Pattern Variables

Parsons makes a significant departure by clearly drawing a distinction between the analytically defined "individual" and the individual as a system generated by the process of social interaction. This aspect of differentiation has been ignored by sociologists and anthropologists alike. According to Kroeber and Parsons (1938) there is a vital distinction between social systems and cultural systems. However, for Parsons they unite in the innate and significant relations between two persons.
While dealing with the typologies of societies and transition and movement from one system to another, there has been a diffusion of political and economic significance. Some theories see them as having primary significance while others see them as having secondary significance. Parsons (1911) considers both the political and economy as a functional sub-system of a society. His primary concern is with functions of integration and of "pattern maintenance."

Below, the concepts and categories used by Parsons are presented in a table:

Table 2.9
Schematic Tabulation of Social Inputs and Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY SOCIAL SUB-SYSTEM</th>
<th>INPUT AND SOURCE</th>
<th>OUTPUT AND DESTINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattern maintenance</td>
<td>Given structure as institutionalized patterns of normative cultures (no external source)</td>
<td>Maintenance of structure and specification of values (no external destination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Plasticity(from behavioural organism)</td>
<td>Patterns for purposive response (to behavioural organism)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contd......
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY SOCIAL SUB-SYSTEM</th>
<th>INPUT AND SOURCE</th>
<th>OUTPUT AND DESTINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal-attainment</td>
<td>Capacity for sociological motivational commitment (from personality)</td>
<td>Goal-gratification (to personality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Codes for organization of information (from cultural system)</td>
<td>Validation of standards of competence (to cultural system).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Parson's scheme the focus of the social system is on the conditions involved in the interaction of actual human individuals who constitute concrete collectivities with determinate membership. The focus of the cultural system is on "patterns" of meaning, e.g., of values, of norms, of organized knowledge and beliefs, and of expressive "form". The basic concept related to the integration of the two focii is "institutionalization".

The social system then involves a frame of reference called "Action". Parsons (1972) treats action as goal
directed behaviour as "adaptive" as "motivated" and as
guided by symbolic processes. "Action" then, is a process
in the actor-situation system which has motivational
significance to the individual actor, or in the case of
a collectivity its component individuals. Parsons (1972)
suggests that social system is only one of three aspects
of the structuring of a completely concrete system of
social action. The other two being personality systems
of the individual actors and the cultural system which is
built into their action.

Parsons thus becomes a link between the theorists
of social organization and theorists of work organizations
by emphasizing the analysis of "actor-situation" system
and action.

To Gould and Kolb (1964) "pattern-variables" are
the dichotomous course of action from each of which 'any'
actor must select explicitly or implicitly in order to
formulate a choice among the options open to him in 'any'
relationship.

The term pattern-variable was introduced by Parsons
and Schills (1951) and further elaborated by Parsons, Bales
and Schils (1953). According to Parsons and Schils (1951) action is behaviour involving a choice among options and the use of criteria derived from past experience to make that choice. The choice must be oriented to the attainment of goals. It may or may not be made self-consciously. To choose is to select from among options. Parsons and Schils emphasize that, while some of the options present at the time of choice are peculiar to a given situation, certain options appear in all situations involving choice.

The actor's choice is determined by two alternatives. First, the actor will be sensitive to the possible rewards or deprivations which a situation may provide for his needs. These, according to Parsons and Schils (1951), are the actor's 'motivational orientation'. Second, the actor's choice takes into account expectations acquired from past experience concerning the criteria which are appropriately used in deciding the alternatives. These are the actor's value orientation.

Parsons and Schils (1951) further elaborate that the emotional orientation has three forms or modes:
1. **Cognitive mode**: The cognitive mode consists of those behaviours by which an actor perceives the existence of situations and discriminates their characteristics and their consequences for gratification or deprivation of his needs.

2. **Cathetic mode**: This mode consists of those forms of behaviour which an actor 'responds' to a situation in accordance with its consequences for his needs.

3. **Evaluative mode**: This mode consists of those types of behaviour by which an actor allocates his energy among the various actions with respect to various cathected objects in an attempt to optimize gratification.

