

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_148803

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

301/R44H P.G. 3032

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

104 JUN 1982

OUP—552—7-7-66—10,000

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 301

Accession No.

PG 3032

Author

R44H

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

The
Dryden Press Handbooks

SAMUEL SMITH

GENERAL EDITOR

Handbook
of
Sociology

EDWARD BYRON REUTER
State University of Iowa

THE DRYDEN PRESS · NEW YORK, N. Y.

Copyright, 1941, by
The Dryden Press, Inc.
103 Park Avenue
New York, N. Y.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. NO PART OF THIS BOOK MAY BE
REPRODUCED IN ANY FORM, BY MIMEOGRAPH OR ANY
OTHER MEANS, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM
THE DRYDEN PRESS.

First Printing, May, 1941
Second Printing, September, 1943

Designed by Burnshaw

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Preface

THIS VOLUME is offered for student use. It is designed to supplement the classroom lectures and reading assignments. The introductory part will give the student a preliminary orientation and a point of view; it will also provide a basis for an intelligently critical attitude toward the elementary writing in the field. The second part contains in brief space and without confusing detail the essential content of the introductory books now in common use. The vocabulary presented in the third part, if used consistently and industriously, will give a familiar and precise command of words necessary to clarity of thought and statement. This part is particularly useful for the reason that few writers of elementary treatises in sociology are careful to define unequivocally the terms they use. The sections are made relatively independent to facilitate their use with various texts and modes of presentation. The final section will give the student some preliminary knowledge of the better-established areas of sociological interest and some suggestions for easy introductory reading.

I am indebted to the great number of sociologists whose ideas have been used and whose words have been quoted in the following pages. The manual reflects, indeed is intended to reflect, the conceptions that are the common property of the present generation of sociologists. My task has been that of choosing from a great wealth of material. I hope that no one has been seriously wronged by having brief excerpts or single sentences quoted out of their context.

Gratitude is hereby expressed to those publishers who have permitted the use of excerpts from their publications. Specific acknowledgement is made in connection with the use of quoted material.

I am particularly indebted and gladly acknowledge my indebtedness to the various scholars who have prepared definitive statements of the specialized fields of sociological study. Each of these contributions is specifically noted at the point where it appears in the text.

Dr. Jitsuichi Masuoka rendered valuable assistance in the preparation of the manuscript; my indebtedness and appreciation are here acknowledged. Finally, I am greatly indebted to Professor Willard Waller of Barnard College of Columbia University for critical reading of the entire manuscript and for invaluable criticism of its form and content. He is, of course, in no way responsible for the faults that remain.

E. B. REUTER

The University of Iowa
January 23, 1941

Table of Contents

Preface	v
PART ONE: <i>Conceptions of Sociology</i>	2
The Folk Sociology	4
The Philosophy of History	8
Welfare Practices and Program	10
<u>Sociology as a Scientific Discipline</u>	12
PART TWO: <i>Summary of Essentials</i>	16
The Nature and Processes of Sociology	16
The Nature of Society	19
The Biological Basis of Human Life	22
The Geographic Environment	25
The Growth of Population	27
Human Ecology	29
Other Distributional Patterns	31
Segregation and Class Structure	33
Groups and Group Life	35
The Human Community	38
Community and Society	40
Human Nature	42
The Development of Personality	45
The Individual and the Person	46
Social Interaction	47
General Forms of Interaction	49
Competition and Spatial Distribution	50
Conflict and the Determination of Status	51
Accommodation and the Social Equilibrium	53
Assimilation and Moral Unity	55
Culture	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Race and Culture	59
Culture and Original Nature	62
<u>Social Organization and Institutions</u>	64
Customs and Conventions	66
<u>Major Social Institutions</u>	67
Institutional Control	69
Social Change and Disorganization	70
Personal Disorganization	72
The Disorganization of Personality	73
Collective Behavior and Social Reorganization	74
PART THREE: <i>Dictionary of Terms</i>	76
PART FOUR: <i>Areas of Specialized Study—Bibliographies</i> 171	
The History of Sociology	177
Social and Sociological Theory	179
Systematic Sociology	182
Human Ecology	184
Population	187
Eugenics	190
Rural Sociology	193
Urban Sociology	196
Social Psychology	199
Social Psychiatry	202
Collective Behavior	205
Public Opinion	208
The Family	210
The Community	213
Sociology of Law	214
Educational Sociology	216
Criminology	218
Penology	221
Social Problems	223
Social Pathology	226
Social Work	228
Other Specialized Interests	231

PART ONE

Conceptions of Sociology

PART ONE

Conceptions of Sociology

It is unusual for the student beginning the study of sociology* to have any clear and definite conception of the nature and scope of the discipline. He may register for a course at the direction of an adviser, because it is a requirement in his sequence of studies, because the title attracts his attention, because it is offered at an hour that is vacant on his program, or for another reason—perhaps good and sufficient in itself—quite apart from any serious consideration as to the contribution the study will make to his education. The occasional student who deliberately chooses sociology as a major field of study often does so because of mistaken notions concerning the content of the discipline; he generally brings to his initial study a body of preconceptions acquired in a secondary school course on social problems.

It also happens, not infrequently that the student comes to the end of his study of sociology with little or no real understanding of the discipline. The introductory course may give him no basic frame of reference and no fundamental orientation. If it leaves him without a clearly defined point of view and a well-ordered system of concepts, he is in the same intellectual haze at its end as he was at its beginning, no matter how interesting in itself the course content may be. If the student persists in the study of sociology, he may find as much confusion as enlightenment in the subsequent courses. The specialized work may proceed without use of or reference to the system of thought presented in the

* Words followed by an asterisk are defined or discussed in the dictionary section (Part III, pp. 76-170).

general introduction, and without reference to the points of view or the empirical content of other concrete courses. His body of information expands but it tends to remain miscellaneous and unorganized; it may become extensive and unwieldy rather than coherent and profound.

In graduate study and specialized research, the student is often still further removed from an integral system of sociological thought. The courses are likely to presuppose that he possesses an adequate and comprehensive background, or that student deficiencies will be independently filled in, or that no body of thought other than that supplied by the course is essential to full and final knowledge. It is quite notorious that much sociological research, at least as it appears in theses, lacks any very close and definite dependence on a body of general theory. Hence, since empirical investigations are essentially meaningless when divorced from theory, this research does not contribute notably to human understanding.

At the end of his period of study, the student may be called upon to give instruction in sociology. In the new role*, he recites the remembered wisdom of his own instructors and, thanks to the system of courses in vogue, is not obligated to reduce his fund of information to a coherent system of thought. If he publishes, his literary activities are more likely to add to the current body of opinion than to contribute to the advancement of social science.

Some part of the cycle of futility just recited arises from the fact that sociology is variously conceived, and from the corollary fact that many different things are presented under its banner. Sociological conceptions vary from that of an ethically neutral body of principles and research procedures, developed in the effort to make human* nature and social behavior intelligible, to that of the common-sense procedures employed in grappling with the concrete and immediately practical problems of community* life. It is necessary that the student learn to identify the various areas of interest, points of view, fields of study, and procedures of research, if for no other reason than that he be able to define his own standpoint and problem.

A first step toward orientation in sociological study is an appreciation of the chief historical and current ideas of the discipline. One approach is by way of the historical sequence.

THE FOLK* SOCIOLOGY

In a loose but not wholly inaccurate sense, sociology is as old as associated life and as universal as human thought. The contacts* of men and their relations in groups* are as general as human life itself. The adjustments* of people to their habitats, the conflicts* with rival groups, experience with famine, disease, population pressure, migration*, the development of class* and caste* divisions, and other items of personal and group life are known to men in all circumstances. These and other social phenomena are matters of observation and reflection; men everywhere think more or less coherently about the conditions of associated life and about their relations and obligations to their fellow men. Sociology begins when men reflect and generalize about social reality and human relationships.

At the simplest primitive level known to modern scholars there are organized ways of life and bodies of thought and doctrine that rationalize and tend to perpetuate and to make general the ways of acting. The customs* of the group—and no group is without folkways* and rules—are not alone ways of behaving; they are also, by implication, definitions of the ways in which men are expected to behave. These ways of acting are generalized and objectified in proverbs and legends. This body of folk wisdom covers in general all the conditions and relations of life; specifically or by indirection it generalizes in regard to honor, bravery, virtue, and other social products that have implications for human relations. No group can carry on without such interpretations and principles, and every group has its proverbs and other elementary types of generalization. The bodies of primitive social doctrine are immature, fragmentary, and sometimes lacking in internal consistency, but they state and generalize the results of group experience and the reflections of the wise men.

The body of folk sociology was surprisingly large in each of the ancient civilizations. The conceptions of human nature and the ideas of social relationships are implicit in the institutional structure, systems of control*, religious practices, and other social products; they are also abundantly and explicitly stated in the proverbs,

laws, moral codes, and elsewhere. These bodies of social thought were, of course, prescientific, inexact, unsophisticated, and un-systemized, but they were extensive; and the concepts and pronouncements often reflected a deep insight into human character and social reality. The amazing number of proverbs and comments in reference to idleness, gossip, greed, intemperance, waste, lying, flattery, bad company, prudence, modesty, and the like, which are still current guides to personal behavior and group relations, testifies to the fact that the reflections and generalizations on human nature and social conduct were often of a high order. The content of the social thought varied with time and place and circumstance, and it reflected the situation in which it appeared, but the nature of the person* and of the group seems everywhere to have been observed and generalized.

Until very recently, the aggregated bodies of folk wisdom constituted the content of the scholarly disciplines. The subject matter of all the existing sciences, until relatively recently, consisted for the most part of informal generalizations checked by the daily observation and experience of those interested along a given line.

In the recent and contemporary periods, the body of folk sociology bulks large; there has been much reflection and generalization concerning human nature and social relations. In some part it has been simple and naïve rationalization* on the bodies of social practice that have grown up to mediate the relations of men in a changing world; in some part it has been a body of homely philosophy articulating the experiences, observations, and biases of individual men and groups, and expounding appreciatively the folklore* and traditional beliefs* upon which the contemporary practices rest.

The current body of social wisdom—the reflections and generalizations on human and cultural reality—rides at the common-sense level. It is not a systematically ordered and coherent body of thought; the various items are not verified; the inferences are drawn from casual observations and common knowledge about historical phenomena, from the concrete happenings of contemporary group life, and from observed apparent relations among men and groups. It is sometimes acute in observation and generalization, it is rarely disinterested, and it is seldom profound.

The folk sociology of the present gets its best expression in editorials, news comment, special "columns," and similar features of newspapers and journals of opinion. But it is equally the subject matter of the generally popular magazines and the popular writers. The playwrights, short-story writers, and novelists who take their craft seriously are concerned with presenting either current analyses and interpretations of human personality or a commentary on social life and human relations. Teachers generally, and ministers particularly, present their individual and class conceptions of human nature and social reality. These diverse bodies of writing and teaching are variously compounded from traditional beliefs, moral sentiments*, class* biases, scholarly publications, and other sources of information and opinion. They present, often with skill and competence, common-sense interpretations and generalizations that reflect, and in a measure influence, the current level of social thought.

A good deal of the sociology taught in the schools and presented in the professional publications is of the folk order. It falls into two indistinctly separated types of interest and exposition.

The discussions of social problems, which have occupied the time of many academic writers and still make up a large percentage of the offerings in most college departments of sociology, are essentially at the folk level. They organize and present a body of information bearing upon unadjusted and maladjusted persons and upon inadequacies and malfunctionings of the social and institutional order. They express disapproval of the described conditions. They assume a knowledge of a desirable state of social affairs and an understanding of the techniques and procedures to be employed in reforms*. The whole treatment is at the common-sense level; the problems of discussion are concrete historical phenomena, and the solutions advocated are drawn from the traditional practices of the group. The purpose is to mobilize the sentiments and direct the activities of men toward immediate and tangible reform procedures.

A very large percentage of present-day sociological activity is directed to the task of collecting concrete information, either as an end in itself, or in connection with or as preparation for practical reform programs. Many of the more popular introductory

textbooks in sociology are essentially informational in content; they make little pretense of being anything more than compendiums of raw data with common-sense inferences and generalizations. The "social survey*" is a form of sociology that records certain immediately observable facts and conditions, and proceeds to conclusions on the basis of the record. The collection of concrete information and inferences from the data collected often involve elaborate and highly sophisticated procedures; but the findings do not differ in essentials from the observations and generalizations that wise men have made in all times, places, and cultures. They are current forms of folk thought; they represent one widely held conception of sociology.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY*

One conception of sociology, represented by a large and important body of scholars, affiliates it with or assimilates it into the corpus of historical thought. It is variously stated and exemplified at all the stages from simple naïveté to academic sophistication; at the one level it fades into simple folk sociology, at the other it becomes an esoteric or mystical body of speculation.

The historian is concerned in the main with presenting a narrative of human experience. He gives a record of unique events: an account of kings and dynasties, of battles and economic rivalries, of inventions and discoveries, of ideas and social movements, and whatever else among the infinite multitude of human acts that he considers significant. To each event he gives a name, and he records the time and place of each. Evaluation is an essential and continuous part of his art; he reports only a minute fraction of historical happenings and each selection and rejection involves an act of judgment, a decision as to what is important and what is insignificant. He is concerned with explaining the historical reality as the logical culmination of a sequence of events or as the result of the intervention of fortuitous circumstances; he is equally concerned with tracing the effects of historical happenings and circumstances on the subsequent train of events.

Beyond this point, as a historian, he is not able to go. He may speculate as to what would have been the course of history had certain events been other than what they were, but in so doing he steps out of the role* of the historian. History makes no generalizations; it discovers no natural laws, no invariable sequences of events that recur regularly. The historian, therefore, makes no attempt to forecast the future; his study does not uncover any body of principles or suggest any likely hypotheses to account for the recorded course of events.

There have, however, been many men, some of them historians, who have read meanings of another order into the stream of historical happenings. Unable to accept the historical record as final in itself, they have sought some purpose, force, process, natural law, or other unifying principle that would resolve the

uniqueness of historical events and bring them within the realm of predictable phenomena.

The unifying factors and explanatory principles that have been suggested and accepted are numerous and diverse. One simple and satisfying philosophy sees all events as parts of some divine pattern, expressions of the will of a supreme being whose purposes are beyond human comprehension. Another body of philosophical thought brings the totality of events within an evolutionary framework; the course of history is seen as a progressive movement toward superior types of men and better forms of social organizations*. Various conceptions of determinism*—geographic, biological, racial, class conflict, and many other doctrines—have been advanced as explanatory principles having universal validity.

Common to the sociologies of this order is the desire to forecast the course of human events. In the absence of some natural process or logical principle, no prediction is possible; one may prophesy—extrapolate past trends or make generalizations on the basis of empirical data—but one cannot predict.

WELFARE PRACTICES AND PROGRAM

Sociology is often conceived as the beliefs and activities of persons engaged in efforts to alleviate human miseries. The humanitarian interests and endeavors are extensive and diverse; consequently, sociology understood in this way tends to be discursive and somewhat incomplete. In the publications as in the procedures, the emphasis varies from person to person and from group to group, according to the aspects of practical endeavor that receive special attention. The emphasis may be upon the concrete art of social work, upon a body of technology that underlies specific practices, upon the body of working rules that have been elaborated in the course of practical experience, upon the belief and maxims of social morality associated with the practices and procedures, or upon some other aspect of ameliorative social behavior*. But regardless of the placement of emphasis, this view conceives sociology to be a complex of welfare practices and a guide in practical affairs, particularly in social work and administrative types of guidance and relief.

Everywhere some degree of care and assistance has been given to the unfortunate members of the group. In the simpler groups, the burden commonly falls upon the family* and immediate relatives, or is assumed by the local community*. At certain times and places the church played a major role in the relief of distress. At other times public care of paupers and of dependent and vicious persons has been more or less adequately provided. But the magnitude and complexity of social problems that result from the efforts of men to carry on a common life in a densely populated and increasingly complex world cannot be adjusted by casual and informal techniques of care and control.

It was out of the conditions of squalor, abuse, and neglect, incident to the increase of population, the rise of industry, and the growth of cities, that the trend toward welfare sociology arose. The surge of humanitarian tendencies in England and the United States during the nineteenth century gave rise to various efforts to bring about social and administrative reforms, particularly in charitable and penal institutions. It is in this movement and the

complex of activities in which it expressed itself that we find the antecedents of practical sociology and the earlier forms of social work.

A widespread interest developed in social problems: prison reform, elementary education, public health, the instruction of the deaf, the care of the blind, infant welfare, the housing of the poor, and other problems regarded as social evils. The desire was to eliminate maladjustments* and reduce the amount of misery. There were various Utopian schemes of economic and social reform*, and numerous concrete programs and activities. Social settlements flourished. There was a general belief in social progress*. There were numerous predictions of social disasters if certain prevailing conditions were not removed; these were always accompanied by programs of means for their removal.

In the schools, this body of sociology generally took the form of courses on social problems. There were numerous courses dealing with charitable and penal institutions and the methods of their administration. The problems of pauperism, crime, intemperance, insanity*, feeble-mindedness*, suicide, abandoned and neglected children, the care and training of the sense defectives, and other similar matters were brought within the orbit of discussion. Practical and ethical considerations were at the core of all treatments of social problems.

In most of the schools at the present time, there are numerous courses given over to a consideration of social problems and their treatment. Such courses constitute the scope of sociology as taught at the high-school level. Family maladjustment, divorce, crime*, poverty*, vice*, unemployment, immigration*, recreation, housing, industrial relations, illiteracy, sickness, public health, and many other things are treated as conditions demanding remedial attention by administrative agencies of national or local government.

Sociology in this sense is a body of practical knowledge and a group of welfare programs and practices for ethical and administrative guidance. At the strictly social work level, it is the current body of rules and practices for dealing with individuals and families in distress.

SOCIOLOGY AS A SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE

As a scholarly discipline, sociology is the ethically neutral study of group* life and human behavior*. Its purpose is to establish a body of valid principles, a fund of objective knowledge, that will make possible the direction and control of social and human reality. It is not immediately concerned with social problems and practical treatment procedures; it is rather a systematic effort to provide a basis for a more adequate understanding of such problems and, consequently, for a more effective mode of dealing with the problems that exist or may arise.

The problems of scientific sociology have a dual reference. On the one hand are matters relating to group life and the social heritage*; on the other are questions of personality* and the social development of human beings. The two aspects of social phenomena are inextricably interrelated in the concrete reality; the human being is a product of his culture* and social life; he lives in and by means of them, he is human by virtue of the fact that they are incorporated in his personal organization. The culture and social life, however, are products of human efforts and desires. Sociology undertakes to analyze the two aspects of social reality and to understand them in their mutually interdependent relationships.

The one problem has to do with the origin and growth of personality and human nature. The individual does not have these at birth, he acquires them through his social experiences. The basic and universal elements of human nature come from family contacts and other face-to-face relations of infancy and childhood by processes that the sociologist seeks to understand and explain. The variations in personality reflect differences in social experience, differences in participation in the social heritage. The nature of the human personality and the processes of personality growth and change are central problems in sociology.

The other major field of interest in sociological study includes the nature of group life and the social heritage. Men everywhere live in close association* with each other. The sociologist is interested in the external group forms and the functions performed by

these associations. He is also interested in the internal relations, the interests*, sentiments*, and loyalties, that bind men into casual or enduring relationships, and in the effects on personality and group achievement of group structure and solidarity. The social heritage in its entirety is a creation of man and it grows and changes through human efforts to satisfy human needs. But culture facts, once created, tend to achieve a semi-independent existence and to have a natural history; capitalism as an economic system, for example, has developed by logical necessity rather than by human foresight and design. The body of achievement, the forms of group life and association, and the beliefs* and attitudes* of men, as well as the store of material goods and productive processes, constitute the environment* into which individuals are born and in which their personalities are formed and their human nature developed.

The sociologist is particularly interested in describing the processes by which social life goes on. Like other scientists, he seeks a body of principles that will enable him to predict, not in the sense of historical prophecy or of foretelling the course of future events, but in the scientific sense that given certain facts and relations, other events may be foretold. The ability to predict is the basis of control*.

PART TWO

Summary of Essentials

PART TWO

*Summary of Essentials**

THE NATURE AND PROCESSES OF SOCIOLOGY

THE GENERAL course in sociology undertakes to give an overview of the whole area of study. It is, in a way, a map of the field that shows the divisions and their relationships but gives relatively little information about the concrete subject matter; it is concerned with the principles and processes rather than with practical problems or research interests.

The purpose of an introduction or first course is to orient the student in the new field of study. Its first aim is to give the beginner a point of view from which the body of reality can be studied profitably. Its further purpose is to familiarize the student with the modes of thought that have proven profitable in the study of social* life. The third objective of the introductory course is to provide the student with the vocabulary and other conceptual tools necessary for clear and objective thinking about human life and social relations.

To achieve these ends, the introductory course defines the range of study; it describes the subject matter and problems that the discipline includes, and it shows the relationships of this subject matter to the content of other sciences. It familiarizes the student with the factors and processes whose operation he observes in

* Words followed by an asterisk are defined or discussed in the dictionary section (Part III, pp. 76-170).

the concrete phenomena. It acquaints him with the social theories and principles that have been tested and verified and about which there is some general agreement. Incidentally, it turns him away from various biased interpretations, false doctrines, and unprofitable hypotheses. It provides him with a frame of reference, a coherent and related body of concepts, that is necessary for advanced and specialized study. For the student who does not progress beyond the general introduction, it provides a frame of reference for understanding his subsequent personal and social experiences, and for making successful adjustments* in his relations with his fellow men.

The minimum essentials in sociological study are three in number. First, attention must be given to the nature of human beings. This involves some consideration of the original* or animal nature of man since this is the physical basis of human or social life. It also necessitates a more extensive study of man's human* or acquired nature, the nature that develops in and through his association* with other human beings. Second, adequate study must be made of the processes of human interaction* and communication*. It is necessary to know how such interaction takes place and to understand how it creates and defines what we call personality.* Third, attention must be given to the environment* to and in which men adjust; it is necessary to understand how the external facts limit the extent and control the direction of human and social development.

The essentials of sociological study have received somewhat diverse treatment by scholars. The factors are not always taken up in the same order; some writers, for example, prefer to discuss the social heritage* before treating the elements of original and human nature, and some introduce the processes of interaction early in the discussion while others prefer to delay consideration of these processes. The various writers place different degrees of emphasis upon the diverse factors and aspects of social reality. Some give much and others little attention to the geographical and biological preconditions of social* life; some give much and others little space to an analysis of human institutions*; some give an elaborate presentation of cultural phenomena while others

allow the emphasis to fall upon the development of human nature and personality.

But regardless of the order in which writers prefer to present the material, and in spite of variations in emphasis, all the writers find it necessary to give some attention to the matters outlined in the sections that follow.

These sections are presented in a reasonably logical sequence, but students using the handbook need give no attention to the order of presentation. Each section is presented as a relatively independent unit so that it may be fitted to the text in use or to the instructor's order of presentation. The statements are brief and simple but they contain the content of the texts in current use without the concrete elaboration and illustration.

THE NATURE OF SOCIETY*

All human life is group* life; men everywhere live in association with their fellow men. In this statement there is a recognition of two types of reality: the human beings and the relationships that exist among them. The same fact is to be observed in all terms that imply any order of collective unity. A flock of birds is not just so many individual birds; it is the birds plus the relationships among them; a family* is not a man and woman and their children, but the members and the set of relations that bind them into a unique unity; the solar system is not alone the sun and the planetary bodies, but also the mutual relations that hold them in a definite pattern. So it is in regard to all terms that imply unity; we recognize the elements, but we also recognize the relationships that bind discrete items into a single unit.

In the vocabulary of sociology, there are certain terms that throw the emphasis on the units in association. The term population*, for example, directs attention to the individuals in the given area. Other terms tend to specify the bonds that give the unity its distinctive character. The term community*, for example, emphasizes the fact of locale; it is always a geographically defined group. The word society* is used in both an abstract and a concrete sense.

When the word is used in an abstract and general sense, it denotes the relationships that exist between and among the associating persons*. In this usage, the concept is of the same general order as the terms social interaction* and communication*. It refers not to a thing but to a process; it refers not to the human beings but to what goes on among associates. In the words of Dewey, "Society not only continues to exist *by* transmission, *by* communication, but it may fairly be said to exist *in* transmission, *in* communication."¹ Just as life is not a thing but a process of living, so society is not a thing but a process of associating.

In a more concrete usage, the word refers to a unity dependent upon the interaction and communication of the members. The

¹ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916), p. 5.

reference here is always to a society, not to society in the abstract sense. But the emphasis, even in the concrete usage, is upon the relationships, upon the persons in the process of communicating, rather than upon the persons as such. In this sense, a society is a dynamic, moving equilibrium, a unity in continual growth and constant change.

Society is a distinctly human phenomenon; societies are always human units. It is true that many animal species live in groups and carry on some form of collective activity. But the interaction* that determines the unity is at the level of inherited instinctive responses: the ants carry on their collective activities through the mechanism of touch and smell; the bees react immediately and instinctively to the pitch of the sounds produced by the hive companions. Man is the only animal that can communicate with his fellows, and communication is the essential characteristic of social life. Communication involves two processes: the deliberate and intentional use of symbols*—words, signs, gestures, etc.—to convey meanings and intentions to others, and the interpretation of these symbols by those who receive them.

The collective life of animal aggregates rests upon the close similarity of the individual organisms and the essentially identical responses to stimuli. In contrast, human groups are characterized by the fact of differences among the associating units. The differences are never so wide as to prevent communication*, else a society* does not exist. Within a human grouping there are age, sex, race*, and other physical differences; and the individual members are unlike in their abilities, interests, knowledge, and other socially determined traits. A considerable part of the difference is the result of social life itself. Social interaction* and communication*, as contrasted to the animal's immediate and direct responses to stimuli, are always interpretative. That is, the person does not react directly and immediately to the other; the response is delayed and is made to his interpretation of the other's behavior*, not to the behavior itself. The effect of association and communication is to develop differences among people.

Human association is also characterized by individual specialization and a division of labor. This is made possible by the fact

of differences and it operates in turn, to accentuate the personal differences upon which it rests.

Finally, attention may be called to the fact that societies are characterized by the development, use, and transmission of a body of culture*. The accidental discoveries and inventions* of men, their beliefs* and practices, their forms of social adjustment*, their institutional structures, and the various other products of association and communication, accumulate and increase. This growing heritage* is passed on by each generation to the next; each generation, in consequence, has a richer heritage than the preceding.

Since the original needs and capacities of men are everywhere the same, there is a fundamental similarity in all societies. But the basic needs of men can be satisfied in a variety of ways, and the external conditions of life differ from one geographic area to another. In consequence, societies are widely unlike in details. All have the same fundamental institutions—family* life, language*, economic organization*, educational procedures—but there is great diversity in the concrete details of content and structure.

THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF HUMAN LIFE

As a physical organism, man is an object of study by the biological sciences. But certain of the biological facts are of great importance to the students of social life. For the necessary information the sociologist turns to the biologist, he does not seek to discover it independently.

Because of the position of the human species in the animal kingdom, man has certain capacities that are denied to the other animal forms and he is without certain capacities that other animals possess in full measure. These endowments and deficiencies are things that determine in part the character of social life.

The human being is a relatively weak and defenseless animal. He has no natural protective covering, hence, in the natural state, is ill adapted for survival in most climatic areas. He has no natural weapons of defense, no great strength, and he is somewhat slow in movement; in consequence he is easy prey for his natural enemies. Relatively his vision is not good, his hearing is not acute, his sense of smell is distinctly inferior. He has no instincts* that operate automatically to adjust him to the external world. The list of man's biological limitations and deficiencies is quite long.

On the side of endowment, man's superior traits are numerous and important. Of most importance is mental capacity; here human beings are greatly superior to other animals. This mental superiority is dependent in the final reckoning upon the size of the brain organ. Because of their superior mentality, human beings have been able to survive and prosper in spite of various physical deficiencies.

The second major human capacity is the power of speech, an endowment that no other animal receives. This capacity depends upon relatively slight variations from the animal larynx and vocal cords. But these comparatively minor physical characters are the things that make speech possible; and speech communication is necessary to the development of culture* and the growth of human intelligence.

Another important biological fact is the complete helplessness of the human infant, which determines a long period of depend-

ent childhood. Going with this dependent status is the indefinite plasticity of the human infant. There are no instincts, no biologically determined behavior* patterns, hence no biologically predetermined modes of behavior. The human child must learn all the human types of behavior; the human capacity to learn rests upon the fact of biological plasticity. The child develops according to the patterns set by the social group* and his degree of development is determined by the level of the culture of the group in which he grows. The long period of childhood and immaturity makes possible the acquisition of the group culture.

The variability of human beings is another biological phenomenon of very great sociological significance. There are three major aspects of variability: the sex dichotomy, the racial differentiations, and the differences among individuals.

The sociologist is not concerned with the study of sex and primary sex differences. The problems are biological. But the physical differences between men and women are quite obvious. Consequently, sex often becomes the basis for a division of labor and for other aspects of the social organization. It thus determines the status* of men and women in the society*. The status, in turn, determines the conceptions that men and women come to have of themselves and of each other; that is, it determines the personality* characteristics and the social behavior of men and women. The sociological concern is with the social organization*, the types of personality, and the behavior forms.

The division of mankind into races* is another biological fact that has wide-reaching implications for social* life and study. The racial facts themselves are physical and are studied by the methods of biology and physical anthropology. Many efforts have been made to interpret historical and cultural reality in racial terms. It has often been assumed that the races differ in important ways in innate capacity, that the mental differences among races are as great as the physical differences. This has been thought to furnish an explanation of the cultural differences among peoples and to account for the unequal levels of civilization among racial groups.

This doctrine, known as biological determinism*, had a great vogue and exercised a deep and vicious influence in human affairs.

It furnished a pseudoscientific justification for human slavery and the various systems for excluding and exploiting the weaker peoples. It is a basic tenet in the ideology of the Nazi powers, it is an essential dogma of the eugenic and other anti-democratic movements and it has invalidated the great bulk of psychological study. The doctrine was never widely endorsed by sociologists or other social science students. By now it is totally discredited; there is no competent and honest student today who holds to the doctrine of racial determinism.

But the facts of racial difference have profound and far-reaching effects in social and cultural reality. Racial differences are made the basis for differential treatment. Individuals and groups of contrasted race and color are isolated; they are avoided, neglected, discriminated against; in some cases they are excluded or segregated, and in other ways their participation in the culture* is obstructed. As a result of this cultural isolation*, they tend to be or to become culturally retarded. Unable to participate in the culture and social life they tend to withdraw, to associate with other avoided individuals, and to avoid other contacts. In consequence they tend to develop divergent customs*, attitudes*, ways of life, and traits of personality*. These facts of retarded culture and divergent manner reinforce, in turn, the disposition to avoid and exclude and so further to retard the culture and increase the attitudinal divergence. The vicious circle is in no sense racial. The phenomena are wholly within the sociological realm; they are studied and understood in terms of social isolation, not in terms of biology.

Any and all types of physical and biological divergence operate according to this pattern. The person* who has a speech defect, who is blind, or deaf, or has any other gross defect is more or less isolated. He tends, in consequence, to find associates among other avoided persons. The effects of this association*, and the limited participation in the general culture, are seen in personal retardation, divergent development, and warped personality patterns.

Biological facts are important for social life and culture but they seldom operate directly; they can never be used to explain social reality.

THE GEOGRAPHIC ENVIRONMENT

The facts of the geographic environment play an important part in the determination of human life and social development. The influence is often exaggerated, sometimes minimized, and commonly misunderstood. It varies in directness of expression with the type of cultural development. The essential facts are relatively simple and readily understood.

Geographic facts determine directly or indirectly the distribution of peoples. They live, and in the large they must live, where the means of life are available. The character and directness of the geographic influences vary somewhat with the level of the culture.

In the simpler types of life, the environment operates directly and immediately to control social and cultural forms. Temperature, rainfall, and other climatic conditions determine the resources of areas and, by doing so, determine the location and distribution of peoples. The primitive peoples were relatively numerous in the climatically favored regions of the earth; the bleak areas of harsh climate were mostly uninhabited. The early civilizations* developed in the fertile river valleys of relatively mild climates. The hard and niggardly areas were slow to be inhabited and even now are sparsely populated.

The geographic factors determined the character of the culture* in the various areas of settlement. The kinds of food were those provided by nature, and the economic structure and general social organization* were in accord with the necessities. Climate determined the types of clothing and shelter; the materials available determined the forms developed. The natural facts of climate and resources determined the character of the culture that could be developed; it determined the imperative needs, and it determined the materials available to meet the needs.

In later stages of culture, the environmental facts play a somewhat different, though an equally important role. With the development of commerce, new centers of population appeared. But the location of these centers was determined by geographic facts, by the location of harbors and the nearness to food and

other natural resources. Civilization grew up along the routes of travel, but these were determined by the topography.

In the present era, the distribution of population is influenced by a different geographic fact—the location of mineral resources. Among the primitive and simple peoples the location of ore deposits was a matter of little or no consequence; in that stage of development of the arts, the minerals could not be utilized. But certain modern peoples are enabled to live by the exploitation of mineral resources. The two great centers of world population—northwest Europe and northeast United States—are the areas where men, in the present economy, can live most abundantly. Other areas of population concentration are determined by the location of resources and the location of the harbor facilities necessary to world commerce; both facts are basically geographic.

These geographic influences are not social facts and they are not studied by sociology. Their analysis is the province of geography. But so far as human and social life are concerned, they are limiting conditions that must be understood by the social students. The natural environment sets the conditions within which human social life must be carried on, but it does not determine the character of the social processes that the sociologist seeks to analyze.

THE GROWTH OF POPULATION

The facts of population* are of first-rate importance to the students of social reality. The detailed study and analysis is the work of a somewhat specialized group of scholars. But the general facts are well established and should be clearly understood by the student of sociology. The important facts are essentially simple.

Human beings, like every other form of life, have the capacity to increase in numbers at an extremely rapid rate. The potential increase is in a geometric ratio; that is, if two parents on the average have the capacity to produce and rear four children, an extremely modest number, the population could double in each generation. Starting with a single pair, the numbers at successive twenty-five-year dates would be 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, and so on. At this rate of increase the offspring of a single pair would in about 650 years equal the present total population of the world.

But the area of the earth's land surface is limited, and its capacity to provide subsistence for human animals is much more sharply limited. Throughout most of the life of man on the earth there was food for only relatively small numbers. Even with the present increased means of food production, numbers cannot increase indefinitely.

The opposition of these two facts—the biological tendency to increase in a geometric ratio and the limited area and productiveness of the earth—is the essence of the population problem. The actual population number of a given historic period represents the point of equilibrium of the opposed forces.

During the most of the human period, the biological urge to mate and reproduce was largely uncontrolled. Human, like animal, offspring came at the rate normal to the species. But the conditions of life were hard, the death rates were high, and numbers increased slowly. Where they tended to increase, food became scarce and starvation resulted, or some social practice, as infanticide, kept the numbers within the means of life. Where the means of life increased, because of improvement in productive techniques or for other reason, numbers increased. Except for

relatively brief and infrequent periods, the world has had at all times about the number of human beings it was able to support.

Since about the middle of the sixteenth century the means of supporting human life have more or less continuously expanded. Population increased correspondingly. From a total of about 465 million in 1650, it increased to 660 million in 1750, to about 1,000 million in 1850, and to about two billion at the present time. The increase or decrease in the century to come will depend upon the means of life available for human subsistence.

In the present, however, a new factor is operating in population growth. The discovery and perfection of means of contraception have markedly retarded the rate of increase of most of the peoples of West European culture. Judged by the consequences that it is destined to have, contraceptive knowledge is one of the half-dozen great human discoveries; it is perhaps equal in importance to the discovery of fire or the invention of language. The desire to prevent pregnancy and avoid the bearing of children seems well-nigh universal; among the primitive peoples and in every subsequent culture stage there have been endless efforts to satisfy the desire.

But the means of contraception are not known or are not available to peoples outside the West European culture. In these areas, the information is largely restricted to the upper and middle-class groups. In consequence, two trends may be observed or anticipated. The rate of increase of Western Europe and North America will decline rapidly and the populations will become stationary or decrease in numbers. The other peoples of the world, those without the knowledge and means of contraception, will continue to increase, as in the past, up to the point of starvation. The second trend is of minor importance though it receives much attention. The restriction of contraceptive knowledge to the upper strata of the population results in a differential birth rate between the classes*. The poor and ignorant produce babies in abundance; the wealthy and the informed are relatively sterile. But, contrary to popular thought, there is no evidence to support the doctrine that this class differential in birth rates is injurious: the lower classes are as genetically sound as are the upper classes.

HUMAN ECOLOGY¹

The distribution of the people within a geographic area is determined by impersonal forces and lies for the most part outside the orbit of control*. The processes are biotic rather than social. The distribution is not a result of social interaction and communication; it expresses, rather, conformity to geographic and biological conditions. Human ecology* is the study of the distributive phenomena and of the biotic and competitive factors that determine the placement.

The determining fact is scarcity. As discussed in the section on population, this arises because numbers tend to increase rapidly, while space and means of subsistence remain stationary or increase slowly. Every form of life tends to fill the space available to it and to exhaust the means necessary to its welfare.

The inevitable consequence of scarcity is a competition for the inadequate supply available. Among the plants it is an individual striving for moisture, sunlight, and nutrient materials, in which the success of one is the measure of another's failure. In the animal world the "struggle for existence" is the search for food and mates, in which the success of one reduces the supply available for others. In a world overfull, man is no exception to the rule; what goes to one, whether person or group, diminishes by so much the amount that others may secure.

In conditions of scarcity and hardship, men and groups may migrate in the hope of finding areas of greater abundance. The peopling of the world, from the area or areas of origin, came about in the age-long effort to escape the condition of scarcity—to escape the consequences of an overrapid multiplication. But migration* brings men into new climatic conditions; survival in the new region requires a greater or less degree of biological adaptation*—an acclimatization* that produces a new or modified racial strain—and changes in food, work, shelter, and other

¹ Human ecology is a major field of sociological research. As such it is set forth in the section on pages 184-186. This section should be consulted. In this and the two following sections, the aspects commonly treated in elementary texts are presented.

elements of the culture*. If settlement is successfully made in a land of abundance, the numbers soon increase and scarcity and deprivation come to be the order of life.

If the land of settlement is already occupied, the invaders come into competition* with the natives for the means of life. They may fail to find the means for a tolerable life and continue their wandering. Or, because of superior skill, or industry or technique, the invaders may displace the earlier occupants. This is called succession*; the descendants of European settlers have displaced the American Indians in a manner fairly typical of the ecological process of succession.

As a result of the factors and processes just sketched the habitable regions of the earth are more or less fully occupied. But the various geographic areas are very unequal in population density. They vary from regions with many hundreds per square mile to regions where there is less than a man per square mile. This distribution of population is little determined by choice and volition. Men are in the areas where they can survive. The processes by which the distribution was brought about and the factors that tend to maintain or disturb it are totally impersonal and generally not even sensed by the people who prosper or merely survive within the area.

OTHER DISTRIBUTIONAL PATTERNS

The spatial distribution of institutions* and specialized forms of behavior* is as obvious and as important for social life and human welfare as the strictly human ecology*. Indeed, many features of the human distributional patterns can be understood only as they are related to the placement of institutional structures and technological centers. The present-day population aggregates, for example, are directly determined by the location of industries, only indirectly by the geographic factors. The modern migrations are made in search of work, not in search of abundant game or unoccupied land, and the work opportunities are most abundant in the industrial areas.

The facts of relative scarcity and the consequent competition* apply to the social and economic structures as fully as they apply to the distribution of populations. Like the human beings, the institutions tend to be at the places best adapted to their survival. These locations are directly determined by the facts of external nature. The steel industry centers about Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, Birmingham, and a few other points because of the location of ore deposits and the coal required for reduction. It is not a matter of choice but of necessity that the mills are located in the areas where they are now found. The automobile industry centers in the Detroit area because of its strategic importance in securing raw materials and distributing the finished product.

The same principle of explanation is applicable over a wide range of economic phenomena. The business firms and the industrial plants that are located at strategic points prosper and survive, those less advantageously placed languish and die. The final distributional pattern shows the survival of the fittest; it is an end result of the operation of essentially impersonal forces.

