

८२६.३०७

134



सत्यमेव जयते

~~८०३८~~
2

~~८०३९ (८)~~
९७८
CD37/2

९७८

Community Mobilization & Group
Formation

24.1, 15.8, 48

By

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR

1815

320-97235 CAR

MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
NEW DELHI

CAR

CD 37/2 CD 38/2
1815
INTRODUCTION

This bulletin is written as the most feasible response to the request of a number of program action leaders in India for an adequate bibliography containing reports of research findings in the field of community mobilization and small group processes. A complete bibliography would contain between 500 and 1,000 titles. No ten, or even twenty, published and easily attainable documents can be selected with faithfully represent the various findings reported under these hundreds of titles. What is done here is: (a) to attempt to synthesize these findings; (b) mention in the body of the report a number of studies which illustrate one or another important contribution; and (c) present, in an appendix, a highly selective bibliography.

To report only sketchily the findings of a great and diverse body of research leaves out much which earnest seekers for all that is known would like to have reported in detail. But if this were done, many directors of action programs would not be attracted to reading what is presented. It is important that both of these groups should be served. It is hoped that the second group will not be lost by this manner of presentation, and that the first group will feel that it can fairly adequately be served by reading a number of the documents listed in the appendix.

Needless to say, the focus of this report is beamed at India's communities and at the basic objectives of India's Community Development Program, as this writer has come to understand those objectives. It has in mind the fact that India is primarily a culture and society of village communities, but that this society is evolving rapidly out of its old folk culture. It is based upon the assumption that India desires to preserve as much as possible of the values of this folk culture while it develops a technically modern society. It is based upon a belief in the validity of the oft-repeated statement that village life in India became "stagnant" during the last few centuries before the country became free and independent, and that it is the deeply dedicated purpose of the Community Development Program to convert hundreds of thousands of "stagnant" village groups into dynamic social action cells of a great democratic society.

It is not the intent of what is written to answer directly all of the specific questions which arise in the day-by-day operation of the Community Development Program. Science seldom directly answers specific practical questions. It, instead, attempts to provide understanding to practical men of basic phenomena and basic processes. Practical men must answer specific practical questions.

The science of sociology, social psychology, and cultural anthropology are concerned with the study of human relations, primarily with the study of *forms* or *systems* of human association, their functional relations with the other necessary groups of what Graham Wallace called, "The Great Society."

The trend into secular behavior is not only universal but inevitable. The first tribesman who communicated with a stranger, tolerating and in any way understanding his behavior, took a step in the direction of the secular in that he diluted his consummate belief that only he and his fellow tribesmen were human. Steady increase in communication, and finally in trade between previously isolated groups inevitably increased his secular (non-folk) relationships. The history of this evolution from isolated folk societies to highly secular societies is quite amply recorded. The collateral social results of this evolution have been noted, pondered, and speculated on for many centuries. Attempts to analyse them have been in process for more than one hundred years.

In both oriental and occidental societies philosophers, religious leaders, and statesmen ranked the producers of food high among the economic and social classes. They universally extolled the moral qualities of what we today call peasants and promoted what we today call "primary group" values. Because religions have attempted to conserve and preserve human values, all of the major religions of the world naturally still teach these basic folk values. But rationalization, the very essence of secularism, has promoted discovery and change. Thus, the central idea of another stream of culture has tended to divert attention from the promotion of folk values.

Before we turn to the story of the rediscovery of these values and a synopsis of the research findings which validate them, it would probably be useful to characterize folk values. They are "folk" values because they arose inevitably out of the necessarily self-sufficing kind of small, isolated folk groups. They were elements in the survival of these groups or small societies in which members were dependent on one another and no one else. Because they were considered as "sacred" values, each generation handed them down as guides to the next generation.

An objective look at the sacred-folk and secular ends of the continuum from simple to complex societies would result in listing the following characteristics of each. In folk-sacred societies, established practices and ideas are taken for granted. There are few contacts with persons outside of the local geographic areas. Kinship relations are dominant. There is little formalized education; teaching is by means of family training, conversation, preaching, and ceremonials. Occupations are learned by apprenticeship. The older men, who have lived longest and whose experiences and memories reach back farthest, are respected and revered. Such societies are relatively changeless; they, in fact, quite generally resist change.

In a highly secular society, means and methods of communication and transportation are ample and ready. Persons are highly mobile both physically and mentally. Formal education is universal. Occupations and professions are learned as technical sciences. Most social relations are impersonal. Even kinship relations are loose in terms of duties and obligations. Changes of all kinds are prevalent, rapid, and generally welcome. Individuals are members of many groups and live by a number of different value systems.

To be completely bound by folk customs and traditions would mean stagnation. To be completely secular would be inhuman or non-social. No present-day society is completely either of these. Those which are nearer the folk end of this continuum are moving, some slowly, some rapidly, toward the secular end of the continuum. The results of too rapid a movement in this direction have been discovered by the study of the most mobile part of the people who live in large cities. The results of little or no movement in this direction are illustrated in a number of countries where a thin layer of wealthy, educated, elite at the top of the social and political structure purposely sabotage change in the large folk segments of their society.

Because findings of research in the most secular segments of complex societies will not be presented elsewhere in this treatise, a few of them are presented at this point. Professor Louis Wirth, one of the outstanding students in the world of urbanism, among other things reports as follows: "Since the city offers the most striking contrasts between riches and poverty, education and ignorance, cultivation and crudity, the range of corresponding interest groups is enormous In the slum areas, a larger per cent of the people are exceedingly mobile Most of our problems of crime, vagrancy, family disruption, disorder, disease, and many other social difficulties are concentrated in this transitional zone of the city Large numbers of inhabitants and density of settlement mean lack of that mutual acquaintanceship which ordinarily inheres between the inhabitants in a neighborhood Whereas the individual gains, on the one hand, a certain degree of emancipation or freedom from the personal and emotional controls of intimate groups, he loses, on the other hand, the spontaneous self-expression, the morale, and the sense of participation that comes with living in an integrated society The close living together and working together of individuals who have no sentimental and emotional ties foster a spirit of competition, aggrandizement, and mutual exploitation Wherever large numbers of differently constituted individuals congregate, the process of depersonalization also enters."