All these three modes exist simultaneously in any given situation. The actor focuses on any one at a time in the order stated above. In the process of perceiving the features of situations and allocating energy to various actions, the actor utilizes the norms, standards and criteria. These are acquired expectations concerning appropriate methods of choosing from among options — the value alternatives. Hence Parsons and Schils (1951) hypothesize a mode of value orientation corresponding to each mode of motivational orientation above. Thus, three
modes emerge. (a) the cognitive mode of value orientation. It involves the various commitments to standards by which the validity of cognitive judgements is established. Next, (b) the appreciative mode. It involves the various commitments to standards by which the appropriateness or consistency of the cathexis of an object or class of objects is assessed. Finally, (c) the moral mode of value orientation. It involves the various commitments to standards by which certain consequences of particular actions and types of action may be assessed with respect to their effects upon systems of action, i.e., upon personality systems or social systems.

Parsons and Schils (1951) further differentiate that when a choice is made in a situation involving social objects, that is other actors - either individual or collective - two further orientations may be utilised.

1. First the actor may judge social subjects significant for his action in terms of the complex of qualities which they embody or in terms of the acts they perform. These options comprise the quality - performance classification.
2. Second, actors orient to social objects according to 'the scope of significance distinction'. Social objects may have broad and undefined significance that he cannot prioritise and responds to all demands. In this sense, the significance is diffuse. The second alternative is that the social objects may have such narrow and clearly defined significance that the actor may not respond to that which is not clearly defined. In this sense, the scope of significance of the object for the actor - subject is "specific".

It is from among these universal and inherent types of motivational and value orientations and of orientations to social objects that Parsons and Schils (1951) suggest that actors must select when they choose in any given social situation. The actors must make five specific dichotomous choices before any situation will have a determinate meaning.

1. **Affective and Affective-Neutrality**

The affective choice gives immediate gratification to impulses without regard to the later consequences of such action. Affective-neutrality means holding up such immediate gratification in the interests of evaluating the
consequences of action. This pair of choices derives from deciding between expressing the cognitive and cathetic modes of motivational orientation or expressing the evaluative mode.

2. **Self-orientation and Collectivity Orientation**

   In applying the moral mode of value orientation, the actor must choose between action for private goals (self orientation) and action on behalf of collective goals (collectivity-orientation).

3. **Universalism and Particularism**

   In applying the cognitive mode and appreciative mode of value orientation, the actor must choose one as having primacy. He may decide to treat the objects in the situation in accordance with a general norm covering 'all' objects in that class. That is a universalistic choice. He may decide to be particularistic, treating them 'in accordance with their standing in some particular relationship to him or his collectivity, independently of the objects' subsumibility under a general norm'.
4. **Quality and Performance**

This was earlier called by Parsons (1951) achievement-ascription. When dealing with social objects, the actor must decide to act toward them in terms of what they are (their quality) or in terms of what they do (their performance).

5. **Diffuseness and Specificity**

When dealing with social objects, the actor must decide to act toward them by accepting no inherent or prior limitation of the scope of the actor's concern with the object, either as an object of interest or of obligations (diffuseness), or by according only a limited and specific type of significance to the object in his system of orientation (specificity).

According to Parsons and Schils (1951) individuals will, in a given structure of a social setting, make either one choice or the other. Parson's propositions of pattern-variables in essence can effectively predict the dominant action choices associated with the dichotomous typologies of societies as stated by Tonnies', Durkheim, Weber, Park, Redfield, etc. In essence, Parson's pattern
variables integrate the diverse and multiple typology of society into a single set of convergent processes influencing man in his interaction with his life space.

As such, Parsons' system approach makes a theoretical bridge between social organization and work organization theories. His proposition of pattern variables for action choice are perhaps the most classical and cogent propositions to analyse role actions of an individual in a work organization. Unfortunately, no empirical work is traceable on the use of pattern variables in this field. The concept of pattern variables does not seem to have been validated through research.

At the manifest level, Parson's analytical scheme of pattern variables can be used to categorize and classify behaviour of an individual in social situations. However, if it is a question of change in the choice of an action, or the question of determining the source of the choices, then the action parameters of the pattern variables seem to give only partial answers.

In order to understand the direction of change and the source of action (Pattern-variable) an understanding
of the role models and concepts promoted by the society and internalized by the individual will be more significant. Parsons's work does not postulate any schema for the understanding of the internalized role models and role concepts operative in society or in organizations.

A Review and Summing up of Social Theories

The above theoretical approaches focusing on the transition from one society to another involve a slow turning away of man from the focus on the repetitive and ordered aspects of social phenomena to a more complex differentiated and emergent social phenomenon. The typologies of the society, though diverse in their focus and perspective, show certain communalities. Naegle (1961) identifies four themes which run parallel and simultaneous in the analysis of social change.