Numerous social phenomena can and should be examined in their distributional aspects. The ecological pattern of religious phenomena, for example, is at least a preliminary step in the study and understanding of such modes of behavior. The mapping of areas of race* prejudice, of psychoses*, of delinquency, of mob* behavior, and so on is an initial procedure in social

study. In this procedure, ecological study is closely related to and often indistinguishable from statistical study. The function of the procedures is to locate the phenomena that must be analyzed ultimately by scientific means; it is useful to find the location and determine the extent of hookworm, malaria, race prejudice, etc., but this must not be confused with more basic methods of study.

SEGREGATION* AND CLASS* STRUCTURE

In the struggle for existence plants and animals have been specialized; that is, they have developed biological characters that enable them to succeed in the competitive order. Plants develop modified foliage and root forms, for example, in response to conditions of scarcity or excess of moisture in the region of their growth. Animals have developed various means of protection or attack—speed, cunning, protective covering, and many others that enable them to live in the climatic area in competition* with other forms. Man, also, has been in a measure biologically adapted to various climatic areas; the skin color of the peoples of the tropics may represent a biological adaptation* to the tropic light.

There are, however, certain adjustments* of a personal and social order which, because they are determined by impersonal competitive factors, may properly be brought within the orbit of ecological* distribution.

An early effect of competition is segregation*. There is a division of labor in the common affairs of life; in some part, this is determined by such biological facts as sex and age; in some part, it is determined by chance factors. Some degree of specialization exists even in the simplest social groups, and within any large group there are specialized subgroups. Persons* and groups are forced into occupations for which they are specially fitted or in which they can survive.

The occupational and class* order in any complex society* is the result of the endless struggle for existence, or for livelihood, or for status*, among unequal contestants. The class structure, with the various classes and occupational groups in their interdependent relationships, is a type of equilibrium not unlike the balance of nature that prevails in the biological realm. To the extent that this is true, to the extent that the class and occupational hierarchy is determined by impersonal competitive factors, it is an ecological rather than a strictly social phenomenon.

It should be noted, finally, that social, moral, sentimental, and other factors may operate in human society to modify or negate

the impersonal forces that get full expression in the animal struggle for existence. But to counteract the effects does not change the principle. By protecting his field crops from the invading weeds or his domesticated animals from their wild enemies, the farmer maintains an artificial ecological pattern but he does not change the principle that underlies ecological distribution. So, the fact that the forces of competition and natural selection are obstructed in their operation in human groups, should not blind the student to their basic importance.

GROUPS AND GROUP LIFE

The term group is the general designation for all types of collectivities from a single pair to a total population*. It implies the existence of cohesive bonds but does not specify their nature. The various specific groups are indicated by the use of qualifying adjectives: family group, play group, school group, etc., or by distinctive terms: crowd*, class, club, etc. The first interest is in the nature and general characteristics of group life.

Associated life is one of the universal human behavior patterns; all human life is group life. This fact has given rise to the idea that man is a gregarious animal, that there is some special instinct that determines association. There is, however, no evidence to support this biological interpretation. Group life seems to be a social development; it rests upon the relative helplessness of the single person and the consequent values and advantages coming from co-operation and mutual aid. The pattern is acquired in infancy; the long period of care by and dependence upon others establishes the habits* and attitudes* that make human beings into social animals.

A fundamentally important general division of groups is that into in-groups* and out-groups*. The former includes all those in which the person holds membership. Here there is a feeling of security and a sense of familiarity and comfort; one is among friends. The out-groups are those to which one does not belong. Their ways are strange and their values different; they are potentially or actually enemies, and contacts* and relationships are dangerous. Contacts* with members of the in-group are commonly sympathetic and personal; those with members of out-groups are categoric and generally impersonal.

The distinction is made in many ways and in many connections. The complex of attitudes* basic to racial divisions is called ethnocentrism*. Patriotism, chauvinism, and provincialism are in-group and out-group division on the basis of political or territorial membership. The old Greek distinction between Greeks and Barbarians was on the basis of language and general culture. Every organization, profession, clique, gang, fraternity, sect, de-

nomination, and so on tends to be an in-group that is suspicious or contemptuous of competing groups and at least potentially at war with them.

In primitive life the in-group out-group distinction was of great practical importance; the safety of the person depended upon the ability to recognize friend and enemy. In the modern world the distinctions are equally real but they commonly serve a different function. The spontaneous responses to the strange and unfamiliar are often fostered and developed into fixed prejudices that can be used to great personal advantage by economic exploiters and by political and other demagogues. The existence of such out-groups as Negroes, Jews, Protestants, and Communists and a lively fear of them are essential to an in-group solidarity that will support the group functionaries.

The second important general division is that into primary* and secondary* groups. In the former the contacts are face-to-face. The members are known to each other personally, the relations are sympathetic and intimate, and association is on the basis of total personalities. The family* is generally cited as the most nearly complete example of a primary group. In the secondary group the contacts are not necessarily face-to-face, the members are frequently unknown to each other personally, the relations are abstract and impersonal, and involve functions rather than the total personalities. The relations of the lawyer and his client, and those of the merchant and his customer, are examples of secondary group contacts.

The terms used are unfortunate and generally confusing. There are few or no groups that are exclusively primary or secondary. In this respect groups tend to lie along a continuum of which the strictly primary and strictly secondary are the opposite extremes. The familiar concrete groups involve both primary and secondary characteristics; they differ in the number of primary and secondary relations involved.

Clearness of thought and exposition requires that one speak of primary and secondary relations and avoid the foggy concepts of primary and secondary group.

Group life is the fundamental basis of personality* and culture*. Men are human because they live in groups. because they

associate and communicate with their fellows. It is in and through the processes of interaction* that the body of knowledge and the store of behavior* patterns are accumulated and transmitted.

At birth and by biological inheritance, the individual has certain physical characters and potentialities, but he has no personality and no social characteristics. He is human only in the sense that he is a member of this species of animals. His human nature is slowly and gradually acquired in the primary relations of group life. He learns by degrees to speak the language, to understand and participate in the activities of the group, to sympathize with others, to regulate his behavior in accord with the expectations, and in other ways gradually become a person* and a member of the group. The personality that is developed is a product of this group life and association.

The second product of group life is the social heritage* or culture. This includes the entire body of invention* and discovery that has been preserved—the language, science, the social institutions*, the tools and machines and process, and other material and nonmaterial facts that distinguish human from animal existence. It has its origin in group life, it is preserved and transmitted through use and communication.

The study of human nature and culture is a major part of the science of sociology.

THE HUMAN COMMUNITY*

The residents of a given area are likely to have various interests in common and, by co-operation or other forms of collective behavior, develop a more or less organized group life. Such an area with its loose and informal organization is a community. The term thus implies a definite location, a geographic setting, and a social unity arising from and dependent upon common interests* and sentiments* and participation in similar or interdependent activities. The community may be large or small in area or population; it is relatively permanent in economic character and is stable in family membership. It is typically without definite boundaries; the members are those who think of themselves as belonging to this rather than some other community. The community normally has some of the characteristics of society*. There is a large degree of personal acquaintance but, unlike the neighborhood*, not all members are known to all others. In a large college community, the average student knows personally only a few dozen of his fellow students. There are many personal and face-to-face contacts, but they are not the rule as in the case of neighborhood groups. There is commonly much mutual helpfulness and co-operative activity in projects of common interest and mutual benefit as distinct from the more personal and intimate relations of neighbors. The neighborhood and the community differ in size; the community is likely to include several or many neighborhoods.

In any large community area there are many business, professional, and other types of secondary relations that are not a part of the neighborhood unit. These abstract and fractional relations are characteristics of secondary rather than of communal organization. No modern community is a self-contained unit. There are men and families who live within the area but who work outside, or who are resident representatives of outside interests, or serve or exploit the group in a professional capacity. Salesmen, schoolteachers, and the like are commonly not an integral part of the communal life.

A common-sense division is usually made between rural and

city communities. The separation is one of convenience rather than one of a logical or analytical nature. The communal processes do not differ in any fundamental way from the country to the city. But the distinction, while inaccurate and superficial, has a degree of usefulness. It is comparable with the practically useful separation of rural and urban sociology.

It would not be easy to exaggerate the importance of neighborhood and communal relations in the life of man. Together with the family, they performed the task of domesticating the human animal, of creating the human person. Practically all the traits and characteristics that we consider distinctly human—personality, human sympathy and appreciation and understanding, loyalty, co-operation, democratic ways of life, moral standards, and so on—have their origin in personal and communal relations. It is the recognition of the central importance of the community way of life in developing human nature and democratic standards of control* that has caused many persons to regret the present decadence.

COMMUNITY AND SOCIETY

In much current sociological writing a sharp distinction is made between folk* society and civilization*. The writers are not always crystal-clear as to the essential contrast, and they are not always disposed to accept the logic of their own position.

In some cases the separation seems to imply little more than a common-sense separation of rural and city ways of life. Folk society is made synonymous with the rural and relatively simple life and organization; civilization, by contrast, becomes synonymous with city life and urban attitudes. So far as this is anything more than the appearance of original thought that is sometimes achieved by using new words in repeating old ideas, it is making an evaluative rather than a descriptive separation in social reality. Civilization is in good repute, it is felt to be a desirable thing, and it is presumably a phenomenon of city life; by contrast, the non-city peoples are uncivilized. Such analyses should be examined in the light of in-group* attitudes*.

In other cases the distinctions run in terms of peoples and cultures. The peoples who have not adopted our ways of life, or if they have accepted the ways but have not reached our level of achievement, are still at a folk stage. In some cases the distinctions are little more than a sophisticated form of ethnocentrism* and cultural provincialism.

When the distinctions are abstractly and somewhat more adequately conceived, folk society seems to be the complex of essentially human relations and values*. It would seem to imply the relations and values of the family and neighborhood, the communal and other co-operative activities of men, and the social attitudes and mutual loyalties that develop in the face-to-face areas of life. Civilization, by contrast, is the complex of secondary relations and values, the complex of means to ends divorced from any consideration of personal or nonutilitarian values. In this conception, civilization is simply the complex of the nonhuman values and activities.

On a concrete level, it is fairly obvious that there is no such

contrast. All that can be said is that the primary contacts and the essentially human values tend to predominate in the folk society, while in the contrasted state of civilization the nonhuman values and the secondary, abstract, and fractional relations tend to predominate.

HUMAN NATURE*

The things that mark the human off from other animal forms are the abilities and characteristics acquired in group life and social communication. The chief of these are subsumed under the terms human nature and personality*.

Human nature is in no sense an original endowment. It cannot be understood as a mere conditioning of native reflexes*, instincts*, appetites, or "drives." Nor is it a product of culture*, as is sometimes assumed. Cultures are diverse and the cultural characteristics are the basis of endless misunderstandings and conflicts. Human nature, on the contrary, is the basis for understanding: it is common to all men and alike in all men. It has its origin in experiences that are common to all men. It is a creation of primary* group life, the one thing common to all men regardless of race, time, or place. It is in the face-to-face groups that the human traits are acquired.

The basis of social control* is in human nature as developed in the primary relations of family* and communal life. Social control itself is an exclusively human phenomenon: it must not be confused with other types of control.

Control is the exercise of any power or influence that directs or determines behavior. It is a universal condition throughout all known reality. The universe is one of law and order, not one of chaos; nothing occurs without cause, and behavior in every realm is determined by the factors operating in that realm of reality.

In human and social reality, control is everywhere a central fact. The forms are numerous, and the interest may be in one aspect rather than another. Two obvious types of control may be mentioned.

Physical control involves the exercise of external force. The nurse in handling and manipulating the baby exercises physical control. Control by the police is essentially physical; it is external to the person controlled. All control of animals is physical; it does not originate in the controlled animal.

Institutional control is a familiar aspect of life. Men behave in accordance with the established patterns. They follow the streets

and highways when they travel, they observe the customary business hours, they conform to the requirements of the prevailing economic structure, and in numerous other ways their behavior is regulated by the existing social patterns*.

Social control, as distinct from these and other types of control, has its origin within the acting person*. In all true social control, the person controls himself. He has acquired and subscribes to the social definitions of the society and behaves according to his own conceptions rather than in response to external force. Sociology is vitally interested in social control, that is, in the direction of human behavior that comes from human control and communication.

The control problem is that of determining how the person is made to conform his wishes* to the ways of the group* in which he holds membership. The answer is sought in the nature of human nature itself. The individual responds spontaneously and immediately to the presence of others. He does not behave in the presence of others as he does in isolation*; that is, he is controlled at the level of elementary reaction. All social control is personal control, control from within; except as the person controls his own behavior, the control is not in reality social. The development of a human nature is, in very considerable measure, the acquisition of the disposition to conform the wishes and behavior patterns to the group norms. The structure of the society and the social processes thus come to have a locus within the person. Social control, in consequence, is commonly extended to include the influence exercised by the customs and standards of the society. The behavior norms implicit in the traditions, customs, ceremonials, myths, creeds, and other social definitions become parts of the habit patterns and sentimental attitudes of the members of the group. Hence, in conforming to the conventional standards, the person is controlled by his own sentiments rather than by the pressure of the group patterns; so far as the person has acquired the group standards, his wishes are defined and his behavior is controlled by them.

The subject is often treated from the point of view of external controls. In this narrower sense, the interest is not in social control in any real sense, it is in the means or instruments of control;

in the various techniques consciously used to control the external behavior; in the ways by which man may be controlled and manipulated by outside forces. This is essentially the common-sense and political usage. Gossip is a very powerful technique for forcing persons to conform to the norms of behavior. Public sentiment likewise operates to force men into line. Law and religion are formal means of compelling conformity. The specific measures and tools used by groups to control persons are very numerous: rewards, praise, flattery, persuasion, advertising, slogans, gossip, propaganda*, commands, threats, and penalties are among the devices for getting others to do as the dominating power desires. None is notably successful; social control is the only effective control.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONALITY*

Personality, like human nature, is acquired in group life and as a result of personal experience. As distinguished from human* nature, which is a product of close primary* contacts, personality is developed in the process of adjusting to the conditions of social life. It is, more than human nature, a product of cultural as distinct from primary relations.

The core of personality is the person's conception of himself. This conception is, in chief measure, a reflection of what others think of him. He holds it as a result of group and social experience. As a child he has a definite place and role* in the group life. Others treat him as a child, and he behaves as a child; he plays the role of a child and sees himself as a child. At other times in life he has a status* in the group and plays a role defined by that status, hence conceives of himself, as others do, in terms of his personal status and social role.

The person's status and role, consequently his conception of himself and his personality, are determined by a complex of factors some of which inhere in the organism and some of which are in the external environmental conditions of life. The person's status and role are in part determined by such facts as age, sex, race, personal appearance, deformities, and other items of physical character; they are determined in part by education, family connections, religious affiliation, occupation, and other facts resulting from the accident of birth.

Types of personality are formed in the course of experience. Where the conditions of life are well defined, the person tends to develop the body of sentiments and conceptions that fit him to the role he has to play. The minister, the lawyer, the politician, the society matron, the retail merchant, the social worker, and numerous others tend to conform to type.

THE INDIVIDUAL* AND THE PERSON*

It is convenient, and conducive to clarity of thought, to distinguish between the individual and the person. The distinction marks the separation of sociological from psychological study.

The concrete person known to experience is both a biological organism and a social product. The two aspects cannot be separated without destroying the concrete reality, the product of their interaction. But attention may be given to one or the other aspect. If the attention is on the reacting organism, the hereditary and original characters, the original nature and its development, the problems are in general psychological. When attention is given to these phases of the organism, the term individual is properly used. The native psychophysical traits and capacities of the organism represent the area of psychological study.

The person, on the other hand, is a product of social life. The social traits and characteristics—the language, manner of speech, beliefs, prejudices, sentiments, attitudes, ways of acting, style of dress, and so on—are determined in social relations. When these characteristics are at the front of attention, we use the term person. Sociology studies the person.

The same distinction is frequently made in characterizing original* nature and human* nature. The one denotes the characteristics and potentialities one has at the beginning of life, the traits and capacities that are his by virtue of his heredity*. The other denotes the characteristics that he has by virtue of training, education, and experience. The concrete person is of course the product of his original, biological, nature and his social experience.

SOCIAL INTERACTION

Interaction* among human beings takes place on different levels and by means of different mechanisms. The most elementary type is the immediate organic response to the mere presence of others. The mutual responses of the mother and the infant are cases in point. The relation is primarily physical; there is no language communication, no transfer of ideas, but each responds to presence and touch at the physiological level. The mutual responses of infatuated adolescent lovers are for the most part below the articulate level. The immediate transfer of emotional states is an important element in crowd* behavior and other forms of collective activity.

The above type of interaction is all that exists among the lower animal forms; it is also common to the higher animal forms and to human beings. Social interaction proper is restricted to the human forms; it is not possible below the language level. Two types of social interaction should be distinguished.

A very large part of human communication is on a conventional level. The meeting and greeting of other persons, the exchange of pleasantries and gossip, and the small talk that makes up the bulk of human intercourse take a traditional pattern. It is behavior according to expectation; it goes on the basis of a body of mutually accepted definitions and customary forms, on the basis of sentiments* that the persons hold in common. It raises no question in regard to the traditionally accepted verities; its social function is rather to reinforce the patterns of agreement that underlie the traditional arrangements.

Critical interaction is sharply contrasted to the sentimental form just described. It has to do with communication on the level of thought and ideas. It is perhaps best typified by scientific discussion and by the deliberations of competent committees and juries. It is concerned exclusively with relevant facts and the discovery of truth.

In the actual concrete relations of men, the three types of interaction are commonly manifested. The concrete groups differ in the degree in which the one or the other form predominates. In

the excited crowd, the spontaneous emotional responses are uppermost, and the conventional and critical types of behavior are largely absent. In a convivial group, as a dinner party, the behavior reactions are sentimentally, conventionally, and traditionally determined; the members do respond immediately to each other and there may be some modicum of intellectual reaction, but both are subordinate to the pattern. In a critical group, as a body of scientists, there is some response to the presence of others that interferes in a measure with clarity of thought and expression, and there is an intrusion of sentiment, prejudice*, and other conventional reactions.

The absence of social interaction is spoken of as isolation*. It is always relative, as is social interaction; human nature is a product of association* and cannot develop or exist in isolation.

Among the causes of isolation, geographic separation is the most immediately obvious. Physical factors, sense defects, bodily deformities, mental deficiencies, ill-health, and the like limit contact and communication. The biological fact of sex in most times and places results in separation and partial isolation of one-half of the human race. Cultural facts, as language differences, degrees of education, poverty, group animosities, religious creeds, class and class barriers, and the like, form the most important group of isolating phenomena.

Isolation results in retardation. This is true whether we refer to person, group, or class.

GENERAL FORMS OF INTERACTION

From the point of view of the cultural processes, interaction takes four major forms: competition*, conflict*, accommodation*, and assimilation*. There are, of course, many minor forms of interaction; writers have enumerated and discussed in the elementary books perhaps as many as half a hundred. But these always turn out, upon examination, to be minor aspects of the fundamental forms. Co-operation, for example, which is often given independent status, is merely an aspect of competition.

The forms of interaction are of course abstractions. They are not concrete, tangible realities in the sense that a book or a house or a tree is tangible and real. They are not empirical generalizations reached by taking an average of similar phenomena or by assembling the common characteristics of diverse behavior. They are rather in the nature of general concepts*. They are derived from rather than descriptive of specific concrete realities.

Each of the four major processes is defined in a special aspect of society. Competition is basic to the economic order and in spatial distribution and other aspects of the ecological order. Conflict is associated with the political order and manifested in numerous concrete phenomena. The social organization* expresses accommodation. Assimilation is particularly manifested in the moral order.

COMPETITION* AND SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION

Competition is universal and continuous among living things. It expresses the fact of scarcity. The amount of space and sustenance is limited. Organisms, always tending to increase in number, strive to satisfy their needs or desires. In the degree that they succeed, they reduce by so much the possibility of other organisms satisfying similar needs and desires. This is a fact of universal incidence: it is true of the plants and lower animals as well as of human beings. And it is a condition that always and everywhere exists.

Competition, if its significance is to be at all adequately appreciated, must be understood as a purely impersonal condition. It normally goes on without the conscious awareness of the competing forms. This is, of course, obvious in the case of the plants, where each strives for the moisture, air, sunlight, etc. that its growth requires with no awareness of other organisms. It is perhaps equally clear in the animal realm, where each is intent on satisfying its own needs and quite unaware that it thereby deprives others. In the human realm, there is an almost equal lack of awareness of either the fact or the inevitability of competition; persons struggle to reach goals and are commonly unaware that their success limits in any way the opportunities of others.

The process is to be understood as elementary or fundamental in character. It underlies and pervades all aspects of life. It is, in general, the only form of interaction* among the lower orders of life. In the human realm, the more strictly social forms of interaction are derived from it.

Competition gets many concrete expressions. The "struggle for existence" of the Darwinian biologists and the equally familiar struggle for mates are animal examples. In the human realm it commonly takes the form of a struggle for livelihood or social position. Its results are everywhere manifest in ecological distribution.

CONFLICT AND THE DETERMINATION OF STATUS

Conflict is a social and human form of interaction. The occasional conflicts observed in the animal world are only in a very minor degree social. Occasionally, in some forms, they appear to be struggles for position or leadership, but for the most part they are accidents of the competitive process with little or no significance beyond the immediate event.

In the social sense, conflict is a conscious struggle with others for the same or similar objectives. Like the other social processes, it arises out of competition*. It develops when persons or groups become aware that the activities of others are obstacles to achievement. In this event the relationship changes and competitors become enemies; impersonal competition changes into personal conflict, into an effort to destroy the enemy.

Conflict takes a very great variety of concrete forms. There are four major or general forms: the conflict of persons*, the conflict of groups*, the conflict of values*, and conflict within the person.

At its simplest level, the conflict of persons is little different from the spontaneous struggles between animals for the possession of food. A very great part of governmental and legal machinery has been evolved in the effort to mediate conflict and to prevent the clash of interests from getting overt and destructive expression. The duel was a substitute for unregulated brawls in the settlement of differences. Litigation is a step further removed from spontaneous fights. Economic competition is a familiar form of conflict, but it is one that is now so well regulated and so highly conventionalized that its basic nature is seldom apparent.

War* is the most spectacular form of the overt conflict of groups. It arises out of a conflict of interests* of groups that are not subject to control by superior power. The feud is a form of warfare between factions within a larger group. Labor wars are organized and regulated forms of conflict between employers and employees.

The conflict of values is an impersonal struggle between incompatible ideas or systems. Religion and science, democracy and

totalitarianism, evolution and special creation, capitalism and socialism, are examples of mutually conflicting systems. In such conflict there is no resolution short of the complete annihilation of one system or the other. The actual conflicts are, of course, carried on by the groups adhering to the opposed values.

In a complex society persons are often so situated that they belong to groups with conflicting values or opposed doctrines. The standards of the home and those of the adolescent world are not always in harmony. The child with a religious background may become a student of natural science. In such cases the external group conflicts may appear as conflicts within the person.

The sociologist is interested in conflict from the point of view of personality and from the point of view of social organization. Conflict is the beginning of conscious life, and the whole process of learning may be viewed as one of resolving conflicts. It is in the progressive mental and personal adjustments that the personality is developed and the character formed. It is thus the organizing factor in the life of the person. On the other hand, it is the chief factor in group organization. In the absence of external conflict, the internal unity declines.

ACCOMMODATION* AND THE SOCIAL EQUILIBRIUM

Accommodation is the third distinctive form of social interaction. It is the process by means of which persons become fitted to a position in the social order and by which minority groups find a position in the more inclusive group. It is central, therefore, in the establishment and maintenance of social equilibrium.

Conflict is an intermittent and recurring rather than a continuous phenomenon. It results in a disturbance more or less profound in the status* of persons or groups. The outcome of a war, for example, whether it is a victory or a defeat, is a period of exhaustion and of new economic, political, and social relations; the result of litigation may be the loss of property or the acquisition of new rights. In any case a period is required for recuperation and adjustment* to the changed conditions of life. Regardless of the status established by the terms of the peace, adjustments are made and accommodations to the new way of life begin. It is in this sense that accommodation follows conflict.

Accommodations may come about, however, without periods of overt conflict. The mutual adjustments of husband and wife in the marriage relation involve accommodations that are often profound but they do not seem, normally, to be preceded by overt conflict. The accommodation of the child in the family, the accommodation of the student to the class routine, and the accommodation of minority groups in the inclusive society are other examples of accommodation not necessarily preceded by conflict.

The person who has a definite status and role in the group presently acquires a body of habits and sentiments in harmony with the position he occupies. This is true whether the position is one of dominance* or subordination; the child, the parent, the peasant, the aristocrat, the slave, the master, and persons in other defined positions develop the habits of thought and action that fit them to the roles they are called upon to play. In the situation they are accommodated. The process of accommodation is largely one of acquiring the habit* complex that defines the status.

Conversion* is a form of accommodation where there is a more

or less sudden shift from one culture complex to another. The shift is familiar in the realm of religious behavior. A person under pressure changes allegiance and aligns himself with a new religious group. In the new situation he gradually loses contact with and interest in his former companions and ways of life and becomes a full and loyal member of the new group. The phenomenon is also familiar in the transfer from one culture group to another, as in the case of immigrants who come in the early years of life. The phenomenon marks a complete change in the life organization of the person.

ASSIMILATION* AND MORAL UNITY

The final major form and process of social interaction is called assimilation. This term connotes the fact of full group membership and the means by which the condition comes about. The child in society gradually and inevitably acquires the language and other cultural baggage of the group into which he is born and, in time, becomes a functioning member of the group. The migrant to a new culture goes through much the same socializing procedure. Gradually and without full awareness of what is going on he loses his earlier acquired sentiments and emotional attachments; he develops at the same time a sense of loyalty and a feeling of belonging to the new group; he loses the feeling of strangeness and comes to think of the society that he entered as a stranger as his society.

As contrasted to accommodation, which is usually achieved in a relatively brief period of time, assimilation is a slow and gradual process of growth and development. In the American society it has commonly required two or three generations for immigrants to become fully assimilated. In some cases the process is further delayed and may not come about at all. Assimilation is not an inevitable consequence of residence; there has been a virtually complete failure to assimilate the American Indians to the European culture. Most of the national groups contain unassimilable racial, religious, or linguistic minorities.

Any factors or conditions that hinder personal association and cultural participation delay or prevent assimilation. Language difference, racial contrasts, religious dogmas, nationalistic phobias, and the like retard the process. Such differences are exploited by all politically disloyal propagandists; they are neutralized and in so far as possible removed when national and social unity is the objective. Conversely, all factors and conditions that favor social contacts and participation in the cultural life promote assimilation. It is for this reason that intermarriage and racial intermixture speed the process of assimilation—the system of public education and the opportunity to participate in political life are important forces in the assimilation of persons of foreign origin or culture.

CULTURE

All culture is a product of human effort; no part comes from the original* nature or from the external environment*, and no other animal form shares in its production or use. Its origin is in human discovery and invention; in part it is the result of happy accident, in part it is the result of insight and effort. Its development is cumulative in character; it grows through accretion, through the addition, use, preservation, and transmission of human discoveries. Its significance lies in the control that it gives over the external world and the forces of nature, and in the fact that it becomes an important part of the environment of the succeeding generations.

While neither biological nor environmental factors determine culture, each exercises a controlling and limiting influence. The original nature and mental capacity of man set limits to the achievement level that he may reach. What this level may be is, of course, unknown but just as man has reached a level not possible for the lower animals, a form of animal superior in capacity to man would doubtless be able to reach cultural heights impossible for man. In somewhat the same way, the environment limits cultural invention. Man must work with the materials that nature provides. The limiting and directing influence is readily seen in any comparison of tropic and arctic cultural achievements; men in each type of geographic area have developed culture forms, but they differ as widely as do the materials with which the groups have to work.

Each item or element of culture has a place of origin. With relatively few exceptions inventions and discoveries have had a single beginning. They commonly come into use and reach a degree of development in a localized group. The place of origin and development is spoken of as a culture center. The area of close communication may come to be characterized by the more or less exclusive use of the invention and its derivatives. The region so characterized is spoken of as a culture* area.

The inventions and discoveries, if useful, are preserved and transmitted. In general the preservation and transmission are

incidental rather than intentional; they are the result of use. A new word, tool, theory, or other invention is learned by the younger from the older members of the group and is thus transmitted from one generation to the next. In part the transmission of culture is intentionally and systematically done. The school systems of modern societies are cultural creations to facilitate the passage of the culture from one generation to the next. Most groups have had some special means for cultural transmission.

But culture facts are not only passed from one generation to the next, they also spread from the place of origin to other near and remote regions. They may spread as single items, as when foreign words are adopted into a language, or as whole complexes. The adoption by the white European settlers in America of the Indian's use and methods of cultivation of corn—the so-called maize complex—is an example. In the contact of peoples of unlike cultures, there is in general mutual borrowing; each takes something from the other. But the transfer is selective; each borrows from the other the items that it needs or appreciates and rejects other items. The simpler peoples, for example, readily accept the tools, weapons, alcoholic beverages of the more advanced group; these are obviously superior to their own. But the language, religions, beliefs, family organization, philosophical ideas, and the like spread more slowly if at all; they have no immediately obvious or easily demonstrable superiority over the corresponding items of familiar usage.

In the present culture stage of the Western peoples, the place of origin of an invention is of little importance. If the new discovery has utilitarian value, its use soon becomes general throughout the civilized world. Many of the items fundamental in American culture, as the germ theory of disease and the doctrine of biological evolution, were borrowed from other countries. In contrast, discoveries in the realms of religion, government, social relations, and the like are slow of acceptance.

The social and the cultural are not always clearly and accurately differentiated in the literature; certain writers use the terms loosely as practically synonymous. In the more discriminating usage, social* life has reference to the association, interaction, and communication of persons, to phenomena of human nature and

personality and personal relations as distinct from the more impersonal and external aspect of the group life. The two are of course related and in some measure interdependent. The forms of social life are in terms of the cultural reality that exists, and the former results in the invention of new culture forms and in the wider distribution and use of the culture forms. But the two processes and conceptions are quite distinct.

There is some current disposition to glorify culture as an unqualified good. Some writers tend to make its study the major part, if not the whole, of sociology. In doing so, they sometimes emphasize certain facts to the neglect of others. It should be clearly understood, however, that man's problems and misfortunes, as well as his achievements, are in the main cultural in origin and nature. Culture includes the stupid and vicious as well as the enlightened and beneficent practices of men. War, vice, crime, racial prejudice, superstition, economic exploitation, and the like are as much cultural inventions as are co-operative behavior, preventive medicine, scientific research, written language, and other positive accomplishments.

RACE* AND CULTURE*

This area of study provides a relatively concrete and profitable approach to sociological reality. It is commonly treated at length in special courses and given only passing attention in the introductory course.

There is no immediate causal relation between race and culture. The two types of phenomena are separate in origin and sharply contrasted in expression. Race is a biological fact; racial differences are matters of physical heredity; racial changes result from mutation and selective survival. Culture is a social fact; cultural differences are results of historical experience; cultural changes result from discovery, invention, accumulation, preservation, and social transmission. The cultural backwardness of certain racial groups is a result of their social isolation*, not a result of their racial origin. But the organic and social processes operate concomitantly in the world of concrete reality: each is modified in its expression by factors of the other order.

The study of race and culture includes, among other problems, the historical and contemporary types of adjustment between and among racial groups within populations: the patterns of miscegenation of races and the social and cultural consequences, the cultural disorganization and enrichment consequent upon the contact and intermixture of racial groups, the demoralization of personality* incident to racial intermixture and cultural fusion, the appearance and role of marginal men and cultures in areas of contact, the natural history of race relations, including the prejudices generated, the ideological systems evolved, and the changing conflict patterns manifested at successive stages of the race relations cycle, the body of racial theories and dogmas* that have functioned to rationalize or implement conflicts in areas of racial friction, the status of minority groups and cultures, including the stimulation of racial consciousness in periods of impending overt conflict, and the resolution of racial and cultural conflicts through personal accommodations* to some new and relatively stable cultural equilibrium.

The intermixture of racial stocks is an area of widespread

misconceptions. The known facts may be stated briefly. There is no evidence to justify a belief that the biological effects are either beneficial or injurious; the primary and secondary genetic characters of individuals depend upon the ancestry, not upon the racial affiliation. Two healthy parents of sound heredity will normally produce sound and healthy offspring. The result is in no way influenced by the fact that the parents are of the same or different racial stock. The contrasted situation is equally true; parents of inferior stamina or defective heredity are likely to produce defective offspring regardless of whether the parents are racially alike or different.

The widespread miscegenation of racial stocks that has preceded or accompanied the rise of civilizations is an incidental accompaniment rather than a cause of cultural efflorescence. The popular misconception that cultural growth is a result of the biological mixture of races is the result of assuming a causal relation between phenomena that appear together or in sequence. The stimulus to cultural advance is the introduction of new material or methods or ideas, either by independent invention or by contact with strange peoples and cultures. The introduction of new tools, weapons, techniques, modes of behavior, ways of thinking, or other cultural and social facts disturbs the established ways of life and makes possible, sometimes inevitable, radical changes in the social* order. The advances in civilization* are thus initiated by the contact and fusion of culture heritages*, not by the mixture of racial stocks.

The fusion of cultures has generally been an undesigned result of the migration* and contact* of peoples. But from the point of view of cultural advance, the racial contacts were incidental. The same results would have been achieved by the introduction of the cultural material without the intermixture of peoples. In the modern world this is the usual procedure; the means of communication are such that cultural innovations spread with ease and rapidity. In the earlier periods, the new and strange came only as it was introduced by people who possessed the foreign culture.

When strange peoples come into contact and association, they

intermarry and produce a hybrid population. This has little or nothing to do with cultural stimulation and advance. But its obvious character leads many people to the erroneous belief that the biological mixture of the peoples is the cause of the cultural phenomena.

CULTURE AND ORIGINAL NATURE

Many of the things that popular thought attributes to original-nature are consequences of social and cultural life. It is particularly in the current mode for social groups to escape the responsibility for disgraceful social conditions by attributing them to an inadequate or defective biological equipment. War is often explained as originating in a fighting instinct, crime is often attributed to limited mentality or criminal traits, poverty is excused as a consequence of the native incapacity of the economically excluded, and so for a considerable range of social phenomena.

Social students now commonly recognize that this order of explanation is generally fallacious. Individual cases of failure may sometimes be understood as the result of mental defect or deficiency that is congenital or hereditary. But there is no evidence to support a belief that social or cultural phenomena can be so explained. The human races* and the social classes* do not differ in biological traits and capacities. Social and cultural phenomena can be understood only in social and cultural terms; war is an institutional pattern, crime is the result of training and education, poverty is a consequence of the maldistribution of goods, illiteracy and ignorance are due to the fact that children are deprived of education.

There is still, however, a general tendency to use a biological formula to explain other phenomena that are only a little less obviously of social origin. The phenomena of intelligence and temperament are cases in point. Culture and social life seem to play a very large role in their determination.

Intelligence is commonly thought to be a biologically determined condition. It is assumed that individuals are differently endowed, that some are mentally superior and others mentally incompetent, and that these differences are biologically unalterable facts. This may be in some part a tenable explanation of the mental differences observable in a complex society. But there is much reason to believe that it is little more than a folk generalization from the fact of observed differences. In the animal realm there is little discoverable difference in the mentality of indi-

viduals of the same species; each individual seems to learn what there is to learn by association with his fellows. In the simple human group there is little difference in the mental ability of different members; by adolescence each has learned what there is to know and mental development ceases. The individual has not reached the limit of his biological capacity, he has reached the ceiling of the culture. The American Negro slaves ceased to develop at about a ten-year level because they had reached the possibilities of the cultural environment, not because they were natively incapable of further advance. And it seems to be so in other areas of culture. Each normal child born into the society is closely similar to every other in his mental potentialities. He will develop according to the stimulations and patterns to which he has access. If he is reared in an institution for feeble-minded children, he will develop to that level and remain throughout life at that mental level. If he is reared in a more stimulating environment, he will develop to the level of the patterns set. No person can develop much beyond the culture* patterns. It is in this general way that we understand the mental differences observable among persons in a complex society. The stimulations and opportunities of children in different home environments and social strata of the population, rather than variations in original biological capacity, seem to account for the observed differences in intelligence.

Temperament* is apparently to be understood, in large part, in similar terms. The Americans, for example, and the Eskimos are notoriously extraverted in their behavior. It seems more plausible to explain the extraversion* in terms of the conditions of life in these areas, than to account for the behavior* patterns by assuming biologically different types of temperament.

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND INSTITUTIONS

Social organization* is a general term for the totality of social institutions* in their interrelationships. The institutions themselves are organized and socially sanctioned sets of behavior patterns, which tend to be as numerous as the values that the particular society recognizes as basic.

The work of this field of study is to analyze and understand the social heritage* in its origin, development, structure, and function. It includes the study of group practices, conventions, customs, social rules, ritual, ceremonial practices, and other elements of folk thought and behavior; the organization of these elements of group life into institutional structures; and the interrelation and integration of the institutions into the inclusive social order.

An inquiry into social origins is the logical point of initial attack. The approach may be made by way of the socialization of the child, or through the examination of ethnological and historical material. The customs*, folk practices, and social rules of the simpler peoples grow up about the persisting or recurring conditions to which adjustments* must be made. They are not, in general, creations of conscious rational deliberation; they are, rather, chance adjustments hit upon in the course of group experience. They develop and function in the presence of and in relation to the other adjustment ways of the group; consequently, the going practices and definitions are at least workably consistent and coherent.

The institutions as such are later developments. They exist in embryo in the relatively undifferentiated social structure of the simple group. But the practices and rules governing economic, family, educational, recreational, religious, and other interests* and activities are one system rather than many. The institutions arise and develop through a gradual process of differentiation, by the gradual separation of functions and the concurrent appearance of specialized functionaries. But they remain, at all stages, intimately related and interdependent. The mutual conditioning, complementary characteristics, and other lines of interdependence

are what give the unity and coherence that characterize a social* order.

The social organization* is in general a matter of unconscious growth, not a result of purposeful planning. The grammar of a language*, for example, which is an excellent example of organization, comes into existence and undergoes change without the knowledge of the users of the language. The family*, as one part of every social organization, was a natural growth and it continues to grow and change.

CUSTOMS AND CONVENTIONS

The genesis of the social organization and of the social institutions is in the folkways* and the personal behavior* patterns of the people. With regard to any value, such as the child or the spirit world or the source of food supply, certain ways of acting grow up and tend to be socially transmitted. As these behavior patterns become familiar they seem to be reasonable and right. They come to be the expected forms of behavior in such circumstances. There presently comes to exist a more or less explicit set of rules that define the proper forms of behavior and sanction them as standard and right. When functionaries are designated to enforce observances of the patterns, an institution exists. It grows by the addition of related functions and activities.

But a very large area of life activities remains outside the realm of institutional organization. Some of the activities are regarded as socially indifferent or as being matters of private concern. With regard to others, there exists a body of expectations and understandings. These are not enforced by any formal sanction but they are generally, often punctiliously, observed. Matters of etiquette, for example, and questions of precedence are often treated as things of real importance. One observes the conventional patterns as a matter of convenience, sometimes as a matter of safety, as in keeping to the right in highway traffic.

Another body of customary behavior is looked upon as morally right or morally wrong. These moral customs* vary from group to group and from time to time. What is defined as moral in one group is treated as indifferent or positively immoral in others. When these group practices come to be formally sanctioned and legally enforced, they take on an institutional character.

MAJOR SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

The sociologists commonly consider certain institutions as fundamental to society*. They seem to be so designated because of the fact that they are, in some form, widely distributed or of universal incidence. Other writers treat them as fundamental because they are organized around certain values* that they believe to be essential to group welfare, around the basic needs of man.

Food and shelter are at the core of a cluster of economic institutions. The nature of the structures is dependent in large measure upon the state of cultural advance and means of livelihood. In the simpler groups, dependent upon food-gathering, hunting, and fishing, or even upon agriculture, the economic organization was relatively simple and unitary. In the current industrial societies of America and Western Europe, however, the economic life is broken down into a group of interrelated and interdependent structures. Agricultural, industrial, financial, commercial, and other organizations in the modern world are highly developed and differentiated aspects of economic organization.

The family* institution is essentially a mother-child relationship. From this center it comes to include sex relationships, parent-and-child relationships, kinship and marriage customs, and other more or less related matters. The natural relation of the mother and her dependent offspring expands into a complicated system of rules, sanctions, ceremonials, and other structures that differ sharply from one social group to another.