In no great country of the world is there greater overt evidence and a more dedicated purpose of making rapid progress in secularization than in India. At the same time, there is the desire and intention of preserving the maximum of the values of simple societies. Working with, developing,

and strengthening local communities, developing new groups, and strengthening old small group leaders is the assigned task of the Community Development Program. The task is not to sabotage the trend of secular or rational development, but insofar as it is possible, to create the conditions and use the social processes which originally developed these values and which tend to re-create them in situations where they are threatened.

CHAPTER II

LOCAL COMMUNITY AND PRIMARY GROUP VALUES

Within local communities in the simplest of societies, there are always at least age and sex groups. Whether from the beginning there were occupational groupings, other than those based on age and sex, we cannot know. But in all primitive societies which have been studied first-hand, there are groupings based on a division of labor between social functions and responsibilities. Not even all adults, men or women, do the same things. No one person may be a specialist in the modern sense, but, as Durkheim pointed out, "division of labor" between various functions to be performed is the framework of group organisation in even the simplest of societies.

The first to become specialised has generally been some sort of a priestly group who not only manage the ceremonies which are always practiced in cases of deaths, but also quite universally practiced in cases of births and marriages. Less universally, but often quite elaborately, these ceremonies are practiced when children arrive at the age of puberty and are initiated into the adult groups of a society. Other ceremonies over which the priestly group presides grew up in relation to those cosmic forces which primitive man could not understand; the coming and going of the seasons, floods, earthquakes, and eclipses of the sun and moon. Because priests were the first specialized groups to evolve, they very often became powerful in local communities. As communities became larger, hereditary governing groups developed, and as relations with other groups developed merchant and trader groups became specialists in inter-group contacts and relations. Military groups were established for defence against other groups.

This is not the place to tell the story of the rise of the great number of specialists who perform the great number of functions which are necessary in modern complex societies. It is, however, germane to point out that groups of specialists are not folk groups, either within their own professional work or in relations with other members of the community. These relations are secular and the greater the number of specialist, the functioning of which a community or society requires, the more secular human relations become. The evolution of awareness of the significance of primary groups and primary group values is fairly well documented.

The development of definitive knowledge about such groups has travelled approximately the following path. Religious leaders and teachers identified, extolled, and promoted the human and social values which derived from primary or folk group living. They did this largely, though not entirely, without any analysis of the structure and processes of these

groups. By necessity, administrators of large human affairs became aware of the living and functioning reality of such groups. In due time, social scientists began studying human groups. In fact the analyses of various types of groups became the heart of their explanation of the larger societies in which these groups function. As is typical of the evolution of science, speculations and broad generalizations became hypotheses for detailed analyses, and step after step in analysis resulted in more definitive observations. As a consequence, carefully validated knowledge concerning the universal existence of local communities and "primary groups," their characteristics, processes, and values became known. Additional steps in analysis have resulted from attempts to apply this accumulated knowledge and understanding to currently operating and projected programs of action. The most recent step was taken toward an understanding of the primal values of small group life when sociologists, who specialize more than anthropologists, in the study of contemporary societies, began to examine the prevalence of small groups and to identify primary group values in even the most advance secular societies.

It is interesting that Sir Henry Maine, administrator of the Indian Empire, was one of the first to study and describe objectively the basic role and functioning of local communities. On the conviction that "a country ought to be governed in conformity with its own notions and customs," he attempted to understand Indian society, from its highest institutional levels to the Andaman Islanders. In his *village Communities East and West*, as well as in a number of other essays and lectures, he included comparative information on many other societies. Many of his statements which are germane to this discussion long antedated many later findings of detailed research. He wrote, "On the whole the conclusion which I arrive at concerning the village communities is that, during the primitive struggle for existence, they were expansive and elastic bodies." That is, they were not tight kinship groups, but locality groups in which non-kinsmen, even strangers who had been taken in, were considered to be "brothers." He says, "The brotherhood, besides the cultivating families who form the major part of the group, comprise families hereditarily engaged in the humble arts which furnish the little society with articles of use and comfort. It includes a village watch and a village police, and there are organised authorities for the settlement of disputes and the maintenance of civil order the council of village elders does not command anything, it merely declares what has always been Nor does it generally declare that which it believes some higher power to have commanded A person aggrieved complains not of an individual wrong, but of the disturbance of the order of the entire community". He believed that "the typical village community—a body of self-styled kinsmen having a government of their own, and engaged under fixed rules of common cultivation, is too peculiar a group to have risen by accident, or to have had its origin in individual caprice." What he was saying in the last statement was that local communities are generic forms of social organisation.

Kropotkin, a Russian biologist who was administrator of a settlement area in northeast Russia, went even further than Maine. He said, "We do not know of one single nation which has not had its period of village communities." Because he turned anthropologist-socialist and himself made some studies, he can be counted as one of the earliest social scientists who studied social groups. Because recent research has tended to confirm, or at least lend strength to, his basic conclusions, we quote the following statements from his book, *Mutual Aid*: "Mutual aid and support is an instinct, slowly developed among animals and men in the course of an extremely long evolution. . . . In the long run, the practice of solidarity proves much more advantageous to the species than the development of individuals endowed with predatory inclinations." He asserted that the common people created and maintained "their own social organisations, which are based upon their own conception of equity, mutual aid, and mutual support." He believed that the village community came out of the disintegration of tribal organisation and "kept members of these groups together for the next fifteen centuries or more." Probably one of his keenest observations was that these communities "disclaimed all rights of interference in what was going on within the family enclosure" and because of this "the family became the primary cell of future organisation."