1. The severalness and coherence of social arrangements

There is a common theme which runs through the works of Comte, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Tonnies and Parsons and that is of institutional order. This order involves a variety of spheres (legal, economic, political, etc.) and
implies the several planes of culture, social relations and individuals personality. Individuals in the society exist within the structure of society. That structure, therefore, persists by virtue of the changing proportions of traditional calculations and charismatic dispositions.

2. Transformation in and transformation of society

Social arrangements differ in their duration and durability. As one moves away from a purely personal perspective, one becomes aware that change and stability are matters of the plans of perspective on which one stands. They are regarded 'as a corporate structure'. A social system can also contain a variety of people who may not themselves be undergoing simultaneous transformations.

3. The distribution of honour and power

Shifts in the determinants of society, the complexity of society, the population expansion, changes in the division of labour, multiplication of corporate groupings, industrialization and other forms of cumulative growth, all add to the transformations. They create new ordering among individuals. The social stratification undergoes
change creating estates, castes or classes. The restructuring and redistribution starts taking shape when stratification based on ascriptive and kinship barriers begin to be replaced by the system of recognition of achievement reflected in educational and occupational mobility. The emergence of professionalization in the context of multiplying of new technologies and work settings add to the momentum of change in the distribution of honour and power.

4. Directionality of change

Weber, Durkheim, Tonnies and others have proposed a directionality toward increased complexities, increased rational and legal patterns and developments of new complex standards of behaviour. These theorists have suggested classification of societies on the basis of dominant gestalt of social relationships obtained in each typology. Though these polarities are not identical in content and focus, they are similar in proposing a dichotomy of personal, interpersonal and social components of life space.

In the above theories the action choices of an individual evolved with the change and typology in the
society. Parson's pattern variables coincide with the postulated directionality of change. Broadly speaking the changes emerge as societies shift from one typology to another in the following five spheres:

1. Changes in the pattern of interaction
2. Changes in the quality of interaction
3. Changes in the nature of authority
4. Changes in the nature of social institutions
5. Changes in the processes and quality of both social and work organizations.

The above theories then, do not directly delineate any constituents and coordinates of the role concept and the life view promoted by the society and its typology. Typologies at best are a phenomenological classifications of and or apriori categories of modalities of social phenomenon. In these typologies emphasis has been to explain the social contextual factors that seem to be associated with the observable locus of action and action choices of individuals and groups within a society. The theories seem to ignore that the action choice, though anchored in the personality structure in the actor situation
system, is also anchored in the role models and role concepts available and prevalent in the culture.

Industrialization, with its concomitant aspects, has become the instrument of change described, analysed and predicted by the above theories. However, industrialization has also led work component of man's life space to acquire greater significance than ever before. As a result, social organizations, social tasks and social authority have become differentiated from work organizations, work tasks and work authority in the life space of man. As stated earlier in the 'Introduction', industrialization has thus established two distinct role space systems in the life space of man.

The shift has been that the social system with its task and authority and which represents the rubric of social identity and its orientations do not act as dominant and significant forces as they did earlier. At times it seems that the orientations and attitudes demanded by the work organizations reflected in the rubric of work identity, are being transferred to social organizations. Work organizations and their logic have become all pervasive just as once the definitions, perspectives and
logic of social organizations were all pervasive. The credo of the work organization has turned a housewife into a house manager. Home science has become home management. Management as conceived by the work organization, a technology of co-ordinating people and other resources for optimal returns is being put on as high a pedestal as once the intellectualism of science, philosophy and technocracy were. This shift in the dominance of work organization over social organization in the life space of man has had a double impact.

1. Development of organization theory

2. Development of science to make man proactive in the face of his loss of belonging, meaning and identity as defined in the pre-industrial era.

1. Development of organization theory

While the development of organization theory has been more systematic, concrete and clear, the development of science to make man absorb the shift and fashion his new identity has been rather scattered. The emergence of work identity on the one hand has been a compulsion due to the demands of work organization, and on the other hand a
source of guilt and decadence of man's being and culture. Very few treatise recognize that the shift has, for the first time, given man the freedom to be an individual and actualize his person instead of being a role-bound object in social transactions. The emergence of work identity has generally been bemoaned.

Though social organizations were all pervasive, thinkers of past did state some of the differences between social organizations and work organizations. According to Khandwalla (1977) as early as four thousand B.C. and down the line Babylonians, the Jews, the Chinese, the Greeks, the Indians, the Romans, the Arabs and the Venetians to the birth of Christ have recognized needs for planning, control, decentralization, incentives, need for systems and standards and need for human relations in work organizations. They also recognized problem of layout, material handling and use of job descriptions.