Some form of external control over members is general in human groups. Some minor part of this expresses the need for protection from the deviate behavior of exceptional persons. But the state and political control seem everywhere to have originated in and developed from the exploitation of the mass* by some organized minority, usually a military faction.

Some commerce with the demon world seems to be universal among primitive and simple peoples. Various magical and religious practices grow up in the effort to control or placate the un-

known and dangerous powers. The institution of the church exists when a group of functionaries develops to mediate the relations between men and the supernatural powers and to enforce special types of behavior.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

The major effect of institutions is to structuralize behavior in certain areas of human endeavor. The habits* of men are thus patterned; men are accommodated to a single mode of procedure and develop the sentiments* and beliefs* that harmonize with the behavior forms. These beliefs and sentiments, in turn, tend to support and glorify the practices and the functionaries who preside over them. The existence of these integrated structures stabilizes the group by making for uniformity in attitudes and practices.

At the same time that institutional control makes for social stability, it makes development and change difficult. With the growth of knowledge or a change in the conditions of group life the institutional structures often come to stand in the way of effective and rational action. Because of the power and accumulated wealth of the functionaries, the institution may persist long after it has ceased to perform a useful function.

SOCIAL CHANGE* AND DISORGANIZATION*

The universal trend in social reality, as elsewhere in the universe, is toward an equilibrium of forces, hence toward a stable or static social* order. The norm is perhaps most readily seen in the simple and relatively isolated social groups. Here a way of life has been worked out, a balance of forces has been reached, and there may be no perceptible change in many generations. The social order is adequate to the needs of the group members; it creates no needs that cannot be met.

Any crisis—a new theory, a mechanical invention, a discovery, an invasion, a failure of a source of food, or other untoward event—disturbs the social and cultural equilibrium that has prevailed. The resulting unbalance among the forces may be slight or profound. It may be so severe and persistent as to destroy the group. In any case, control tends to break down; old ways of acting are no longer effective and new and unsanctioned behavior makes its appearance. There is a more or less prolonged period of social disorganization and disorder.

In time, if the group weathers the crisis, adjustments* are worked out on a trial-and-error basis; through the collective* behavior process new institutional forms and relations emerge and find acceptance. A new balance of forces is established. Social order is gradually restored and the group enters upon a new period of stable social existence. This is the simple paradigm of all social order; the inherent movement is ever toward a more and more complete adjustment, but the basic trend toward equilibrium and stability is periodically interrupted by the intrusion of disturbing factors. The analogy with a body of water is quite close: the basic tendency of the water in the lake is to come to rest, but it is periodically disturbed by wind and other external forces.

In the modern world, crises* follow one another in rapid succession. New inventions and discoveries appear before the effects of previous discoveries and inventions have subsided. Wars and political events, often at distant points, upset the balance of forces; the uneven growth of population and the migration of peoples are

and have everywhere been disturbing forces. Moreover, the crises in the late centuries have been not only numerous but profoundly disturbing. The population of the world has doubled in the past hundred years; the European peoples have increased threefold. The industrial revolution is not yet complete in the Western world and is just beginning to have profound disturbing effects in the Orient. The effects of the period of the discoveries are still to be observed in the modern struggle for national power. The recent discovery of effective means of contraception, one of the few great human discoveries, is now throwing the world into new disorder, which will doubtless continue for some centuries and result in racial and social readjustments as profound as those produced by the discovery of fire or the development of language.

The social disorganization* and the consequent personal maladjustments* and demoralizations* that characterize the modern world will doubtless long continue. But the chronic disorder is the result of numerous and successive discoveries working themselves out more or less simultaneously, not of any change in the universal trend toward social equilibrium.

The doctrine of "cultural* lag," usually presented in the current texts, expounds one limited aspect of the process of social change.

PERSONAL DISORGANIZATION*

In periods of rapid change in culture and social life, many persons are unable to make satisfying adjustment and may become temporarily or chronically demoralized. The loss of employment in periods of industrial depression destroys the independent status* of many persons and their dependents. The gradual depletion of the soil fertility of the American South, aggravated by certain other factors, reduces increasing numbers to a disorganized and dependent status. Any condition resulting from the loss of values* about which the life organization has been built disorganizes the person; any event that changes the social status of the person is at least temporarily disorganizing. It results in a lack of harmony between his status and his conception of himself. The loss of income, the increase of hopeless poverty*, the death of a husband or wife, or other event requires new adjustments*, a changed *role*, and a revision of the self. The whole range of phenomena commonly discussed as "social pathology"—poverty, dependency, unemployment, vice*, delinquency, and so on—are consequences of social changes that are allowed to go on without direction or control.

THE DISORGANIZATION OF PERSONALITY*

Personality is the subjective aspect of group life and social relations; its character reflects the nature of the group life. It tends to be dull and thin when the culture* is simple and little differentiated; it tends to be rich and varied when cultural stimulations and opportunities are numerous. But there is no internal conflict so long as the pattern of life remains relatively stable and uniform.

The problems of personality arise in areas that present a confusion of standards and a variety of cultural norms. In such situations the person may live in more than one world. Consequently his personal organization may incorporate various incompatible elements. He may, for example, be a loyal member of a conservative religious sect and a student of the natural sciences. There is no difficulty unless circumstances force him to bring together the incompatible bodies of thought. This ordinarily comes about when there is conflict* between the two groups to which he belongs. In the above example, any open conflict between science and religion would result in the conflict being transferred from the outer groups to the person; he would be obligated to discard one or the other of the incompatible systems of ideas, or to resolve the conflict by some body of rationalization*. Conflicts of personality are always the result of outer conflicts, though the connection may be at times obscure.

Conflicts of this order must not be confused with family or group problems created by the divergent behavior of certain members of the group. Delinquency, for example, is a problem of the social order; the person is in conflict with some objective set of social rules. This is not a personality problem, though, in some cases, the overt behavior may arise from conflicts within the individual. Conflicts within the personality arise only when the person becomes a problem to himself, when he has conflicting loyalties and is unable to act without violating one set or another.

COLLECTIVE* BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL REORGANIZATION

In the period of change from one time of stable social equilibrium to another, the social structures tend to crumble and the sentiments* and behavior* patterns derived from and, in turn, supporting the social structures are disorganized. In this period spontaneous and erratic forms of behavior are numerous; sometimes they tend to dominate the social* order. This body of behavior is at once a consequence of the breakdown of an old order and a method of arriving at a new equilibrium and a new set of social structures. The study of collective behavior is a major area of sociological research. Its research aspects are presented in brief detail in another section.¹

¹ See pages 206-209.

PART THREE

Dictionary of Terms

PART THREE

Dictionary of Terms

THE TERMINOLOGY of sociology presents no peculiar or especially difficult problems. For the most part and with relatively few exceptions, the words used in sociological writing are those in general use; they are commonly known in some of their connotations to the majority of college students.

But words in general currency tend to be somewhat lacking in definiteness and precision; they are inconstant in usage, and they vary in meaning or shades of meaning with the subject matter and specific context. They lack the rigid exactness, the clean-cut character, that is essential to careful thought and plain statement. It is necessary, therefore, that the sociology student define with meticulous care the terms that he uses in a technical sense; it is, of course, equally essential that he adhere consistently to a single definition and usage.

There is, of course, no authoritative list of sociological terms. The concepts essential to one system of thought may find a subordinate place or no place at all in another system. Even within the same school of writers there are often sharp differences in terminology. Quite properly, each writer chooses from the words at his command those that best express his thought or that lend distinction to his composition.¹

¹The sociological student should be keenly conscious of the terminological idiosyncrasies of various writers; he should also develop an ability to understand what lies behind deviate usage. In some cases, of course, it is nothing more than simple ignorance of standard practice; in other cases there is a desire to avoid

In spite of many variations in the work of different writers, there is substantial agreement in regard to certain major concepts. Certain terms reappear in all the general books and are featured in each of the published lists and glossaries.

The first compilation of essential sociological terms appears to have been that presented by Professor Small in 1905.² The list consisted of forty-eight items. They are given here in alphabetical arrangement.³

adjustment, social	individualization
ascendancy, social	institutions, social
assimilation, social	integration
association	interests
authority, social	mechanism, social
conditions of society	nature of the social process
conflict	order, social
consciousness, social	organism, social
constitution of the corporation	physical environment
contacts	process, social
content of the social process	reactions, social
control, social	relationships, social
corporation	situation, social
differentiation	social
elements of society	socialization
ends or purposes, social	society
evolution, social	spiritual environment
forces, social	stages of the social process
form of the group	status
function	stimulus and response
genesis	structure, social
genetic structures	subjective environment
group	telesis
individual	unity, social

words or concepts used by rivals; in still other cases, the author avoids the appearance of plagiarism by varying the language of the writer whose thought he is copying. But the student should also recognize that the use of a strange word to express a commonplace idea or familiar fact often creates the illusion of original thought. There are writers in sociology, as in other areas of scholarship, whose reputations rest upon verbal inventions rather than upon scientific contributions.

² Albion W. Small, *General Sociology* (Chicago, 1905), pp. 401-403.

³ Earle E. Eubank, *The Concepts of Sociology* (New York, 1932), p. 38.

In an elaborate study of sociological concepts in 1932, Professor Eubank arrived at a catalogue of three hundred and thirty-two items.⁴ Professor Young appended a glossary of ninety-seven terms to his elementary volume.⁵ Wright and Elmer supplied a glossary of eighty-five terms for their elementary treatise.⁶ The glossary accompanying Panunzio's volume contains one hundred and seventy-two items.⁷ Some years ago a committee of the American Sociological Society presented a list of terms as constituting the minimum vocabulary to be mastered by the beginning student.⁸

The following list contains the principal terms used in present-day sociological literature. Included are many words that are to all intents and purposes nontechnical and generally used without special connotation. The list also contains a sprinkling of terms that have little currency but are featured by writers whose books have some circulation among college students. The terms in the list compiled by the committee of the American Sociological Society are all included in this section. The terms are briefly defined. In the case of the more important terms, the definitions are supplemented by quotations from careful or influential writers.⁹ The relative importance of the concepts to clear and effective thinking in sociology is roughly indicated by the amount of space allotted for the presentation.

The boldface numerals following each quotation in the glossary refer to the source (listed on pages 164-170) from which the definition is taken; the lightface numerals give the pages on which the statement may be found in its context. In nearly all cases these have been taken from elementary volumes that are generally available. Where no numerals are given, the source of the quotation is indicated directly.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 39-43.

⁵ Kimball Young, *An Introductory Sociology* (rev. ed., New York, 1939), pp. 595-600.

⁶ Verne Wright and Manuel C. Elmer, *General Sociology* (New York, 1939), pp. 627-631.

⁷ Constantine Panunzio, *Major Social Institutions* (New York, 1939), pp. 523-568.

⁸ The report of the committee with the list of terms recommended was published in the *Journal of Educational Sociology*, VII (1933), pp. 81-82.

⁹ In some cases variant uses are given. Care has been exercised, however, not to quote definitions where the variations seem to be caused by the fact that the author did not quite understand the standard usage.

Dictionary of Terms

NOTE: Words or terms followed by an asterisk are also discussed in this section. All entries are in alphabetical order, so that these words can be located readily for additional information.

Acclimatization. The biological process by which species or varieties are adapted to a new climatic area. Because of individual* differences among organisms, there is a differential death rate when the species comes into a strange climatic situation. If the individual differences are also hereditary differences, the lethal selection results in the survival of certain strains and the elimination of others. The test of acclimatization is the survival of the species or variety.

“Acclimatization, in the full sense of having white men and women living for successive generations in the tropics, and reproducing their kind without physical, mental, and moral degeneration—i.e., colonization in the true sense—is impossible.”—115, 204. See ADAPTATION; DOMESTICATION.

Accommodation. The process by which persons* or groups* gradually become reconciled to their conditions of life through the formation of habits*, interests*, and attitudes* that arise from and are necessary in the social situation. It is the basic means of adjustment* among groups*, of fitting the person* to his status* in the group, and of resolving conflicts within the person. As a state or condition accompanying and resulting from the process, accommodation is the recognition and acceptance of the relations that define the status of the person in the group or of the group in the more inclusive social* organization. The social pattern that accommodation always takes is the subordination of a person or group to another person or group. The child is subordinate to his parents; the slave is inferior in status

to the master; the nobleman is accommodated to a superior, and the peasant to an inferior, status in the society. The term must be sharply distinguished from adaptation*, which is a biological process, and from adjustment*, which is a conscious and purposeful procedure.

"If adaptation is defined as structural changes in the organism which take place through biological variation and selection, the term 'accommodation' may be reserved for the functional changes which take place in the habits and customs of persons and groups and which are socially rather than biologically transmitted."—11, I, 403.

"As a process, accommodation is the sequence of steps by which persons are reconciled to changed conditions of life through the formation of habits and attitudes made necessary by the changed conditions themselves."—92, 322.

✍ "Accommodation is the process by which competing or conflicting forces become adjusted to each other and form working relationships, even though there remains considerable social* distance between those who associate."—106, 637. See ADJUSTMENT; ASSIMILATION.

Accommodation Groups. See GROUPS, ACCOMMODATION.

Acculturation. The transmission of the social heritage* from one group* or class* to another, particularly the process of transmission among primitive peoples. The corresponding sociological term is assimilation*.

"Acculturation is the process by which one group or people learns from another, whether the culture* or civilization be gotten by imitation* or by inculcation. As there must be contact, acculturation is sometimes ascribed to 'contagion*.'"—61, 216.

"Acculturation, then, is the name given to all the various ways in which individuals or groups take on new culture traits, and incorporate them into their own manner of living."—37, 372.

"Acculturation is the process whereby individuals reared in one culture and transferred to another take on the behavior* patterns of the second society*."—84, 383. See ASSIMILATION.

Act, The. A series of movements with an end in view.

"A distinction is sometimes made between the social act, which is directed toward a responding object and the physical act, which is directed toward a non-responding object. Certain social psychologists,

notably Mead and Faris, have organized their discussions around the concept of the act. Gestures*, attitude*, emotion, thought, and other mental activities are thus placed into a schema of the act.”—WILLARD WALLER.

Adaptation. The process of biological change through selective survival that fits an animal or plant form more perfectly to the conditions of its environment*. Adaptation is to be distinguished sharply from accommodation*, adjustment*, assimilation*, and other terms that connote personal, social, or cultural processes as distinct from biological processes. The term “social adaptation” which is sometimes found in the literature is a contradiction of terms and its use should be scrupulously avoided.

“Adaptation applies to those changes which tend to equip the organism as such, or provide auxiliary aids, for its security and survival in relation to its physical environment.”—26, 304.

“It is a gradual process, whose results usually become noticeable only in the evolution of a group or race, or at least only after a long series of generations. It is opposed to the influence of heredity*.”—117.

“The present populations of the earth represent physical adaptations to their environments.”—98, 37. See ACCLIMATIZATION; DOMESTICATION.

Adjustment. The deliberate and purposeful procedure of arranging persons* or functions into a system of working relations in order to avoid friction or conflict*. It is the process of establishing a satisfactory or harmonious relationship; it is a conscious matter of fitting oneself into a situation. It must be distinguished from the unconscious process of accommodation*, of which it is often the first step, and from adaptation*, which is an end result of biological selection. As a state or condition, adjustment is the existence of harmonious relationships.

“In theory, adjustment is a situational balance between the person and his environment; it is a ‘not too perfect’ balance for this would be abnormal. Perfect adjustment as a real life situation would mean a lack of tension, hence inactivity and lack of achievement.”—16, 356.

“Rivals and enemies are adjusted in their respective roles to their opponents and to the situation in which they find themselves at the

moment, quite as much as are friends and co-workers among themselves."—26, 301.

"The process by which individuals or groups more or less consciously fit themselves to each other, or fit into, or act in accordance with, the prevailing culture."—86, 524. See ACCOMMODATION; ORGANIZATION; DISORGANIZATION; MALADJUSTMENT.

Adjustment* Pattern. The behavior forms and systems of relationships by means of which associated life is rendered effective and harmonious.

"Patterns of adjustment may be defined as those configurations* of behavior* and relationship that groups develop for furthering adjustment to situations that have been experienced over and over in the past."—21, 89. See FOLKWAYS; MORES; CUSTOMS; CONVENTIONS; INSTITUTIONS.

Aggregation. Any assemblage of individuals in spatial proximity, especially if unorganized and of heterogeneous composition.

"All assemblages of any kind—crowds*, congregations, audiences, mobs*, mass meetings—are easily classed as aggregations . . . In all cases, there is personal propinquity, which is the one thing needful to transform a category into an aggregation."—37, 158. See GROUP; CROWD; MASS.

Amalgamation. The biological process of racial fusion through the inbreeding or intermarriage of originally distinct racial strains. The process should be carefully distinguished from assimilation* and acculturation* which denote the blending and integration* of social heritages*.

"Racial amalgamation is related as both cause and effect to social assimilation. Biological intermixture, by increasing the number and intimacy of social contacts*, promotes the fusion of social heritages and the diffusion and blending of cultures*. On the other hand, the social and psychological similarity resulting from cultural assimilation favors intermarriage through increasing mutual understanding and personal appreciation."—91, II, 17.

"Amalgamation, while it is limited to the crossing of racial traits through intermarriage, naturally promotes assimilation or the cross-fertilization of social heritages. The offspring of a 'mixed' marriage not only biologically inherits physical and temperamental traits from

both parents, but also acquires in the nurture of family life the attitudes*, sentiments*, and memories of both father and mother. Thus the amalgamation of races* insures the conditions of primary social* contacts most favorable to assimilation.”—89, 737-738.

“It is one of the gains of modern social theory to have developed a careful discrimination between assimilation, as the blending and unification of divergent cultures, and amalgamation, the term now commonly used to denote the mixture of originally distinct racial strains.”—57, 308.

Americanization. A special case of assimilation*; the process by which the person of foreign birth or heritage acquires the customs, ideas, and loyalties of the American group.

“Americanization involves the social adjustment* of the immigrant to the American environment—the processes of social assimilation by which immigrants in the United States come to participate in the common life of the nation and to identify themselves with it in thought and feeling.”—70, II, 33.

Animism. The form of religious behavior based upon the belief that all objects in nature, animate and inanimate, are possessed of spirits or souls.

“The primitive mind is capable of investing with life all sorts of things, such as rocks, trees, and clouds, a practice which is designated as animism.”—85, 665. See MAGIC; RELIGION.

Anthropomorphism. The form of religion that endows the deity with a human appearance and personality*.

Anthropology. The study of man considered as a social being and as a member of the animal species. “Its subject matter includes all the phenomena of the social life of man without limitation of time and space” (Boas). In this overall sense of “the science of man” or “the science of the human organism,” anthropology includes all the social sciences, plus history, philosophy, and linguistics, as well as much of biology and psychology.

In actual procedure and practice, anthropology is the segment of social science that is concerned with primitive peoples and cultures*. It is divided into several branches and into antagonistic schools of thought. Physical anthropology or anthropometry, which is con-

cerned chiefly with the measurement of human beings, is properly a subdivision of human biology. Archaeology, or the study of the past life and activities of human beings through the discovery and examination of preserved relics, is properly a branch of history. Ethnology or cultural anthropology is the division of general sociology that specializes in primitive life and culture. The distinctions between sociology and cultural anthropology are not always clearly drawn; many sociologists make a considerable use of anthropological materials and methods and often borrow from the latter's terminology; many of the modern anthropologists are essentially sociologists in their interests and points of view.

Argot. The conventionalized slang of a group; specifically, the secret jargon of thieves.

Assimilation, Social. As a physiological term, assimilation refers to the conversion or incorporation of nutritive material into the fluid or solid substance of the body. In the social usage, it refers to the process by which persons* who are unlike in their social heritages* come to share the same body of sentiments*, traditions*, and loyalties.

"Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes* of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a cultural life."—89, 735.

"The central fact is that he shares the memories and sentiments of those who knew not the race and culture of his father's country."—25, 552.

;"The fusion of unlike social units so that a uniform culture results, as seen in the change of immigrants from Old-World culture to American culture."—123, 627.

"The conditions for successful social assimilation must be . . . the conditions which are favorable to the acquiring of relatively similar habits*, similar ideas, and similar standards by all members of the group, and to the co-ordinating of their activities and traditions into an harmonious whole."—35, 143.

"Assimilation in any case takes place gradually and by degrees so slight that they are not open to observation or measurement."—87, II, 281. See ACCOMMODATION; ACCULTURATION; ADJUSTMENT; AMERICANIZATION.

Association. The process of interaction* resulting in the formation of groups* or existing among the members of groups. In the sense of an association, as distinct from the process, reference is to the formal organization or group resulting from interaction of persons* with common interests* and purposes. In this usage an association and a society* are essentially interchangeable terms as, The American Sociological Society, The Sociological Research Association. In psychological usage association sometimes implies mere casual juxtaposition of units, in contrast to organization which implies control by a general pattern.

“An association. . . is a group organized for the pursuit of an interest or group of interests in common. It is not a community*, but an organization within a community.”—75, 11.

“When individuals recognize their like interests and begin to act unitedly in promoting them, they constitute an interest group or association.”—55, 32.

“A general term to describe a group of interacting persons, sometimes and synonymously with a consciously formed group, usually of secondary* sort.”—125, 595. See GROUP; INSTITUTION; COMMUNITY; CO-OPERATION; SOCIAL ORGANIZATION.

Attention. A psychological term denoting the orientation of the organism toward any object of sense, representation, or thought.

Attitudes. An attitude is a tendency to act, positively or negatively, toward a value, or toward a total situation or a complex of values.

“An attitude may variously be designated as a gesture*, an incomplete act*, or tendency to act. Some attitudes are overtly motor or muscular, though we speak of ‘mental’ attitudes, where the behavior* is delayed or only expected, yet always possible.”—ELLSWORTH FARIS.

“The attitude is thus the subjective element in the culture* complex, the individual counterpart of the social value. It is the individual tendency to react, either positively or negatively, to a given social value*.”—108, I, 24.

“An attitude is an acquired predisposition to act in a certain way toward a specific object or person or in a specific situation; it is a tendency to respond that exists previous to the response itself.”—106, 211.

“The word habit* may seem twisted somewhat from its customary

use when employed as we have been using it. But we need a word to express the kind of human activity which is influenced by prior activity and in that sense acquired; which contains within itself a certain ordering or systematization of minor elements of action; which is projective, dynamic in quality, ready for overt manifestation; and which is operative in some subdued subordinate form even when not obviously dominating activity. Habit, even in ordinary usage, comes nearer to denoting these facts than any other word. If the facts are recognized we may also use the words attitude and disposition."—29, 40-41. See SENTIMENTS; HABITS; OPINIONS.

Attitudes, Social. Those attitudes* that are communicated or capable of being communicated, and tend to become general.

"Our moral sentiments* and social attitudes are very largely fixed and determined by our past experiences of which we are only vaguely conscious."—89, 477. See PROCESS, SOCIAL; TRADITION; LANGUAGE; COMMUNICATION; PUBLIC OPINION.

Authority. A form of control* resting upon external convention*; power attached to office or position.

"Authority is the right or the capacity to command or to exercise power over others . . . Established authority, institutionalized leadership, always resides in an office or a class and not in an individual* as such. The individual derives his authority from his occupation of the office or from his membership in the class*."—92, 423-424.

"By authority we mean the power attached to office, involving the respect, the submission, or the reverence accorded to those who represent the office or are invested with its rights."—75, 336. See PUBLIC OPINION; LAW.

Autism. Absorption in phantasy* to the exclusion of interest in external reality.

Autistic-Schizoid. A psychological term for the condition of preoccupation with dreams and phantasies*.

Autistic Thinking. A form of "wishful thinking" in which perceptions of the universe are unduly colored by the state of mind.

Behavior. The way of acting.

"Behavior may be viewed as the sequential motions and changes in organisms, to readjust functioning in the face of varying environ-

mental conditions. Behavior is simple or complex in proportion to the intricacy of organic structure."—53, 313. See CONDUCT.

Behavior, Collective. The spontaneous group behavior* that arises, under the influence of sentiments* and impulses* developed through circular* interaction*, in the absence of standardized and rational procedures adequate to the situation. It is exemplified in the crowd*, the mob*, the panic, mass* movements, and other behavior characteristic of periods of social change* and disorder.

In another usage, the term is made essentially synonymous with group* behavior. In a third usage, it refers to the interaction restricted to a particular situation.

"Uniform, usually conventional action carried on by groups in response to social situations and as if prompted by common impulses."—85, 528.

"Viewed as a general social process, collective behavior includes the various stages in the transition from one type of social organization to another."—92, 439.

"One may say that sociology in general is interested in studying the social* order and its constituents (customs*, rules, institutions*, etc.) as they are; collective behavior is concerned in studying the ways by which the social order comes into existence, in the sense of the emergence and solidification of new forms of collective behavior."—4, 223.

"Collective behavior may be tentatively defined as the interaction which occurs between two or more socialized human beings for the duration of the particular situation in which that interaction occurs."—67, 3.

"A funeral, a wedding, or merely a picnic tends to evoke the sentiments proper to it and to create in the assemblage the atmosphere proper to the occasion. In so far as every individual in such an assemblage is moved to think and act under the influence of a mood or state of mind, in which each shares and to which each contributes, the resulting behavior may be described as collective."—87, 631. See BEHAVIOR PATTERN. See also pages 205-208.

Behavior, Social. Behavior* in response to the presence or activity of others, or that which reflects or incorporates the behavior of others.

Behaviorism. A school of psychology based chiefly upon the concept

of the conditioned* reflex. It incorporates the view that psychology as a science is concerned exclusively with overt behavior. All references to sensations, feelings, images, and to consciousness and conscious processes are either excluded as not being open to scientific investigation or reinterpreted as implicit language responses.

Behavior Pattern. A relatively uniform way of acting, usually of habitual or conventional character, that characterizes the responses of persons or groups in familiar situations.

"A relatively uniform mode of action of an individual or of a group resulting from uniform responses to the same stimuli."—86, 526.

"A configuration or organization of actions and habits into a larger whole directed toward some object or purpose."—125, 591. See CONVENTION; HABIT; FOLKWAYS; COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR.

Belief. Intellectual assent to the truth of some proposition or to the reality of some phenomenon in the absence of evidence adequate to a convincing demonstration.

"Beliefs are explanations of cause and effect relationships between objects, which arise whenever the relationship is not immediately apparent in experience and hence requires that some causal connection between objects be set up to satisfy wish*, will, or fancy. They tend to become relatively fixed and permanent in the behavior* of the individual* and traditional in the culture* of the group*."—65, 284.

"All judgments that are non-scientific are beliefs, whatever their contents may be."—102, 601.

"Specific forms of belief are largely social in origin . . . through following a certain mode of life, one generally ends by sharing the beliefs of others who share that mode."—15, II, 500. See CONDUCT; CUSTOM; TRADITION; RELIGION.

Bias. A tendency to favor a certain position or conclusion in the absence of adequate evidence or even in spite of evidence.

"By bias we mean a disposition to reject the logic of evidence in favor of a preconceived belief*."—75, 520. See PREJUDICE.

Bolshevism. The name applied to the variant form of the Marxian doctrine as worked out by a group of Russian revolutionists, particularly by Lenin, during the first quarter of the present century. In its original usage the term meant* the larger party, or the majority.*

Case Study. The examination of all available information concerning a single person, group, or situation, required for full understanding. Also, the method of research that makes an intensive inquiry into individual cases by means of interviews, life histories, autobiographies, and other personal documents. It is characterized by the collection of a more or less exhaustive body of facts concerning a small number of cases, together with an attempt to state the interrelationships of the facts.

"This new method is an attempt to go deeper into social situations [than can be done by statistical procedures] by finding out the opinions and attitudes, the memories and wishes, and the hopes and fears of individual human beings."—82, 30. See RESEARCH, SOCIOLOGICAL.

Caste. An hereditary and endogamous class of persons.

"Caste is the principle of distributing functions and social privileges on the basis of inheritance. . . . The presence of caste is revealed by two crucial attitudes: (1) a sentiment against intermarriage; (2) the practice of judging individuals on the basis of their group membership rather than their individual merits."—21, 287.

☐ "A caste may be defined as an endogamous and hereditary subdivision of an ethnic unit, occupying a position of superior or inferior rank or social esteem in comparison with other such subdivisions."—64, III, 254.

"A caste is a marriage union, the constituents of which were drawn from various different tribes (or from various other castes similarly formed) in virtue of some industry, craft, or function, either secular or religious, which they possessed in common."—93, 407-408.

"A caste may be described as an endogamous group whose members follow by tradition* a single occupation, or certain cognate occupations, and who are held together by definite social rules of behavior, and by common ceremonial* or ritual* observances."—46, 116. See CLASS; SECT; STATUS; STRATIFICATION.

Categoric Contacts. See CONTACT, CATEGORIC.

Catharsis. The release of repressed emotions through verbal expression or vicarious experiences.

Ceremony. Any formal and sanctioned body of observances, learned by observation or precept, indicating "an attitude of reverence or a

sense of the exceptional importance of an occasion." It takes on the character of ritual* when the order of words or the pattern of behavior is thought to have inherent virtue or power to produce results.

"Ceremony . . . means any established procedure of a formal and dignified nature designed to mark and impress the importance of an event or occasion."—75, 339.

"Ceremonial is one method of reviving in the group a lively sense of the past. It is a method of reinstating the excitements and the sentiments* which inspired an earlier collective action."—89, 790.

"Ceremonial derives its force for control* from the fact that it is both a mode of group expression and a type of collective* representation. The nature of ceremonial control is such that it does not necessarily determine the attitudes* and sentiments* but it does prescribe specific acts."—25, 668.

"When the essentially nonrational nature of human beings is considered, the apparent waste of effort implied in ceremony achieves in truth a kind of economy of its own. That is to say, the individual, instead of being obliged to devise solutions to meet a series of constantly shifting social contingencies, has his course definitely prescribed in its minutest details."—72, III, 314. See RITUAL.

Change. Any alteration of a pre-existing element or complex. Culture* change is any alteration of a culture* trait or complex*; social change refers to an alteration in social relations.

"Social change, specifically, is an alteration of social relations."—90, 77.

Character. The established and integrated system of habits* and patterns* of behavior*.

"Character is nothing more than the sum and co-ordination of those mechanisms which we call habit and which are formed on the basis of the inherited and instinctive tendencies and dispositions which we share in so large measure with the lower animals."—89, 84.

"The integration of the attitude and habit systems into a super-system may be designated as the person's character. From this point of view, character means what we may expect the person to do with more or less consistency in a given situation. It signifies his measure of dependability."—25, 639. See PERSONALITY; HABIT.

Circle, Vicious. A situation in which any attempt to relieve or control existing conditions tends to aggravate them.

"A chain of circumstances constituting a situation in which the process of solving one difficulty creates a new problem involving increased difficulty in the original situation."—117, 2841. See MILLING; REACTION, CIRCULAR.

Circular Reaction. See REACTION, CIRCULAR.

Civilization. A system of social customs and organization, particularly the more rational and effective control of nature by man. "A special aspect of more advanced culture*." "The literate and more developed culture." "The late phases of culture." Degrees and stages of civilization are generally identified by the application of criteria taken from one's own culture.

"The stage or aspect of societal development in which culture becomes highly organized, artificialized, removed from contact with nature, especially as found in the great centers of population."—86, 528.

"The word civilization describes the late phases of culture. Civilization is generally considered to have begun at the time of writing and the advent of metals."—85, VII, 42.

"By civilization . . . we mean the whole mechanism and organization which man has devised in his endeavor to control the conditions of his life. It would include not only our systems of social organization but also our techniques and our material instruments."—75, 272. See CULTURE; URBANIZATION; ETHNOCENTRISM.

Class. A group* separated and segregated in terms of specialization of function and having a measure of internal unity and cohesion, such as a ruling class, a priestly class, or a social set. More loosely used, it refers to any part of a population* having common characteristics or similar social status*, as for example, an educated class, the middle class, the wage-earning class, etc.

"A social class may be defined as a major group within an economic system whose members are recognizably and significantly alike in their relations to a basic division of economic power or function. In other words, a social class is an economic group whose members are alike in their relations to the process of getting a living."—21, 287.

"Classes in modern societies may be described as groups of individuals who, through common descent, similarity of occupation, wealth and education, have come to have a similar mode of life, a similar stock of ideas, feelings, attitudes and forms of behavior and who, on any or all of these grounds, meet one another on equal terms and regard themselves, although with varying degrees of explicitness, as belonging to one group."—47, III, 536.

"Briefly stated, a social class is any comparatively permanent division in society which is differentiated by relatively persistent dissimilarities in rank and separated from other strata by social* distance. When a class system is well established, it has the following characteristics: an assumption of superiority and the appropriation of certain rights by a portion of a population; the acceptance of inferiority by another portion; standards of conduct recognizing the place or status of each class, and rationalizations* to explain and justify the existing arrangements."—55, 36-37.

"Class hardens into caste* when the jealous upper class resists or retards the admissions of commoners, however great their merit or wealth."—94, 341. See CASTE; STATUS; STRATIFICATION.

Class Consciousness. The awareness of sharing interests with other members of one's class.

"[Class consciousness suggests] not merely the submergence of the individual and the consequent solidarity of the group, but it signifies a mental mobilization and preparedness of the individual and of the group for collective* or corporate action."—89, 41.

"We think of class consciousness as a sentiment uniting a whole group who occupy a similar social status, but there is a more personal form of class sentiment* which frequently determines the conduct of individuals towards one another without involving on their part any express recognition of the whole groups to which they respectively belong."—75, 174. See RACE CONSCIOUSNESS; NATIONALISM.

Collective Action. See BEHAVIOR, COLLECTIVE.

Collective Behavior. See BEHAVIOR, COLLECTIVE.

Collective Psychology. The aspect of social* psychology which studies conditions and forms of collective behavior. See BEHAVIOR, COLLECTIVE.

Collective Representations. Concepts and material symbols that have

a common meaning and arouse similar emotional responses; symbols that embody and seem to make articulate the objectives of group activity.

"An easily recognizable object or act symbolizing common concepts, sentiments or ideals, producing similar overt reaction; for example, a flag, the cross or the crescent, the wedding ring, the singing of the national hymn."—86, 529.

"The vernacular is a bond uniting the members of the group, and a symbol of their common life, a 'collective representation' and a carrier of the sentiments* born of common experiences."—55, 119. See RITUAL; SYMBOL.

Collectivism. A general label for comprehensive schemes of authoritative control such as socialism*, communism*, syndicalism, bolshevism*, fascism, nazism, totalitarianism; and especially a name for the trend away from the extreme *laissez faire* of the nineteenth century.

Colonization. A type of population movement in which a company of people are transported from the mother country to an area politically subject to the home state, where they remain subject to the jurisdiction of the parent state. The colonist thinks of himself as a citizen of his native land.

Communication. The process of transmitting, sharing, or making common any experience; "the exchange or circulation of ideas among people."

". . . the mechanism through which human relations exist and develop—all the symbols* of the mind, together with the means of conveying them through space and preserving them in time. It includes the expression of the face, attitudes* and gesture*, the tones of the voice, words, writing, printing, railways, telegraphs, telephones, and whatever else may be the latest achievement in the conquest of space and time."—17, 61.

"Among the primary communicative processes of society* may be mentioned: language; gesture in its widest sense; the imitation* of behavior; and a large and ill-defined group of implicit processes which grow out of overt behavior and which may be vaguely referred to as 'social suggestion*.'"—94, 78.

"Through communication, different individuals come to have like

feelings and ideas—the *sine qua non* of common activities.”—45, 337-338.

Communism. The practice or the belief in the desirability of a system of social organization* in which there is social control* of economic life and in which there is social ownership of property. See SOCIALISM; BOLSHEVISM; COLLECTIVISM.

Communities. Geographically defined units within a larger society*, in which the common interests and activities embrace most of the social* relationships.

“A community may be defined as a permanent, local aggregation* of people, having diversified as well as common interests* and served by a constellation of institutions*.”—21, 27.

“The mark of a community is that one’s life may be lived wholly within it, that all one’s social relationships may be found within it . . . A community . . . is always a group* occupying a territorial area.”—75, 9.

“There is a difference between a society, in the sense of an association*, and a community . . . Natural associations are conditions for the existence of a community, but a community adds the function of communication in which emotions and ideas are shared as well as joint undertakings engaged in.”—28, 159.

“We . . . designate as a community any plural [group] which has a given minimum degree of geographic homogeneity and a given minimum degree and kinds of interaction*.”—74, 361.

“A social unit of a basic character made up of the people who function and reside in a given locality.”—123, 627.

“A group living in one locality or region under the same culture and having some common geographical focus for their major activities.”—125, 595. See NEIGHBORHOOD; SOCIETY. See also pages 214-215.

Community Disorganization. A decline in local group* unity resulting from an increased diversity of interests*. The concept is strictly relative; there is, perhaps, no case where all the social relations of all the members are within the local group, hence there is always some degree of disorganization*. When the outside interests and activities are numerous and important, the community is disorganized; when the interests and social relations come to be predominantly outside of the

geographic area, the community no longer exists. See **DISORGANIZATION, SOCIAL.**

Community Organization. The system of mutual accommodations* and interdependent activities that give geographically defined aggregations* the basic characteristics of a moral and social* order. As currently used in social work and practical reform programs, the term has a special connotation, the intentional organization of community facilities to meet practical problems.

"Community organization is a term that has recently come into common use to designate the various activities and programs of social reconstruction that are built around the community as a social and ecological* unit."—103, IV, 106.

Community, Plant. A term used to denote the competition* and cooperation* and the consequent spatial distribution of plants of different species within a particular area and their struggle for existence within that area.

"The members of a plant community live together in a relation of mutual interdependence which we call social probably because, while it is close and vital, it is not biological. It is not biological because the relation is a merely external one and the plants that compose it are not even of the same species . . . The members of the plant community adapt themselves to one another as all living things adapt themselves to their environment*, but there is no conflict* between them because they are not conscious."—89, 506.

Compartmentalization. The mental organization in which incompatible and inconsistent beliefs and impulses are held and given expression in some sort of temporal order.

Compensation. A form of the individual struggle for status* in which some attitude, habit, or behavior system is substituted for one of greater initial appeal but one in which the person is unable to excel.

"Making up in one trait or activity for a loss in another. Substitutive behavior where responses are built up around some new object or some new situation in order to offset some actual or imagined weakness or inefficiency."—125, 595.

Competition. The impersonal form of interaction*—universal and continuous in the world of living things—arising from the fact of

scarcity and resulting in ecological* organization. In the plant world it takes the form of a struggle for light, air, moisture, and nutrient materials; in the animal world it takes the form of the biological struggle for existence; in the human realm, in addition to the biological struggle for existence, there is the struggle for status* and position. But the competitive process must be conceived abstractly, apart from and independent of its various concrete expressions, but without reification. In the plant community, the process of competition may be observed in isolation from social processes.

“Of the four great types of interaction—competition, conflict*, accommodation*, and assimilation*—competition is the elementary, universal, and fundamental form. Social contact . . . initiates interaction. But competition, strictly speaking, is interaction without social contact. . . .

“Competition determines the distribution of populations territorially and vocationally. The division of labor and all the vast organized economic interdependence of individuals characteristic of modern life are a product of competition. On the other hand, the moral and political order, which imposes itself upon this competitive organization, is a product of conflict, accommodation and assimilation.”—89, 506-508.

“Both [competition and conflict] are processes of interaction, but in the case of the former the activities tend to go on in uncontrolled and impersonal ways and remain unconscious; whereas in the case of conflict the struggle between individuals, or groups of individuals, is personal and always conscious. The former does not depend upon contacts or communication, while the latter needs both. The former is continuous, while the latter is spasmodic and intermittent. Competition is entirely lacking in emotional content . . . When competition becomes a conscious process it passes over into the area of conflict.”—25, 432.

Competition, Economic. A specialized form of conflict*, the struggle for goods and services within a social* order and subject to political control*.

“A social process in which individuals and groups strive and endeavor to get what is scarce or limited. Merchants compete with each other for customers from whom they may profit.”—123, 628.

"The independent effort of two or more persons or groups to obtain the business patronage of a third person or group by offering more advantageous terms as an inducement to secure trade."—125, 596.

Complex, Culture. See CULTURE COMPLEX.