Durkheim, a French sociologist, said that the mere fact of "members living in juxtaposition to each other" resulted in "mechanical solidarity," but "organic solidarity" developed only when "there is interaction between members." It was only then that members "depended on personal interdependence" and developed "like-mindedness." This interdependence required and always developed a "division of labor" among sub-groups within the basic group.

Tonnies, a German sociologist, in attempting to analyse a very complex society, saw these local community group characteristics at all levels of society, but found them operating most ideally only in small, fairly self-sufficient communities. He called such communities "gemeinschaften" and this cluster of characteristics "gemeinschaft" as contrasted to the "gesellschaft" which is characterized by impersonal relations and rationalized organisations.

Cooley, an American sociologist, called Durkheim's "organic solidarities" and Tonnies' "gemeinschaften", "primary groups". His purpose is best explained by his statement, "By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate, face-to-face association and cooperation. 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 groups." He adds, "It is not to be supposed that this unity of the primary group is one of mere harmony and love. It is

always a differentiated and usually competitive unity, admitting of self-assertion and various appropriate passions; but these passions are socialised by sympathy, and come, or tend to come, under the discipline of a common spirit. This individual will be ambitious, but the chief object of his ambition will be some desired place in the thought of others, and he will feel allegiance to common standards of service and fair play."

Whether one accepts Kropotkin's evidence that "mutual aid" has always been a main factor in both group and individual survival and is therefore "a law of nature" or Cooley's observations that both the individual self and group allegiance are products of intimate and abiding face-to-face association, it can be taken for granted that all human associations or organisations are not the same, and many of them are not "primary groups." The reader who wants a summary review and analysis of this basic sociological fact will find it in Loomis and Beegle, *Rural Social Systems*.

The characteristics of primary groups which set them apart from all other types of groups are: (1) in these groups, every member knows all other members; relations are inter-personal; (2) Members of the groups interact with each other constantly, or at least frequently; (3) Every member participates in one or more ways in the groups activities; (4) Each member's contacts and interactions within the group are far more frequent than they are with persons outside the group. Members of the group are thus dependent one on another. To use Kropotkin's terms, "mutual aid and mutual support" are the methods of the individual's, as well as the group's way of life.

The characteristics have been found by every study made of primitive groups. But it was taken for granted that they were universal characteristics of primitive societies only because small groups were isolated from all except within-group contacts. It was not until they were identified in societies that were far from primitive that their generic significance was recognized and real analyses of their genius began.

The conditions which create, maintain, and sustain primary groups quite adequately describe their uniqueness and genius. Such groups are composed of relatively few persons or families who live near enough to each other that they can constantly react to each other or interact with each other. They are groups whose members, at least most of them do react to each other much more frequently than they do to other persons. They are thus interdependent, consciously dependent one on the others. These relationships are relatively permanent, not fleeting. Because of these physically and socially conditioning factors, they become cooperative, mutual aid groups. Whether for survival or for social satisfaction, or both, they become truly human groups, the group not obliterating their individual personalities, but transcending, and thus guiding and inspiring their personal efforts and aspirations. Not all types of human associations are of this nature. Only families, cohesive local communities, relatively permanent work and play groups have these characteristics.

It was almost by accident that attention again came to be directed to the persistence, and even to the value, of primary groups. There was the discovery by colonial administrators that they were still dealing with societies which were still largely organized on a primary group basis. Efficiency experts in mass production discovered that primary group relations, or their absence, greatly conditioned both labor turnover and production output in great factories. Military men, in World War II, found that morale did not depend so much on discipline as it did on the primary group relations among combat troops. These discoveries, like DeVries' accidental discovery of mutations in plant breeding, have sharply reoriented anthropological and sociological studies, and fortunately developed the interest of practical men in what these studies may reveal as guides to the solution of problems with which they wrestle.

The reader may feel at this point that he has been asked to be interested in something like the evolution of sociology as a science. This is not the purpose of what has thus far been written. Its purpose instead has been an introduction to empirical research in the field of local communities and small groups. The impulse to study these two types of human groups came from a growing recognition that in societies which had moved far into secular, social, economic, and political organization not only was the integrity of local communities diminishing but that primary group values were being diluted and weakened.

CHAPTER III

SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH STUDIES OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES

In the long history of the world, in both simple and complex societies, hundreds of millions of people have learned how to live in face-to-face reciprocal and mutual aid relationships. Over most of this long period, however, each local community was sharply isolated from all others. Each thought of itself as unique, so unlike others that what others had learned from their experiences had no contribution to make to them. There were no social scientists, as today, who were attempting to discover the common denominators of all group life and organisation. Kropotkin said there has now developed "a whole science devoted to the embryology of human institutions." This science has been used to analyse many local rural communities.

We have noted that Maine and Kropotkin, neither of them sociologists, saw the universality of village communities and explained their significance. We have also noted that early great scholars in sociology—Durkheim, Tonnies, and Cooley—had emphasized the universality and significance of primary groups and primary group values. It was not, however, until about fifty years ago that sociologists began making detailed, definitive analyses of local communities as such.