The tradition of differentiating between social organizations and the unique aspects required by work organizations were sporadic statements during these last four thousand years. They were not integrated into a systematic pattern of knowledge. Like many other traditions
of human knowledge it is only at the beginning of the 19th century that some systematic attempts to crystallize knowledge of work organization began. This is reflected in the works of James Watt and Mathew Boulton.

It took another hundred years, when with the work of Frederic Taylor around 1900 a real thrust for the study of work organization in their various aspects began. Following Taylor and Henry Fayole were writers like Roethlisberger and Dickson (1938, 1939), Roethlisberger (1942), Mayo (1946) and others focused on the significance of group dynamics in the functioning of organizations. Following their tradition triggered studies on leadership and styles of leadership led by Lippit and Whyte (1939) and later others.

Fayole’s (1949) ideas were picked up by Mooney and Reiley (1931), Follett (1923, 1942), Urwick (1943) and others who developed the whole stream organization theory now identified as "Principles of Management School".

Mayo’s (1946) work followed by Lippit, Mcgregor (1960), Argyris (1956), Likert (1961) crystallised in "Human Relations School of Organization Theory". Weber’s
approach to bureaucracy, his focus on social action and his emphasis on rationality of systems triggered diverse work which, to some degree, can be seen as related to the work of Simon and March (1964) who represent the "Bounded Rationality School of Management."

It is interesting to note that through the early phase of traditional and mechanical industrialization, the theorists were exclusively concerned with defining the nature of work organizations, the nature of roles, criteria of efficiency and optimisation, quality of control and formalisation of authority for goal setting and task achievement. Later a counter move began protesting against work organizations treating the role of a human being as similar to the role of a machine. Earlier, there was not much, if at all, concern about the total life space of man. The counter move initially beginning with the human relation school gathered further momentum in the post World War II era. The problems thrown open by the second phase of industrial revolution made theorists look at man with links beyond the work.

For the first time organizational task and man as a human being beyond the role got integrated into a
theoretical approach within the setting of work organizations. This concept was initiated and represented by socio-technical schools. The same movement later extended itself into the quality of work-life approach and attempted to integrate work organizations with community organizations.

The emergence of work organizations and the problems therein arising from human factor triggered studies on needs, motivation, leadership, technology, power etc. In fact organization men become overstudied. There is hardly any aspect of his being and becoming which has not been subjected to intense research.

2. Development of science of Organization Development

Gradually the organization theorists became concerned with action planning in organizations and applying their theories to solve problems. This built up massive experience as well as provided critical feedback to the theories. Thus, gradually a new science, Organization Development (O.D.) which basically deals with problems of change in organizations evolved.
Theorists with different persuasions in England and United States began experimentation. In England movement was centered around the work of Rice (1958), and Trist (1963) from the Tavistock Institute. It is interesting to note that some of the original work of Rice was done in India at Calico. This approach broadly known as socio-technical system approach combines both structural and role interventions.

In the United States the proponents of these theories are (March and Simon 1964; Argyris 1962, 1964; Blake and Mouton 1964a; 1964b; Blake and Shepard 1965; Greiner 1967; Kahn et al 1964; Lawrence and Lorsch 1970, 1972; Likert 1961; Litwin 1968; Schein 1965; Beckhard 1969; Bennis 1965, 1966).

Three or four major trends can be identified. One of the trends is around Thomson (1967) and Lawrence and Lorsch (1970, 1972). Their approach anchored in the principle of differentiation and integration is concerned with identification of tasks and the nature of structure needed. They accept the idea of re-training of the staff for new orientation of task. The second major trend can be identified with the work of Bekhard (1969)
who is the culminating point of much of the work of human relation school and the laboratory approach of N.T.L. Behind him has gone the work of stalwarts like Argyris (1962, 1964), Bennis (1965, 1966) and Schein (1965).

The third trend is around the work of Blake and Mouton (1964a, 1964b). It is known as 'Managerial Grid'. It aims at extensive and long range changes in management philosophy and practices. It basically focuses on change of attitudes and finding a balance between the concern for task and people.

In a broad perspective the management by objective or in short called the M.B.O. and a whole set of work on motivational training fostered by McClelland (1965) and others can also be classified in O.D. efforts. This approach is more concerned with efficiency than effectiveness. O.D. proponents seem to exclude these approaches from the O.D. stream.

Beckhard (1969) defines O.D. as "an effort (1) planned, (2) organization-wide, and (3) managed from the top, to (4) increase organization - effectiveness and health through (5) planned interventions in the
organization's 'processes' using behaviour-science
knowledge". p.9.