Complex, Mental. A system or constellation of impulses. A system of connected ideas, having a strong emotional tone and displaying a tendency to produce or influence conscious thought or action in a definite and predetermined direction, is called a complex.

Comprehension. A rational and deliberative process involving ideational responses, involving the ascertainment of meaning and cause, interpretation, judgment and the consequent understanding of an object, event, person, or situation.

Compromise. An agreement reached by mutual concession.

"Compromise is that mode of resolving conflict* in which all parties agree to renounce or to reduce some of their demands."—68, IV, 147.

Concepts. General ideas; generalizations abstracted from the percepts from which they are derived.

"A concept is not my concept; I hold it in common with other men, or, in any case, can communicate it to them. It is impossible for me to make a sensation pass from my consciousness into that of another; it holds closely to my organism and personality* and cannot be detached from them. All that I can do is to invite others to place themselves before the same object as myself and to leave themselves to its action. On the other hand, conversation and all intellectual communication between men is an exchange of concepts. The concept is an essentially impersonal representation; it is through it that human intelligences communicate."—34, 433-434. See COLLECTIVE REPRESENTATION.

Conditioned Response, Conditioned Reflex. A learned reaction to an originally indifferent stimulus, brought about by the coincident presentation of an indifferent and an adequate stimulus. If a gong be sounded at the moment that an animal is stimulated by food, it comes to be associated with food and thereafter the food responses of the animal may be aroused by the sound of the gong.

"Acquired uniform reaction to a given stimulus, occurring whenever the special stimulus reappears."—86, 531.

"Conditioned reflex, sometimes called conditioned response, is . . . the doctrinal keystone of a system of psychology known as behaviorism*. It designates acquired or learned reactions to stimuli as contrasted with innate or instinctive ones, which are correspondingly called unconditioned reflexes or responses."—59, IV, 175.

Conduct. Behavior* as evaluated in terms of the mores* or conventions*; also self-conscious and personal behavior.

"[Conduct is] the sort of behavior which may be regarded as distinctly and exclusively human, namely, that which is self-conscious and personal. In this sense blushing may be regarded as a form of conduct, quite as much as the manufacture of tools, trade and barter, conversation or prayer."—89, 191.

Configuration. A behavior* pattern; a sensory pattern; figure; *Gestalt**.

"Configuration is defined by the *Gestalt* psychologists as any organized whole in which each part influences every other and is in turn influenced by the other, so that the whole is greater than merely a sum of its parts."—M. J. Nelson, *Handbook of Educational Psychology*.

Conflict. A mutually destructive relationship of individuals or groups. It involves a clash of interests* or values and the effort of persons or groups to make one set prevail over another. The objective is the defeat, subjection, or annihilation of the opposing person or group. In contrast to competition*, which is continuous, unconscious, and impersonal, conflict is intermittent, conscious, and personal.

"As a form of interaction*, conflict is sociologically significant both from the point of view of personality* and from that of social organization*. It is at the base and origin of all conscious life; both self-consciousness and group consciousness are the result of conflict."—92, 311.

"Social conflict results from the conscious pursuit of exclusive values. In the widest sense of the word conflict is conscious competition, and competitors become self-conscious rivals, opponents or enemies."—68, IV, 194.

"It is only in periods of crisis, when men are making new and conscious efforts to control the conditions of their common life, that the forces with which they are competing get identified with persons,

and competition is converted into conflict."—89, 509. See **COMPETITION**; **STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE**.

Conflict Groups. See **GROUPS**, **CONFLICT**.

Conflict, Mental. The subjective aspect of group conflict*. The person who holds membership in conflicting groups, such as the religious and the scientific, is impelled toward divergent goals, is torn by incompatible motives. The term is also used with reference to the mental state of a person who is a member of a group but is unable to measure up to its ideals, or who is left behind in competition* with others, or finds the group standards in conflict with strong biological tendencies. Such frustration or failure may occur without mental conflict.

Conflict Mind-set. A state of mind conducive to continued hostility between individuals or groups.

Conflict of Values. The objective and impersonal aspect of conflict*. Certain abstract values, such as political democracy and totalitarianism, are incompatible and mutually exclusive.

Conformity. Behavior* according to pattern*.

"Conscious or unconscious acceptance of or acquiescence to the folkways*, mores*, and other usages."—85, 531.

Conscience. The consciousness on the part of the person that his behavior*, if known, would arouse the approval or disapproval of the members of his group. It is the personal aspect of the moral standards of the group.

Consciousness, Social. The process of interaction* and communication* and the deposits of the process—the traditions*, customs*, and other similarly objective aspects of social reality.

"If society is anything more than a collection of like-minded individuals, it is so because of the existence (1) of a social process and (2) of a body of tradition and opinion* . . . which has a relatively objective character and imposes itself upon the individual as a form of control, social control*. This process and its product are the social consciousness."—89, 39.

"The self-consciousness of nations, like that of individuals, arises as they become aware of others, similar yet different, with which to

compare themselves.”—19, 18. See RACE CONSCIOUSNESS; CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS.

Consensus. The fundamental form or aspect of group* unity. It is the kind of agreement that results from the discussion and conflict* of contending factions in social areas where there is freedom of belief and action. Three aspects of consensus are commonly recognized: *esprit de corps**, morale*, and collective* representation.

“The continuity* and life of a society* depend upon its success in transmitting from one generation to the next its folkways, mores, technique, and ideals. From the standpoint of collective behavior* these cultural traits may all be reduced to the one term ‘consensus.’ Society viewed abstractly is an organization of individuals; considered concretely it is a complex of organized habits*, sentiments*, and social* attitudes—in short, consensus.”—89, 163. See ESPRIT DE CORPS; MORALE; COLLECTIVE REPRESENTATION.

Conservatism. A love for and reverential attitude toward tradition* and authority*. In a social sense it is the disposition to support the existing manners, customs*, and institutions* regardless of what they may be.

Contact. A connection between things that has the character of an event or impact; a connection that is momentary or intermittent. Contacts are significant in the degree that they initiate interaction* and enduring relationship. Contact is the initial stage in social interaction, and the type of contact, whether primary* or secondary*, personal or impersonal, determines the nature of the interaction that can take place. The word is also widely used to conceptualize the relationships or areas of interaction that result from contacts.

“The coming into physical or mental relations of two or more individuals*, groups*, peoples, races*, nations, or cultures*.”—86, 532.

“A contact is simply a stimulation that has significance for the understanding of group behavior*.”—89, 329.

Contacts, Categorical. Contacts on the basis of group membership rather than on the basis of personal traits.

“As an outsider, the person is classed as belonging to a different group and he is treated not as an individual but as a representative of the out-group*. He is in a certain category, a representative of

another group, and as such he is treated prejudicially—that is, he is assumed to have the traits of character* and personality* assumed to define the group that he represents. He is seen not as a person but as a stereotype*.”—91, 241. See CONTACTS, SECONDARY.

Contacts, Primary. Personal, face-to-face, intimate contacts of personalities*.

“In primary association* individuals are in contact with each other at practically all points of their lives.”—89, 285. See CONTACTS, SYMPATHETIC.

Contacts, Secondary. The social contacts that involve only a part of the personality*, or a function of the person*, such as those between merchant and customer, or lawyer and client. They are variously characterized as abstract, categoric, fractional, impersonal. See CONTACTS, CATEGORIC.

Contacts, Social. The coming into relations of interaction* and communication*, or the initiation of relations between or among two or more persons*, groups*, or peoples.

“Social contact may be defined as the situation within which social interaction involving communication and the interchange of experience is operative.”—26, 205.

“. . . the coming together of human beings is truly social only when there is a mutual response, an inner adjustment* of behavior to the actions of others.”—106, 625.

“Contact refers to the connection between persons and groups; interaction refers to the mutual modification and reciprocal behavior responses that result. Interaction is initiated by contact, but the interaction itself is an independent process. In a sense, contact may be conceived of as the medium of interaction rather than as its primary phase.”—92, 234.

Contacts, Sympathetic. Those involving a degree of mutual understanding and personal appreciation; primary, in-group* contacts. An antonym of categoric contacts. See CONTACTS, PRIMARY.

Contagion, Social. The rapid transfer and intensification of emotional states.

“Social contagion refers to the relatively rapid, unwitting, and non-rational dissemination of a mood, impulse, or form of conduct; it is

well exemplified by the spread of crazes*, manias, and fads*."—4, 230. See SUGGESTION.

Continuity, Social. The persistence of the social heritage* in spite of a continuous modification of the culture* forms and in spite of the changing population and the succession of generations. It specifies the continuing unity of social organization* resulting from the fact that the culture forms of one period are modifications and developments of antecedent forms.

Control, Means of. The techniques and devices used to modify the behavior* of others.

"Those processes and instrumentalities whereby the conduct of individuals is brought into conformity with social standards."—52, 372.

"The use of coercion, force, restraint, suggestion*, or persuasion of one group over another, or of a group over its members, or of persons over others, to enforce the prescribed rules of the game."—125, 520.

Control, Social. The modifications in behavior* that result from the communication of meanings and the sharing of experience; "the modified forms of action caused in men by the presence of their fellows"; the immediate regulation of behavior by the sentiments* and standards derived from the social rules and behavior patterns of the group.

The concept of social control must not be confused with control, of which it is a single aspect. Control is the power or the exercise of power to direct, restrain, regulate, or otherwise dominate and govern the behavior of persons, things, or the course of events. Social control must not be confused with physical control, however exercised. It is equally an error to confuse social control with "controls" in general. Likewise, the control exercised by the institutional structures is not social; they are external conditions to which adjustments* must be made, not facts of the social personality*.

But the variety of beliefs*, myths*, mores*, customs*, folkways*, traditions*, attitudes*, ceremonials, creeds, dogmas, and the like, that are developed through the interactional process come within the concept, since they are integral parts of the mental organization of the person*. In his conformity to and observation of the requirements

of the heritage*, the person is controlled from within. All true social control is self-control.

"Social control signifies the social definition of the wishes* of the individual and their incorporation in the common attitudes* and objectives of the group."—25, 654.

"Social control is achieved through social interaction* and depends upon social contact*."—48, 587.

"The mores* are the folkways* considered under a particular aspect, as regulations of behavior*, not merely as ways of behaving. Every social usage is also in degree a social control."—74, 17.

"Although custom* and convention*, for instance, are powerful in conditioning the thought and conduct of man, society does not exercise through them the same kind of control as it does through education or the movement toward the abolition of war."—38, IV, 344-345.

Conventions. The generally observed forms of behavior* current in the social group*; also the rules defining proper and approved usage.

"A commonly accepted, relatively fixed, and inflexible rule or usage, ordinarily followed unthinkingly."—86, 532.

"Conventions are rules or standards of conduct or behavior prescribing what is to be done or not to be done by the members of a given group or community."—46, IV, 351.

"Convention prescribes those usages the basis of which is felt to be merely social agreement rather than any significant connection between the usage and the meaning attached to it."—75, 365.

"The folkways and the mores of a group are supported, generalized, and perpetuated by convention and the whole body of ceremony* and social ritual* that grow up and surround the continually recurring contingencies of life."—92, 157.

Conversion. A turning from one party*, sect*, or course of action, accompanied or preceded by a change in conviction or belief.

"[Conversion is] a change of allegiance, a denial and repudiation of former associations, doctrines, or ways of life, and an acceptance of new companions, creeds, or practices."—92, 340.

"Conversion is the sudden mutation of life attitudes through a reorganization or transformation of the wishes*."—89, 669.

"Conversion is a rapid, abrupt overturning of one's whole life or

ganization, a turning of one's back unreservedly upon a culture* long cherished."—25, 446.

Co-operation. A variant form of competition* in which two or more individuals* work in mutual helpfulness.

"A social process in which persons* aid each other and work together for common or mutual ends."—123, 628.

"Joint action or working together for a common object or end; mutual aid."—125, 596.

"A form of social action in which individuals and groups work or act together to achieve common objectives."—86, 533. See ASSOCIATION; COMPETITION; CONFLICT; SOCIAL ORGANIZATION.

Corporate Action. The acting together of individuals as though they were parts of a single organism. See CO-OPERATION; COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR.

Craze. An intensified fad* or fashion* movement, "frequently motivated by interests* other than those of novelty and diversion," by the desire for economic gain.

"The more superficial aspects of fashion change are often referred to as 'crazes' or 'fads.' A fad is usually confined to minor details of dress and ornamentation. We find a stimulation, a vividness, and an excitement in the craze which makes it extremely appealing. Crazes in fashion are really types of mental epidemics, and are open to the same interpretation."—126, 555.

Crime. The commission of an act forbidden "under penalty of a state-imposed punishment."

Criminology. See page 219.

Crisis. A situation created by any occurrence which interrupts the run of habit* and interferes with customary activities, and hence demands attention and gives rise to new definitions and procedures.

"Any change in cultural pattern constitutes a crisis, that is, a difficult and novel situation around which the individual* and the group* have to develop new habits."—106, 660.

"Of course a crisis may be so serious as to kill the organism or destroy the group, or it may result in failure or deterioration. But crisis . . . is not to be regarded as habitually violent. It is simply a

disturbance of habit, and it may be no more than an incident, a stimulation, a suggestion*.”—109, 18.

Crowd. An aggregation* of human individuals* among whom a condition of mental isolation* and *rapport** has been established and the attention of whose members is focused on some collective* representation. It is a spontaneous and temporary grouping; it forms in response to a given situation, it melts away as the situation changes.

“A crowd in the ordinary sense of the term is any chance collection of individuals. Such a collectivity becomes a crowd in the sociological sense only when a condition of *rapport* has been established among the individuals who compose it.”—89, 893.

“A crowd is a large or small aggregate of human beings held together by some common though transient bond, desire, or emotion, without organization or organizational aim, ordinarily without past history, and usually acting nonrationally.”—86, 533.

“The crowd proper we distinguish as a physically compact aggregation of human beings brought into direct, temporary, and unorganized contact, one with another.”—75, 187. See AGGREGATION; GROUP.

Cultural Change. See CHANGE.

Cultural Heritage. See HERITAGE, SOCIAL.

Cultural Lag. The doctrine that holds that the material aspects of culture* change with relative ease and rapidity as compared with the ease and rate of change in the nonmaterial aspects, thereby giving rise to various social and institutional maladjustments*.

“Where one part of culture changes first, through some discovery or invention, and occasions changes in some part of the culture dependent upon it, there frequently is a delay in the changes occasioned in the dependent part of culture. The extent of this lag will vary according to the nature of the cultural material.”—84, 201.

Culture. The mode of life of a people. All that belongs to man which is socially rather than biologically transmitted; the totality of the social heritages* viewed as an organized body of achievement. Division is often made into the body of artifacts and the system of customs*.

‘That complex whole which includes knowledge, belief*, art,

morals*, law, custom*, and other capabilities and habits* acquired by man as a member of society.”—109, I, 1.

“The word ‘culture’ properly includes, as does the term ‘social heritage,’ both the material culture and also such parts of culture as knowledge, belief, morals, law, and custom.”—84, 4.

“Culture contains the following essential elements: (1) It is man-made, as distinct from creations of nature, unmodified by the hand of man. (2) It includes the products of mind which are intangible and nonmaterial as well as those material forms which are made by his hands. (3) It is preservable and accumulative, and increases in complexity and quality through the building up of new accretions. (4) It is psychically transmissible; from person to person, from group to group; and from generation to generation.”—37, 339. See CIVILIZATION; SOCIETY; SOCIAL ORDER; SOCIAL HERITAGE.

Culture Accumulation. The process of culture* growth through the addition of new practices, concepts, tools, skills, or other items, to the previously existing social heritage*.

“This cumulative aspect is due to two features of the cultural process: one is the persistence of cultural forms and the other is the addition of new forms.”—84, 74-75.

Culture Area. A geographical region in which relatively homogeneous cultural patterns prevail.

“A culture* area is a geographic region within which is to be found distributed a number of culture traits sufficiently distinctive to mark off the area from other culture areas. In the absence of pronounced topographical barriers, culture areas overlap, leaving marginal areas where the major type of culture is indistinct.”—25, 567.

“A regional, continental, or intercontinental territory over which the inhabitants have many similar culture* traits.”—123, 628.

“A geographical unit, not necessarily having definite boundaries, within which relatively homogeneous culture* patterns prevail, which are sufficiently unique to mark the area off from other areas.”—86, 535.

“In brief, the culture area is a classification of coexistential cultural data according to their objective and psychological resemblances and in terms of their regional distributions.”—101, 114.

Culture Center. The area in which a culture* complex is found in its most characteristic and least corrupted form.

"That locality where a culture complex originates, where it exists in its original, least modified, most developed and intensive forms, and out of which the complex radiates its influence."—86, 535.

"In tracing cultural distribution, we find in its spread a center where the culture complex is strongest and where the traits persist in most typical form. This center is the nucleus of the culture from which it permeates the surrounding area."—49, 138.

Culture Complex. A group of interrelated and interdependent culture* traits that functions as a unit.

"It has been discovered, however, that traits are as a rule joined to each other in larger systems which are now called culture complexes."—57, 290.

"If, for example, we observe the use of snowshoes and record that as a culture trait, we must still seek the methods for their use, how they are made, social etiquette concerning them, beliefs and artistic emotions associated with them, property [rights] in [them], etc. The snowshoe thus stands for a complex of beliefs, techniques, and procedures that must, to some extent, be considered a unit . . . It is this working of culture traits that has led to the use of the term 'complex.'"—122, 343.

"A cluster of culture* traits which are associated together in a functional way . . . The rice complex, the kava complex, and the baseball complex."—123, 628.

Culture Conflict. The term is a reification of the incompatibility of values. As commonly used, it refers to the group conflict that frequently results when peoples with differing heritages* come together, and to the internal and moral conflicts that result from divided loyalties. See **GROUP CONFLICT**; **MARGINAL MAN**.

Culture Contact. The introduction of culture* traits or groups of traits into a strange context, and the resulting competition for survival or supremacy. The term is sometimes used loosely to refer to the contact* of peoples possessing different cultures, that is, to group contact.

"The process of culture contact proceeds slowly and imperceptibly, arises from the impingement of culture minorities and never from

whole cultures, may produce harmonious or conflictive reactions, and always results in some measure of culture cross-fertilization, intensification, advance, and refinement."—86, 536.

"It is now generally admitted that the most important element in cultural progress is the contact of many cultures, while nothing breeds stagnation like isolation. Hence an environment* which invites contact and provides easy access to and from other districts will promote psychic plasticity and cultural advancement, while one which produces isolation* must of necessity lead to psychic stagnation and repetition."—107, 7.

Culture Cross-Fertilization. The stimulation of cultural development resulting from "borrowing" and the incidental introduction of foreign traits in the relations of peoples.

Culture Diffusion. The spread or extension of culture, usually the spread of units of culture, or culture* traits. It is generally a slow and gradual process.

"Diffusion is obviously allied to tradition* in that both pass culture material on from one group to another. Tradition refers to the transmission of cultural content from one generation to another; diffusion, from one population to another."—64, V, 140.

"According to current anthropological theory, the presence of a culture trait in a given group may be accounted for as a result either of diffusion or invention*. Since most culture traits have been invented but once, the great majority of the culture traits of any group have come to that group through borrowing, that is, through diffusion."—WILLARD WALLER.

"The transference of culture traits from one area to another or from one part of culture to another part is called diffusion."—85, 781.

Culture Pattern. A group of closely interrelated culture* traits forming a distinctive working unit, such as the American Congressional system. Universal culture patterns of family life, religious practices, and control machinery are found among all peoples.

"On the surface, in public, and for popular consumption, there are explicitly agreed-upon policies that are incorporated in the rules of the party organization, expressed in its platform, and announced through the press. These are the manifest pattern of the political institution."—14, 21.

"Separate units or traits of culture organized into some more or less constant form or configuration*."—125, 596.

"The broad forms, shapes, or configurations which a culture represents, such as aggressive or nonaggressive, simple or complex, democratic or non-democratic, and individualistic or co-operative."—123, 628. See CULTURE COMPLEX; CULTURE TRAITS.

Culture Traits. Single units or elements of a culture* pattern.

"The smallest functional unit of culture as represented by a pencil, a knife, a hat, a word, an idea, an automobile, and a comic story. Culture traits are the units which make up culture* complexes and culture patterns."—123, 628. See CULTURE COMPLEX; CULTURE PATTERN.

Custom. The way of acting in defined situations that is of relatively long duration and is generally observed without deliberation.

"The word custom is used to apply to the totality of behavior* patterns which are carried by tradition and lodged in the group, as contrasted with the more random personal activities of the individual."—94, IV, 658.

"Custom regulates the whole of man's action—his bathing, washing, cutting his hair, eating, drinking, and fasting. From his cradle to his grave he is the slave of ancient usage."—105, 4.

"Traditional custom . . . is a mass of detailed behavior more astonishing than what any one person can ever evolve in individual action . . . Yet that is a rather trivial aspect of the matter. The fact of first-rate importance is the predominant role that custom plays in experience and in belief*, and the very great varieties it may manifest."—1, 2. See FOLKWAYS; HABITS; MORES; TRADITION.

Dance, The. A rhythmic and patterned succession of movements. It is, in general, expressive behavior*. On the one hand, it is a spontaneous expression of emotional excitement and a form of celebration; on the other hand, it is a means of generating, intensifying, and communicating excitement, hence widely used by certain religious and orgiastic groups.

"The purest and most typical expression of simple feeling is that which consists of random movements. When these motions assume, as they do easily, the character of a fixed sequence in time, that is to

say when they are rhythmical, they can be and inevitably are, as by a sort of inner compulsion, imitated by the onlookers."—89, 870.

Definition of the Situation. The determination of the appropriate behavior* in a given set of circumstances. In most areas of life, ready-made definitions exist in the conventions*, folkways*, mores*, taboos*, laws, collective* representations, and other rules and practices of the group.

"The assignment of meaning to an act or any other value may be said to define, or be a definition of, the situation."—55, 584.

"Definition of the situation . . . is the process in which the individual* explores the behavior possibilities of a situation, marking out particularly the limitations which the situation imposes upon his behavior, with the final result that the individual forms an attitude . . . in the situation."—111, 292.

Demography. The quantitative study of the vital processes and movement of human population, based upon census and registration data.

Demoralization, Personal. The disruption or loss of the familiar system of values, concepts, or working definitions that leaves the person without adequate guides to action and results in more or less random, erratic, and contradictory behavior. It must not be confused with delinquency with which it has no necessary or common association. See DISORGANIZATION, PERSONAL.

Denominations. See ACCOMMODATION GROUPS.

Dereism, Dereistic Thinking. Day dreaming. "Absorption in phantasy* to the exclusion of interest in external reality." See AUTISTIC THINKING.

Desires. See WISHES.

Determinism. The doctrine that the acts of human beings are caused by factors outside the person*; that there is no free will. Also, the doctrine that social reality is to be explained in terms of responses to environment*. Among the forms of the latter doctrine are physical determination, which explains social phenomena in terms of categories of physics; geographic determinism, which explains the character of culture and social* life in terms of climate, rainfall, soil,

or other geographic facts; biological determinism, which holds cultural differences among groups to be expressions of innate factors; and psychological determinism, which explains social reality in terms of innate tendencies, instincts*, libido, or other unconditioned response, or in terms of the conditioned* responses. Economic determinism and cultural determinism are other forms of particularistic doctrines.

“When the social phenomenon is thought of as purely a response; in other words, when the environmental change is regarded as prior, not itself dependent on changing human purposes, inevitably followed therefore by the particular response, we have the deterministic or, as it is often called, the materialistic explanation of social* change.”—75, 444.

Dialects. A variant form of speech actually in use in a community as the customary mode of communication*.

“By preference the term is restricted to a form of speech which does not differ sufficiently from another form of speech to be unintelligible to the speakers of the latter.”—95, V, 123.

Diffusion. See CULTURE DIFFUSION.

Discourse, Universe of. See UNIVERSE OF DISCOURSE.

Discussion. A means of resolving differences and arriving at consensus* on the matters at issue through an orderly procedure of oral exchange.

Disintegration, Social. The final stage of social disorganization* in which there is complete collapse of social reorganization and group unity and a disappearance of the group.

Disorganization. The process of disarranging or destroying the organic structure or regular system; also the state or condition of a system in a state of disorder.

“Disorganization implies a disintegration or breakup of certain habits* and attitudes* as a preparation for the organization of new habits and attitudes.”—65, 387.

“The state or process of disintegration or breakdown of culture* patterns or of individual habits, ideas, and attitudes when measured against a norm of culture or behavior.”—125, 596.

Disorganization, Personal. The disintegration of the personal life organization; usually a concomitant of social disorganization.

“. . . a decrease of the individual's ability to organize his whole life for the efficient, progressive, and continuous realization of his fundamental interests.”—108, II, 1128-1129.

“Personal disorganization does not always involve a direct conflict* between the wishes of the person and the codes of society. The mal-adjusted person more often suffers an inner conflict between competing impulses of his own. The demands of society are not clear and uniform. Social groups vie with each other to impose themselves upon the person. Loyalty to one means treason to another. The person is forced to choose between his own social values. Personal disorganization due to such lack of accommodation* between groups is but the personal aspect of social disorder. The conflict is transferred from the social arena to the inner consciousness of the individual.”—25, 759.

Disorganization, Social. The relative decline of order* and discipline, of unity and rationality, and of integration* that renders the social mechanism inadequate to the effective patterning of collective behavior.

“Social change* in which there is an abrupt break in existing working relations or a decline in the rules of behavior is known as social disorganization.”—55, 435.

“These points must be kept in mind if we are to understand the question of social disorganization. We can define the latter briefly as a decrease of the influence of existing social rules of behavior* upon individual* members of the group*. This decrease may present innumerable degrees, ranging from a single break of some particular rule by one individual up to a general decay of all the institutions* of the group.

“Disorganization of the family as a primary group* is thus an unavoidable consequence of modern civilization*.”—108, II, 1128, 1167-1168.

“Social disorganization refers to the breakdown of the societal order to such an extent that the former controls* are dissipated, the former close correlation of personality* and culture* is destroyed,

and a certain chaos or disorder arises in which the old ways of doing have been lost and new ways not yet developed."—124, 54.

Displacement. An ecological* term. The exclusion, without political conquest, of a weaker group from its habitat and the occupation of the vacated territory by the stronger group.

Displacement is also widely used in psychological literature. The term was coined by Freud, and refers to a psychological mechanism by which one idea surrenders its emotional charge to another idea.

"Displacement is a function primarily of the superior material culture and superior fecundity of the displacing group. In displacement*, biological and cultural factors are dominant and political aspects are minor or secondary."—78, IV, 205. See SUCCESSION.

Dissociation. A concept of abnormal psychology. A special type of personality disorganization* in which certain memory constellations are rendered inaccessible to consciousness, thus resulting in a dual or multiple personality*.

Distance, Social. See SOCIAL DISTANCE.

Division of Labor. The differentiation and distribution of the varied functions and activities of society among individuals*, sexes, groups*, agencies, and institutions*.—117, 761. See SPECIALIZATION.

Dogma. An authoritatively promulgated doctrine that claims ultimate truth. In theology, dogma refers to the theory authoritatively defined and enforced by the sect* as immutable, universal, and eternally valid. In science and philosophy, dogmas are in the nature of axioms or hypotheses.

"A settled personal conviction which is held in common by the members of the group."—25, 121.

Domestication. A process of biological selection in the course of which the original nature of a species is so changed as to adapt it to a special mode of life. The dog is an animal form gradually evolved from some wolflike ancestor through long generations of biological selection. It is a specific form of adaptation*, and must be clearly differentiated from taming, which is a social process.

"Man may be thought of as domesticated through social selection."—89, 165. See ADAPTATION.

Dominance. An ecological* term to specify the controlling power of the city or other strategic center over outlying and marginal areas.

Domination. The subjection and control of other individuals* or groups* and the direction of their activities to ends not of their choosing.

"The process by which individuals, groups, associations*, or institutions* consciously or unconsciously subject other individuals, groups, associations, or institutions to their own will or interests; also the condition or state resulting from the process."—86, 540.

Dream Interpretation. The doctrine and technique of psychoanalysis* which undertakes to reveal the hidden meaning that is assumed to exist in dreams.

Duel. A combat with weapons by agreement between two persons to secure satisfaction for personal grievances and usually in accordance with set regulations and in the presence of witnesses.

"The duel reached a more elaborate stage of development than perhaps any other form of personal combat. It was in part a form of sport and as such limited in its use to the aristocracy and upper classes. It was evolved as a refined and orderly substitute for personal brawls and came to be the conventional and socially sanctioned means for the redress of certain grievances among the upper classes. For conducting this type of personal encounter, very definite rules of procedure were elaborated; the code was not only elaborate but punctiliously observed."—92, 300-301.

Ecesis. An ecological* term for that aspect of the process of invasion which describes the adjustment* of a migrating plant to a new habitat.

Ecology, Human. The division of sociology that studies the special distribution of human beings and culture* forms as determined by the impersonal competitive struggle arising from the fact of relative scarcity.

"The scientific study of the distribution of human life and social forms in space and time and of the forces determining this distribution is called human ecology*."—21, 231. See pages 29 and 185.

Ecological. See ECOLOGY, HUMAN.

Economic Crises. See CRISIS.

Economic Man. The abstraction of self-interest from the complex of factors determining human behavior. When reified in popular thought, the economic man is an imaginary being who always behaves in accordance with his economic interest*.

Economic Process. The process by which prices are fixed and the exchange of values effected. To be conceived as an abstraction from the concrete procedures of production and distribution of goods.

Educational Sociology. See page 217.

Element. The unit of analysis in explaining interaction* from the point of view of a given discipline, such as the atom of chemistry or the cell of biology. The element is consistent in behavior* and irreducible for the science employing it.

“For sociology in general, social attitudes* are the elements because they are the simplest communicable units of social behavior*.”—26, 252.

Emulation. The conscious effort to equal or excel another or others. Emulation* differs from rivalry* in that its goal must always be socially approved. Sometimes this is true of rivalry but not always. Rivalry in attaining grace or virtue is emulation. See RIVALRY.

Endocrine Glands. The glands of internal secretion, such as the adrenal, thyroid, thymus, and pituitary.

Environment. The conditions and influences external to the person*, group*, or other entity that affect its life and development.

“[The geographic environment] consists of land, water, natural resources, atmosphere, and climate. It is sometimes used to include flora and fauna.”—123, 629.

Environmentalism. In a fundamental sociological sense, the objects toward which the organism pays attention and reacts. It is conceived as functional to the structure of the organic form. Also used as the equivalent of environmental determinism.

“Environmentalism is the tendency to stress the importance of physical, biological, psychological, or cultural environment as a factor influencing the structure or behavior of animals, including man.”—111, V, 561.

Epidemics, Social. A term to designate extreme and spectacular forms

of social unrest* in which social contagion* is an important factor. Giggling and laughing frequently, and sometimes weeping, fainting, biting, and more extreme forms of behavior sweep through a group. Land booms, financial bubbles, fear manias, witchcraft, and the like are historically familiar examples of social epidemics.

Esprit de Corps. An aspect of consensus*, the state of we-feeling marked by intense enthusiasm or ecstasy, such as the ecstasy of religious ceremonial, the enthusiasm of spectators of an athletic contest, or the ebullient fellowship of the members of a fraternal order.

"*Esprit de corps* might be thought of as the organizing of feelings on behalf of the movement. In itself, it is the sense which people have of belonging together and of being identified with one another in a common undertaking."—4, 262.

Ethnocentrism. The attitude* where one's own race* or society* is the central criterion for evaluating other groups* or cultures*.

"Ethnocentrism, as ordinarily used, is the emotional attitude which places high value on one's own customs* and traditions* and belittles all others, rating as least valuable those who differ most."—40, 13.

"Ethnocentrism is the technical name for this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled with reference to it . . . Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities, and looks with contempt on outsiders."—105, 13.

Ethnology. See ANTHROPOLOGY.

Eugenics. A social reform* program designed to improve the quality of the population by retarding the birth rate of the "inferior" individuals and classes and by stimulating the birth rate of the "superior" individuals and classes. It is a conscious effort at further human domestication*.

"Activities of individuals and groups in behalf of a better or improved biological inheritance."—123, 629. See DOMESTICATION; REFORM. See also pages 191-194.

Evolution, Social. A theory of social* change that conceives of the development of society* or culture* as one phase of universal evolution*. See SOCIAL CHANGE; PROGRESS.

Experience. The living through or participation in any incident or occurrence.

Extraversion. The directing of one's interests exclusively or mainly to the external world. See **INTROVERSION**.

Extravert. An individual whose attention is directed mainly outward: one who lives "outside his head"; as contrasted to the introvert whose attention is directed mainly inward: one who lives "inside his head." The successful salesman is typically an extravert; the poet more commonly tends to be an introvert. See **INTROVERT**.

Fads. Exaggerated forms of behavior* of local incidence and relatively brief duration. They differ from fashion* in that they always have "something unexpected, irresponsible, or bizarre" about them. See **FASHION**; **CRAZE**.

Family. The social institution* developed around the child-mother relationship.

" . . . and since the family is the first group in which the individual finds himself, it is not surprising that the core of human nature should develop in the family circle. Nor is it any more surprising that, having had his nature so indelibly molded in the family, the individual should find that type of relation an almost indispensable phase of his entire life. Thus the family performs the dual function of providing a milieu in which human nature may be developed and in which many of the impulses of human nature may be realized."—80, 41-42. See **MARRIAGE**. See also pages 211-213.

Fashion. A contemporary variation of customary practice which derives its compelling power from the fact of its present acceptance.

"A particular fashion differs from a given taste in suggesting some measure of compulsion on the part of the group, as contrasted with individual choice from among a number of possibilities."—95, 139-140.

"An action, thought, or object which has been recently accepted within a society. A fashion is something new which is approved, as, for example, a fashionable hat."—123, 629.

Feeble-mindedness. The level of mentality that falls below what is accepted as normal.

Feelings. Pleasant or unpleasant tonal qualities associated with particular states of the organism.

Feral Men. Literally, wild men. The sociological reference is to the fact that individuals deprived of human associates lose or never develop a human nature.

Feud. A type of warfare between factions within and under the immediate jurisdiction of an inclusive group. The long-continued enmity and strife between families in Southern mountain areas, and the bloody struggles of criminal gangs are cases in point.

"Feuds are relations of mutual animosity among intimate groups in which a resort to violence is anticipated on both sides."—68, VI, 220.

Flock. A natural assemblage of gregarious animals characterized by more or less standard formations and patterns* of behavior*, which are typically loose and fluctuating but always centered about a leader. The term is applied particularly to sheep and goats and to birds. It frequently implies guidance and protection, as when used in the familiar expression, "a pastor and his flock."

Folk. The simpler, uneducated, and less sophisticated members of a population*, the masses of a population who by sheer weight of numbers determine the character of the group and preserve and perpetuate its culture* traits; also a tribe or group of kindred people.

Folklore. The survivals in modern society of archaic belief*, customs*, and traditions*; also, the study of such survivals.

Folk Psychology. The psychology of folk*, or primitive peoples.

Folkways. Customs*; the ways of the folk; the ways of doing things current in a particular group*. They are simply habits of action common to the members of the group that are in a measure standardized and have some degree of traditional sanction for their persistence. The handshake as a form of greeting; eating three meals a day, the manner of dress, the forms of courtship are familiar examples of folk practice.

"At their simplest and most primitive level [patterns* of adjustment*] appear as folkways—the spontaneous, unpremeditated, com-

mon ways of acting which men adopt in life situations in response to life needs."—21, 89.

"The operation by which folkways are produced consists in the frequent repetition of petty acts, often by great numbers acting in concert or, at least, acting in the same way when face to face with the same need."—105, 3.

"Culturalized habits common to a group or community. Includes both moral and nonmoral habits. Often used as a synonym for culture*."—125, 597.

"Modes of behavior or action that, arising out of life conditions, compulsions, and experience, have become repetitive and more or less compulsory, and usually carry the connotation of propriety."—86, 543.

"The forms of action which are common to peoples and societies. When broadly conceived, the folkways include the mores."—123, 629. See CUSTOMS; MORES; FORCES, SOCIAL.

Forces, Social. The factors involved in a social process; elements that initiate and direct social phenomena. As commonly conceived, they include attitudes*, appetites, wishes*, desires, motives, tendencies, habits*, or other items that are assumed to underlie the patterned forms of conduct or to move men to action. Racial prejudice, the love of country, propaganda, scientific research, and so on, are social forces.

"Social forces may be defined as those factors arising in the human environment* as a product of social* interaction which motivate human conduct or move the individual to action."—48, 65. See DESIRES; ATTITUDES; CUSTOMS; FOLKWAYS.

Formalism. The strict adherence to prescribed forms that have ceased to have vitality or meaning. It is found most extensively in the church and in the law, where precedent is commonly placed above function.

"Too much mechanism in society gives us something for which there are many names, slightly different in meaning, as institutionalism, formalism, traditionalism, conventionalism, ritualism, bureaucracy, and the like. It is by no means easy, however, to determine whether mechanism is in excess or not. It becomes an evil, no doubt, when it interferes with growth and adaptation*, when it suppresses

individuality and stupefies or misdirects the energies of human nature."—17, 342. See CONVENTIONS; CEREMONY; RITUAL.

Fundamentalism. A militant conservative movement in the Protestant churches of the United States characterized by five fundamental dogmas—the Virgin Birth; the actual, physical resurrection; the inerrancy of the Scriptures; the substitutional theory of atonement; and the imminent, physical second Coming of Jesus Christ—and by aggressive efforts to impose the creed upon the churches and upon the public and denominational schools of the country.

Gambling. Participating in games where there is deliberate staking of valuable considerations upon future events which are presumed to depend upon chance.

Gang, The. A more or less spontaneous conflict* group of simple organization and local extent. It is often a permanent form of the mob*.

"Such a group is generally highly localized, often with a definite rendezvous; it has a real though not always recognized leader; it has a restricted and sometimes secret membership; often it develops a body of tradition* and of custom* and ritual*; and in other ways it develops a degree of unity, solidarity, and relative permanence."—93, 310-311. See CONFLICT GROUP; PARTY; MOB.

Genius. A person whose mental or moral capacity or achievements are of extraordinarily high quality.

Geographic Determinism. See DETERMINISM.

Geographic Environment. See ENVIRONMENT.

Gestalt Psychology. The school of psychology which rests its interpretations upon the presence in experience of certain patterns, configurations*, or *Gestalten*. The school holds that these patterns of behavior, biological structure, etc., are the units of observation and study; to analyze them into simpler elements is to destroy the most important aspects of the phenomena.

Gesture. Any motion of the body or its parts expressive of some idea or emotion. It is socially important since it is the beginning of the social act*, the stimuli for the responses of other persons. Particularly significant for human interaction are vocal gestures, since these stimu-

late, simultaneously and equally, the person who performs the gesture and the auditor. For this reason Mead spoke of language as "the significant gesture."

Government. A system of control* that has achieved a definite institutional organization and functions through legislation enforced by definite penalties.

"It can easily be seen that, in the development and control of social institutions* and forces, the key institution is that of . . . government."—83, 380.

Gregariousness. The disposition to live in aggregations* and to move in masses*. Certain schools of thought have posited a specific instinct of gregariousness to account for the observed fact of group life. The concept has no importance in modern sociological thought.

Group, The. A neutral generic term that comprehends all forms of associations* and aggregations*.

". . . any collection of social beings who enter into distinctive social* relationships with one another . . . A group, as we understand it, involves reciprocity between its members."—75, 13.

"The group is not a mere name for separate individuals but is thought of as a reality, an aggregation, united in a set of relations which can be defined and studied."—40, 97.

"The term group is used in a generic sense to state the fact of association without implication as to the nature of the relationship obtaining among the associated units. It implies nothing as to the size, form, permanence, or cohesive principle. It is any number of people with such relations between or among them as to make it possible to think of them as a whole."—92, 126.

"The term 'group' serves as a convenient sociological designation for any number of people, larger or smaller, between whom such relations are discovered that they must be thought of together."—100, 495. See AGGREGATIONS; CROWD; SOCIETY.

Groups, Accommodation. The divisions of a society* in which a relatively stable equilibrium has been achieved, usually by the imposition of one primary group* upon another. A fivefold classification includes clubs, social classes and vocational groups, castes*, denominations, and nations. They stand in contrast to conflict* groups which

represent the area of unstable equilibrium in a society. See DENOMINATIONS; SOCIAL GROUP; CASTE.