Interest in the study of modern local communities was first shown in the United States, primarily by persons and agencies who had become aware of the fact that modern means of transportation and communication had so enlarged the contacts of those living in local areas that local communities were no longer the only concern of the people who lived in them. Individuals were not only participating in wider market contacts, but in educational, religious, and recreational affairs which were not centered in the local communities. Many of the early studies were made by religious and educational leaders because of their conviction that local institutions would have to be strengthened if local communities were to maintain themselves. Some of these studies were by scientific sociologists who wanted to know to what extent in a rapidly changing society old community structures and values were weakened and to what extent they still persisted.

During the intervening fifty years, studies of specific local communities have been made in practically all North and South American countries and in all European countries. Some have been made in the Middle East and Asia and some in the Far East. Because of this, it is possible to know a great deal, not only about the structure and functioning of local communities in contemporary society, but about communities which can be said

to be in transition between those in folk societies and those in highly secular societies. The foci of all these studies have not been the same. Some have attempted to ascertain the personal identification of local residents with their local communities. Others have attempted to discover for what common objects local residents organised themselves for action. Others have studied what kinds of behavior and what types of social relationship had become institutionalized and what happened to these relationships, and to these groups themselves, under the impact of forces from outside the community.

One whole series of studies was made to ascertain the degree of community solidarity still existing in communities which have been variously affected by the penetration of influence from the outside. Other studies not focused on this particular line of analysis have learned much about these particular problems. More recently studies have attempted to ascertain to what extent it is possible to mobilize all members of the community for common undertakings and what the relations of smaller than community-wide groups are to the total community and its activities. More recently still some researchers have analysed how community decisions are made and the varying roles of local leaders and outside leaders in making decisions.

Some of the most significant findings concerning the relative role of local communities in a total society or culture do not derive from any one community study. They derive from the findings of a great number of studies which have made various findings a part of their objective. The major findings are concerned with the influence of increasing contacts with persons, agencies, institutions, and centers of information which are outside the local community area. The influence may be nothing more than radio programs broadcast from outside the local area, or an increasing flow of newspapers into the community from the outside, or they may be the much greater and more direct influence of overhead agencies which at one time had not covered the local area with their services. Under the impact and as a result of the infiltration of these influences, the functioning social structure of the community always changes. The dominance of some groups diminishes and the ascendancy of other groups emerges. The hierarchy of leadership changes. Sometimes representatives of some outside influence become so powerful that they are something like feudal lords over the community. Sometimes new leaders emerge because they foresaw and facilitated changes. Those who had desired and practiced change were quite often opposed by those who were firmly wedded to old ways of thinking and action. Those who could read and did read widely and who for these reasons, and others, had considerable contact and interaction with persons and agencies from outside the area gained a different status in their own eyes and in the eyes of others. Those who operated the new channels and facilities of communication, of trade, and of finance came to constitute a new social class.

In none of the communities studied did all members of the community change in their thinking and action at the same rate, even when all had changed in some ways. Some segments of the community gained in economic and social status and generally others lost in their relative economic and social status. In some of the communities which had moved far enough to see, the possibility of undertaking projects which would improve life and living for all members of the community, it was found that the old leadership was unable to enlist or mobilize all segments of the community for such undertakings, but new leaders were. In some communities where the first undertaking proved to be more beneficial to its promoters than to others, or where the expectation of members of the community had been raised beyond what the undertaking actually accomplished, schisms were deepened and the general degree of readiness for change in the whole community was lessened. In communities where an early undertaking proved to be beneficial to many who had not assisted in the undertaking, there were more supporters for the next project. If each succeeding project proved itself, in due time almost the complete community was mobilized for any kind of community undertaking.

In some small communities where all the people helped to make the decisions, most, and sometimes all, helped to carry out the undertaking. In communities where there existed a number of small groups, each with a different purpose or goal, something approaching complete community mobilization was accomplished by enlisting the support of all the groups for the worthy activities of each group.

It is impossible to summarize in detail the findings of all of the studies which have been made of communities which today are functioning as organised living entities in one or another stage of the age-long but universal movement of societies from simple folk cultures to highly secularized, commercialized, urbanised complex cultures. When one attempts to distill from the hundreds of studies ranging from those which are of the simplest and most isolated communities in the world to those which are part of national and even world society, he is driven to some system of classification in order that he may categorize the findings of communities as they appear on a continuum from very simple to very complex societies.

In an attempt to look down the road which India will travel and foresee what will happen to her rural communities as she becomes steadily more modern, complex, and secular, it is necessary to reduce the findings from the hundreds of community studies to the simplest classification possible. To do this we use the quite universally accepted dichotomy of "sacred and secular", "folk and urban" cultures, and "primary and secondary" or "gemeinschaft and gesellschaft" type of groups. None of the simplest communities ever studied fit perfectly what might be described as the ideal *gemeinschaft* or sacred folk communities. But by describing the distinguishing characteristics of such communities, hundreds of thousands

of which still exist and many of which have been studied, we can fairly validly point out what happens to these characteristics and to the communities themselves as the societies of which they are a part become steadily more secular.

Hundreds of local *Communities in Folk Societies* have been studied by anthropologists. The findings of these studies will be summarised first. The findings of four of the best studies of local communities in peasant societies, or what might be considered as communities in transition, will then be presented, one from each of the following countries. Columbia, in South America; Egypt, in the Middle East; India, in South Asia; and China, in the Far East. Finally, in this chapter, the findings of the very great number of studies of local communities in the United States will be synthesized. By this order of presentation, it is hoped that what happens to local communities as societies move from folk to secular relationships and values will be fairly accurately documented.

The characteristics of *Communities in Folk Societies* can be broadly generalized as follows:

1. Each community is something approximating a complete society in terms of both geography and people.

2. No external forces other than the physical environment enter the community. Few strangers ever come to the community.

3. Each community is composed of families and other kinship groups, the systematic relations between which constitute the social structure of the community.

4. The rights and duties of these groups are passed down from generation to generation and maintained by a value system which consists of the mores of the community. They are accepted by everyone.