Essentially then, O.D. is a planned programme which
is initiated and arranged with the commitment of the top
management. Its objectives are fulfilment and achievement
of organization's overall tasks, goals, policies and
objectives. In order to achieve all this the major energy
and time is invested in bringing about changes in action
orientations of the personnel of the organizations. Very
often the O.D. effort involves the technology of expe-
rienced based learning in a group setting.

As in the case of social theories the organization
theorists also seemed to have been caught with the manage-
ment of ongoing transactions between roles. In their
attempts to do this they continued to deal with role
negotiation and effectiveness. They deal with issues of
leadership and conflict resolution but nowhere there is
any postulation for the constituents of the role concepts
which are part of the individual who is operating in a
role.
It seems that whenever the social scientists have been caught with problems of change they have chosen of the following two alternatives:

i. To continue to deal with the phenomenological transaction between roles. Their intervention strategy is to manage problems of these transactions by modifying structural boundaries of role space.

ii. To continue to deal with the so called attitudes and manage the problem by bringing about change in attitudes.

For the first alternative they have drawn concepts and constructs heavily from organization theories, and for the second alternative they have drawn concepts and constructs from personality and motivation theories. Thus, they have sought structural solutions for behavioural problems, or behavioural solutions for structural problems. Sometimes they have adopted the simultaneity of the two problems.

It is surprising, if not baffling, how the tradition of the social scientists have treated 'role' as a
construct of inter-phase between the structure and the personality constituents and failed to recognize that role besides being an inter-phase between social and personality structures may have independent roots in the internalization and introjects of man.

Garg and Parikh (1976) in their work with Indian youth and Indian organization compiled evidence which suggests that though the role is a construct of inter-phase between personality and structural constituents it is not dependent on the nature of the actual transactions happening in the organization. Their evidence suggests that the individual during his process of socialization internalizes and introjects, besides the significant others, the social setting, its process and structure as well. This internalization encompasses the role models as well as an affective-cognitive map of the social system. This internalized map of the social system is not so comprehensive as made out by sociologists and anthropologists who describe his social system. In fact, it may be very divergent.

According to their findings Garg and Parikh (to be published) postulate that man does not symbolise only the
significant individuals as stated by Freuc but he also symbolises life situations. It is the symbol of the situation which when projected on to a transaction in real life that translates the other individual in interaction into the symbols of significant others.

Their further analysis of the introjects of the social system and situation led them to evolve the construct of the matrix of role acts and role coordinates. The chapter 'Theoretical Framework' of this research discusses the construct of the matrix in detail.

The subject matter of both the social and organization theories is linked with the nature, process and direction of change. The former provides concepts and constructs to comprehend, classify and evaluate the transition and change in society, while the latter, besides doing the above, also provides concepts and constructs for planning, designing, implementing, and finally managing change.

While these theories reviewed above have a broad application to the Indian society and culture, there are significant and critical areas where the application of
these theories do not help to deal with the emerging social reality of India. In the Indian context, the structuring of birth and occupation and freezing of the mobility in terms of caste leaves the significance of action choices a secondary element for the individual. The concepts of motivation, achievement and such other concepts operate as secondary elements. What becomes primary then, is the internalization of the role concept of the system and its introjects. These are then nurtured, fostered and reinforced by the society. As such, in the Indian context action choices are more governed by the primary role concept the individual has internalized, the primary role model he has introjected, and the primary social system in terms of its processes that the individual has internalized as the operating reality. These introjected and internalized models of roles, and the social system processes may not be what the sociologists describe from normative standards of universal concepts.

According to Murray (1935) man has something in common with all man (universal culture), something in common with some man (group culture specific) and something unique and not common with anyone (individual specificity).
His statement can well be stated that organizations have something in common with all organizations (universal), have something in common with some organizations (culture specificity) and something unique and not common with any organization (individual specificity).

The above insight of Murray seems to have been forgotten or bypassed. Much of the work in the process of change gets stuck with the universalising or particularising the findings. It is high time that attempts to develop concepts and constructs to deal with the group-culture specific aspects of an organization or society's phenomenology are generated. The concept of internalization of the transactions and social setting of the child's experiences with the significant others and its transposition into an affective-cognitive matrix of role acts and role coordinates developed by Garg and Parikh (1976)* is one such attempt.

The present research, as indicated in the introduction, is an attempt to test empirically the prototype model of role acts and role coordinates in order to understand the sources, directionality and quality of action choices of managers in Indian organizations.

* See Appendix VIII