Groups, Conflict. Groups in conflict with other groups or their members, or groups organized for such conflict. Gangs*, parties*, sects*, are conflict groups; an army or a nation is a conflict group in times of war. The conflict group is an illustration of the principle that the outer relations of a group determine its inner structure.

"Other groups, as gangs, parties, and sects, exist more or less definitely as fighting organizations. Conflict is their normal or chief function. They are more or less continually in warfare with other groups or with the inclusive social community."—92, 310.

Groups, Primary. A concept in general use to designate relatively small, intimate, face-to-face groupings with some feeling of unity and mutual understanding. These groupings include family*, language*, and local or neighborhood groups.

"The simplest, the first, the most universal of all forms of association is that in which a small number of persons meet 'face-to-face' for companionship, mutual aid, the discussion of some question that concerns them all, or the discovery and execution of some common policy. The face-to-face group is the nucleus of all organization, remaining, in a modified form, within the most complex systems. It is, as it were, the unit of all the social structure. It is the group which, in the form of the family, initiates us into the secrets of society*. It is the group through which, as comrades and playmates, we first give creative expression to our social impulses. It is the breeding ground of our mores*, the nurse of our loyalties. It is the first and always remains the chief form of our social satisfactions. It is the group in which we really can reveal our social nature."—75, 236-237.

"Primary groups are characterized by intimate face-to-face contacts, while secondary groups consist of persons in social relations but not in face-to-face contact."—127, 48.

"By primary groups, I mean those characterized by intimate, face-to-face association* and co-operation*. They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for many purposes at least, is the

common life and purpose of the group. Perhaps the simplest way of describing this wholeness is by saying that it is a 'we'; it involves a sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which 'we' is the natural expression. One lives in the feeling of the whole, and finds the chief aims of his will in that feeling."—17, 23.

"This later concept, primary groups, is in general use to designate those *intimate, face-to-face* aggregations* with a more or less distinct feeling of unity, such as the family*, the neighborhood*, and the play* group of children."—92, 246. See IN-GROUP; CONTACTS, PRIMARY; CONTACTS, SYMPATHETIC.

Groups, Secondary. Associations* on the basis of conscious common interests, not necessarily dependent on face-to-face contacts, involving only a segment of the personality* of each member, such as professional societies and business organizations. In contrast to the intimacy of primary groups, relations among the members of secondary groups are formal, abstract, and segmental.

"A group or association founded on conscious common interests, not necessarily dependent on face-to-face relations."—125, 599.

"A nonintimate group in which the relations may be either face-to-face or indirect. Examples are: church groups, office groups, committees, discussion groups."—123, 630. See OUT-GROUP; CONTACTS, CATEGORIC; CONTACTS, SECONDARY.

Groups, Social. Areas of social* interaction. The term asserts communication* and hence some sharing of experience. In a concrete sense, they are larger or smaller numbers of persons bound together in significant functional relations.

All human groups are social groups. The term social is sometimes used in connection with the group to emphasize the fact of communication or interaction among the members and thereby to distinguish it sharply from an aggregation, where the only relation specified is that of physical proximity, and from a category, which is a division in classification. See GROUPS; SOCIETY; INTERACTION; CONTACTS, SOCIAL.

Habits. Acquired tendencies to act in specific ways; learned responses that have become, in a measure, automatic and care for certain adjustments* with a minimum of conscious attention and emotional strain.

"Habit is recurrent behavior* not determined by heredity*. This definition involves difficulties which are inherent in the concept itself. Organisms are never free from environmental influences, so that all conduct is a product of both inheritance and learning. Such considerations force a recognition of the relativity of the distinction between instinct* and habit; habit is merely the relatively stereotyped aspect of conduct which bears relatively obvious imprints of the individual's life history."—81, VII, 236.

"Habits, in their totality, make up the character of the individual; that is, they are the individual, as he appears to other people."—33, 3. See ATTITUDES; CUSTOMS; FOLKWAYS; CHARACTER.

Headship. A position of power, as distinct from the individual in the position of power. The individual may inherit the position, be chosen for it, or fill it by virtue of some system of promotion on the scale of authority*.

Herd, Human. A herd is a number of cattle or other large animals assembled together. Strictly speaking, there is no human herd. The term is sometimes used to suggest by analogy certain similarities between the herd and the mass*, particularly similarities in behavior* in times of stress. At other times the term is used as an epithet signifying the common people—the "crowd," the "rabble." See MILLING.

Heredity. The transmission of organic traits or characters from parents to offspring through the biological mechanisms. In a loose popular usage, which must be avoided in careful thought, it refers to the fact of family resemblance—to the fact that closely related individuals, on the average, show more points of resemblance than do individuals more distantly related.

Heritage, Social. Culture* viewed from the point of view of its transmission; the achievements, the artifacts, and the mental organization resulting from and underlying them that are socially transmitted.

"That part of the culture total which is transmitted to us from the past we are accustomed to speak of as the social heritage."—37, 360.

"This heritage is social and is common in general to all the children born into a particular group. It is also called social heritage because it is the product of human society*, the results of many so-

cial achievements during the ages that man has been on the earth."—84, 3.

Historical Continuity. The continuity of culture* forms, such as the language, the religious complex, the form of economic exploitation, and other items of the heritage*, through a series of generations and in spite of population changes. The fact that members of the United States Senate serve for six-year terms while one-third of the membership is elected each two years, gives a historical continuity to the Senate that dates from its beginning.

Historical Fact. A fact or event with a definite location and date, such as the battle of Waterloo, the death of Washington, the Declaration of Independence. It stands sharply contrasted to scientific facts, such as human nature, organic evolution, or the boiling point of water, which are general and timeless things.

History. The succession of events through which anything passes; the study that undertakes to reconstruct and give a realistic picture of the past in all its variety and individuality.

"A fundamental distinction between the subject matter of history and the subject matter of sociology is that history deals primarily with the unique events peculiar to a particular time and place while sociology is concerned with general events of human nature and society irrespective of time and place."—48, 633.

Human Ecology. See ECOLOGY, HUMAN.

Human Nature. See NATURE, HUMAN.

Hypnosis. A psychological term to designate an extreme form of temporary dissociation of memories.

Identification. The act or process of putting oneself imaginatively in the place of another and sharing vicariously the experiences and emotional states of the other.

"Method of putting oneself in the place of another in imagination or activity; the process often going so far as to result in a sense of oneness with the other person."—125, 597. See PROJECTION.

Image. The representation of reality. It may be a memory of an earlier perception, a product of phantasy*, or an imaginative construction in the sense of an end, objective, or goal of activity.

"The internal environment is constituted of images and ideas which modify and also determine these same attitudes and habits. A man's image of his mother will be of great importance in aiding us to understand his attitudes* and reactions not only toward his mother but toward other women as well. . . . The 'pictures in our heads' of the Negro race in general will definitely affect our relations with individual members of the black race."—125, 429. See COLLECTIVE REPRESENTATIONS.

Imitation. The more-or-less conscious and intentional reproduction of acts observed by the performer. It is a learning process by which the person acquires the interpretations and objective behavior* patterns common to the groups* in which he holds membership.

"Imitation is the mechanism by which we set up in ourselves patterns of behavior similar to those which we see in others."—26, 287.

"Imitation and suggestion* are both mechanisms of social* interaction in which an individual or group is controlled by another individual or group. The distinction between the two processes is now clear. The characteristic mark of imitation is the tendency, under the influence of copies socially presented, to build up mechanisms of habits, sentiments, ideals, and patterns of life. The process of suggestion, as differentiated from imitation in social interaction, is to release under the appropriate social stimuli mechanisms already organized, whether instincts*, habits*, or sentiments*. The other differences between imitation and suggestion grow out of this fundamental distinction. In imitation, attention is alert now on the copy and now on the response. In suggestion, the attention is either absorbed in, or distracted from, the copy."—89, 344.

"A process or action in which an individual or social unit tries to be like, or act like, some model or example."—123, 629.

Immigration. The entrance into a country of persons of foreign birth or allegiance who intend to participate in the life of the country, to make it their place of residence, and to become citizens.

Impulse. A blind or quasi-blind tendency to act.

Individual. A biopsychological concept. The concrete human being, when attention is focussed upon biological traits and characteristics.

"By individual we shall understand the organism with its innate

physical and mental capacities. We are individuals at birth, but we become persons* when we acquire status* in a group, a reputation, a role*, and a conception of our place among our associates and even among our contemporaries generally.”—55, 479. See PERSON; NATURE, ORIGINAL.

Individual Representation. A term used by Durkheim, the foremost representative of modern psychosociological thought in France, and by his followers to refer to the private, noncommunicable percept of the individual person’s experience in contrast to collective* representations.

“The thing that characterizes Durkheim and his followers is their insistence upon the fact that all cultural materials, and expressions, including language, science, religion, public opinion, and law, since they are the products of social interaction, are bound to have an objective, public and social character such as no product of an individual mind either has or can have. Durkheim speaks of these mental products, individual and social, as representations. The characteristic product of the individual mind is the percept, or, as Durkheim describes it, the ‘individual representation.’”—89, 195. See COLLECTIVE REPRESENTATION.

Individualism. An attitude of mind that exalts self-interest and independence of thought and action as influenced only slightly by tradition* and authority*. The fiction of “rugged individualism” is basic to the doctrine that there should be little or no restraint of the pursuit of self-interest and the exercise of individual initiative.

Individuation. The atomization of the members of the social group*; the emancipation of the person from effective group control; a displacement of the reverential attitude toward institutions* and other conventional values by a rational and utilitarian attitude toward them. See INDIVIDUALISM; SOCIAL CONTROL; SECULARIZATION.

Inferiority. Relative incapacity in some situation or in the performance of some act.

Inferiority Complex. A sense of incapacity or inadequacy in respect to some situation or type of behavior; an attitude* of reticence caused by a lack of confidence in one’s status*. This is the feeling* of inferiority.

Adler's view, corroborated by much empirical evidence, is that the inferiority feeling is nearly always attended by a compensatory superstructure of conceit, etc., and that the totality constitutes the inferiority complex.

In-Group. The group with which one identifies himself sentimentally; the group in which one holds membership as contrasted to other groups of which one is not a member.

"The term 'in-group' designates any association toward which the persons composing it have attitudes of loyalty, devotion, sympathy, respect, and co-operation."—48, 20.

"The loyalty, fidelity, and *rapport* toward members of the in-group turn into hostility, trickery, and distrust toward outsiders, depending upon the general level of civilization and the degree of strangeness and traditional hostility."—55, 23-24.

". . . Kinship, cultural, territorial or other groups, whose members evince loyalty, solidarity, and co-operation toward each other, and, on the other hand, express exclusiveness, and sometimes even repulsion and enmity, toward all other individuals and groups."—86, 546.

"Thus a differentiation arises between ourselves, the we-group, or in-group, and everybody else, or the others-groups, out-groups*."—105, 12. See PRIMARY GROUP; OUT-GROUP; ETHNOCENTRISM; CONTACT, PRIMARY; CONTACT, SYMPATHETIC.

Inheritance, Biological. See HEREDITY.

Inheritance, Social. See HERITAGE, SOCIAL.

"Inner Enemies." The defectives, dependents, delinquents, and other deviate persons who are thought to be, potentially if not actually, destructive of social well-being.

Insanity. A legal concept. A person is insane who has been declared insane by a court of law. In familiar usage it implies mental disorder so extreme as to render the person a menace to others or to leave him unable to manage his own affairs. See PSYCHOPATHY; PSYCHOSIS; PSYCHIATRY; PSYCHOTHERAPY; NEUROSIS.

Insight. The ability to see meanings and relations not generally obvious.

Inspiration. A state of emotional excitement, usually of direct or in-

direct crowd* origin, in which the person believes himself to be under supernatural influence. Colloquially, the word is used for "encouragement." In this sense, it is free of the supernatural element. "He was inspired to do it by their expressions of confidence in him."

Instinct. A biological concept. A relatively complex inherited action pattern eventuating in overt behavior. The concept is not used in modern social thought; in psychology the mode is to substitute "drive," "prepotent reflex," or other approximately synonymous term.

"The use of the words 'instinct' and 'impulse' as practical equivalents is intentional. The word 'instinct' taken alone is still too laden with the older notion that an instinct is always definitely organized and adopted—which for the most part is just what it is not in human beings. The word 'impulse' suggests something primitive, yet loose, undirected, initial. Man can progress as beasts cannot, precisely because he has so many 'instincts' that they cut across one another, so that most serviceable actions must be learned."—29, 105.

Institutions. The organized system of practices and social roles* developed about a value or series of values*, and the machinery evolved to regulate the practices and administer the rules. The major social institutions—family*, church, government*, and so on—consist of the organizations that have developed to regulate and standardize behavior toward the values considered essential to group welfare and survival. People have a sense of loyalty to these systems of social relationships because they are thought to embody the ultimate values that the people have in common.

"Institutions and laws are produced out of mores*. An institution consists of a concept (idea, notion, doctrine, interest) and a structure. The structure is a framework, or apparatus, or perhaps only a number of functionaries set to co-operate in prescribed ways at a certain conjuncture. The structure holds the concept and furnishes instrumentalities for bringing it into the world of facts and action in a way to serve the interests* of men in society. Institutions are [either] crescive when they take shape in the mores, growing by the instinctive efforts by which the mores are produced. . . . Enacted institutions are the products of rational invention and intention. They belong to high civilization."—105, 53-54.

"An institution is a complex, integrated organization of collective* behavior, established in the social heritage* and meeting some persistent need or want. . . . The great institutions are the outcome of that organization which human thought naturally takes on when it is directed for age after age upon a particular subject, and so gradually crystallizes in definite forms—enduring sentiment*, beliefs*, customs*, and symbols*."—21, 402.

"A social institution is a complex of concepts* and attitudes* . . . regarding the ordering of a particular class of unavoidable or indispensable human relationships that are involved in satisfying certain elemental individual wants, certain compelling social needs, or other eminently desirable social ends."—54, 67.

"These institutions were not, of course, tangible entities, but were rather patterns of social organization which could be perceived in the behavior of many human beings."—67, 63. See ASSOCIATION; CUSTOM.

Integration. The act or process of associating the parts in a unity or a whole.

"Building up units of response by co-ordination into a larger pattern or a totality."—125, 597. See DISINTEGRATION.

Intelligence. The capacity to learn, or to act successfully in new situations. Essentially, it is the capacity to see relationships, have insight into the operation of forces at work, and have the ability to use available means to adjust to existing conditions and to realize the ends desired.

"In its most important and most generally accepted use, intelligence means capacity to learn."—32, 267.

Intelligence Quotient. The number derived by dividing the age equivalent of a score made on special tests (the mental age) by the chronological age of the person submitting to the tests.

Interaction, Social. The fact or process of reciprocal relations and influences that obtain between and among the members of the group*.

"Any natural process involves not only the elements but also the ways in which these elements influence one another. The reciprocal influence of the social factors that result in human nature* and in human culture* is what is meant by social interaction."—92, 256.

"Interplay of forms in which contact among persons and groups

results in the modification of the behavior* of the participants.”—106, 569. See COMMUNICATION, IMITATION, SUGGESTION, SOCIAL CONTACT.

Interests. Objects toward which attitudes* are directed. In Small’s usage, interests are the generalized and abstract needs of human and social life. He classified them into six general categories: health, wealth, sociability, knowledge, beauty, and rightness.

“Interests and attitudes are correlative . . . Put in one list such terms as fear, love, surprise, pride, sympathy, and veneration, and in another list such terms as enemy, friend, discovery, family, victim of accident, and God. Terms of the first group connote attitudes; those of the second, interests. The former signify subjective reactions, states of consciousness relative to objects; the latter signify the objects relative to the subjective reaction.”—76, 20. See WISHES; VALUES; ATTITUDES.

Introversion. The centering of attention upon one’s self and the products of one’s imagination to the virtual exclusion of external reality. See EXTRAVERSION.

Introvert. A person whose attention is directed mainly inward; one who lives “within his head.”

“The distinction between the extravert and introvert has also proved of considerable utility in the discussion of human conduct*. The introvert concentrates upon inner experiences and maintains a partial contact with the outside world. The extravert . . . scarcely sees anything but the external world and maintains the least possible inner personality.”—50, 175. See EXTRAVERT.

Invasion. The ecological* process of infringement, either of population units or institutions*, which results from competition*.

“Invasion means that there is an intrusion in an area possessing some degree of equilibrium, and that the entering individual, group, or function . . . produces disturbance in the previously existing organization in the given area.”—55, 258-259. See COMPETITION; ECOLOGY; MIGRATION.

Invention. The process of bringing previously existing culture* facts, either objects or ideas, into new relations to produce new culture facts. Also, any relatively new culture fact is an invention.

“The development or construction of a new form of material or

nonmaterial culture. Every invention is based on a new combination of familiar culture traits."—123, 629.

"An invention is a new combination of familiar culture traits."—114, 364.

"The creation of a new concept, form, organization, instrument, trait, in contrast with mere repetition or imitation*."—86, 547. See CHANGE; CULTURE DIFFUSION.

Investigation. See RESEARCH.

Isolation. Social separation; the absence of social* relations; any hindrance to free communication. In psychoanalytical theory, isolation is the mechanism whereby one admits an idea to consciousness but excludes its emotional content.

"The stability or instability of isolation depends upon the characteristics of the existing culture which form the basis for individual and social behavior. Isolation of castes* and ranks . . . social classes* . . . isolation emotionally conditioned by hostile sentiments* . . . feelings* of strangeness and indifference, etc."—6, VIII, 350.

"The process or condition in which individuals, groups*, or communities*, physically, mentally, or culturally distant, have relatively little contact, communication or free and harmonious co-operation*."—86, 547-548. See COMMUNICATION; SOCIAL CONTACT; PRIVACY; SEGREGATION.

Lag, Culture. See CULTURAL LAG.

Laissez Faire. The economic doctrine that, in the absence of interference by the state or other organization with coercive power, the individual actions of men operate to produce the maximum in individual and collective economic welfare. It is no longer a postulate of economic science, but it is still a powerful tool of economic pressure groups. See INDIVIDUALISM.

Language. A conventionalized system of sound patterns that can be reproduced as intentional symbols of meaning to others. Its significance lies in several related facts: it is essential to the existence and creation of thought; it is necessary to the exchange of thought and the communication of ideas, desires, and emotions; it is essential to human life and social control*; and it is a prerequisite to the preserva-

tion and transmission of the social heritage*.—See COMMUNICATION; GESTURE.

Language Revivals. See REVIVALS, LANGUAGE.

Laughter. A socially defined gesture*, involuntary in origin, expressing a release from tension created by an identification of ourselves with another in an uncomfortable or embarrassing situation. It is a distinctively human response. Its peculiar social significance lies in its power to control behavior.

“The fear of ridicule is the most dominant of our feelings, that which control us in most things and with the most strength. Because of this fear one . . . submits to an infinite number of obligations . . . The ludicrous . . . condemns the little misdeeds . . . Laughter is thus the great censor of vices.”—89, 373-374.

Law. See page 215.

Law, Natural. A statement of the order or sequence of events, invariable in the given condition; a generalized descriptive statement of a natural process.

“The expression ‘laws of nature’ means nothing but the uniformities which exist among natural phenomena . . . when reduced to their simplest expression.”—J. S. MILL. See NATURAL.

Leadership. The control of many by a single person or by few individuals. Creative leadership is the result of an ability to persuade or direct men, apart from the prestige* or power that comes from office or other external circumstance. Representative or symbolic leadership is that which is derived from office or established position, apart from the personal characteristics of the functionary. Both types of leadership may be represented in one person.

“Strictly speaking, the relation of leadership arises only where a group* follows an individual* from free choice and not under command or coercion and, secondly, not in response to blind drives, but on positive and more or less rational grounds.”—97, IX, 282.

Legend. A fictitious or semifictitious narrative of some person or incident that is popularly accepted as historical, without any evidence of its credibility other than that which it itself contains. It gives tangible expression to the fears, longings, or ideals of a people and it functions

as a control* by supporting the prevailing social norms. The various stories recited about Lincoln—his great humanity, his ribald stories, etc.—are examples of familiar legends.

“The origin and development of legends are related to critical situations in group experience, when the hopes and fears and the wishes and longings of the group are aroused and organized with reference to some emergency.”—92, 420-421. See MYTH.

Life Organization. The pattern of life determined by the cultural situation in which the person functions; “the objective side of personality*.”

“The person* is born into a world where there are schemes for meeting typical social situations. These include the objects or values of the various groups and ways of controlling these social realities in satisfying the needs of the persons. If the person treats these sanctioned ways lightly or unadvisedly, he forces social disapproval and a reduction of his social status*.”—25, 640-641. See TYPES, SOCIAL.

Looking-Glass Self. The person’s conception of the way in which he appears to others.

“The reflected or looking-glass self . . . seems to have three principal elements; the imagination of our appearances to the other person, the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification. The comparison with a looking-glass self hardly suggests the second element, the imagined judgment, which is quite essential. The thing that moves us to pride or shame is not the mere mechanical reflection of ourselves, but an imputed sentiment*, the imagined effect of this reflection upon another’s mind. This is evident from the fact that the character and weight of that other, in whose mind we see ourselves, makes all the difference with our feelings.”—18, 152-153.

Magic. The body of practices designed to coerce the supernatural powers to do the will of the one who performs the rites.

“We define magic as the ritual* act performed to bring about a practical result unachievable by man’s unaided force.”—77, 242.

Maladjustment. The condition of being ill-adapted or poorly accommodated to the condition of life or the position in the group. The application of the concept always implies some standard of value*.

"Maladjustment is an inability or unwillingness to maintain an average or model equilibrium. Maladjustment arises from two sets of factors. One set of causes is within the individual* . . . The second set of causes is found within the environment* . . . Normally both sets of factors operate within the same 'total situation' to produce maladjustment."—16, 357. See ADJUSTMENT; SOCIAL PROBLEM.

Marginal Culture. In anthropological usage it refers to the culture* existing between two spatially separated culture* areas. In the sociological usage it specifies the type of polyglot culture that tends to be the mode at the borders of racial contact.

Marginal Man. One who lives in two incompatible or conflicting cultures*, participating in a measure in each, and incorporates within himself many of their divergent ideas, attitudes*, and habits*; one who is excluded from full participation in the culture but has not achieved the status* of the stranger*. The mixed-blood person is often a marginal man. See STRANGER.

Marriage. The legal union of a man and woman as man and wife; also the ceremony* initiating or celebrating such union.

Masses. The general body of a population*; the populace as contrasted to the classes*.

Mass Movement. Similar and simultaneous behavior of a large number of people, each acting on individual* impulse and to similar ends but without organization or program, such as a migration* or a rush.

"We see in unorganized mass movements the presence of a powerful social contagion* but no collective goal . . . each one acts as an individual seeking his own ends. Such movements effect no direct change in the mores* or in social organization*. Social* movements proper are relatively slower in their development and the participants have a more or less definite consciousness of a purpose or an end and of a means or program to that end."—25, 782.

Mental Conflict. See CONFLICT, MENTAL.

Migration. A change of residence from one country or region to another.

"The movement of individuals or groups from one place to another

inhabited place. Used broadly, this also includes dispersion."—123, 629.

Milling. A pattern form of behavior* resulting from circular interaction*; the unrest of one is communicated to others and becomes in turn the stimulus to further unrest. Milling is a characteristic aspect of crowd* behavior; it is a major part of behavior in the modern world. See UNREST; HERD; CIRCLE, VICIOUS; CROWD.

Miscegenation. See AMALGAMATION.

Mob. A crowd* that has defined an objective toward which the members act co-operatively or in concert; an active crowd.

"When a crowd changes from a passive state, or from one of mere interaction* among its members, into a state of aggressive, collective action toward some unreasoned objective, it becomes a mob."—37, 154-155.

"A mob is a crowd in action toward a common purpose under an emotional impulse."—45, 403.

"An excited, aroused crowd with some purpose such as an attack on a person or group, or the destruction of property."—123, 629. See CROWD. See also pages 206-209.

Mobility, Social. In ecological* usage, mobility refers to the spatial movement of persons from place to place. Vertical mobility, frequently confused with social mobility, denotes movement from class* to class in the social hierarchy. Social mobility proper has reference to the number and variety of stimulations and the responses and adjustments* to stimulations provided by communication*. The mobility of the hobo is physical, that of the student is social and mental.

"Mobility in an individual or in a population is measured, not merely by the change of location, but rather by the number and variety of the stimulations to which the individual or population responds. Mobility depends, not merely upon transportation, but upon communication."—25, 301.

Morale. That aspect of consensus* that involves the serious, sober, persistent, and patient determination to succeed in the group* enterprise.

"Morale may be defined as collective will—it represents an organization of behavior tendencies. The discipline of the individual, his

subordination to the group, lies in his participation and reglementation in social activities.”—89, 166.

“Group morale is group persistence in the pursuit of collective purposes . . . [It] depends upon subordinating the plurality of individual possibilities to the units of collective purposes.”—68, X, 64. See *Esprit de Corps*; COLLECTIVE REPRESENTATION; CONSENSUS.

Morals. The group* customs* or mores*; the rules of conduct* that the group defines as right and which it imposes upon individual members by sanctions and penalties. Morals should not be confused with ethical standards or ideals which may be sharply at variance with the prevailing moral code.

“Morals are those mores which have become positive in dogma* and which dominate on account of their importance, real or assumed.”—22, VI, 295. See MORES; CUSTOMS; FOLKWAYS; RELIGION.

Mores. The moral standards of a group; the customs* or folkways* that are considered conducive to or indispensable to group welfare.

“The mores are the more explicitly defined and emphasized folkways, firmly underscored because regarded as positively essential to the welfare of society*.”—60, 28.

“The stages of custom are more generally agreed upon. They begin as *folkways*, the unwitting uniformities of behavior which arise in every society.

“The second stage of development of folkways is known among sociologists as the *mores* which, while still unformulated, are more conscious and always in some degree emotional. The violation or threatened violation causes concern or resentment.”—40, 308.

“The mores are patterns of adjustment* to which certain rationalizations* or reasons have become attached.”—21, 92.

“When the conviction arises that certain folkways are indispensable to the welfare of society, that they are the only ‘right’ ways and that departure from them will involve calamity; i.e. when philosophical and ethical generalizations are developed about them, they are called mores.”—22, 6:294.

“Certain of the group-ways come in time to have a moral sanction. Their origin is forgotten and the conviction arises that they are useful and necessary to the welfare of the group . . . In this case, conformity to them is right and nonconformity is definitely wrong.

At this stage of their development they are known as moral customs or mores; they have become doctrines of group welfare."—92, 154. See FOLKWAYS; CUSTOMS; TRADITIONS; MORALS; PUBLIC OPINION.

Motivation. An inner tension prompting to activity.

Mythology. The body of myths*, or the study of myths, as for example, the Norse mythology, the Greek mythology, the body of myths that accumulated during the War of 1914-1918.

Myths. Imaginative accounts of the meaning of life. The creation myths are those that explain creation in terms of personal beings or forces of nature personified as gods or demons. In another form, the myth is the biography of a god. In still another form, it is a narration that supplies a supernatural origin and sanction for group customs. The vital myth is an image of things as they might be, an anticipation of the future. Many creators of myths regard them chiefly as suggested patterns of action.

"Myth fulfills in primitive culture* an indispensable function; it expresses, enhances, and codifies belief*; it safeguards and enforces morality; it vouches for the efficiency of ritual* and contains practical rules for the guidance of man."—MALINOWSKI. See LEGEND.

Nationalism. The constellation of sentiments*, arising in or nurtured by conflict*, that unifies the members of physically or culturally divergent groups and isolates them from other elements of the society*. In its fully developed form, it is characterized by ambitions for political self-determination.

Nationality. A racial, language, or cultural group that has reached the point of self-conscious unity in the struggle for status* within a larger group but has not attained independent political organization, as for example, the Irish nationality or the Polish nationality.

Natural Area. A specialized and well-differentiated region of relatively homogeneous character, usually with a relatively uniform population* resulting from migration* and segregation* on the basis of racial, economic, or cultural characteristics.

"Both the neighborhood* and the community* are natural areas, in that they are not the result of planned effort or legislation, but have developed in response to certain rather definite geographic,

economic, and social factors. A natural social area . . . has two characteristics, geographical and social: it has a physical individuality, and it has a distinctive culture*."—105, 410.

Natural History. The steps in the life cycle of a biological organism, or of an institution* or other social reality. It carries the specific assumption that each step in the changing structure is an evolution of the preceding stage and, in turn, gives rise to that which will follow. It excludes fortuitous factors, which are matters of history but not of natural history. The sequence of steps from infancy and babyhood to old age and death is the life history of man—each individual passes through the same stages and in the same order. The natural history of the family* is the sequence of steps in its development from the animal or natural family of early men to the institutional forms of the advanced culture peoples.

Naturalization. A political concept denoting the act and process of admitting an alien to the status* and privileges of a native-born citizen.

Nature, Human. The nature developed in primary group* relations.

"Objectively considered, human nature is a primary phase of society, that is, a trend of sentiment*, a body of ideals, an underlying *rappori**, while, subjectively viewed, it is a body of primary group attitudes*. Each member of the group takes over into his own person the common sentiments and ideals where they exist as attitudes."—26, 761-762.

"The acquired patterns of behavior* or habits*, attitudes, and ideas which people learn in social life. Often confused with original* nature."—125, 597.

"By human nature we may understand those sentiments and impulses that are human in being superior to those of lower animals, and also in the sense that they belong to mankind at large, and not to any particular race or time. It means, particularly, sympathy and the innumerable sentiments into which sympathy enters. . . .

"Human nature in this sense is justly regarded as a comparatively permanent element in society* . . . It is always safe to assume that people are and have been human.

"Human nature is not something existing separately in the individual, but a group nature or primary phase of society, a relatively

simple and general condition of the social mind. It is something more, on the one hand, than the mere instinct* that is born in us—though that enters into it—and something less, on the other, than the more elaborate development of ideas and sentiments that makes up institutions*. It is the nature which is developed and expressed in those simple, face-to-face groups that are somewhat alike in all societies; groups of the family*, the playground, and the neighborhood*. In the essential similarity of these is to be found the basis, in experience, for similar ideas and sentiments in the human mind. In these, everywhere, human nature comes into existence. Man does not have it at birth; he cannot acquire it except through fellowship; and it decays in isolation*.”—17, 28-30. See PERSONALITY; PERSON.

Nature, Natural. The essential characteristics or distinguishing qualities of a substance, organism, or species.

“The words ‘nature’ and ‘natural’ are among the most ambiguous of all the words used to justify courses of action. Their very ambiguity is one source of their use in defense of any measure and end regarded as desirable. The words mean what is native, what is original or innate, what exists at birth, in distinction from what is acquired by cultivation and as a consequence of experience. But it also means that which men have got used to, inured to by custom*, that imagination can hardly conceive of anything different. Habit* is second nature and second nature under ordinary circumstances is as potent and urgent as first nature. Again, nature has a definitely moral import; that which is *normal* and hence right; that which should be.”—28, 63-64.

Nature, Original. The nature of the organism before its modification by environmental experience, that is, at the time of conception.

“The organic structure and corresponding functions which the individual possesses at birth.”—125, 598. See INSTINCTS.

Neighborhood. A small geographic unit in which the relationships of the people are intimate and personal. Quasi-neighborhoods sometimes develop within cities where the typical relationships are highly abstract and impersonal.

“The first grouping beyond the family* which has social significance and which is conscious of some local unity.”—75, 148.

“A social unit which consists of individuals and families that live

near each other and that are related as neighbors."—123, 629. See COMMUNITY; GROUP, PRIMARY; SOCIETY.

Neo-Malthusianism. A social* movement designed to make general the knowledge of means of contraception in order that the Malthusian checks to population growth may not become active.

Neurosis. A personality disorder resulting in marked behavior abnormalities but without the characteristics of one of the major mental disorders. "A functional nervous disorder, without demonstrable physical lesion."

Nominalism. The scholastic doctrine which holds that only particular individual things and events exist, hence that all general terms, such as man, tree, group, city, etc., are mere words, vocal utterances that have no real objective things to which they refer. See REALISM.

Opinion. A judgment formed on evidence insufficient to demonstration.

"Conviction about some person or object which falls short of positive knowledge."—125, 598.

"Opinions are rationalizations of attitudes; they are secondary and derivative."—92, 100. See PUBLIC OPINION; BELIEF.

Order, Social. The constellation of social institutions in their interrelationships.

Organism, Social. The conception of society* as analogous to a biological organism. The concept has very limited present currency, the currently favored term being social organization*.

Organization. The process of co-ordinating activities so that the parts become interdependent and the system functions as an organic unity. Also, the state or manner of being organized into a functioning system of interdependent parts; a society* or association*.

Organization, Economic. The system of control* by which diverse economic activities are co-ordinated in the process of producing goods and distributing profits.

Organization, Social. The system of enduring relationships among persons, among groups, and between persons and groups that give unity and solidarity to the structure as a whole. The emphasis is

upon the nature and form of the relationships rather than upon the content.

"Social organization is the sum total of accommodations to past and present situations. All the social heritages*, traditions*, sentiments*, culture*, technique are accommodations: they are acquired adjustments* that are socially and not biologically transmitted."—11, I, 403.

"The direct and simple type of social organization arises spontaneously wherever the life activities of a small number of persons bring them into frequent and regular contact, and into association in which the various members come to know each other as persons."—92, 163.

"More or less conventional or standard form or structure of group life which grows out of repeated and common social interaction*."—125, 599.

"The structure of social life with its many units and the relations between these units. The result of social organization is a somewhat orderly and standardized life."—123, 631. See pages 64-65.

Original Nature. See NATURE, ORIGINAL.

Original Tendencies. Organic biases toward specific behavior responses.

Out-Group. Any group apart from or opposed to the in-group* in question.

"The out-group is . . . a competing or contrasting group with which one compares his own family, economic association, sect, nation, etc."—55, 24.

"Therefore each in-group forms its own ways, and looks with contempt and abhorrence upon the ways of an out-group."—105, 116. See IN-GROUP.

Overcompensation. See COMPENSATION.

Pack. A temporary grouping of nongregarious predatory animals.

Participation. Act of sharing in common with others.

"Social interaction* within a group* directed to some common end or sharing social activities with others."—125, 598.

"Activity within a group as a member, employee, official, committeeman, or guest."—123, 630.

Party. The party is a somewhat durable organization of persons* within a society* which functions to advance the interests of the organization, hence of its leaders, rather than to promote the welfare of the society as a whole. It may, and commonly does, claim to promote the welfare of the society as a whole. It is an opportunistic group* of conflict* pattern, guided by expediency, and without principles that it will not compromise.

“A party is a durable organization which . . . contrary to the view usually held, has for its immediate end the advancement of the interests* and the realization of the ideals, not of the people as a whole, but of the particular group or groups which it represents.”—25, 422.

Pathology, Social. See DISORGANIZATION. See also pages 70 and 227-229.

Pattern of Life. See LIFE ORGANIZATION.

Pattern, Social. Any functional arrangement of social and cultural phenomena, as a culture*, civilization*, institution*, or body of social rules.

Penology. See page 222.

Person, The. An individual human being who has acquired a human nature and achieved a position in the group*. The newborn babe is not a person; he becomes a person as he becomes a participating member of the group.

“The person is an individual* who has status*. We come into the world as individuals. We acquire status, and become persons.”—89, 55.

“The term person is used when reference is had to the qualities and attributes that are results of social life, when it is intended to stress the human rather than the original nature.”—92, 54-55.

Personality. The way in which the person* is organized; the way in which he tends to act toward others and toward himself.

“The totality of those aspects of behavior* which give meaning to an individual* in society* and differentiate him from other members in the community*.”—96, XII, 85.

“Personality can be regarded as the personal or social organization* which is formed by the individual as he develops social conduct* . . . Personality represents the organization of tendencies to act that are

developed by an individual in the course of his interaction* with others.”—3, 176.

“Totality of habits*, attitudes*, ideas, and characteristics of an individual which grow out of his role* and status* in the various groups of which he is a member.”—125, 598.

Phantasy. The reconstruction of the world in terms of one’s wishes*. It may be either conscious or unconscious.

Philosophy, Social. An interpretation, or rationalization, of a way of life.

Play. Activity without ulterior motive; activity that is carried on for its own sake; “activity that is its own reward.”

Population. The inhabitants of a given area. In population study the interest is on the more or less discrete units in the defined area. See pages 27 and 188.

Poverty. The relative absence of wealth or income, particularly the condition where income is insufficient for health and working efficiency.

Prejudice. A prejudgment concerning a person*, a group*, or a situation such that one is unable to make an objective evaluation. It is a socially predetermined attitude*, and one held without regard to the actual facts.

“The stranger* whom we feel to be divergent as compared with ourselves, is indifferent or an object of prejudice; the stranger whom we feel ourselves unable to measure by our standards, whose measure—not his qualities—we feel to be different, we receive with prestige*. We look with prejudice on the stranger whom we dissociate, we receive with prestige the stranger who is dissociated.”—69, 42. See **BIAS**; **PRESTIGE**.

Prepotent Reflexes. The responses that are more easily aroused and so take precedence over others that are simultaneously stimulated. The term is essentially synonymous with instincts*. See **INSTINCT**.

Pressure Group. Any group* that endeavors to control the policy of some larger organization with which it is affiliated. The Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, American Legion, Catholic Church, and Association of Newspaper Publishers are examples of

organizations that endeavor to control legislation and public policy to favor their groups.

Pressure, Social. Any group* influence exerted to restrict or change the activity of persons* or groups. The influence of the Catholic Church has prevented Congress from legalizing the dissemination of birth-control information.

“Pressure, as we shall use it, is always a group phenomenon. It indicates the push and resistance between groups. The balance of the group pressures is the existing state of society*. Pressure is broad enough to include all forms of the group influence upon group, from battle and riot to abstract reasoning and sensitive morality.”—89, 458. See CONTROL; INDOCTRINATION; PROPAGANDA.

Prestige. The quasi-magical quality a person has in the minds of others that renders these others susceptible to suggestion* from him, or amenable to his leadership, or inclined to use him as a model for imitation*. See PREJUDICE.

Primary Contacts. See CONTACTS, PRIMARY.

Primary Group. See GROUP, PRIMARY.

Privacy. A state of seclusion or separation from others that is subject to control* by the person*. See ISOLATION.

Private. Accessible only to the individual.

Problems, Social. Remediable conditions, the removal of which is opposed by persons, groups, or interests that profit by the *status quo* or would be adversely affected by their removal. Social problems should be sharply differentiated from technical problems and scientific problems, on the one hand, and from disasters and miserable conditions of existence, on the other.

“A social problem may be envisaged as a phenomenon, or situation, for the appearance of which no one individual or a few individuals are responsible, which threatens injurious results for many persons, and the removal or control of which is completely beyond the ability of one person or a few individuals.”—44, 4.

“. . . any difficulty or misbehavior of a fairly large number of persons which we wish to remove or correct.”—42, XXX, 463.

“Social problems are bits of concrete reality unified on the basis

of the immediate situation in which action is necessary."—92, 25.
See *PATHOLOGY, SOCIAL*. See also pages 224-227.

Process. The regular sequence of steps in growth and change, as the life history of a plant from the germination of the seed to the maturity and death of the plant, or the course of a disease from the initial infection to the recovery or death of the person, or the steps in the manufacture of a commercial article; the interaction* of elements resulting in structural emergence and change.

Process, Social. The interaction of elements in social change* and the transition from one social condition to another. The general process is commonly broken down into four major divisions—the historical, the cultural, the economic, and the political.

"A process is a collection of occurrences, each of which has meaning for every other, the whole of which constitutes some sort of becoming . . . Human association is such a process . . . The social process is the incessant evolution of persons* through the evolution of institutions*, which evolve completer persons who evoke completer institutions, and so on beyond any limit that we can fix."—100, 85.

Progress. Change or movement toward a human goal. Progress is a normative rather than a scientific concept. It has been largely superseded by the ethically neutral concept of social change.

"Progress is always measured with reference to the advancement of some objective of a group . . . Progress is only a local, temporary, and specialized type of social change."—55, 630.

"Life in the primary* groups gives rise to social ideals which, as they spring from similar experiences, have much in common throughout the human race. These naturally become the motive and test of social progress. Under all systems men strive, however blindly, to realize objectives suggested by the familiar experience of primary association."—21, 60.