5. There are no written constitutions or contracts. Relations between groups are monitored and even enforced by the elders of the group.

6. The community perpetuates itself by teaching each on coming generation its old way of doing and thinking. Apprenticeship in occupations and initiation into each new age group by various types of ceremonials guarantees that each new generation shall know and do as the old generation did.

7. The natural resources which the people use to sustain their economic life are quite generally owned by the whole community. Each family sustains itself economically by participating in the development and utilization of these resources, and participates in the economic returns from the resources.

8. The economic relations of the community are the accepted division of labor between groups rather than by trade or even by barter. The economic and social security of all is, therefore, a total community responsibility.

9. There is thus possibility of change in the status of groups, much less of individuals, in the community.

To the degree that simple communities manifest these characteristics, they are whole societies, in terms not only of social, economic, and political structures, but in terms of value systems. Each person growing up in one of these communities believes and practices these values, plays his assigned roles without questioning, and as a person is pretty much a complete reflection of the community as a whole.

In peasant societies some new types of behavior develop, but by no means all the old characteristics of folk society disappear. We are reporting below briefly the generalized findings of four studies of communities from four different peasant societies. Each of the communities studied was only a few decades past folk society. The frame of their old folk organization is still there and is buttressed by their old folk values. But the outside world has moved in on them. The findings of the four community studies fairly adequately describe what things have caused changes in the community. I would catalog these factors as follows:

1. The first thing was that trade or commerce entered the village. In the Egyptian village the first trading shop came to the village about 60 years ago. In China a market town developed not too far from the village, which town also served a number of other villages. In Columbia some large public works furnished outside employment for village persons who previously had been tied to the village economy. In India the same sorts of things happened.

2. As contact with trade centers, either with merchants located in the village or with trade towns, developed, at least on the part of a few of the village people there developed a knowledge of the outside world in terms of activities about which they had previously known very little. What they learned naturally became matters of gossip within the village and, therefore, some understanding of marketing, prices, and things of that kind developed on the part of all village people.

3. Government had entered all of these villages many years back, but modern government of the type which brings services and assistance to villagers was fairly new in all of the villages. Agents of the government had come in and promoted development and welfare activities. When this happened there was a new basis for forming groups in the village, sometimes new parties, and often new factions, developed.

4. Government's servants, located in or serving the village, were seldom the local villagers themselves, therefore, new persons, generally persons with more education and receiving higher incomes than the villagers, introduced a new type of person and, in some ways, tended to introduce new social status among the other statuses of the village.

5. Government came in all cases, sooner or later, in terms of establishing and helping to maintain schools. School teachers were new citizens of the community and, in some cases, played quite different roles than any outsider had ever played in the village.

6. As some youth of the village received considerable education, they became capable of making contacts and did make contacts, outside the village. Some of them accepted employment outside the village and thus became a channel of cultural traffic in and out of the village.

7. In a few cases, persons with a degree of education took up new occupations different from those which they had traditionally followed, and moved away from the village.

8. As the price and market economy entered the village, some persons began making more money. Those who had made more money or had better contacts with outside agencies became money lenders. In three of the four villages they began to accumulate land that had previously been held by peasants who now lost the ownership of their land. Thus a whole new elite developed in the village—sometimes a quite powerful group.

9. In the case of contacts with the market town or with outside sources of income, a certain number of the villages began to attend picture shows and other recreational events outside the village.

10. In the Chinese village new leaders arose—lay leaders who, while they had not yet challenged the status of the old folk leaders, were looked to by other villagers. Under their leadership some new things were undertaken in the village. In Egypt there was a quite distinct tendency for those who had received a degree of education to exercise a type of leadership which had previously not been in the village. In India, government servants began to be looked up to rather than feared.

11. In all the villages a degree of individualism developed. Some persons did not feel so bound to their family groups as in the past.

12. Some new smaller groups developed. In the Columbia village, actual new local neighborhoods grew up within the village.

13. In all the villages the lower classes; that is, the lower income people, tended to form a group which protested against the large owners.

14. I think it can be said that it was quite clearly evident from the findings that the same old reverence for elders, and for the set class structure, and even for the village values, had been considerably diluted.

These peasant communities are, however, far from having lost all their old folk characteristics. The following such characteristics, though somewhat modified, still maintain.

1. The elders, while they no longer constitute the village government, are highly respected and are still counselors on many types of issues.

2. The village community's organisation is perpetuated by each new generation's tending to follow the family occupations of previous generations.

3. There is in all of these villages some division of labor between the families, this division of labor being fixed by the traditions of the community.

4. Families, generally extended families, are more integral social groups than are the villages as a whole.

5. Sentiment for the land, pride and tenacity in the ownership of the land, is still very strong.

6. There is relatively little tolerance for new ways of thinking and doing. To quote Professor Dube who studied the India village reported on here, "If the people were asked to choose between tradition and progress, tradition would perhaps be their instinctive choice although a second choice might induce them to take a few hesitating steps in the direction of change"

Studies of a number of other peasant communities have been made, some of them European villages, where the people and the economy have moved quite far toward what we are calling here secular societies. Probably, however, what was discovered by the analysts in these four villages will suffice to indicate that the great differences which exist between highly secularized societies and folk societies were a long while in developing, but in their development they traveled steadily away from the old folk cultures and steadily in the direction of more highly secular organisations and value systems. We, therefore, turn to the elaborate research which has been done in secular societies.