"Social progress is an improvement in social relations; greater social efficiency; a change in social life leading to increased health and satisfaction. This is an evaluative concept."—123, 631.

"The progress of humanity belongs to the same order of ideas as Providence or personal immortality. It is true or it is false, and like them it cannot be proved either true or false. Belief in it is an act of faith."—12, 4.

Projection. Perceiving mental experiences as if they were of external origin. Delusions of persecution come from attributing to others the sentiments* the person* himself harbors. In racial prejudice persons attribute to members of the other race* the emotions they themselves feel but of which they are ashamed.

“Thrusting qualities upon others which arise from one’s repressed attitudes* and feelings*.”—125, 598.

Propaganda. The conscious effort to manipulate public* opinion and sentiment*, particularly by hidden means or with sinister motives.

“Propaganda is an organized effort by covert means to create an uncritical emotional and ideational consensus* favorable to some interest or mode of action defined by the propagandist.”—92, 432.

“Propaganda in the broadest sense is the technique of influencing human action by the manipulation of representation.”—68, XII, 521.

“Propaganda is a systematic attempt by an interested individual (or individuals) to control* the attitudes* of groups of individuals through the use of suggestion* and, consequently, to control their actions; unintentionally propaganda is the control of the attitudes and, consequently, the actions of groups of individuals through the use of suggestion.”—30, 75.

Psychiatry. The treatment of mental diseases and aberrations.

Psychoanalysis. The school of psychotherapy* elaborated by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), and the conception of human nature derived from or basic to the therapeutic procedure. The school is now broken into sects, the chief variants being the “individual psychology” of Adler and the “analytical psychology” of Jung. In recent years, a number of psychoanalysts, notable among whom is Karen Horney, have closely approached the sociological point of view. Psychoanalysis traces experiences, such as dreams, of which the individual is generally unaware.

Psychology, Collective. See COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR.

Psychopathy. A mental disorder, usually one falling short of a major psychosis*. Also an alternative term for psychiatry* and abnormal psychology.

Psychosis. A major mental illness.

Psychotherapy. The treatment of the mentally ill by the use of psychological techniques.

Public, The. The public is any group*, aggregate or nonaggregate, that achieves corporate unity through critical interaction*. The public is never a formal organization but an area of communication*, critical discussion, and consensus* arrived at through the clash and modification of opinions*. The public is sometimes visualized as a noncontiguous crowd*.

"The crowd mills, develops *rapport**, and reaches a unanimity unmarred by disagreement. The public interacts on the basis of interpretation, enters into dispute, and consequently is characterized by conflict* relations . . . In the public, arguments are advanced, are criticized, and are met by counter arguments."—89, 799. See PUBLICS; CROWD; PUBLIC OPINION.

Public Opinion. A consensus* or judgment arrived at through conflict* and discussion on the basis of facts.

"In regard to political questions and social matters generally, the complex that passes as public opinion and determines group policy is commonly something quite different. Most often it is a highly complex mass of prejudice*, sentiment*, and special interest* masquerading under a pretense of rationality. It is more often general sentiment than public opinion; its derivation is in the emotions rather than in the intellect."—92, 505.

"The mores* . . . are the judgments of public opinion in regard to issues that have been settled and forgotten."—89, 795.

"Public opinion is formed more by the interaction* of characters than of arguments."—19, 25. See pages 209-211.

Publics. Concrete groups* that deliberate and arrive at judgments at least partly through critical interaction*.

Race. A main biological division of the human species set apart from others by hereditary physical difference.

"A biological division of the *genus homo* possessing permanently established physical traits which are sufficiently marked to distinguish it from all other similar divisions and which are biologically transmissible."—86, 555.

Race Conflict. Pronounced concrete expressions of friction between race groups, such as racial wars and race riots.

Race Consciousness. An awareness of racial differences that isolates the members of a group*, and the sense of belonging together consequent upon the exclusion.

"It is not unlikely that, as long as we have groups even approximately separate in our civilization, there will be group and race consciousness; there will be demands for group and race purity, and theories to explain these group or race differences."—116, 19.

"Such subordinate groups react to the situation in which they find themselves by developing race consciousness. This is a feeling of being set apart, as regards other groups, and the accompanying feeling of common destiny as regards other members of the same group."—50, 76.

Race Differences. When accurately used, race differences are facts of original nature, biological characters that differentiate one race from another. The differences among racial groups in culture*, mental habits*, social customs*, religious beliefs*, etc. are differences in social heritage*, not race differences.

Race Mixture. See AMALGAMATION.

Race Prejudice. Antagonistic attitude toward the member of another race*. It differs from class* or caste* prejudice in that the sentiments* that support the racial taboos* are based on fear of the unfamiliar and uncomprehended.

"The more fundamental and essentially personal feelings of repulsion felt when the representatives of one race come into face-to-face association or direct competition with members of another race is more properly designated racial antipathy.

"At the root of race prejudice is an aversion to strange appearances and ways of life which are often held to be proof of inferior standards; such attitudes* are strengthened by the desire of the dominating group to maintain its solidarity."—63, XIII, 39. See PREJUDICE.

Race Suicide. This term expresses the belief* that, because of the fact that certain classes* of society* increase less rapidly than others, the race is being destroyed by deterioration.

"By this term is meant the selective breeding of different classes

in our society which is evidenced by the smaller families among the better educated and more prosperous and the larger families among the so-called 'lower' classes. The assumption here is that the 'better' classes have on the average better heredity* and that therefore we are breeding future generations in a disproportionate degree from the poorer hereditary stocks."—21, 24.

Rapport. The relation that obtains between the hypnotized person and the hypnotizer during the period of hypnosis*. In sociological usage *rapport* refers to a condition of mutual responsiveness among a larger or smaller group of persons such that each responds immediately, spontaneously, and sympathetically to every other member.

Rationalization. The process by which persons provide plausible explanations and socially acceptable reasons for behavior*, or for beliefs* and sentiments*, when a conscious recognition of the genuine explanation would reduce self-esteem, precipitate internal conflict and necessitate change. It is thus a means of maintaining a pseudo-consistency of behavior* through self-deception in areas of conflicting desire.

"Alleging some socially justifiable reason for an act* really performed from some other motive."—125, 599.

Reaction, Circular. A series of interactions*, usually on the level of immediate responses to stimulations, in which the gestures* of some stimulate others whose responses become, in turn, additional stimuli to further gestures. The phenomenon is best seen at its primitive level, in the milling* of the herd*.

"Unrest* in the individual* becomes social when it is, or seems to be, transmitted from one individual to another, but more particularly when it produces something akin to the milling process in the herd, so that the manifestations of discontent in A communicated to B, and from B reflected back to A, produce the circular reaction described in the preceding chapter."—89, 866.

"A self-repeating reaction, the outcome of which provides a stimulus to the same reaction."—117, 488. See IMITATION; MILLING; CIRCLE, VICIOUS.

Realism. As used in social science, realism is the acceptance of the world of sense as real; the position that groups*, institutions*, etc.

have a reality apart from the individual* members or the creators and users. See NOMINALISM.

Reflex. A definite, unlearned, and uniform reaction to specific stimuli, commonly involving only a part of the organism, as, for example, the eye wink.

Reform, Social. A program designed to change by legislative means the behavior* of men or groups or social structures to conform with traditional standards or ideal definitions.

"[Social reforms are political movements that] seek to change fundamental institutions* and conditions to bring them into conformity with the existing mores*; they aim to change policy and administration."—25, 787.

"Social reform . . . has come to be supplanted by the . . . term social* planning. Both terms are employed to designate programs designed for the realization of certain ends believed to be worth-while."—48, 562.

Regression. In the psychoanalytic sense, regression signifies a failure of adaptation* at the adult level resulting in an attempt to reinstate the attitudes* and behavior* of infancy.

Also, the biological or biometric doctrine that offspring tend to inherit qualities nearer the average of the species than to those of their parents.

"Regression is a psychic act of movement away from the adaptations of life, toward that condition of security which the infant experiences in its mother's arms before he has discovered the responsibilities of the world."—JUNG.

Regression of Attitudes. The doctrine that every attitude* or value* may be traced to a prior attitude and a value, that every attitude is the present link in a long chain of inner and outer causal processes.

Religion. A more or less coherent body of beliefs* and practices concerned with the unknown and uncontrolled, together with the emotional states arising in collective behavior*. It must be understood apart from theology, which is a body of speculation about the nature of God, and apart from the church, which is an institutional organization to perpetuate and generalize the behavior toward the demon world. The term is sometimes enlarged to include the so-called per-

sonal religion, in which there is an absence of forms and ritual* and of crowd excitement.

"A form of behavior born of a sense of insecurity, highly emotionalized, and socially stimulated, which seeks reinforcement from supernatural sources."—25, 696.

"Here lies the difference between religion and magic, closely interwoven as the two have been. For magic is a system of manipulation of the unknown . . . But religion seeks to enter into communication with the higher powers. Its modes of communication*, such as worship, intercession, prayer, and hymn, do not imply control*."—75, 317. See MAGIC. See also pages 67 and 232.

Religious Revivals. See REVIVALS, RELIGIOUS.

Reorganization, Social. See ORGANIZATION.

Repression. The refusal to recognize, be aware of, or admit to consciousness an idea, memory, or impulse that is unpleasant or otherwise obnoxious.

Research, Sociological. Systematic efforts to isolate and describe the social processes.

Revivals. Folk movements designed to revitalize and reinstate decaying culture* forms or institutions*. See COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR.

Revivals, Language. Special cultural movements designed to reinstate a disappearing folk* language, or to elevate a dialect*, as the common mode of communication or of literary expression. They are a frequent accompaniment of nationalistic movements, organized struggles for autonomy and status by oppressed minority groups.

"In the struggle against repressive measures there is the oft repeated attempt of minority groups to erect their language into the status of a fully accredited medium of cultural and literary expression. Many of these restored or semimanufactured languages have come in on the wave of resistance to exterior political or cultural hostility. This may be seen in the case of Gaelic, Lithuanian, the Hebrew of the Zionists, and the Provençal of Southern France."—95, IX, 167-168.

Revivals, Religious. Social* movements designed to revitalize obsolescent modes of thought. Also, the phenomena and methods of mod-

ern evangelism. In common usage, the term includes "all religious practices involving mass enthusiasm or group excitement."

Revolution. A mass* movement designed to destroy the existing social* order, or some portion of it, in order to realize new values* or to restore old values. The latter is often spoken of as a "counter-revolution"; the Spanish Civil War against the Republic by the group that formerly held power is a case in point.

"A mass movement which seeks to change the mores* by destroying the existing social order."—89, 934. See REFORM, SOCIAL.

Rites. See RITUAL.

Ritual. A prescribed and elaborated set of behavior forms that need not be understood but must not be criticized or neglected.

"A ceremony* or set of acts*, usually traditional and sacerdotal, which gives expression to some fundamental beliefs*, for example, the ritual of the Roman Catholic Mass or the initiation formalities of a fraternal order."—86, 557. See CEREMONY.

Rivalry. A form of conflict* controlled by the group* in its own interests*. See EMULATION.

Role, Social. The part played by the person* in the group* or social situation; "the function of a person in a group."

Rural Sociology. See p. 194.

Secondary Contacts. See CONTACTS, SECONDARY.

Secondary Groups. See GROUPS, SECONDARY.

Sectarianism. Unreasoned and exclusive adherence to a doctrinaire school of thought.

Sects. A sect is a conflict* group committed to a definite set of principles that stands in opposition to the going institutional order. The sect members are cemented into a strong union by a common faith or ideal. The Communists are an economic sect; the Quakers and Methodists were religious sects in the predomination stage.

Segregation. Voluntary or enforced separation from others as of the Negro population of a city or of defective school children in special rooms or institutions.

"In sociology segregation represents that form of isolation* in

which social* distance is based upon physical separation. The physical barriers and spatial distances that set individuals apart from the mass* and group* are sociologically significant only to the extent that they become obstacles to communication and inhibit social contact*."—94, 643. See ISOLATION.

Self, Social. In the metaphysical sense, the self is the sum and coordination of all the experience or behavior* of the person*. In sociology, the social self is the person's conception of his role* or, more loosely, the totality of the person's behavior which has social significance. See PERSONALITY; ROLE, SOCIAL; LOOKING-GLASS SELF.

Sentiments. Generalized definitions of conduct*; complex emotional biases toward some value or system of values*, as mother love, which is a complex of fear, joy, sorrow, anger, etc., organized about the child.

Situation. A concept incorporating the totality of the inner and outer worlds in which behavior* occurs . . . The configuration* of persons*, the roles* of the persons in and attitudes* toward the condition, and the cultural definitions that influence the manner in which experience is received.

Social Attitudes. See ATTITUDES, SOCIAL.

Social Behavior. See BEHAVIOR, SOCIAL.

Social Change. See CHANGE.

Social Classes. See CLASSES, SOCIAL.

Social Consciousness. See CONSCIOUSNESS, SOCIAL.

Social Conditioning. A behavioristic term for social influencing.

Social Contact. See CONTACT, SOCIAL.

Social Control. See CONTROL, SOCIAL.

Social Disorganization. See DISORGANIZATION, SOCIAL.

Social Distance. A relationship in which the person* allows only a part of his personality* to become involved.

"The psychological and sociological nearness or separation of individuals* and groups*, their convergence or divergence in sympathy and understanding."—92, 212.

"Toward members of our own congeniality group, own family*, own comrades, own neighbors, own race*, or own nation we feel intimate and friendly. Toward other families, communities, nations, and races we feel much more remote, much more distant, much less intimate or kindly."—124, 97.

"The degree to which interaction* and cooperation* do or do not obtain between individuals, groups, nations, or cultures*."—86, 559.

"Relation between social units characterized by disapproval, dislike, or hatred. Measured by willingness of individuals to associate intimately or intermarry."—123, 630.

Social Environment. See ENVIRONMENT.

Social Evolution. See EVOLUTION, SOCIAL.

Social Forces. See FORCES, SOCIAL.

Social Groups. See GROUPS, SOCIAL.

Social Heritage. See HERITAGE, SOCIAL.

Social Interaction. See INTERACTION, SOCIAL.

Social Interstimulation and Response. See INTERACTION, SOCIAL.

Social Law. See LAW, NATURAL.

Social Life. Association* on the basis of communication*.

Social Mobility. See MOBILITY, SOCIAL.

Social Movements. General term for various forms of collective behavior* in which the participants have defined a goal and developed a program or course of action, as Christianity, Protestantism, temperance, conservatism, etc.

"An organization of individuals and groups designed to change the social practices and institutions*."—123, 631.

Social Order. The sum and interrelations of the social institutions*.

Social Organism. See ORGANIZATION, SOCIAL.

Social Organization. See ORGANIZATION, SOCIAL.

Social Pathology. See p. 227.

Social Planning. Current term for social reform*; the working out of schemes for solving human and social problems. See REFORM, SOCIAL.

Social Pressure. See PRESSURE, SOCIAL.

Social Problems. See PROBLEMS, SOCIAL.

Social Psychiatry. See page 203.

Social Psychology. That branch of sociology which studies human nature* and personality*. See page 209.

Social Relationship. The interaction* of personalities* through communication*, based on a sense of community, a mutual sense of belonging together. "A social relationship is the path traversed by causal processes involving two or more persons*."

Social Self. See SELF, SOCIAL.

Social Solidarity. The unity resulting from sentiments* of loyalty and habits* of co-operation*.

Social Status. See STATUS, SOCIAL.

Social Theory. See page 180.

Social Type. See TYPE, SOCIAL.

Social Unity. See SOCIAL SOLIDARITY.

Social Values. See VALUES.

Social Work. A quasi-professional area of public service developed from the spontaneous and neighborly assistance extended, in the simpler societies, to persons in distress. See pages 228-230.

Socialism. The practice of or the belief in the desirability of the social ownership of production goods.

Socialization. The process by which individuals are taught to function in the group in which their wishes* are created and realized.

"The change by which the individual* member of society becomes a functioning part of the group*, acting according to its standards, conforming to its mores*, subject to its traditions* and feeling himself a part of it sufficiently to command the tolerance if not the admiration of his fellows."—45, 291.

"The process of learning to conform to group standards, mores, and traditions, and becoming imbued with a sense of oneness, intercommunication, and co-operation."—86, 561.

Societies. Societies are definite, concrete, and limited social-contact groups. A society, as distinct from society, is any organization by means of which people carry on a common life.

"We may for our purposes here define a society as any permanent or continuing grouping of men, women, and children, able to carry on independently the processes of racial perpetuation and maintenance, on their own cultural level."—52, 444.

Society. An abstract term that connotes the complex of interrelations that exist between and among the members of the group; the interaction* and communication* rather than the interacting person*.

"When . . . the behavior of many people living together is examined as a system of human relationships, it . . . is found to be a picture; it has a pattern*. It is that pattern, not the people, which we term 'society.'"—66, 55.

"Society is a complex of forms or processes each of which is living and growing by interaction with the others, the whole being so unified that what takes place in one part affects all the rest. It is a vast tissue of reciprocal activity, differentiated into innumerable systems, some of them quite distinct, others not readily traceable, and all interwoven to such a degree that you see different systems according to the point of view you take."—20, 28.

Sociology. The discipline that undertakes to isolate and define the processes of social interaction* that result in human personality* and social organization*. It seeks to formulate natural laws and generalization in regard to human nature and society that are of universal validity. See pages 2-13.

Solitude. The state of being alone and without opportunity for companionship, especially in the subjective sense. It is to be contrasted to isolation* which suggests the objective fact of detachment. See ISOLATION; PRIVACY.

Standardization. Reduced to uniformity by authority* or by accepted or established custom* or by general consent.

Status, Social. Position in the group*; relation to other members of the society in the social scale.

"Relative position, rank, or standing of a person in a group, or of a group in reference to some larger grouping."—125, 599.

"The position, rating, rank, or prestige* given to an individual by others. Status is based on caste*, class*, age, sex, and individual traits."—123, 631.

"The position that the person occupies in relation to his fellows; also the position of the group in relation to other groups.

"A person's status in a group has a double aspect. On the one hand, it rests in the minds of his associates, since it is the way they treat him and consider him. On the other hand, status is registered in the mind of the individual himself, as a sort of reflection of how he stands in the eyes of others."—65, 83. See CLASS; CASTE; STRATIFICATION.

Stereotypes. Preconceived or conventional notions of the character* and personality* of persons* to which we react, at least initially, rather than to the persons directly; "the pictures in our heads."

"Group-accepted image or idea, usually expressed in verbal form, with which is often associated a strong feeling-emotional tone."—125, 599. See CONTACTS, CATEGORICAL.

Stranger, The. Any person who is sufficiently emancipated from the provincial customs* and traditions* to analyze the social situation objectively and comparatively. See ISOLATION; MARGINAL MAN.

Stratification. The process, arising in and operating through competition* and conflict*, of forming class*, caste*, rank, or other fixed status-giving distinctions within a society*. Also, the fact of divisions on the basis of political, military, occupational, religious, income, or other roles* with associated status*.

"The process of forming caste, class, or other status-giving groups, or of determining level or plane of status for the individual within a group, community*, or society*."—125, 599.

"There are two ways in which demographic crystallization may have taken place. A people may have become rigid horizontally, divided into castes, or social strata; or it may be geographically segregated into localized communities, varying in size all the way from the isolated hamlet to the highly individualized nation. Both of the forms of crystallization are breaking down today under the pressure of modern industrialism and democracy, in Europe as well as in America."—89, 533.

Struggle for Existence. A specialized concrete form of competition*;

the efforts of organisms to obtain the means of life. The tendency of all living forms to increase in a geometric ratio in a world limited in space and other necessities of life makes the struggle to survive and reproduce ceaseless and severe.

"The typical struggle in human society* is for livelihood rather than for the means of existence; the human struggle is for economic security and for place and power and status*."—92, 291.

Sublimation. The process of redirecting the wishes* from "gross" or socially disapproved goals into the "finer" or socially sacred channels of expression, as when the biological sex appetites get expression in the form of religion or art; a social or ethically acceptable substitute response.

Submission. Yielding to the power or authority* of a superior.

Succession. The displacement of a population by invaders as the result of a successful invasion. See *INVASION*.

Suggestion. The process involved in the release of mechanisms that have been fixed in the previous experience of the person*.

"Suggestion is the process by which a stimulus evokes a pre-established response."—48, 57.

"It is the simple release of modes of action that are already there."—25, 312.

"Imitation* and suggestion are both mechanisms of social interaction in which an individual or group is controlled by another individual or group. The characteristic mark of imitation is the tendency, under the influence of copies socially presented, to build up mechanisms of habits*, sentiments*, ideals, and patterns of life. The process of suggestion, as differentiated from imitation, is to release under the appropriate social stimuli mechanisms already organized, whether instincts*, habits, or sentiments."—89, 345-346.

Survey, Social. A systematic assembling of relevant data on a particular aspect or unit of a society* in order to formulate and implement a community reform* program. It is an inventory and a method of diagnosis.

Symbiosis. Living together. A relationship, such as is frequently found in the animal world, where different forms live in an association which, without being social, is of some mutual though unde-

signed advantage. The tree gives shade to the plant near its trunk while the plants conserve the moisture needed by the tree. The division of labor in society* creates specialized groups and classes*, which are mutually dependent and whose relations are more symbiotic than social.

"When physical barriers prevent assimilation*, members of the different groups may live together in a sort of symbiotic relationship. That is to say, they exist side by side, even become accommodated to each other in superficial ways, but remain discrete entities, never really members of a common life."—106, 606.

Symbol. Any mark, object, sound, or other device, without meaning or importance in its own right, which is used to recall or direct attention to ideas, actions, or things that are of social significance, as words, writings, national flags, musical notation, etc.

"An easily recognizable object or act* which represents something other than itself and which ordinarily evokes a uniform group response . . . a national flag, a national emblem . . . the cross, the crescent . . . the engagement or wedding ring."—86, 565.

"The purpose of symbols is to bring the world of reality under more effective control. They are nonmaterial tools."—41, 23. See COLLECTIVE REPRESENTATION.

Systematic Sociology. See page 183.

Taboo. An injunction against the performance of an act* that derives its efficacy from fear of swift and dire punishment by supernatural powers. The "Thou shalt nots" of the Jewish mythology are familiar examples of taboo.

"Taboos are perhaps not so much a means of enforcing custom*, as they are themselves customs invested with peculiar and awful sanction. They prohibit or ban any contact with persons or objects under penalty or danger from unseen things."—DEWEY.

Temperament. An elementary but distinctive tendency, possibly innate or biologically determined, to react to the environment* in a characteristic way. Classical thought recognized four types of temperament: sanguine, choleric, melancholic, and phlegmatic. See EXTRAVERSION; INTROVERSION.

Tradition. The belief* or judgment that certain arrangements or

ways of acting are desirable or right. Also, the body of customs*, sentiments*, beliefs—the social heritage*—transmitted from one generation to the next. A way of thinking that has come down from the past.

“Tradition is the rationalized portion of social behavior, as custom is its objective behavioristic side. People not merely do things in a fixed fashion, they find reasons for doing them. The reasons which they discover are their traditions. The traditions take on a historical background, being thrust back into the beginning of the group life or into some other portion of its past. Many of these we call myths*.”—114, 352. See CUSTOM; FOLKWAYS; MORES; MYTHS.

Types, Ideal. Imagined constructs for which there is no exact counterpart in empirical reality. They are designed to help in the understanding of reality through abstracting and personalizing a single complex of factors. The “economic man” of the classical economists symbolizes the forces of economic competition*, it does not present a kind of human being. See TYPE, OCCUPATIONAL; TYPE, SOCIAL; ECONOMIC MAN.

Types, Occupational. The type of personality* determined by a particular occupation, either because the occupation selects the type or because the personality is formed by the conditions of life within the occupation, or both.

“Types have grown up as a result of the numerous modern divisions of labor . . . The financier, the lawyer, the teacher, the taxicab driver, the bellhop, the actress, the social worker, the plumber, the labor leader, and many others are illustrations of occupational types. The occupation stamps itself upon them.”—25, 645. See TYPE, IDEAL; TYPE, SOCIAL.

Types, Social. A social type is a more or less perfect exemplification of a group* or of a complex of factors operating in a given life situation. In this usage the type is merely a kind of human, a personal representative of the group. It should not be confused with the more abstract conception of ideal type.

“The term ‘social type’ does not refer to the mechanisms of personality reactions, but to attitudes*, values*, and philosophy of life derived from copies presented by society. The role* which a person

assumes and to which he is assigned by society creates the social type."—99, 193-194. See **TYPE, IDEAL**; **TYPE, OCCUPATIONAL**.

Unconscious, The. A psychoanalytical term that denotes the content of mental life that was never in consciousness or, if previously in consciousness, has been repressed.

Unconscious, The Socially. The body of customs*, conventions*, creeds, and other elements of the social heritage* that influence or determine thought and behavior without the awareness of the persons acting.

Universe of Discourse. A realm or area of words and meanings, of ideas, social definitions, points of view, and basic assumptions that the members of a group* share in common.

"A universe of discourse is in part the vocabulary of words and meanings which are readily used and commonly understood by the members of a group. But these words are grouped into idiomatic phrases; the group, too, has certain assumptions—leading ideas in connection with which most phrases and sentences are used. Thus, a universe of discourse includes the group's point of view in the main situations of life."—25, 270-271.

"For this process of discussion to go on, it is essential for the public to have what has been called a 'universe of discourse'—the possession of a common language or the ability to agree on the meanings of fundamental terms."—4, 248.

Unrest, Social. Random activity arising from tensions or unsatisfied desires; activity in response to an organic impulse which does not satisfy the impulse. Unrest becomes social when it is communicated and particularly when it takes the form of circular reactions*.

"Social unrest is the initial and most elementary form of collective behavior*. It is the activity which results from the mutual and circular stimulation of persons*, some or many of whose needs have failed of satisfaction in the environment*. It is a symptom of maladjustment* and a product of social interaction*."—92, 449.

Urban Sociology. See page 197.

Urbanism. The state of existence where attitudes* are individual and rational and the relationships of men are abstract and impersonal or

approach, in some measure, this limit. Also used, loosely and inaccurately, as a synonym for city life.

Urbanization. The process of becoming urban, or moving from primary and personal attitudes* and sacred values* toward the area of secondary and impersonal attitudes and secular values. Also used to refer to the movement of population from the country to the city, and to the increasing percentage of populations living in cities.

Utopias. Plans or conditions of ideal perfection or schemes for social regeneration and human perfection.

Values. Objects of human desire or appreciation: any objects, conditions, or principles around which meanings have grown up in the course of experience of social interaction*.

“Social values are those objects and activities which have common meanings for the members of a particular group . . . A value is the objective counterpart of the attitude* and possesses qualities that elicit the common interest* of group members.”—108, II, 21-22.

“Anything capable of being appreciated (wished for) is a ‘value.’ Food, money, a poem, a political doctrine, a religious creed, a member of the other sex, etc., are values. There are also negative values—things which exist, but which the individual does not want, which he may even despise. Liquor or the Yiddish language may be a positive value for one person and a negative value for another.”—89, 488.
See ATTITUDES.

Vice. Activity injurious to the organism or demoralizing to the personal organization.

Vicious Circle. See CIRCLE, VICIOUS.

War. A specialized form of conflict*. The armed struggle of nations or other politically organized units.

“The term war is generally applied to armed conflict between population groups conceived of as organic unities, such as races* or tribes or lesser geographic units, religions or political parties*, economic classes*. Armed conflict between states that legally enjoy complete and unlimited sovereignty is in modern thought treated as typically war.”—58, XV, 331.

We-Group. See IN-GROUP.

Wish. An impulse accompanied by an image of its satisfaction.

Wishes, Fundamental. A classification proposed by W. I. Thomas of concrete wishes into four abstract categories: the desire for new experience, security, response, and recognition.

SOURCES CITED IN DICTIONARY OF TERMS

1. BENEDICT, RUTH. *Patterns of Culture*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934.
2. BENTLEY, ARTHUR F. *The Processes of Government*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908.
3. BLUMER, HERBERT. In *Man and Society*, ed. E. P. Schmidt. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1937.
4. ———. In R. E. PARK, and OTHERS. *An Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1939.
5. BOAS, FRANZ. *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1928.
6. BOEHM, MAX. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
7. BOETTIGER, LOUIS A. *Fundamentals of Sociology*. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1938.
8. BOGARDUS, EMORY S. *Sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934.
9. BOSSARD, JAMES H. S. *Social Change and Social Problems*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1934.
10. BURGESS, E. W. In CLIFFORD R. SHAW, *The Jack-Roller*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1930.
11. ———. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
12. BURY, J. B. *The Idea of Progress*. London: The Macmillan Co., 1921.
13. CASE, CLARENCE M. *Outlines of Introductory Sociology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1924.
14. CHAPIN, F. STUART. *Contemporary American Institutions*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935.
15. COHEN, MORRIS R. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
16. COOK, LLOYD A. *Community Backgrounds of Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.
17. COOLEY, CHARLES H. *Social Organization*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

18. COOLEY, CHARLES H. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.
19. ———. *Life and the Student*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
20. ———. *The Social Process*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
21. COOLEY, C. H., R. C. ANGELL, and L. J. CARR. *Introductory Sociology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.
22. DAVIE, MAURICE R. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
23. ———. *Problems of City Life*. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 1932.
24. DAVIS, JEROME, HARRY E. BARNES, and OTHERS. *An Introduction to Sociology*. New York: D. C. Heath and Co., 1927.
25. DAWSON, C. A. and W. E. GETTYS. *An Introduction to Sociology*. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1929.
26. ———. *An Introduction to Sociology*. Rev. ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1935.
27. DEWEY, JOHN. *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916.
28. ———. *Freedom and Culture*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939.
29. ———. *Human Nature and Conduct*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1922.
30. DOOB, LEONARD W. *Propaganda*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1935.
31. DOW, GROVE. *Society and Its Problems*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1922.
32. DUNLAP, KNIGHT. *Civilized Life*. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Co., 1934.
33. ———. *Habits*. New York: H. Liveright, 1932.
34. DURKHEIM, EMILE. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. London: Allen, 1915.
35. ELLWOOD, CHARLES A. *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: D. Appleton Co., 1917.
36. *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931.
37. EUBANK, EARLE E. *The Concepts of Sociology*. New York: D. C. Heath and Co., 1932.
38. EVERETT, HELEN. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.

39. FAIRCHILD, HENRY PRATT. *General Sociology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1934.
40. FARIS, ELLSWORTH. *The Nature of Human Nature*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937.
41. FOLSOM, JOSEPH K. *Culture and Social Progress*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928.
42. FRANK, L. K. "Social Problems," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, XXX (1925), 463.
43. GIDDINGS, FRANKLIN H. *Civilization and Society*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1932.
44. GILLETTE, JOHN M., and JAMES M. REINHARDT. *Social Problems*. New York: American Book Co., 1937.
45. GILLIN, JOHN L., and F. W. BLACKMAR. *Outlines of Sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.
46. GINSBERG, MORRIS. *Sociology*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1934.
47. ———. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
48. GREGORY, EDWARD W., and LEE BIDGOOD. *Introductory Sociology*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939.
49. GROVES, ERNEST R. *An Introduction to Sociology*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928.
50. GROVES, ERNEST R., and HARRY E. MOORE. *An Introduction to Sociology*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1940.
51. HAMILTON, W. H. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
52. HANKINS, FRANK H. *An Introduction to the Study of Society*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928.
53. HARING, DOUGLAS G. and MARY E. JOHNSON. *Order and Possibility in Social Life*. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1940.
54. HERTZLER, JOYCE O. *Social Institutions*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1929.
55. HILLER, E. T. *Principles of Sociology*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1933.
56. HOLLINGSHEAD, A. B. In R. E. PARK and OTHERS. *An Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1939.
57. HOUSE, FLOYD N. *The Range of Social Theory*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1929.
58. JOHNSON, ALVIN. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.

59. KALLEN, H. M. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
60. KELLER, ALBERT G. *Man's Rough Road*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1932.
61. ———. *Societal Evolution*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1915.
62. KLEIN, P. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
63. KOHN, HANS. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
64. KROEBER, A. L. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
65. KRUEGER, E. T., and WALTER C. RECKLESS. *Social Psychology*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1931.
66. LA PIERE, RICHARD T., and PAUL R. FARNSWORTH. *Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936.
67. LA PIERE, RICHARD T. *Collective Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.
68. LASSWELL, H. D. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
69. LEOPOLD, LEWIS. *Prestige*. London: T. F. Unwin, 1913.
70. LEWIS, READ. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
71. LINDSAY, A. D. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
72. LOWIE, R. H. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
73. LUMLEY, FREDERICK E. *Principles of Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1928.
74. LUNDBERG, GEORGE A. *Foundations of Sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939.
75. MACIVER, ROBERT M. *Society: A Textbook of Sociology*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1937.
76. ———. *Society: Its Structure and Changes*. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, 1931.
77. MALINOWSKI, B. In R. B. CATTELL, and OTHERS. *Human Affairs*. London: The Macmillan Co., 1937.
78. MCLEAD, W. C. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
79. MEAD, GEORGE H. *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.
80. MOWRER, ERNEST R. *The Family*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1932.
81. MURPHY, GARDNER. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
82. MURRAY, RAYMOND W. *Introductory Sociology*. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1935.
83. ODUM, HOWARD W. *Man's Quest for Social Guidance*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1927.

84. OGBURN, WILLIAM F. *Social Change*. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1922.
85. OGBURN, WILLIAM F., and MEYER F. NIMKOFF. *Sociology*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940.
86. PANUNZIO, CONSTANTINE. *Major Social Institutions*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939.
87. PARK, ROBERT E. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
88. PARK, ROBERT E., and OTHERS. *An Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1939.
89. PARK, ROBERT E., and E. W. BURGESS. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921; second edition, 1924.
90. PHELPS, HAROLD A. *Principles and Laws of Sociology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1936.
91. REUTER, E. B. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
92. REUTER, E. B., and C. W. HART. *Introduction to Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933.
93. RISLEY, HERBERT H. *The People of India*. London: W. Thacker and Co., 1915.
94. ROSS, E. A. *Principles of Sociology*. New York: The Century Co., 1930.
95. SAPIR, EDWARD. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
96. ———. In *The Unconscious*, ed. W. I. Thomas. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
97. SCHMIDT, RICHARD. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
98. SEMPLE, ELLEN CHURCHILL. *Influences of the Geographic Environment*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1911.
99. SHAW, CLIFFORD R. *The Jack-Roller*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1930.
100. SMALL, ALBION W. *General Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1905.
101. SMITH, RUSSELL GORDON. *Fugitive Papers*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931.
102. SOROKIN, P. *Contemporary Sociological Theories*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1928.
103. STEINER, J. F. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
104. STONEQUIST, E. V. *The Marginal Man*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

105. SUMNER, WILLIAM G. *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1906.
106. SUTHERLAND, R. L., and J. L. WOODWARD. *Introductory Sociology*. 2nd ed. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1940.
107. THOMAS, FRANKLIN. *The Environmental Basis of Society*. New York: The Century Co., 1925.
108. THOMAS, W. I., and FLORIAN ZNANIECKI. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. 2 vol. ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
109. THOMAS, W. I. *Source Book for Social Origins*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909.
110. TYLOR, E. B. *Primitive Culture*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1889.
111. WALLER, WILLARD. *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1932.
112. WALLER, WILLARD and OTHERS. *War in the Twentieth Century*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1940.
113. WALLIS, WILSON D. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
114. ———. *Introduction to Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1926.
115. WARD, ROBERT DE C. *Climate*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.
116. WEATHERFORD, W. D., and C. S. JOHNSON. *Race Relations*. New York: D. C. Heath and Co., 1934.
117. *Webster's New International Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1935.
118. WESTERMARCK, EDWARD. *History of Human Marriage*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1894.
119. WILLEY, M. M. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
120. ———. In J. DAVIS, H. E. BARNES, and OTHERS. *An Introduction to Sociology*. New York: D. C. Heath and Co., 1927.
121. WIRTH, LOUIS. In *Ency. Soc. Sciences*.
122. WISSLER, CLARK. *Introduction to Social Anthropology*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1929.
123. WRIGHT, VERNE, and MANUEL C. ELMER. *General Sociology*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1939.
124. YOUNG, KIMBALL. *An Introductory Sociology*. New York: American Book Co., 1934.

125. YOUNG, KIMBALL. *An Introductory Sociology*. Rev. ed. New York: American Book Co., 1939.
126. ———. *Social Psychology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1920.
127. ZELENY, LESLIE DAY. *Practical Sociology*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1937.

PART FOUR

*Areas of Specialized Study
Bibliographies*

PART FOUR

Areas of Specialized Study Bibliographies

THE field of sociological study is very broad. The research interests and the concrete problems of individual workers are often far removed from those of other persons equally entitled to be called sociologists. The unity of the discipline is maintained in large measure by the point of view from which the study is undertaken. This group point of view is common to all strictly sociological work; in other words, all research carried on from the standpoint of the group is sociological in character.

It is quite possible to subdivide the sociological field of interest into logically related units of study. Several of the general texts that treat sociology* as a theoretical or scientific discipline do so with at least a tentative measure of success. An additional suggestion looking in this direction is made by a leading scholar in the field:

Of course, these distinctions between theory and practical procedures are not always strictly applicable to books and articles, especially since many books include theoretic or sociological and practical or social problems; and sociologists dealing with

* Words followed by an asterisk are defined or discussed in the dictionary section (Part III, pp. 76-170).

certain complexes of social phenomena are often interested in them both theoretically and practically. For these reasons and until better separation of science and technology is achieved in our field, it may be well to preserve such logically mixed subdivisions as "criminology," "urban" and "rural" sociology, sociology of the family.

I should suggest therefore the following subdivisions of sociology:

- I. History of sociology
- II. Methodology of social sciences
- III. Theoretic sociology (or sociological theory)
 1. General or systematic sociology
 2. Special subdivisions of theoretic sociology. These may or may not include social* psychology, but must certainly include any branches of theoretic study in which sociologists have actually specialized, such as the theory of social groups (which may be further subdivided), of social roles* (including class* and caste*), of social relations, of social processes (including such problems as public opinion and war*), sociology of knowledge, sociology of religion, etc.
- IV. Descriptive sociology (sociography)
 1. Ethnography of lower societies
 2. Regional sociography
 3. Community surveys*
 4. Population surveys
 5. Human ecology*
- V. Social technology
 1. Sociology of social* work
 2. Sociology of public administration
 3. Political sociology
 4. Educational sociology (*not* sociological theory of education), etc.
- VI. Mixed
 1. Criminology
 2. Urban sociology

3. Rural sociology
4. Sociology and ethics of family life¹

In a recent volume, Professor Eubank has presented "the grand continental divisions that emerge as one essays to construct a map of the entire planet of sociological theory. They are therefore suggested as the seven major concepts* of sociology, in the belief that they provide a logical and systematic scheme whereby to organize the essentials of this field of study."² They are, in abbreviated tabular statement, as follows:

- A. Societary Composition
 1. The single human being
 2. The human plural
- B. Societary Causation
 3. Societary energy
 4. Societary control*
- C. Societary Change*
 5. Societary action
 6. Societary relationship
- D. Societary Products
 7. Culture*

Any logical organization of the sociological subject matter is likely to depart somewhat far from present and familiar practice. For that reason it would have relatively little interest or value in a presentation chiefly concerned with the existing state of academic practice.

The existing divisions are historical phenomena; they came into existence, gradually and without design, through the activity of individuals in following specialized research and teaching interests. In consequence, they are not always clearly differentiated in subject matter or problems; each student tends to bring within his field of study any items or problems that seem relevant, regardless of the fact that they may be treated at length by other scholars in other connections.

¹ Florian Znaniecki. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

² Earle Edward Eubank, "The Conceptual Approach to Sociology," in *Contemporary Social Theory*, Harry Elmer Barnes, Howard Becker, and Frances Bennett Becker, eds. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940).