Studies of Local Communities in Secular Societies have revealed not only the characteristics of these communities but have served to make more definitive the characteristics of folk and peasant communities which are in sharp contrast with them. Furthermore, in a society which has developed as rapidly as the United States, it is possible to study the whole span of development. In this span are seen communities which are still quite folk-like. Many immigrants who came from Europe have tended to continue their ways of life for some time, tended to build and maintain peasant-type communities. Some studies, the findings of which are included in this synthesis, were made fifty years ago. They, therefore, offer a bench mark of information from which to observe the causes and effects of the steady development of secularization.

There are still in the United States local rural communities which are something like folk groups. These are communities which are generally relatively isolated physically and their production is largely for home consumption. The larger part of their interactions are still with neighbors, and the groups to which they belong are generally local groups. Quite often

they are notional groups, or groups composed of persons who are adherents to the same religion. They are especially cohesive groups when they are ethnic-religious groups which attempt to restrict as much as possible the beyond-local-community contacts. These types of communities have sometimes been called "cultural islands" because they, to a considerable degree, restrict their relationships with the great society in which they live. The members of these communities, however, generally buy some consumption goods and some production goods from the general market. The members of the community also quite generally have a number of town contacts. Most of them go to the towns for their commercialized recreation, to buy some of their consumption goods, and for professional services. The existence of secular services within their reach keeps them from being true folk communities.

At the opposite end of the scale there are highly commercialized farming areas where families living immediately adjacent to each other do not in any way constitute a local community. They do not exchange labor or farm implements, and each farm is a complete physical and commercial entity within itself. All farm production is for sale and is marketed outside the local areas. Few or none of the items for farm or family consumption are produced on the farm or in the local area. All the families' economic contacts and relations are with persons living outside the locality. Their churches are located outside the locality. They go to town for their commercialized recreation, cinemas, sports events, etc. No one in the locality is blood relative of anyone else. Their circle of friends consists of relatives or other persons and families who live in a number of other localities. Contacts and relations with others in these social circles may be either formal or informal, but they are easily maintained because a person or a family can reach the place of the meeting of the circle or club, even though it is ten or fifteen miles away, by going in an automobile as easily and as quickly as they could walk a few hundred yards. In the Great Plains Area of the United States members of conviviality groups maintain these types of relationships by travelling sometimes fifty miles. They travel as much as one hundred miles on weekends to see moving pictures and to attend church.

Between these two extremes are many gradients. One series of studies attempted to sample and analyse a number of these gradients on a conceptual continuum from relatively high community stability to relatively high community instability. Six communities were studied; two which were highly stable, two which were relatively unstable, and two intermediate between these extremes. The findings from one of each of these two pairs will be briefly described.

The most stable community was a Spanish-American village community in the southwestern part of the United States. It had inherited its pattern of village settlement from Mexico, from whence the settlers came about one hundred years ago. All members of the community speak

Spanish and all are members of the Catholic church. The priest is highly revered by everyone and the church is the main social institution in the village. Arts and crafts, as well as agriculture, are economic occupations. Cultivation is chiefly subsistence farming and things not produced by cultivator families are procured from local village artisans. During the past few decades an increasing number of persons in this village have accepted employment elsewhere. Government assistance programs have entered the village. Trade with outside towns has increased, but the village is still an integral self-conscious local community. Its organisations are still family or folk organisations, and its value system is quite definitely of the folk type.

The most unstable community of the six is in what sixty years ago was a frontier area—a homestead settlement area. Settlers first came into the area in 1885 and took up 160-acre homestead farms. This provided a population of about twenty persons per square mile. They built local schools and churches, and a number of small trade centres grew up; they were neighborhood trade centers. For a number of years rainfall was adequate and production satisfactory, and then droughts began which lasted off and on for a period of six years. By the end of that time, two-thirds of the families had moved out of the area, schools and churches were closed and some towns went completely out of existence. For the next three decades, the rainfall in the area, though always spotted, induced settlers to return to the area, and it was again completely occupied, though this time by many fewer families because the farms had increased to three or four times the size they were in 1885. A degree of institutional stability had again been built in the area. Farms are so large that are now only from five to ten persons per square mile. Most of the institutions, schools, churches, and recreation places are now located in towns. Most of the farm families themselves live in town and drive to their farms daily. During the winter months the rural areas are almost deserted.

Gradually institutions have been re-established. Local neighborhoods, however, have disappeared. The town is the social center. The schools are large and excellent in every way—far more adequate than were the neighborhood schools of the olden days. The towns are, therefore, not only good trade centers, but good institutional centers, and could be said to be social centers. They, however, are not communities by the widest stretch of the imagination. Any primary groups, and there are many of them, which exist in this community are not community groups but what might be called special interest groups. Persons living in the area may speak of belonging to a given community, but, with the exception of the larger institutions like the schools and churches, their social life is lived in many groups.

The group or community intermediate between these two extremes is in the Middle West, in a highly profitable agricultural area. In this area there were at one time many local neighborhoods, each one with its own school. Farm families were real neighbors, they exchanged work

and farm implements. They helped care for the sick and bury the dead. They were highly community—or neighborhood-conscious. While they were commercial farmers to some extent, even in the early days, they were also the type of farmers who produced most of their consumption goods on their own farms and in their own community. Today a large consolidated school, high school, is the social centre of the area. In fact, there are no longer any neighborhood schools. Many of the churches which at one time were located in the open country area have either moved into the large trade center or to the number of smaller trade centres that exist in the area. Farming in the area today is highly mechanised and highly commercialized. Farmers practice scientific farming, and are not only competent farm managers of high priced farms, but competent business men. Farm homes are modern in every way. Home work is as highly mechanised as is farming. The majority of the fathers and mothers are high school graduates, some of them college graduates. They participate not only in the economic but also in the social and cultural life of the large society, but they have not thereby abandoned participation in and concern for local community life. They go often to the chief town centre of the area. Their children go there to school and they go there to church. They are in good and affable social relations with the people who live in the town. They drive far beyond this local town, fifty to one hundred miles to large cities, to purchase certain types of their consumption goods and some of their production goods. They, however, still speak of their local communities, and even of their local neighborhoods.

It is interesting, therefore, to see and understand how a degree of folk culture, at least folk organisation, has still been maintained in this community. It is not done so much by actual community organisation as it is done by a number of special interest groups located in the community; 4-H clubs, home demonstration clubs, farmer organisation local units, conviviality groups, families that play cards in each other's homes or in larger groups. Neighboring is still practiced in terms of visiting back and forth in each other's homes. Farmers still exchange work in organised co-operative work groups. One who knows the community well would have to say that these people, while now participants in the great society, still cherish and maintain their local community values and a great many of their local community organisations.

This series of studies and a number of others similar to them serve to show what happens to old community types of organisation and community values when the society in which they exist has become highly secular. In some highly urbanised rural areas, local neighborhoods in the sociological sense no longer exist. Families who live immediately adjacent to each other have far fewer contacts with each other than they do with personal friends who live at a considerable distance from them. Many of the groups in which rural families participate are "Special interest", not

community or neighborhood groups. Families associate with one group of people in economic affairs and different other groups in recreation, religious, and educational affairs. Their various economic or business relations may be with a number of different towns. Members of the same family quite often are members of groups which take them in different directions and at different times. Relatively few groups enjoy the participation of a number of whole family groups.

Because the trend into secular relations and secular organisations is already in progress in India and because it will accelerate, all that has been learned about what happens in local rural communities in such a trend should be known by those who are guiding community development in India. A final summary of the hundred or more American rural community studies is presented as a contribution to this objective.

The earliest analysts set themselves the task of discovering to what extent and in what ways local rural groups still functioned as community conscious social entities. It has been proved that many rural communities are still living functioning entities. Studies have shown that nearly all local geographic areas have community names by which they are clearly identified. It has, however, been discovered that many of these are mere place names which identify their geographic location on a stream or near some other topographic object, or near a church or a school. Some of them retain the names of what were at one time well-known cohesive community groups. In some areas large consolidated schools now serve an area in which there were in the past a number of small local schools, each serving as a neighborhood center. In many areas where immigrants constituted cohesive local communities, these social groups have dissolved in their growing interactions with "old American" sectors of society.

It has also been discovered that many members of these communities give much more of their time and have greater emotional attachment to other than local community groups. Some research has, therefore, been directed to an analysis of those factors and forces which cause community cohesion and those which dilute it or lessen emotional attachment to local communities.

The factor which operated most frequently tending to dilute old community cohesion was the entrance of agencies and agents that rendered services which neighbors either individually or as groups had previously rendered. The first of these were government agencies. Government first entered rural communities by building schools and supplying teachers. In the pioneer days local neighborhoods had themselves built their schools and themselves employed teachers, often one of the neighbors doing the teaching. Local district schools were in fact neighborhood schools. But in due time they became township and then country schools. The same thing happened to local road districts. The trend to larger areas of service and higher echelons of administration has continued. Units of government have

steadily increased their financial support and administrative influence over activities and institutions which were initiated and once directed by local neighborhoods and communities. Local responsibilities were thereby lessened and weakened. Community sentiment was automatically weakened because local communities no longer alone had to assume, as an organized group, the complete responsibilities or even the initiative for all of the improvements they desired.

As pioneer communities which were by necessity isolated and because of this isolation were by necessity self-sufficient entered more and more into a market economy, they developed trade and marked contacts and interactions with an increasing number of persons and agencies located outside their local community. These contacts and interactions also divided their time and attention, not all of which were any longer centered in and on local community affairs.

As this whole gamut of contacts increased, persons living in local communities became increasingly aware of alternative economic and social opportunities which lay outside the local community. With increased educational status, a number of persons, usually young adults, moved out of local communities to take advantage of these opportunities. They seldom severed their family ties, however, and therefore often returned to their home communities. They were a leaven from the great society. But their families and others still accepted them socially, though, of course, not as active members of the community.

The findings of a whole series of studies have now pretty well established the fact that the more isolated a community is the more self-sufficient and the more cohesive it is as a human group. Its self-sufficiency is often anything but sufficient in terms of its level of living, but its group cohesion and community sentiment is strong. In communities where such cohesion or solidarity no longer exists, persons are still members of groups. They still participate in local institutions, but they also participate in many other types of organisations and groups.

In the typical American rural community it is only on special occasions or for emergency undertakings that the community as a whole mobilizes for action. Government agencies and other secular services provide most of the needs which one hundred, or even fifty, years ago neighbors joined hands to provide for themselves. Members of the community, however, participate far more in group life than they did a few generations ago. A great many studies of well-established communities have been made to ascertain who participates and to what extent in community affairs and what factors are associated with such participation.

All members of the community automatically participate in family units. Not all of them, however, participate in community units. But between these two types of groups there are a number of other groups in the community in which residents of the community participate. Most of

these other groups are "special interest" groups; that is, they are composed of only those persons in the community who have common special desires and interests. There are many such groups in a typical American community, business, recreation education, professional and conviviality groups. Some persons may be members of a number of these groups and some persons may not participate in any of them. Some of these are what are called "formal groups". That is, they have constitutions and by-laws, a set of officers and committees, and have specified qualifications for membership. Quite generally persons are elected to membership in these groups. There are, however, also informal groups, families, neighborhoods, visiting and play groups. Because all of these together constitute the social organisation of the community, analysts have made many studies of so-called group participation by getting information on the group participation of each family in the community. They have thus ascertained the group structure and the group functioning of a great many secular or semi-secular rural communities. The major findings have been as follows:

1. Those with high socio-economic status in the local community participate more in formal organisations than do those with low socio-economic status.