The wide diversity of interests among the men engaged in sociological research and teaching is indicated, in a measure, by the groups specially organized within the American Sociological Society. The program meetings of the association, designed to satisfy the specialized interests of the members, are arranged on the basis of divisions and sections. But the divisions and sections represent, in many cases, groupings of related interests rather than specialized lines of research. They give, therefore, a somewhat oversimplified picture of the range of sociological study. The major subdivisions recognized by the association are as follows:

- General and Historical Sociology
- Social Psychology
- Methods of Research
- Social Biology
- Educational Sociology
- Statistical Sociology
- Rural Sociology
- Community Study
- Sociology and Social Work
- Teaching of Social Studies
- The Family
- Sociology of Religion
- Sociology and Psychiatry
- Criminology
- Political Sociology

In a volume published in 1933, an attempt was made to characterize the chief subdivisions of sociology. The total list included twenty-nine fields, of which sixteen were deemed of sufficient importance to merit extended treatment.¹

- Historical Sociology
- Biological Sociology
- Demography
- Social Geography
- Human Ecology*

¹ *The Fields and Methods of Sociology*, L. L. Bernard, editor (New York: Ray Long and Richard Smith, 1934), p. 12.

Study of the Community*
Rural Sociology
Urban Sociology
Folk* Sociology
Cultural Sociology
Sociology of Art
Social* Psychology
Social Psychiatry
Educational Sociology
Sociology of Religion*
Sociology of Law
Study of the Family*
Political Sociology
Social Ethics
Sociology of Institutions
Social Organization*
Social Control*
Sociology of Economic Relations
Social Pathology
Criminology and Delinquency
Penology
Social* Work
Social Investigation
Social Statistics

In the following discussion, the areas of specialized study are broken down into somewhat smaller units. These units are of quite unequal importance when they are considered as parts of a general system of sociological thought, when they are compared with respect to the number of students at work, or when they are compared from other points of view. But each represents an area of sociological interest in which competent work has been done. They are presented here with little regard for degrees of relative importance.¹

¹The references appended to the various topics are for the most part to texts and other brief treatises generally easily available. They are not in any sense to be taken as adequate minimum bibliographies or as lists of the essential books in the fields; they are intended, rather, to give some initial guidance to the student who is seeking to orient himself in specialized areas of study.

THE HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY

The history of sociology is a chapter in history rather than a chapter in sociology. Its subject matter, however, is of more immediate interest to the students of social science than to the students of historical reality. Like economics, mathematics, biology, and other sciences and intellectual disciplines, sociology has had a relatively long period of development; it has reached its present scholarly and academic status, and its present body of doctrine and method, as a result of prolonged reflection and research.

The history of the discipline undertakes to trace the development of sociology from the unsystematic folk thought and ancient lore, through the period in which sociological thought was gradually differentiated from the current bodies of wisdom and from historical and philosophical thought, and through the period of effort to clarify the point of view and define the problems and methods, to its present position as a scientific discipline. The account is concerned with the appearance of ideas, methods, and doctrines, and with their clarification and modification in later thought. It seeks to describe and evaluate the various social theories and philosophies, to show them within their cultural settings, and to trace their evolution. It is also concerned, in a lesser degree, with the men who contributed to the growth of the science and with the schools that have flourished and passed.

In the performance of its task, the history of sociology employs the methods and techniques of historical scholarship.

Among the values that come to the student from a study of this history, two may be mentioned here. It is only in the light of a historical perspective that the student is able to see the relative importance of his specific problem and field of specialization and to escape a research provincialism. The history of the science gives an account of the various doctrines that have been expounded, the problems that have been defined, the methods of research that have been employed, and other data that are necessary to the student who would avoid wasting his efforts along lines that have proved to be futile or unprofitable.

The field of study is characterized by one of the leading American students as follows:

In my conception, the study of the history of sociology is justified on the premise that there are some things that can be adequately understood for what they are only by some investigation of their history, i.e., the process of development by which they have come to be what they are. This seems to be particularly true of the phenomena of culture; and all sciences and theories, including sociological theory, are surely cultural phenomena. Comte said that when any science reaches maturity it need no longer be studied historically, but can be handled dogmatically. This may be true of sociology, but I am convinced that an understanding of sociology as it is now cannot be had without some attention to the process of its development. Terms and propositions which have been urged for inclusion in the body of sociological theory need to be examined with reference to the context, the historical setting, in which they took shape. Removed from that context, they are likely to be misunderstood.

If this standpoint is valid, it implies that sociological concepts and theories need to be studied in the light of some knowledge of the situations in which their authors were placed, and the problems (including practical, social, political, and economic problems) which they were trying to illuminate. It also implies that the student of the history of sociology must pay some attention to the history of other subjects; for political theory, philosophies of history, political economy, and a great many general philosophical ideas, in addition to the beginnings of modern physical and biological science, were already in existence when sociology first appeared as a distinct subject. These older disciplines formed an important part of the context of early sociology; indeed they still form an important part of the context of sociology.¹

REFERENCES:

BARNES, HARRY E., and HOWARD BECKER. *Social Thought From Lore to Science: A History and Interpretation of Man's Ideas About Life with his Fellows*. 2 vols. New York: D. C. Heath and Co., 1938. The first volume deals with the early types of thought in which social ideas are embodied; the second volume

¹ Floyd N. House. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

traces recent social thought in the countries where sociology is important.

ELLWOOD, CHARLES A. *A History of Social Philosophy*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1938. The purpose of this book is to trace and evaluate the great currents of social thought in our civilization.

HERTZLER, JOYCE O. *The Social Thought of the Ancient Civilizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936. A wealth of material presented with a minimum of interpretation.

HOUSE, FLOYD N. *The Development of Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936. Concerned with the history of sociology as a means to an understanding of sociological theory.

LICHTENBERGER, JAMES P. *The Development of Social Theory*. New York: The Century Company, 1923. "An attempt to uncover the foundation upon which the present structure has been erected and to clarify the processes without which . . . it could not have been built at all."

SMALL, ALBION W. *The Origin of Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1924. The best volume in this field.

———. "Fifty Years of Sociology in the United States, 1865-1915," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.* XXI, 6 (May, 1916). The best account of the beginnings of American sociology.

SOCIAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

The term theory is commonly used to designate the analysis of data in order to discover general principles as distinct from applied science. It specifies the pure as distinguished from the applied aspect of science. Social theory has the same connotation; it is the search for the abstract principles or ideal relations that will make the concrete empirical phenomena comprehensible; it is, therefore, contrasted to social work, teaching, and other arts and techniques as well as to the applied social sciences, social technologies, and historical disciplines. Sociological theory, as distinct from general social theory, has a somewhat more restricted connotation; it is limited to the search for and exposition of general principles necessary to an explanation and understanding of sociological phenomena.

In its developed form, social or sociological theory presents the

basic assumption or postulates upon which the system rests, it states the central problems and the series of more specific dependent problems that it seeks to solve, and it considers the requirements for a valid method of reflection and research in the effort to solve these problems. In its developed form, it consists of a tentative but coherent group of propositions that account in a systematic way for all the relevant phenomena.

The nature and present status of social theory are admirably set forth in the reflections of Professor Florian Znaniecki:

It seems to me that the term itself is as much a misnomer as would be a term "electric physics." There are physical theories of electric phenomena, just as there are sociological theories of social phenomena, but a sociological theory is not social (except insofar as socially conditioned, which is a special problem in the sociology of knowledge) any more than a physical theory of electricity is electric.

But leaving this point aside, the question is what kind or branch of knowledge can be denoted by the term "social" or, better still, "sociological" theory?

Let us turn once more to older and logically more consistent sciences. In physics, "physical theory" or "theoretical physics" is distinguished from "experimental physics" on the one hand, "applied physics" or "physical technology" or "physical engineering" on the other hand. Experimental physics gives observable facts; theoretical physics draws scientific generalizations from these facts, which are in turn tested by new observations. Applied physics uses the theories and observations of theoretical and experimental physics for technological planning.

It seems to me that in our field the same differentiation clearly exists. We have "descriptive sociology" (a good old term initiated by Spencer) or "sociography," and "theoretical sociology" or "sociological theory"; we have also applied sociology used by social workers, social reformers, legislators, educators, and others in planning and guiding practical social activity.

There seems to be no difficulty about distinguishing sociological theory from the history of sociology. Although nearly

every work in sociological theory contains references to other works that are also dealt with by historians of sociology, yet the historical treatment of scientific theories, even if accompanied by positive or negative criticism, is very different from utilization of them for building a new theory.

There remains one branch of knowledge closely connected with sociology: the methodology of social sciences in general and of sociology in particular. Though not logically a part of sociology but a part of a general comparative theory of scientific knowledge, still for various reasons it must be studied by sociologists. However, methodology is not sociological theory, only theory of sociological theories.¹

REFERENCES:

BARNES, HARRY E., HOWARD BECKER, and FRANCES BENNETT BECKER, eds. *Contemporary Social Theory*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940. A symposium in the field of historical sociology.

BLUMER, HERBERT. *An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America."* New York: Social Science Research Council, 1939. "A highly illuminating analysis of a most important publication."

HOUSE, FLOYD N. *The Range of Social Theory: A Survey of the Development, Literature, Tendencies, and Fundamental Problems of the Social Sciences*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1929. Designed to give a comprehensive acquaintance with the literature and history of the social sciences.

RICE, STUART A., ed. *Methods in Social Science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931. "A series of interpretations of the scientific methods employed by authors of significant contributions to social science."

SOROKIN, PITIRIM A. *Contemporary Sociological Theories*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1928. The sociological theories since the middle of the nineteenth century and an examination of their scientific validity.

THOMAS, W. I., and FLORIAN ZNANIECKI. *The Polish Peasant in*

¹ Florian Znaniecki. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

Europe and America. 2 vol. ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927. An outstanding research monograph, with extended attention to methodological procedures.

SYSTEMATIC SOCIOLOGY

No clear-cut line of distinction can be drawn that will separate social or sociological theory from systematic sociology. System is an inherent characteristic of all theory, and all systematic sociology is of necessity theoretical. The phrase "systematic sociology" is often loosely used as more or less synonymous with comparative sociology when it is desired to direct attention toward various or contrasting systems of sociology or social thought, particularly when theoretical systems are treated comparatively and critically. But this is colloquial rather than critical usage. The term is also in use to designate the more general and comprehensive sociological systems as apart from theoretical studies of partial nature or limited scope.

For present purposes, the field is set out in adequate detail in its relationship to sociological theory in the statements by Professors Znaniecki and Sorokin.

I cannot see any clear-cut division between sociological theory and systematic sociology. All theory must be systematic. Whether a theoretical work bears upon a larger or a smaller section of the field of a certain science is a matter of relative comprehensiveness and generality, not of systematic character. A theory of the family*, of race* relations, or of public* opinion is a systematic sociological theory of a certain logical class of social phenomena. In particular, I fail to understand how those who regard social* psychology—a systematic theoretical discipline—as a part of sociology can separate it from sociological theory. Perhaps the term "systematic sociology" can be reserved for the works that cover the entire field of social phenomena; but this can be only a subdivision within the general division of sociological theory.¹

By systematic sociology I mean a consistent set of sociological

¹ Florian Znaniecki. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

principles mutually interdependent and supplementing one another and in their totality giving us an understanding of all the important aspects of structure as well as change of socio-cultural phenomena, with all their hows and whys. In this sense it is a sociological theory. But in contradistinction to unsystematic inconsistent congeries of various theories and bits of information, systematic sociological theory differs by the above characteristics. All great sociological theories, from Plato and Aristotle up to Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Karl Marx, Durkheim, and Pareto, in this sense have been systematic theories.¹

REFERENCES:

- GIDDINGS, FRANKLIN H. *The Principles of Sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1896. One of the early American systems of sociology.
- MACIVER, ROBERT M. *Society: A Textbook of Sociology*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937. Another system of thought centering about social relationships.
- PARETO, VILFREDO. *Mind and Society*. Translated and edited by Arthur Livingston. 3 Vols. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1935. A comprehensive system.
- PARK, R. E., and E. W. BURGESS. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921; second edition, 1924. An outstanding American system of sociology.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT. *The Structure of Social Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937. An effort to state the coherent body of theory found in Marshall, Pareto, Durkheim, and Max Weber.
- ROSS, EDWARD A. *Principles of Sociology*. New York: the Century Company, 1930. 3rd ed. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938. A system of sociology. "The parts are fitted to one another, and taken together they are intended to cover the field."
- SMALL, ALBION W. *General Sociology: An Exposition of the Main Developments in Sociological Theory from Spencer to Ratzel*

¹ Pitirim A. Sorokin. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

hofer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1905. "The aim of this syllabus is not to exploit another of these competing systems of sociology, but to bring into view the field of knowledge which all sociologists have instinctively attempted to survey."

SOROKIN, PITIRIM A. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. 3 volumes published to date. New York: American Book Company, 1937. The most recent and one of the most pretentious systems.

ZNANIECKI, FLORIAN. *Social Action*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1936. A general systematic survey.

HUMAN ECOLOGY*

Human ecology is the scientific study of the distributional patterns of human life and social forms in space and time and of the factors determining the distribution. Otherwise stated, this field of interest includes all those data relevant to an understanding of the geographic placement, the cultural status*, and the migratory movements of people in so far as these phenomena are determined by the facts of relative scarcity, that is, so far as they are determined by the impersonal processes of competition*.

The physical world is fixed and limited in area; its productivity cannot be easily or indefinitely expanded. On the other hand, man, as other living forms, tends to increase in a geometric ratio. The inevitable result of multiplying forms in limited space is a struggle to survive, prosper, and propagate. But the resources of the earth are not only limited in quantity. They are unequally distributed in space; also, men and groups are unequally equipped for the subsistence struggle. The result is a competition of unequal forms for the limited and localized means of livelihood. This, in turn, expresses itself in the phenomena of spatial distribution, acclimatization*, and other forms of biological adaptation*, segregation*, migration*, the adjustment* of men to the external environment* and to one another in the same habitat, and human modification through the differential survival of the competing forms.

The ecological processes observable in the life history of communities are variously stated, but there is fair consensus in regard

to essentials. The existence of resources or other means of livelihood leads to migration from areas less well fitted to satisfy the existing human needs. The invasion* of the area results in intensified competition* and an increased segregation* and division of labor, which may result in the gradual displacement of the original inhabitants by the invaders. This is the phenomenon of succession*. In the usual statement, the major ecological processes are given as concentration, centralization-decentralization, segregation, invasion, and succession. More completely the ecological concepts include symbiosis*, segregation, migration, invasion, succession, domination*, mobility*, centralization, decentralization, ecological organization, ecological areas, and regionalism.

The analysis is commonly applied to human institutions* and culture facts as well as to the population units. The competition for survival determines the location of industrial cities within the geographic area, of business areas within the city, of specific business establishments within the business area, and so on.

It is the problem of the human ecologists to discover the factors and define the principles that explain the changing spatial patterns of peoples and institutions. But position affects the character of human and institutional behavior, thus giving rise to phenomena that are social rather than ecological in character. In some ecological studies, these social results of placement are included as aspects of ecology.

The following paragraph, by an American sociologist who has made a brilliant contribution to ecological study, adequately summarizes a present-day conception of the field and the major problems:

Human ecology is the study of the competitive forces that arrange into positions, people and institutions, and the various effects of these arrangements. The arrangements may be patterns of distribution in space, over the surface of the earth, within a continent, or in and about cities, or they may be positions in the occupational pyramid, in power systems, and other rankings. Since forces other than the competitive struggle for existence, such as tradition* and sentiment*, are generally in-

termingled in the process, ecological study must include the proper statement of the part they play. The arrangements of population* and institutions have significant connections with some aspects of social disorganization*, with the emergence of new movements and institutions, and with behavior of persons*, and these matters are thus within the proper sphere of ecological study.¹

REFERENCES:

- BIEWS, J. W. *Human Ecology*. London: Oxford University Press, 1935. A volume by a botanist who conceives of human ecology as providing the patterns into which all the separate human sciences are fitted and unified.
- BURGESS, E. W., ed. *The Urban Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1926. Selected papers from the *Proceedings of the American Sociological Society*, 1925.
- FARIS, ROBERT E. L., and H. W. DUNHAM. *Mental Disorders in Urban Areas*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939. "A pioneer study in the social aspects of mental disorder in the City of Chicago." "This is the first application of a refined ecological technique to the problem of mental disorder."
- HOLLINGSHEAD, A. B. "Human Ecology," in R. E. PARK and OTHERS. *An Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1939. An outline conception of the field and problems.
- LIND, ANDREW W. *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938. "This study brings to bear upon a single region the accumulated methodology of human ecology. It indicates, moreover, the manner in which ecological principles may contribute to an understanding of race and class relations."
- McKENZIE, ROBERT D. *The Metropolitan Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933. As in the case of Park, much of McKenzie's best work appears in journal articles and chapters in other men's books. The student should consult the article in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*; "The Scope of Human
- ¹ Robert E. L. Faris. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

Ecology," *Publ. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XX (1926), 141-154; "The Field and Problems of Demography, Human Geography, and Human Ecology," in L. L. Bernard, ed., *Fields and Methods of Sociology*; and "The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community," in R. E. Park, ed., *The City*.

PARK, ROBERT E., and OTHERS. *The City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925. The mind of Dr. Park stands behind much of the best work in the ecological field, but his publications are chiefly in the form of journal articles. The student should early consult the article on "Human Ecology," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.* XLII (1937), 1-15, and the article on "Symbiosis and Socialization," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, XL (1939), 1-25.

POPULATION

The study of population* is the chapter in human ecology that undertakes to describe and explain the distribution of peoples in time and place through an analysis of the factors that control birth rates, death rates, and migratory movements.

Population phenomena have been a source of continuing interest from very early times. They have, however, commonly not been treated systematically; the interest has usually been upon a single or a few aspects made timely by the social circumstances of the period or area, and the interest has shifted in response to changes in local conditions and in the growth trends themselves. Moreover, the interest in population questions has often been secondary, an interest incidental or subsidiary to questions of economic development, military power, or other matters of national policy or practice. It arose more often out of the desire to control the growth of numbers than out of any disinterested scientific desire to understand population movements. In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the interest was in means of assuring abundant man power for economic and military use. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the thought was largely dominated by the Malthusian formula in regard to the relationship between numbers and poverty. In the late nineteenth-century conditions, and particularly as the declining trend in family size was noted, the fear of overpopulation

was replaced by an anxiety concerning adequate increase. In the present century this anxiety tends to become acute.

Today, much of the population study is practical and administrative in character and point of view. Numerous students are engaged in collecting and classifying demographic facts, thus providing raw materials for theoretical and scientific use. But the theory of population is relatively neglected. The present study is in general motivated by a desire to control growth in the interest of group purposes; the central problem is the relation of numbers to economic and political development. It may take the relatively disinterested form of inquiry concerning the optimum population in a present civilization and stage of development of the industrial arts. But the major amount of attention is now given to predictions of future size and growth trends, to speculation concerning the economic effects of declining numbers, and to the formulation of means to arrest or reverse the present trends.

A leading student of population gives this characterization of the field of study:

Modern population study was probably given its initial direction by the fact that Malthus thought of the population problem in terms of the relation of the number of people to the resources available for their support. This statement of the problem of population had scarcely been revived before it became apparent that circumstances were rendering it obsolete. There were places on the earth where the growth of population was not being determined solely by the resources available for its subsistence. The realization of this fact led very naturally to the study of the differentials in rates of growth in different populations and in different areas. On the one hand, the investigation of differential birth rates became a major center of interest for many students of population, while, on the other hand, the study of the various and varied aspects of the distribution of population among different areas attracted increasing attention.

As time passed, it became increasingly clear that these differentials in birth rates and in spatial distribution affected human

welfare in many and significant ways. In particular it appeared that more attention should be given to the quality of the population as influenced both by heredity* and economic status*, and to the study of the effects of different patterns of spatial distribution on social welfare. Once students had become interested in the various aspects of the relation of man's numbers and the changes in them to his welfare, it was to be expected that nations would begin to wonder whether population growth could not be controlled for the common weal. Thus the study of population has branched out steadily and may tentatively be said to include the study of the many and diverse relations of man's numbers to his welfare. Students of population would scarcely assert exclusive rights to any particular segment of this broad field and certainly not to all of it; for any social scientist who sees ways in which he may contribute to a better understanding of the relation of man's numbers to his welfare will be adding to our knowledge of population no matter what the discipline in which he is chiefly interested.¹

REFERENCES:

- CARR-SAUNDERS, A. M. *The Population Problem: A Study in Human Evolution*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1922. Chiefly of value for its data on early practices influencing population growth.
- DUBLIN, LOUIS I., ed. *Population Problems in the United States and Canada*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1926. Papers presented at the eighty-sixth annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, December, 1924.
- FIELD, JAMES A. *Essays on Population and Other Papers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931. Includes material from Dr. Field's notes and lectures edited by Helen Fisher Hohman.
- KUEZYNSKI, ROBERT R. *The Balance of Births and Deaths*. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928-1931. An early formulation of the relation between present birth rates and future growth.

¹ Warren S. Thompson. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

- MALTHUS, THOMAS ROBERT. *An Essay on Population*. The work from which most population study has started since its publication in 1798. Most easily available in Everyman's Library, Numbers 692 and 693.
- PEARL, RAYMOND. *The Biology of Population Growth*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925. A good statement of Pearl's position.
- REUTER, E. B. *Population Problems*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1937. A widely used text.
- SANGER, MARGARET, ed. *Proceedings of the World Population Conference*. London: E. Arnold and Co., 1927. Papers and proceedings of the population conference held at the Salle Centrale, Geneva, August 29 to September 3, 1937.
- STRANGELAND, CHARLES E. *Pre-Malthusian Doctrines of Population: A Study in the History of Economic Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1904. A good preliminary orientation in the field of interest covered by the title.
- THOMPSON, WARREN S. *Population Problems*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1935. A widely used text.

EUGENICS*

Problems of quality have been generally neglected in the population literature. A systematic treatment requires a somewhat unusual type of specialized training—a considerable degree of competence in genetic biology and a fundamental training in sociology. The economic writers on population, while frequently recognizing an intimate interdependent relationship between the quantitative and the qualitative phenomena, have not been interested or equipped to carry on extensive analyses. Various aspects of population quality have been treated, frequently as discrete phenomena, by the sociologists, particularly by those dealing directly with social-pathological conditions and with concrete problems of the social life. Certain biological students and medical men have given some attention to human genetics and the physical basis of social life. This interest in the biological aspects of population quality is what is commonly implied by the term eugenics.

The chief interest has been in biological reform. The extent

and apparent increase of physical and mental defects and deficiencies in human population are noted, and measures designed to change the conditions are formulated. So far as the ills afflicting the populations are due to hereditary factors, they tend to be biologically transmitted and to reappear in the following generations. This condition can be changed only by selective measures that will eliminate the defective germ plasm. But some human defects, such as most physical and mental diseases, are social in origin and nontransmissible in character. It would be an uneconomic as well as an ineffective procedure to attempt to remove these by selective means. The eugenicist, therefore, is concerned to discover which of the human defects are hereditary. He is then concerned to devise measures for their effective control.

Eugenics is also concerned with measures to stimulate the increase of individuals from genetically superior strains. This, again, involves the problem of determining the types of superiority that are the result of genetic factors as distinct from those that are expressions of adequate nutrition and fortunate social circumstances, and it also involves the problem of devising means to stimulate the reproductive rate of the natively superior.

At present, eugenics is tending to become sociological rather than biological in point of view. There is an increasing recognition that heredity is a less important factor in population quality than was once believed; and there is more appreciation of the fact that the measures designed to change the hereditary characters of the race are social measures. A present trend is toward the development of eugenics into an ethically neutral study of population quality that will give a basis for administrative procedures in the area of social reform.

Mr. Osborn, who has long been active in eugenic work, states the nature of the field and its problems and methods:

The eugenics movement is concerned first, with the reduction of hereditary defect, and second, with the increase of births among parents who are above the average in genetic capacity. In the first field, there is need for a genetic approach to the study of so-called constitutional diseases and of many types of mental diseases. The responsibility for research and

for the introduction of eugenic measures for reducing defect lies with medical and public health authorities.

The second field of eugenics concerns the great majority of births, which occur among those who are in no sense abnormal or defective and yet vary widely in genetic characteristics. In this latter group no arbitrary control of births appears desirable or practical to American eugenicists at the present time. Rather the aim of eugenicists is to provide such social and economic and psychological factors in the environment* that, by a natural and unconscious process, couples above the average in genetic capacity will tend on the whole to have more children than those who are below the average in genetic capacity.

Much more research is needed to define an environment which will produce such a eugenic result. But certain of its broader aspects can be suggested.

In such an environment, all parents should be equally free to limit the number of their children to those they will care for in a responsible manner. On the economic side, all parents should be able to have large families without sacrificing the level of living they would otherwise enjoy. On the social side, communities should be so planned for the physical and personal care of children that the raising of a large family under urban conditions would not place too heavy a personal burden on conscientious parents; and, finally, the environment should be such as to encourage the normal development of the deeper human emotions related to children and the future of the race.

Eugenics thus broadly based is inevitably closely inter-related with other efforts to improve the conditions of human life.¹

REFERENCES:

- CARR-SAUNDERS, A. M. *Eugenics*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1926. A brief readable statement.
- HALDANE, J. B. S. *Heredity and Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1938. A popular and superficial presentation of the conventional eugenic doctrine.

¹ Frederick Osborn. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

- HOLMES, S. J. *Human Genetics and Its Social Import*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936. A presentation of the phenomena of human heredity and natural increase and some of the social consequences of the biological factors.
- JENNINGS, H. S. *The Biological Basis of Human Nature*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1930. A standard work in the field.
- LORIMER, FRANK, and FREDERICK OSBORN. *Dynamics of Population: Social and Biological Significance of Changing Birth Rates in the United States*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. A marshaling of evidence in support of the traditional eugenic position.
- OSBORN, FREDERICK. *Preface to Eugenics*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940. A virtual surrender of the traditional eugenic dogmas and an acceptance of a social point of view.
- SCHEINFELD, AMRAM. *You and Heredity*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1939. A popular book, but one of some genuine merit.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY

Rural sociology is the branch of the general science concerned with the associated life and group activities of the people who live in the country. It is an area of study that is separated on grounds of convenience rather than by logical considerations. It has to do with the analysis and description of human groups dependent upon agriculture for livelihood; it is concerned with studying the effects of rural life and activities on the character* and personality* of the farm people. It deals with the immediate social relations, the relations of rural people to the nonrural parts of the population, the rural institutions*, and other phenomena and consequences of rural residence.

Contemporary rural sociology is strongly oriented toward immediately practical problems, and it is definitely concerned with programs of remedial and socially constructive action. It is concerned with the well-being of the rural people and seeks to promote a more adequate social organization. It seeks to understand and develop the rural institutions, to elevate the rural standards of living, to find solutions for the personal and social problems that arise as a result of life on the farm and in farm communities.

It considers the methods and means and agencies by which the farm population can participate in the better aspects of human and cultural experience.

In rural life the relations of social and economic activities are direct and immediate; the social activities are in large measure dependent upon the economic factors. In consequence, rural sociology is not always clearly differentiated from rural economics. Such problems as the drift to the city, the decadence of the rural church, the inadequacy of the rural schools, the meagre facilities for rural recreation, and the increase of farm tenancy involve both sociological and economic factors and consequences.

One of the outstanding students of rural sociology gives a summary statement of the field of interest and of the problems faced and the methods used:

Rural sociology is an area of specialized study, not a unique or peculiar brand of sociology. It is specialized for the following reasons: (1) rural society* or culture* is sufficiently distinctive to constitute a special area or universe for analysis; (2) many social problems are sufficiently different in rural areas to warrant special treatment and analysis; (3) rural sociology is a necessary complement to agricultural economics and finds special opportunity for development and financial support at agricultural experiment stations. Its methods are not in any way different from good methods in any or all fields of sociology. Its problems are different just to the extent that rural life is different, and to no greater extent. As a matter of fact, teaching or research in the field of rural sociology that isn't conducted on a basis of comparing urban and rural culture, urban and rural problems, urban and rural institutions, urban and rural patterns of associations, etc., would probably be rural technology but not rural sociology. If, however, such comparative methods are employed, I see no reason why there might not be developed treatises and college courses on Rural Demography, Rural Social Psychology, Rural Social Ecology, Rural Communities, Rural Culture, and even Rural Social Pathology. This could be done just because these are specialized types of studies. I don't believe there should or could be such a thing

as "Rural Social Theory" or "Principles of Rural Sociology." Such treatises would either be just sociology or they would be lopsided. Rural sociology is only an area of specialized sociological study.¹

REFERENCES:

- LANDIS, PAUL H. *Rural Life in Process*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940. On the assumption that rural society can be understood only when seen as a part of the whole pattern of American life, the book treats rural society in its functional and interactive aspects.
- SANDERSON, DWIGHT, and ROBERT A. POLSON. *The Rural Community*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1939. A valuable specialized study.
- SMITH, T. LYNN. *The Sociology of Rural Life*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940. "This book is an attempt to assemble in a single volume the essential facts and the basic principles that have been derived from the application of the scientific method in the study of rural social relationships. An endeavor is made to present these in a manner that can be understood by college students of sophomore standing."
- SOROKIN, PITIRIM A., CARLE C. ZIMMERMAN, and CHARLES J. GALPIN. *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology*. 3 vols. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1930. A valuable general source book.
- TAYLOR, CARL C. *The Field of Rural Sociology*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1926. This book is the outcome of "an attempt to bring together a consideration of outstanding specific problems of rural life and the general principles of the science of sociology."
- WILLIAMS, JAMES W. *Our Rural Heritage. The Social Psychology of Rural Development*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925. An excellent monographic study. "It offers an analysis of the attitudes and beliefs that enter into our rural heritage."
- . *Rural Expansion*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925.

¹ Carl C. Taylor. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

This study undertakes to show the rural heritage in the course of its adaptation to changing conditions.

URBAN SOCIOLOGY

The basic factors in the growth and organization of cities are economic in character. The distribution of natural resources available in a given stage of cultural advance, and the techniques for their exploitation and distribution determine the areas of dense settlement. Men live of necessity in the places where the means of life are more abundantly available. The aggregation of people into cities is subject to study from a variety of points of view; history, economics, geography, ecology, political science, and other disciplines have been interested in the study of the city.

As a division of sociology determined by the general separation of the population into rural and city segments, urban sociology has frequently been a composite study of selected practical problems of city life. Problems of housing, health, recreation, police and fire protection, and similar matters are sometimes the objects of attention. In other cases, the interest is in delinquency, suicide, personal disorganization*, and the like; the interest is in means designed to improve immediately the conditions in the slum areas. Some students have been interested in the adaptive customs*, moral codes, behavior manners, institutional structures, types of mind, and the like that emerge when human beings are crowded into limited areas. Many factual and statistical studies of population, transportation, marketing and the like have been treated as urban sociology.

In another conception, urban sociology has to do with the city as a cultural development. It seeks, in some form, a natural history of population aggregations*. It would show the adjustments* made, the types of freedom and social control*, the groups and organizations formed, the types of personality* produced, and other sociological and social-psychological phenomena that emerge in life conditions in the city.

In the following statement Professor Wirth gives a sociological conception of urban sociology:

In an increasing number of academic institutions, courses

on urban sociology have recently been introduced, supplementing the somewhat earlier emphasis upon rural sociology. This academic development may be regarded as a natural outcome of the urban trend in the Western world and a need for understanding its social implications. The terms "urban" and "rural" as applied to courses and textbooks, however, may have given rise to the erroneous notion that these two fields are in some sense antithetical. It requires no profound analysis to see that neither urban nor rural sociology in the conventional sense gives us an adequate and comprehensive view of the intricate web of social* life we are seeking to comprehend. There are two general approaches to this problem: (1) to conceive of urban sociology as a special subdivision of sociology seeking to set forth in a coherent fashion our knowledge of the city; and (2) to conceive of the task of urban sociology as being primarily that of seeking to understand our civilization*, which, since it is predominantly urban, can best be analyzed if the city is taken as the central point of reference. The former would make of urban sociology a special delimited subject matter; the latter would make of it a point of view or a frame of reference, which would be to view from the platform of the city our contemporary social life, which in many of its aspects still bears the imprint of the preindustrial rural folk society out of which it has emerged. In the former case, urban sociology would be distinct from rural sociology; in the latter case, urban sociology would be merely one pole of a continuum that would shade indefinitely into the other pole and would in this sense comprehend rural sociology as well.

The danger in the conception of urban sociology as a special subject matter within sociology lies in the fact that generally it turns out to be an encyclopedic venture treating the geographical, technological, economic, demographic, social, and psychological phenomena of cities and the process of urbanization*. This would make urban sociology a miniature sociology, but more likely it would make of urban sociology a miscellaneous collection of descriptive materials covering every conceivable aspect of urbanism*. This is in fact what the textbooks on the city for the most part have turned out to be. The

specifically sociological ingredient that they contain is difficult to discern. They contain chapters on sanitation, transportation, government, and economy, as well as on population, housing, social organization, recreation, and crime, without anything more to hold them together than the fact that these phenomena occur on the urban scene. The second conception of urban sociology would presumably deal more with rural-urban contrasts and comparisons than with the specific description of the phenomena occurring within the confines of the city itself. Insofar as urban sociology or the sociology of the city aspires to become a coherent body of knowledge, it will have to be based upon a theory of the city that enables us to single out what is relevant to the term "urban" and that will knit together the various subject matters pertaining to the city into a coherent body of knowledge.

Thus my conception of urban sociology is the study of the relations between men arising out of the fact that they live together in large numbers and relatively great density in more or less permanent communities under conditions of great interdependence, a high division of labor, a high degree of anonymity, heterogeneity, and impersonality. This would make urban sociology a relatively compact and coherent subject matter, which could be divided into the following subcategories: urban ecology*, urban social organization*, urban collective* behavior. Only those data would be relevant by virtue of which social life, both in its objective and subjective aspects, takes on a distinctive character under the conditions of existence described above as characteristic of cities. This would obviously make of the city not so much a place as a set of specific conditions of existence, wherever they may obtain. Under this conception of urban sociology we would be studying a certain kind of community life of man, which on occasion might be found in what the census describes as rural communities as well.¹

REFERENCES:

BURGESS, E. W., ed. *The Urban Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1926.

¹Louis Wirth. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

- GIST, N. P., and L. A. HALBERT. *Urban Society*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1933. A text in which the data are interpreted in terms of social processes rather than in terms of a series of problems.
- McKENZIE, R. D. *The Metropolitan Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933. "This study attempts to show in an objective and verifiable manner some of the basic changes that have taken place in American cities since the advent of motor transportation."
- NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: RESEARCH COMMITTEE ON URBANISM. *Our Cities: Their Role in the National Economy*. Washington: U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1937. Presents a wide range of relevant subjects, including urban population trends, urban and rural ways of life, industrial centralization and decentralization, model cities, urban planning and housing, urban growth, transport facilities, land politics, urban government, unions of cities, and Federality relations.
- PARK, R. E., and OTHERS. *The City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925. A series of papers on the sociology of city life.
- QUEEN, S. A., and L. F. THOMAS. *The City*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939. This text emphasizes the methods of city study and presents some of the findings, especially as they relate to cities in the United States. It undertakes to integrate geographical and sociological interpretations of cities.
- WIRTH, LOUIS. "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *Amer. Jour. of Sociol.* XLIV (1938), 1-24; "The Urban Society and Civilization," *Amer. Jour. of Sociol.* XLV (1940), 743-755. Two papers of fundamental importance.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Social* psychology is the branch of sociology that undertakes the study of human* nature and personality* as they form and develop within the social process. It seeks to understand how the immature human child becomes a member of a society*, how he becomes a developed person* with his own unique individuality and character; and it endeavors to show how the behavior

of the person is determined by the intimate, nonstandardized, face-to-face relationships and by the conventionalized, group-accepted behavior forms and culture* patterns. In the research division of labor, the field is broken down into a number of specialized interests, particularly social control*, political sociology, and at least certain collective behavior phenomena, such as studies in public* opinion and propaganda*.

But human nature and personality are merely one aspect of all cultural reality. Social psychology is, therefore, intimately related to psychiatry, ethnology, child study, economics, and the disciplines treating specialized segments of social and cultural reality. Its development has been contributed to by students of political science, history, economics, psychology, and other fields; philosophers and literary men have made valuable contributions to the body of doctrine.

The current research and publication tend to fall into one or the other of two somewhat sharply divided groups. The psychological students represent in general a neurological point of view and hold to some order of biological determinism*. The sociological students represent in general a social point of view and find the factors determining human nature and personality in the face-to-face relations of the primary* groups and in the processes of cultural communication. The bulk of the secondary writing is eclectic and, so far as basic postulates are concerned, somewhat confused.

An outstanding contributor to the sociological point of view in social psychology gives the following statement concerning the nature of the discipline and its problems and methods of research:

Social psychology is a term that has been used to denote at least three areas of interest: (1) "folk* psychology," or the ethos of peoples in the attempt to account for the differences in national character; (2) "collective* behavior," in which groups as groups are studied, attempting to understand crowds*, mobs*, publics*, and social* "movements" besides other related aspects of human life, and (3) human personality* as influenced by contact* and communication*.

The problems of social psychology, so defined, include the

origin of the self* and the complete analysis of action. This makes necessary the investigation of the nature of those aspects of human experience that we call imagination, reasoning, emotion, feeling, perception, and their highly various results in personality and character.

As to the methods, they would seem to be limited at present to observation of others, communication with them, and introspective recall and interpretation of the social psychologists. Observation and communication include listening to people and asking them questions, reading what they have written either in answer to specific requests or otherwise. Direct scrutiny of conduct and reports of such scrutiny are also of service. The use made of data so secured must, if the procedure is sound, conform to the requirements of the logic of discovery. The question to be answered must be accurately and clearly formulated, the obtained facts must be relevant and significant, the inferences must be limited to what can be tested, and the conclusion so formulated as to be intelligible and verifiable by the public* to which it must be addressed. Exact laboratory and experimental methods, so fruitful in the exact sciences, have not as yet been developed in this field of inquiry.

Knowledge of the groups in which the subject lives is imperative. The difference between an Eskimo and a Russian is in large degree due to difference in language and social customs*. In some sense personality* seems to be the subjective aspect of culture*.¹

REFERENCES:

- COOLEY, CHARLES H. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, rev. ed., 1922. "It is my general aim to set forth, from various points of view, what the individual is, considered as a member of a social whole."
- DEWEY, JOHN. *Human Nature and Conduct; An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1922. "The book . . . sets forth a belief that an understanding of habit is the key to social psychology."

¹ Ellsworth Faris. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

- DEWEY, JOHN. *Experience and Nature*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1925. An important and readable statement.
- FARIS, ELLSWORTH. *The Nature of Human Nature*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937. Essays dealing with "the nature of personality in relation to social life and culture."
- KARPF, FAY B. *American Social Psychology: Its Origin, Development, and European Background*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1932. A study of the development of social-psychological thought since the nineteenth century designed to illuminate American social-psychological thought.
- KRUEGER, E. T., and WALTER C. RECKLESS. *Social Psychology*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1931. Intended as an inventory of "the most usable material in social-psychological observation and research." The text maintains a reasonably consistent sociological point of view.
- LAPIERE, RICHARD T., and PAUL F. FARNSWORTH. *Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936. A textbook treating the chief problems and concepts of, and experimental approaches to, social psychology. It presents the central thesis that social behavior is an outgrowth of interaction among individuals.
- MEAD, GEORGE H. *The Philosophy of the Act*. Edited, with introduction, by C. W. Morris . . . in collaboration with J. W. Brewster . . . A. M. Dunham, and D. L. Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938. An analysis of basic importance.
- THOMAS, W. I., and FLORIAN ZNANIECKI. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. 2 Vol. ed. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1927.

SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY

Social psychiatry designates both an area of theoretical interest and a field of professional service; it is concerned to understand the nature of social disorganization* and to prevent its appearance, or to treat the pathological disorders that arise. The question of the relation of the person* to the group* takes the form of that of the relationship between personal and social disorganization. There is a practical need to understand the factors that explain the development and spread of attitudes* and neuroses*

and of the processes by which adjustments* are effected between the standards and attitudes of persons and the changing social structures. The field of interest is not altogether well defined. There is no full consensus as to what the term connotes nor as to the fundamental and empirical problems; there is a somewhat wide diversity in the point of view of the workers. Certain students, assuming a nominalist position, see social disorganization as nothing other than the presence of disorganized persons in the population; others see social disorganization as a reality resulting, perhaps, among other causes, from the presence of disorganized persons in the group.

It is commonly recognized that the great number of psychoneuroses in the present day civilization is not simple coincidence. And the sociologists have demonstrated a relation between social and personal disorganization. In one view social disorganization is explained by individual disorganization; the individual becomes disorganized because the cultural demands conflict with the biological needs of the organism, and inhibiting effects of the cultural standards result in neuroses, and so in crimes, revolts, war, and other types of social disorganization. Neuroses are an accompaniment and result of changes in social structures; they express and measure the divergence between the needs of the organism and the demand of social structure and group ideals.

In the more strictly sociological view, individual disorganization is to be understood in terms of the fact that the culture* in which the individual is placed is in conflict with itself. The human individual is readily capable of accommodation* to any body of consistent culture demands that may be imposed. This seems to be borne out by the great variety of social and cultural standards to which men have, in various times and places, adjusted without neuroses being produced. The inhibiting effects of social standards never cause personal disorganization except as the culture stimulates at the same time that it inhibits. It is thus not a conflict between the individual and the culture but conflicts within the culture that cause personality disorganization, that is, conflict within the person. It follows, in this view, that individual education alone cannot eliminate social disorganization.

Professor Davis has given a careful statement in regard to the definition and scope of social psychiatry:

Though the causes of mental disorder admittedly ramify beyond any one nomothetic science, it is hard for practitioners trained in physiology to see that social causes are as genuine and fundamental as any other kind. Yet if their genuineness is granted, the advisability of a specialty within the field of psychiatry—a specialty devoted to the application of social science to the understanding and treatment of mental disorder—becomes apparent. Such a special branch would attempt two major tasks, one theoretical and the other applied.

The first task would be a general, systematic analysis of (a) the social factors determining rates and incidences of mental disorder in various populations—the society as a whole being taken as a causally integrated system within which the phenomena of derangement occur in a determinate order, and the method involving a comparative study of structure, process, and change within different cultures and groups; and (b) the social factors determining the form and nature of mental disorder in the individual—the personality as a whole being taken as a causally integrated system which, as a unit, may exhibit derangement, and the method involving a comparative and experimental study of cases.

The second task would be the application of this systematic knowledge to (a) the isolation and standardized recording of the social factors figuring in the etiology of each concrete instance of mental disorder, and (b) the therapeutic manipulation of the patient's social life so as to eliminate or ameliorate these factors. The difficulty of such a specialty need not be underestimated. As members of society we are limited as to the scope, objectivity, and publicity which we may give to our analyses of social relationships, and as to the degree to which we can manipulate such relationships. Yet something can be done, and a specialty resting upon a science fully as necessary in understanding the genesis and therapy of mental disorders as any other, would not have the subordinate and limited status that "psychiatric social work" has, nor would its de-

votes require any less rigidity of training than the specialists in any other branch of psychiatry.¹

REFERENCES:

Symposium, "The Contributions of Psychiatry to the Understanding of Human Society," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.* XLII (1937), 773-894. "Seven American psychiatrists, representing different points of view, offer the products of their recent thinking for the consideration of our readers. Two further papers, one by a cultural anthropologist and the other by a social psychologist, attempt to define and to evaluate these contributions in their relation to our present knowledge of the impact of culture and society upon personality."

This symposium is an indispensable item in the student's bibliography and may well serve as his initial point of attack.

The editors of the *Journal* also include a bibliography compiled from lists prepared by sociologists and psychiatrists in response to an editorial invitation to recommend publications that would be helpful to students of society. The existence of these recommendations makes it unnecessary to give bibliographical material here.

COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR

In a general sense, collective* behavior includes the study of all associated human activity; it is the study of society in its collective aspects. In this usage the term is virtually synonymous with human behavior, and the study will include sociology as well as most of the other social disciplines.

But in the sociological literature the term has come to have a somewhat specific and limited connotation. It is concerned with the study of the elementary and spontaneous forms of behavior arising directly from the interaction* of persons* and expressive of common impulses. The various forms of group activity that are regularized by common understandings, customs*, institutional practices, legal norms, or other going types of control* are outside the orbit of immediate interest. The attention is upon

¹ Kingsley Davis. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

such specialized processes and phenomena as social unrest*, circular stimulation and social contagion*, crowd* behavior and mass* movements, fads* and fashions*, panics and stampedes, crusades and revivals*, public* opinion and propaganda*, reform* and revolution*, and other spontaneous and unchanneled expressions. The students of collective behavior undertake to explain the origin of such apparent spontaneous phenomena, to display the forms and manifestations, and to follow the course of development to the regularized stage of customary and institutional practice. Collective behavior thus undertakes the analysis and description of the process by which a new social* order comes into being through the emergence and acceptance of new definitions and forms of behavior, or by which an old order is changed through the emergence of new behavior phenomena and their present incorporation into the social structure.

A leading student of collective behavior has characterized the area of study and the problems and appropriate research method:

The study of collective behavior is concerned with such topics as crowds, mobs, panics, manias, psychic epidemics, stampedes, mass behavior, public opinion, propaganda, fashion, fads, social movements, revolutions, and reforms. While all group behavior is collective in nature, the interest in the study of collective behavior is focused on those kinds of group actions that are not under the control of established rules, regulations, or understandings. These forms of group behavior, such as those mentioned above, emerge with a breakdown of the institutional framework of life. People find it necessary to develop new schemes of collective action; this is accomplished through various forms of collective behavior. The general problem of how new schemes develop from a spontaneous, unorganized form into an established, organized mold is the central problem in the study of collective behavior.

The major interests of concern become then:

- a. The isolation of the elementary and spontaneous collective groupings such as the crowd, the mass, and the public.
- b. Designation of the mechanics of elementary collective

behavior, such as the "milling"* process and public discussion.

c. The ways in which social* movements develop.

d. The mechanics that operate to develop solidarity and persistency in social movements.

For the most part, the study of such problems has been unsystematic and impressionistic. The firsthand observations of different forms of collective behavior are usually fragmentary, of varying merit, and, unfortunately, are scattered haphazardly through the literature. Primary reliance, however, must be based on these accounts. The primary method of study, consequently, is historical, and comparative. Advance of knowledge must come through an interplay of hypothetical schemes of interpretation with the accounts of collective behavior—a method in which imagination and judgment are of primary importance.¹

REFERENCES:

- BLUMER, HERBERT. "Collective Behavior," in R. E. PARK, ed. *An Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1939. A brief but admirable outline of the field.
- LAPIERE, RICHARD T. *Collective Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938. Analysis and presentation of concrete materials, with attention to social interaction as the basic concept and principal object of investigation.
- PARK, R. E., and E. W. BURGESS. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1924. Chaps. 12-13. A systematic discussion with amplifying materials, treating collective behavior as stages in the process of social disorganization and subsequent social reorganization.
- REUTER, E. B., and C. W. HART. *Introduction to Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933. Chaps. 17-19. Presentation of certain major forms of collective behavior, organized about the concept of social interaction and designed to show the process of institutional formation.

¹ Herbert Blumer. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

- Ross, E. A. *Social Psychology*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1915. Given over in major part to questions of collective behavior.
- YOUNG, KIMBALL. *Social Psychology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930. Part V. Brief treatment of the crowd and the public. The accompanying *Source Book for Social Psychology*, Part VI, presents valuable concrete material.

PUBLIC OPINION

In the literature, public* opinion is commonly treated as a subdivision of social* psychology. In a consistently logical organization it would, perhaps, appear as an aspect of collective behavior. The discussions, however, are generally more concerned with the determination of the concrete reality than with its nature and place in a coherent system of social theory.

In a fundamental treatment, public opinion is a highly abstract concept. The public itself is an abstraction rather than a concrete reality; it is a unity established through critical interaction* on the basis of instrumental considerations. An opinion is a conclusion reached or a judgment formed in a problematical situation on the basis of evidence or facts that are weighed or discussed. Public opinion is in the nature of a consensus* arrived at through adequate discussion on the basis of relevant facts.

In most of the current discussion, however, the term is used to designate a body of concrete and tangible reality that is dealt with in common-sense terms and at the common-sense level. It designates the complex and confused body of views that prevails in a given time or place and which, in democratic procedure, determines public policy and political activity. This complex is somewhat more in the nature of group or general sentiment than of rational judgment or consensus. It is an indefinite mixture of conflicting sentiments* and convictions rooted in special interests*, traditional prejudices*, partial information, rational discussion, and various other elements. There is wide interest in public opinion in this concrete sense. It is tangible and lends itself to various types of empirical investigation. There is much effort to determine its character at a particular time, to note its changes, and prophesy its future trend. Commercial advertising campaigns and propaganda activities are designed to control its

character. Most of the literature bears upon the concrete phenomena and the related practical problems.

The present character of research interest in public opinion is clearly stated by Dr. Lasswell:

Research in this field centers around the problem of mass communication*. A channel of mass communication presents symbols* at the focus of attention of many people in the community at the same time. Research pivots around such questions as "Who—says what—to whom—in what channel—in what style—with what effect?" Facts are needed about the social and personal characteristics of those who control or are exposed to instruments of mass communication. Research can be conducted from the contemplative or manipulative standpoint. Research on manipulation of the flow of mass communication is the field of propaganda study.¹

REFERENCES:

- ALBIG, WILLIAM. *Public Opinion*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939. A textbook that summarizes many of the useful fact-gathering methods now at hand.
- BERNAYS, E. L. *Propaganda*. New York: H. Liveright, 1928. "It is the purpose of this book to explain the structure of the mechanism which controls the public mind, and to tell how it is manipulated by the special pleader who seeks to create public acceptance for a particular idea or commodity."
- CHILDS, HARWOOD L. *An Introduction to Public Opinion*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940. Popular lectures to business men analyzing public relations, public opinion, and propaganda.
- DOOB, LEONARD W. *Propaganda; Its Psychology and Technique*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1935. An effort to consider what propaganda is and to describe and analyze how it works.
- LASSWELL, HAROLD D. *Propaganda Technique in the World War*. New York: P. Smith, 1938. Analysis of the propagandists of the World War from the objective, wholly nonethical point of view.
- LIPPMANN, WALTER. *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace

¹ Harold D. Lasswell. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

and Co., 1922. A valuable analysis. Places emphasis upon the factors that distort the picture inside of men in their dealing with the world outside.

MANHEIM, KARL. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Translated by Louis Wirth and E. A. Shils. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936. "This book is concerned with the problem of how men actually think. The aim of these studies is to investigate . . . how it [thinking] really functions in public life and in politics as an instrument of collective action."

THE FAMILY*

Of the various social institutions*, the family has received the greatest amount of attention from the sociological students. It is always close at hand and, in some of its aspects, open to immediate observation. It is commonly thought of as the most important of the social institutions, as the first in point of time, and as the one from which the other institutions and human* nature itself have come.

The study has been approached from various points of view and with widely differing degrees of specific emphasis. The historic forms of the family and the external and comparative legal features have been treated at length by certain writers. Others have been concerned with the so-called natural family, the biological structure resulting from the helplessness of the human child. Still others have interested themselves in primitive sex and family practices. The psychology of sex, the economics of family life, the educational features of the family, and the like have been treated in detail. The family as a social unity, as a reality apart from the legally enforced family coherence, and its part in the development of human nature and personality are receiving increased attention in the sociological literature.

A very large part of the writing of the sociologists has been motivated by immediately practical considerations. Convinced of the paramount importance of the traditional sex and family structure, and observing the disorganization and loss of function, the writers have addressed themselves to the analysis of concrete problems and the consideration of reform measures de-

signed to restore the family to a more central position in the life of man and society. Some study has been directed to means of predicting success in marriage*, and there is much present activity in the realm of marriage counseling. The nature of the field of family study is clearly stated by Willard Waller, who has written one of the valuable recent books in the field:

There are many points of views from which valuable studies of the family have been and still can be made. We can study the family in different cultures*, a point of view which affords much illumination. We can study the historical family, thus acquiring new understanding of the modern family. Because all social institutions are interrelated, it is helpful to study the relation of the family to other institutions. The psychiatrists have contributed greatly to the understanding of the family through the study of its pathologies. It is valuable to collect facts about the family through the ordinary methods of scholarship and through statistical methods. The serious student cannot afford to omit consideration of the tendentious literature concerning the family.

The point of view that seems most fruitful to me is the study of family interaction. The interaction* concept, if interpreted in terms of social* psychology, seems to solve more of our puzzles than any other. The interaction point of view enables us to make out the meaning of facts contributed by other points of view, such as, for example, the study of the relation of the family to the economic structure. It also has considerable practical value in that it makes it possible to relate our findings to the lives of individuals. There are a number of levels, or areas, of family interaction, no one of which can be overlooked.

I do not think it is necessary to say anything special about methodology. The same considerations hold here as in the rest of our field of study. All methods are useful. Each method has its peculiar excellencies and its drawbacks. Case study methods reveal mechanisms but are silent as to the numerical frequency of causal sequences. Statistical methods enable us to ascertain frequencies and sometimes give clues to mechanisms, but are less helpful in the latter task. The ordinary

methods of scholarship, i.e., fact-grubbing research in libraries and good hard thinking, will never, I hope, fall into disuse. We must also recognize that there is need for both specialized researches and for attempts at synthesis.¹

REFERENCES:

- BABER, RAY E. *Marriage and the Family*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939. An elementary text that presents a study of the problems of courtship, marriage, and parenthood.
- BURGESS, E. W., and L. S. COTTRELL, JR. *Predicting Success and Failure in Marriage*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939. A valuable research monograph.
- FOLSOM, J. K. *The Family: Its Sociology and Social Psychiatry*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1934. The institution is approached culturally and the volume contains some valuable source material.
- FRAZIER, E. FRANKLIN. *The Negro Family in the United States*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939. This monograph "is a basic study of the family in its two chief aspects—as a natural human association and as a social institution subjected to the severest stresses and strains of social change."
- GOODSELL, WILLYSTINE. *A History of Marriage and the Family*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934. An elementary text from the historical point of view, which traces the family through various civilizations.
- MOWRER, ERNEST R. *The Family: Its Organization and Disorganization*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1932. A sociological study of the contemporary family, with emphasis on the problems of research.
- REUTER, E. B., and JESSE R. RUNNER. *The Family*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1931. A general text and source book.
- WALLER, WILLARD. *The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1938. The family life of middle-class Americans, with the emphasis upon the human-nature aspects of family life.

¹ Willard Waller. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

THE COMMUNITY

The community* is a social and ecological unit, a congeries of family and neighborhood groups. It is a geographic area of ill-defined boundaries within which the residents have common needs and interests* and participate in group activities. The community is to be distinguished from the neighborhood*, on the one hand, and from society*, on the other. The neighborhood is the small area of primary contacts and personal relations; the community is characterized by social and functional relations resulting from the common interests and activities within the local area. The concept society has reference to the relationships among persons*, not to the persons themselves or to their geographic position.

The community, in spite of its fairly obvious sociological significance, has received relatively little study of a theoretically fundamental character. The American attention has been in large measure upon the gradual disintegration of community life. The growth of factory production, the development of means of transportation and communication, the increased mobility* of labor, and other characteristics of modern life have greatly increased the contacts and interests of persons outside the community area and correspondingly decreased their interest and participation in matters of local concern. The local community deteriorates just in the degree that the residents find their work and their recreation outside the boundaries, and just in the degree that the area comes to harbor outsiders whose interests in the community are largely or wholly commercial.

The present status of community life and study is admirably set out in the statement by Robert C. Angell:

The term community in modern sociology is ambiguous. In former times local communities were closely knit so that the persons who lived near together spatially felt close together psychologically. The German writers have used the word *Gemeinschaft* to cover this situation in which there is a community of values as well as of place. Under the impact of modern industrial organization, however, this simple pattern

has been transcended. Those who live in urban aggregates have become so differentiated as not to have anything in common except the land on which they live and the economic organization they utilize. In other words, the local aggregate is a community only ecologically. Its sociopsychologic unity has vanished. Under these circumstances I prefer not to use the word community, unmodified, at all, except perhaps in referring to small rural aggregates. For the spatial concept, I would use the phrase ecological community. If I wished to discuss sociopsychological unity as it may appear in various situations, I would use the term moral community.¹

REFERENCES:

- ANGELL, ROBERT C. *The Integration of Society*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941. A recent analysis of great value.
- BRUNNER, EDMUND DE S. *Village Communities*. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1927.
- MACIVER, ROBERT M. *Community: A Sociological Study*. 3rd ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931. "An attempt to set out the nature and fundamental laws of social life."
- STEINER, J. F. *The American Community in Action: Case Studies of American Communities*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1928. Analyses of communities, with special emphasis upon the interplay of social forces rather than upon conditions and problems.

SOCIOLOGY OF LAW

Law is definitely a part of culture* and as such legitimate subject matter of sociological study. It is a formalized means of control*. It represents the measures taken by the ruling groups to enforce the definitions deemed essential to a stable social equilibrium. It is, therefore, an index of the forms of behavior believed, in a given time and place, to menace class* or group welfare. Human and social behavior in so far as it is controlled by law and

¹ Robert C. Angell. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

in so far as it determines the legal norms is a sociological field of inquiry.

The basic problems of the sociology of law fall into three or more related categories. Granting that legal norms do control behavior, it is necessary to analyze how this is accomplished and to discover the conditions in which legal norms have and do not have the power to control. Recognizing, on the other hand, that laws are definitions of desired behavior, it becomes necessary to determine the factors that lead to the formation of legal norms and that result in their change or destruction. In the third place, there is a series of problems concerning the relations between specific social structures and specific legal formulations, and between the changes in law and changes in the other elements of the culture.

The sociology of law, once it develops and becomes a dependable body of science, will form the basis for an applied science of legislation.

A leading American student of the sociology of law presents the field as a specialized branch of general sociology:

The sociology of law is a special branch of sociology studying the uniformities in human behavior that may be explained by the existence of the social phenomenon called law. As sociology in general, the sociology of law is a nomographic science (in contradistinction to idiographic or descriptive sciences); consequently, the study of the content of legal rules does not belong to its task. It has to analyze the mechanisms and processes by means of which such uniformities are established, manifested, changed, or destroyed; these mechanisms and processes must be related to mechanisms, processes, and situations appearing in social life, in the first place to other forms of societal regulation (morals, mores, and the like), and, second, to the mechanisms, processes, and structures in which the various needs and interests are expressed (political, economic, religious, and the like). The methods of the sociology of law are those of the nomographic sciences, i.e. (1) observation of individual facts (if possible, also experiment) and analytical induction, and (2) mass observation by means of statistics,

followed by technical interpretation and logical inference. The range of facts to be observed should be as large as possible, concerning various types of societies, contemporary or past, primitive and advanced. In all cases stress must be laid on the understanding of the meaning of the observable phenomena (as appearing for those who are subject to the legal regulation and for those who impose legal rules), whereas purely behavioristic studies may play only a secondary part.¹

REFERENCE:

TIMASHEFF, N. S. *An Introduction to the Sociology of Law*. Cambridge: University Committee on Research in the Social Sciences, 1939. This book is indispensable to the student, and its excellent general bibliography makes unnecessary the citation of additional references here.

EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

The school as a social institution occupies the attention of numerous sociological scholars. Also, a good many educational writers deal with problems that fall within the province of educational sociology. The literature is for the most part not systematic; there appears to be no mature and adequate treatise defining the field and locating the problems. In the main, writers have followed special interests, sometimes interests of professional or practical nature, and have been little concerned with general problems of a theoretical order. In consequence, educational sociology is variously conceived and defined.

A good many students see the problem as one of applying sociological principles in educational procedures. A large number of students have been concerned with education and the school from the point of view of control; in some cases education is studied as social control*, in other cases it is treated as an agency or instrument of control. In a few cases education is studied as a form of the social process of communication*. Several writers conceive educational sociology to be the study and determination of educational objectives and concern themselves with problems of curricular content. Others consider the province of sociology to

¹ N. S. Timasheff. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

be that of the extracurricular activities of the students, the relation of the school to the community, the relations of the teachers to the community, and like matters. A good many other conceptions are found in the writing in the field.

In spite of wide diversity in conception and practice, the school is one of the major social institutions, which requires a degree of serious study that it has not received. The processes of communication are apparently nowhere better exemplified than in the educational procedures. The consequences on personality* and the social* order of the aggregated character of most modern educational practice is a sociological question of some theoretical and practical interest. The factors leading to the maintenance of elaborate educational programs, and the modifications in curricular content in response to social pressures are other matters that come within the field of educational sociology.

The following statement by a leading student in the field of educational sociology presents the trends and conceptions current in this area of study:

During the past decade, educational sociology has given evidence of moving from its earlier indefinite status as a rubric under which sociologists offered "contributions to education" and educators speculated about society. Movement is toward a special field, the essence of which is the acculturation* process as found in schools and schoollike structures. This center of interest has arisen from a number of causes, and it has led to research and teaching in such areas as curriculum making, the learning process, the culture of the young, induction of youth into adult society, social interaction in the school, extraschool forces shaping personality, effects of schooling, school adjustment to environment, adult uses of school plant, pressures influencing education, status and adjustment of school personnel, and institutionalization of community functions. It should be added that much time is still spent in assembling factual overviews of such units as an urban community or a region, with little or no indication of educational uses or implications.

Down to 1930, approaches to data gathering and processing were largely philosophical, historical, and observational, with

the techniques and devices commonly associated with these orientations. On publication of Peters' *Foundations of Educational Sociology*, statistical research came into general use and, along with refined case-study procedures, now dominates the field. For example, major contributions have been made of late via questionnaires, personality inventories, rating scales, new-type tests, participant-observer and interviewing techniques, and life histories of persons, groups and institutions. Finally, experimentation should be mentioned, chiefly because of its promise in classroom and "community school" situations where at least a score of important studies are underway.¹

REFERENCES:

- BRUNNER, EDMUND DE S., Chairman. "Social Backgrounds of Education," *Review of Educational Research*, X (February 1940), 1-72.
- COOK, LLOYD ALLEN. *Community Backgrounds of Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937. A valuable sociological study on the relations of the school to the community life.
- KULP, D. H. *Educational Sociology*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932. Sociological analyses of educational problems, particularly the ends of education.
- PAYNE, GEORGE E., ed. *Readings in Educational Sociology*. 2 Vols. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934.
- WALLER, WILLARD. *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932. The book is designed "to give teachers social insight into the realities of the school." It gives a sociological interpretation of the school and contains interesting material for an understanding of the effects of the school on personality.

CRIMINOLOGY

Criminology is the body of knowledge in regard to behavior that violates the social rules promulgated and enforced by the state. It is a specialized aspect of general sociology, the study of crime* as a social phenomenon. In comprehensive treatment,

¹Lloyd Allen Cook. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

criminology has to do with the legally enforced rules of conduct, the individual violations of the rules, and the reactions to violations of the penal code. In the study of criminal law, the criminologist is particularly interested in the origin of the penal formulations,* in the determinants of the contents of penal codes, in the uniformities and variations in the types of behavior* interdicted in different culture* contexts, in the conceptions of human* nature and social control* implicit in the criminal codes, and other matters that give insight into the processes of lawmaking. In the study of lawbreaking, the criminologist seeks to understand the nature of the criminal and the educational processes that determined the disposition to violate the formal rules of conduct. Finally, in his study of the treatment of offenders, he is particularly interested in the personal and social consequences of different systems and in the relative effectiveness of different types of treatment.

In most modern research on adult criminality as on juvenile delinquency, the center of interest is in the origin and development of criminal behavior. But the chief popular interest, consequently the bulk of the writing, is concerned with the problem of apprehending criminals and of reducing the number of crimes.

An outstanding American sociologist gives the following characterization of the field of criminology:

Criminology as an area of specialized study includes the genetic processes of making laws, of breaking laws, and of reacting to the breaking of laws. The boundaries of this area are fixed principally by legislative enactments, and this is not done in a purely logical manner. This is not unique, for all other social behavior is defined by the parties who are engaged in the interactions*, and the definitions, whether made logically or illogically, are important aspects of the behavior.

The objective of criminology as a science is the development of a body of verified and interrelated generalizations regarding these genetic processes. In so far as such generalizations can be stated, the individuals involved in the interaction become interchangeable and can therefore be taken for granted.

The hypothesis that has emerged from earlier studies in this

area is that criminal behavior is like other evaluated behavior in its general processes, and that it differs from other behavior only in the content of its patterns. The important processes in this area are processes of communication* and they produce the same effects when they relate to crime as when they relate to politics, religion, or industry. All of the other sociological concepts may be used within this area to as good advantage as elsewhere, including culture, mores, institutions, competition, conflict, caste, division of labor, social change, and social control.

The methods of criminology are the same as the methods in other areas of study, because the problems are the same. It is probable that a larger body of detailed information has been accumulated in this area than in any other area of social life, due to the more ready availability of case histories and of statistical reports.¹

REFERENCES:

ETTINGER, CLAYTON J. *The Problem of Crime*. New York: Ray Long and Richard Smith, 1932. A social psychiatric point of view with a chief emphasis on reform.

FERRI, ENRICO. *Criminal Sociology*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1917. This book is in the Lombroso anthropological tradition. It contains a widely quoted classification of criminals. Otherwise, it is chiefly of historic interest.

GAULT, ROBERT H. *Criminology*. New York: D. C. Heath and Co., 1932. This text emphasizes the neurological factors in the development of the criminal personality.

GILLIN, JOHN L. *Criminology and Penology*. New York: The Century Co., 1926. An informational text stressing the social problems aspect of criminal behavior.

HAYNES, F. E. *Criminology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1930. A text concerned with the factors immediately associated with crime and the treatment of criminals with attention to rehabilitation.

LOMBROSO, CESARE. *Criminal Man*. New York: G. P. Putnam's

¹ Edwin H. Sutherland. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

- Sons, 1911. An adequate presentation of the outmoded biological explanation of criminal behavior.
- RECKLESS, WALTER C. *Criminal Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940. This text "covers in detail a wide range of important criminological researches in Europe and America, and evaluates the various measures of treatment and prevention of crime."
- RECKLESS, WALTER C., and MAPHEUS SMITH. *Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1932. A valuable presentation of factual material.
- SHAW, CLIFFORD R. *The Jack Roller*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931. An early and still valuable example of the case-history technique in sociological research.
- SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H. *Principles of Criminology*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939. An indispensable book.
- SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H. *The Professional Thief*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937. An outstanding contribution to the research literature of criminology and sociological research method.

PENOLOGY

Penology is the aspect of criminology that has to do with the treatment of criminals. The study is in part historical and descriptive; it recites the various forms of punishment that have been used in different times and cultures, and it describes the treatment accorded offenders at the present time. But penology endeavors to understand and explain as well as to describe the punishment practices. The penal codes and the actual modes of treatment are aspects of culture*; they are related as cause and effect to the theories of human nature and crime causation, and they express the objectives—punishment, deterrence, reformation, or what not—that are to be reached by the means employed. The penologist further undertakes to discover and state the effects on the offender and on the social group that come from the various forms of penal practice. Finally, he wishes to promote a more enlightened and effective method of treatment of offenders.

The nature of penology is admirably set out in the following paragraphs by an eminent scholar in the field of criminology:

Penology is the collection of knowledge regarding punishment as a means of social control*.

This part of the wider field of criminology was at first a small set of rules, checked by religious considerations or mere custom*. There was an empirical practice, but no science of punishment. The execution of the death sentence or of banishment, for instance, presented some minor technical difficulties; it was not, however, experienced as a psychological or sociological problem.

When the death sentence and the mutilating sentences declined, confinement took their place. In contrast to the absolute penalties the essence of penal treatment was flexibility. The rigor of imprisonment could be dosed by spans of time. It was obvious, from the very beginning that the effects of confinement varied according to the personality* of the offender. They varied according to his place in society* and to the conditions of this society.

It is from this moment on that psychological reflections and sociological considerations entered the technique of execution. They slowly developed into a sort of system and the system is gradually becoming a science.

A further step was taken when alternatives of confinement evolved. The very old penological measure of setting aside or moderating a penalty by granting a pardon was complemented by two of its derivatives: probation and parole. These moves, by shortening the term of confinement and establishing a period of supervised free life, introduced the whole of sociological and mainly psychological problems into the simple administrative system of execution. All of a sudden the complications and perplexities of modern life had become a vital part of our penal treatment and our penology.

Prior to the introduction of methods of probation and parole the same intricacy had shown up in our efforts to rehabilitate the ex-convict. It had been found that punishment, although limited in its scope by formal bounds, expanded unrestrained into the sphere of free life. It was a factual, not a legal afterclap

hitting the convict with all the power of its anonymity. Penology must be concerned with these after effects. They are a part of the prison issues.

Thus the whole body of knowledge regarding the psychology of the mass* is a part and parcel of penology. From the sociology of the punished object we can not exclude the sociology of the penalty-dispensing subjects.

Justly medical and educative forms of treatment have been included in modern penology; sterilization and similar eugenic measures are on the border line of penology and race hygiene.

If we should be able to make a prudent use of the experimental method in the field of punishment, penology would reach the rank of a real science.¹

REFERENCES:

BATES, SANFORD. *Prisons and Beyond*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936. The book gives a detailed description of the structure and administration of the Federal penal system.

HAYNES, F. E. *The American Criminal System*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939. Factual material on the treatment of criminals.

HENTIG, HANS VON. *Punishment: Its Origin, Purpose and Psychology*. London: W. Hodge and Co., 1937. Written for the reasoning members of the general public who, rather than the scholars, make good or bad laws. A short history clearly and simply presented.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

This field of study includes all considerations of social phenomena from the practical or administrative point of view, study motivated by the desire to bring about more or less direct and immediate changes in the conditions prevailing. The content of social problems study is very diverse; poverty, unemployment, health, old age, consumer protection, housing, delinquency, individual deficiencies and defects, divorce, vice, political corruption, race relations, and child labor are among the topics commonly se-

¹ Hans von Hentig. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

lected for treatment. Anything is a social problem that people treat as such. More specifically, a social problem, as distinct from scientific and technical problems, is any condition or set of conditions that arouses public disapproval but that can be changed only by a form of community action that the group is unwilling to take because the remedial action would destroy other cherished values.

The sociological interest in social problems is chiefly in analysis, in discovering the causal sequences involved in the concrete situations that arouse public concern and condemnation. The sociologist endeavors to proceed objectively and with a minimum of emotional bias. He observes that social problems are temporally and spatially relative, and that the problems of a given area at a particular time are intimately interrelated. The public interest, on the other hand, centers on solutions, on what ought to be done. The popular sentiment* and discussion* commonly set the general ends; the decisions of policy and practice are determined, at least in large measure, by moral and political considerations and by a balancing of competing interests. The student is concerned with research that will make available a body of pertinent facts that may be used in formulating policies, and in describing the means available to reach the objectives decided upon.

In the following statement Professor Fuller draws a most enlightening distinction between social problems as an area of theoretical research and social problems in the sense of practical or administrative procedures in the concrete situation:

The study of social problems as a specialized area of theory and research is a relatively new interest in sociology. Traditionally, attention has been given to "a social problem" or some aspects of a social problem, rather than to "social problems" or the concept "social problem" as such. Where social problems have been treated collectively in general survey texts or courses, there has been little unifying and systematic theory. Recent efforts to find some common theoretical orientation have taken two distinct but related lines. The first is a rethinking of the vague concept social disorganization so as to make it a more precise and serviceable tool for analysis. Sociologists so occupied

are concerned with devising techniques for measuring norms of organization and deviations from these norms. The second development starts with the concept "social problem" rather than with an overall theory of social disorganization*. The common element in social problems that is regarded as the subject matter for sociology is the conflict of cultural values*, which gives rise to and sustains the condition that is defined as a problem. Attention is given to the conflicting definitions of right and wrong that people make of the same conditions, and to their conflicting definitions of the policy to be followed in alternative solution. The virtue of this emphasis is its realism. Social problems are not taken for granted, as objective evils, as in the earlier literature. The basic assumption is that only those conditions that people define as social problems are social problems to them. We are thus primarily concerned with the value-judgments of the people involved, and only secondarily with the definitions of outsiders and scientists who are not involved. The methodology of this approach, yet to be explored, is the discovery and application of techniques that will measure the value-judgments of the individuals and groups whose beliefs and institutions are responsible for the existence and perpetuation of the social problem.¹

REFERENCES:

The chief bibliography of the field, as far as theoretical questions are considered, is in journal articles. The discussion of specific social problems is in part in books dealing with delinquency and pathology and social work practice. These special bibliographies should be consulted.

BOSSARD, JAMES H. S. *Social Change and Social Problems*. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1938. An introduction to social problems against a background of social change. The introductory chapters give an excellent statement of the regional aspects of social problems.

FRANK, LAWRENCE K. "Social Problems," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, XXX (1925), 463-473.

¹ Richard C. Fuller. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

- FULLER, RICHARD C. "The Problem of Teaching Social Problems," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, XLIV (1938), 415-425.
- GILLETTE, JOHN M., and JAMES M. REINHARDT. *Current Social Problems*. New York: American Book Co., 1937. A brief prospectus of the field of society and of the nature of social problems followed by discussion of selected problems.
- NORTH, C. C. *Social Problems and Social Planning*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1932. An attempt to base the study of social problems upon fundamental social theory.
- ODUM, HOWARD W. *American Social Problems*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1939. An effort to give a comprehensive statement of the present situation in America, with emphasis on the dilemmas of the people, and to consider what is to be done about the situation.
- PHELPS, HAROLD A. *Contemporary Social Problems*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1938. This text gives particular attention to the analysis of problems and minor attention to the current methods recommended for their treatment.
- WALLER, WILLARD. "Social Problems and the Mores," *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, I (1936), 924.

SOCIAL PATHOLOGY

The conception of social pathology is that of a morbid state or diseased condition that departs more or less radically from the norm of social health. The term is derived by simple analogy from biological science and the healing arts where "patho-," in its various combinations, specifies suffering or disease as distinct from organic welfare and healthy tissue. The basic concept in social as in biological science is that of health; the pathologies are departures from organic or social well being. A comprehensive, fundamental, and fruitful study of social pathology necessitates or presupposes an analysis of the social organization and the social process; this is a basic prerequisite to the identification, definition, and evaluation of deviate facts and trends.

Most of the current discussion, however, is little concerned with the determination of norms or with problems of theoretical character. A knowledge of socially undesirable conditions and changes

is assumed; the going social definitions are adequate for the interest in hand. Any deviation from the mores* or from customary practice may be treated as a form of individual or social inadequacy or maladjustment*. The field thus becomes a kind of applied sociology; or, more accurately, a social technology, a mobilization of data from several scientific disciplines organized in reference to problems of concrete experience. In some cases, the interest is restricted to selected problems, as the treatment of the handicapped; in other cases the interests cover the whole range of inadequacies and maladjustments, and social pathology becomes virtually synonymous with social problems as treated by other authors.

The specific content of the field is diverse and miscellaneous; it varies from writer to writer, though often more in terminology than in content. Among the specific conditions and items discussed are poverty* and dependency including dependent families, dependent and neglected children, and the care of the aged; the defective and the handicapped including the deaf, blind, crippled, mentally deficient, and other types; crime*, delinquency, and other forms of individual maladjustment; vice*, especially in the form of prostitution, drug addiction, and sex perversion; and disease, sickness, and mental and nervous disorders.

A leading student in this field defines and contrasts the two interests in this area of reality, the theoretical and scientific study, on the one hand, and the practical and humanitarian interests and administrative problems on the other:

An arctic explorer was once asked, "What is an Eskimo dog?" He replied, "Any dog belonging to an Eskimo." In similar vein one might describe social pathology as including anything published under that title. However, the varied books and articles in this ill-defined field may be grouped under two main categories. Using popular terms we may call these "practical" and "theoretical." The first type is concerned with immediate problems of "real" life and how they may be met. These problems in turn may be classified as (1) technical and administrative problems, (2) questions of broad policy, and (3) conflicts over the mores. As illustrations we may cite: (1) how to check

sabotage, (2) what should be the scope of hemisphere defense, (3) is military preparedness morally justified. In dealing with these questions, works on social pathology have commonly brought together data from various sciences, from empirical observations and from the experience of practitioners. This type of social pathology may well be regarded as a phase of social technology. At the risk of seeming to reflect on the first, the second type may be regarded as a phase of social science. Sociologists, economists, psychologists, and other scientists abstract from the complex whole of particular living human situations generic problems for research. Thus, instead of studying unemployment and its control (a problem in social technology), we compare the social participation of unemployed and of employed men otherwise alike, we examine the relation of unemployment to the organization and disorganization of social groups, we look to see whether a cultural lag may be involved.¹

REFERENCES:

- ELLIOTT, MABEL A., and F. E. MERRILL. *Social Disorganization*. New York: Harper & Brothers, rev. ed., 1941. An attempt to study social problems "from the standpoint of the social processes which bring them about. It is . . . a study of the genesis of anti-social attitudes . . . and of the conflict between these attitudes and those held by the larger defining group."
- GILLIN, JOHN L. *Social Pathology*. Rev. ed. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1940. "It is unique in that it deals with social maladjustment as an integral part of the whole social process, rather than as an unescapable by-product of social progress."
- QUEEN, STUART A., and JENNETTE R. GRUENER. *Social Pathology*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1940. New edition of a standard work.

SOCIAL WORK

Social* work is a profession, or a field of vocational activity, rather than a logical division of social science. It is an attempt to

¹ Stuart A. Queen. Quoted by permission from a personal communication.

OTHER SPECIALIZED INTERESTS

The number of fields in which sociological work is being done is large and increasing. The present trend toward specialization will doubtless continue and, as the central core of abstract theory is better understood and its significance more fully appreciated, the sociological point of view will become general in several related fields of study. In the present, certain areas of sociological study are still relatively undefined and little exploited by research students. Several areas of great sociological significance, as they have been developed, are related to sociology rather than a part of it. Space limitations prevent any extended presentation of other specialized fields of sociological interest and research. Only passing reference may be made to a few of the areas in which productive work is being carried along.

Religious phenomena are of sociological interest from several points of view. The general and doctrinal literature is very large but the amount of sociological work that has been done is not impressive. The overt behavior itself falls within the province of social* psychology. The same is true in regard to bodies of sentiment* and belief*, the mythologies*, the growth of doctrine and dogmas*, the effects on personality* and mental organization, the informal control* items, the institutional control through education and propaganda*, and other aspects. Other large segments of religious activity are within the realm of collective* behavior: the origin of sects* and their growth and evolution, the spontaneous, expressive, and orgiastic behavior of revivals* and other religious crowds*, and the reaction to hostility manifested by the outside world are examples. The organized forms of religion* concern the sociological students of regulated behavior. The church as one of the major social institutions calls for study as such. Its rise, forms, and changes, its structure, its machinery for propaganda, its influence on and interaction with the school, the state, and the other social institutions, its power over adherents, and its effect on human welfare are among the items that concern students of social organization.

In view of the importance of such study for general sociology, the folk customs and institutional practices of particular peoples

and specific groups have been unduly neglected. One aspect of the field of folk sociology has been somewhat industriously cultivated by anthropological students. Various primitive tribes have been observed in some detail, and numerous monographic reports have recorded the personal observations of missionaries, administrators, and student field workers. But other limited and fairly homogeneous groups are equally open to observation, and some work has been carried on. Certain immigrant groups, farm communities, village settlements, mountain areas, social classes*, segregated religious sects, and other more or less isolated and circumscribed groups have been reported upon. But only a beginning has been made. Genuinely reputable work in this area of interest requires an intimate acquaintance with the people that comes only as a result of residence among and participation in the life of the group.

The study of social origins or cultural sociology, the synthetic study of the origin, spread, and evolution of customs and institutions, has not been carried far. Such generalized knowledge is an essential guide to the field workers in folk sociology, and, on the other hand, the studies of the field workers will acquire new meaning as they are related to a generalized pattern.

Of a somewhat different order is the field of political sociology. The problems that lie in this area include, in one conception of the field, any body of human interactions affected by the interest of individuals or factions in the use, preservation, or redistribution of the means of control; that is, in the control of key positions and the machinery of coercion.

The study of propaganda, in spite of its great significance in the modern world, has not progressed far. A considerable literature has developed, but it is for the most part, with a few significant exceptions, at a popular and relatively superficial level. The opportunity for theoretically sound and socially valuable empirical studies will doubtless result in rapid advance in this area.

The field of recreation has not been extensively exploited by the research sociologists. The extensive literature, produced in the main by promoters and administrators, is popular, descriptive, and moralistic; it is concerned in large measure with the promotion of recreational facilities.

The sociological aspects of economic relations, the sociology of art and literature, the study of the various institutions and institutional functions are illustrations of promising but as yet relatively neglected areas of study. The method of research in sociology has held the attention of many students; the interest is still a live one, and the literature is quite voluminous. The teaching of the social studies may be mentioned as a final area of interest.