2. Relative educational status conditions the amount of social participation in formal organisations.

3. There are marked differences in the amount of participation of various age groups in formal organisations. Children and young persons participate little, those in the middle age group participate most, and participation of older persons declines steadily with increasing age.

4. Where a great deal of participation is in formal groups, actual group affiliation in terms of group sentiment is only nominal.

5. Participation in informal groups tends to decrease when a local community increases the number of its formal groups. This does not occur, however, when the old informal groups continue to do things which create satisfaction for their members.

6. The more isolated a local community is, the relatively greater is the prevalence of informal group participation.

We should add that informal groups are generally primary groups whereas formal groups are practically never primary groups. Primary group values are often maintained in families, and to the extent that the family circle competes with other associations for the time spent in the family circle, even the family as a preserver of primary group values is weakened.

In final summary of what has been learned from research studies of local communities, it must be kept in mind that the main research has been so discover what a local community is in terms of community action

and community sentiment. Because it has not been feasible to present the detailed findings of the hundreds of studies, we have ordered our summary of these findings on a scale or continuum from local communities in folk societies to local communities in secular societies. In order to heighten the reader's awareness of what this form of presentation would yield if it were possible to present all available data, we present quotations from one of the greatest students of the characteristics of primary groups, and quotations of one of the greatest students of the characteristics of secular groups.

Professor Rudolph Heberle, son-in-law of Ferdinand Tonnies whom we earlier cited as author of the *gemeinschaft-gesellschaft* dichotomy, says "Gemeinschaft may be thought of as a creation of genuine concord, *gesellschaft* as a result of agreement." The first is illustrated by family, neighborhood, and local community relations. The second is illustrated by all sorts of groups, those formed to implement special, but not all the, interests of their members. As Professor Heberle says, "There is a more profound kind of social unity than that which originates from interest—the kind of unity which is present in any normal family group, in a neighborhood where families have been living together and have been friends and helpers in good and hard times for many generations, the kind of unity which exists between people who know that they share religious ideals and ethical values. This kind of social unity is denoted by the term "community" in the strict sense.

The second quotation consists of a number of sentences from Professor Louis Wirth, an outstanding student of urban organization and life. Wirth says, "In a community composed of a larger number of individuals than can know one another intimately and can be assembled in one spot, it becomes necessary to communicate through indirect media and to articulate individual interests by a process of delegation. . . . The individual counts for little, but the voice of the representative is heard with a deference roughly proportional to the numbers for whom he speaks." . . . "The close living together and working together of individuals who have no sentimental and emotional ties foster a spirit of competition, aggrandizement, and mutual exploitation. Formal controls are instituted to counteract irresponsibility and potential disorder." . . . "The distinctive features of the urban mode of life consist of the substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the weakening of bonds of kinship, and the declining social significance of the family, the disappearance of the neighborhood, and the undermining of the traditional basis of social solidarity." . . . "Reduced to a stage of virtual importance as an individual, the urbanite is bound to exert himself by joining with others of similar interest into groups organized to obtain his ends. This results in an enormous multiplication of volutary organizations directed toward as great variety of objectives as there are human needs and interests."

The findings of research to be presented in the next chapter show that under conditions where local community life and organization is difficult and very often does not exist, individuals not only organize and participate in special interest groups, but organize and participate in primary groups. These findings are fairly revolutionary in that they show the possibility of preserving, and even recreating, primary group practices and values which tend to be sacrificed in secular behaviour and pretty thoroughly lost in secular societies.

CHAPTER IV

FIELD AND SHOP STUDIES OF GROUP FORMATION

It is assumed by many that rural communities still retain considerable cohesion and solidarity, only because they have not yet evolved into completely secular social organisations. From some of the things written here, it may seem that the author holds this view. Such a view can scarcely be maintained in the face of findings which tend to prove that something approaching "primary groups" are found everywhere, in even the most secular societies. The findings of three research studies are briefly synopsized here. They represent not only the most recent, but probably the most definitive, research findings on new group formation. Two of these studies are used as basic samples, not only because they were among the earliest, but because they are both included in George C. Homans' "The Human Group," the reading of which is definitely recommended to anyone who desires to do what might be called advanced study of small group behavior.

The first of these was a whole series of studies designed to analyse how physical work conditions in a large manufacturing plant influenced the production output of industrial workers. A few quotations from the director of these elaborate studies will serve to describe the almost accidental discovery, after five years of studying physical and economic factors, of what might be described as the functioning of "social groups" on an industrial assembly line. After describing beneficial changes which resulted from better illuminations, shorter working days, rest periods, free luncheons, different rates and methods of paying wages, he writes, "There was another type of change, however, of which the investigators were not so consciously aware. This was manifest in two ways: first, in the gradual change in social interrelations among operators themselves, which displayed itself in the form of new group loyalties and solidarities; secondly, in a change in relations between operators and their supervisors."

He elaborates by saying, "No longer were the operators isolated individuals, working together only in the sense of an actual physical proximity. They had become participating members of a working group with all the psychological and social implications peculiar to such a group." Other statements are, "A situation had been created which was described by the operators as one in which there were no longer any 'bosses.' Increased morale had been shown by, (1) a decrease in absenteeism, (2) an increased amount of social action.....among operator outside of working hours, (3) an increased amount of socialised

conversation during working hours, (4) a willingness to help one another for the good of the group, (5) pacing each other in output." "That any social solidarity did develop in this heterogenous group was astonishing and showed what could be accomplished through segregating workers into small compact groups".

On the basis of these findings, revealed as sidelights in a purely industrial management study, these same researches, counselled by sociological scientists, initiated the Bank Wiring Room study which has now become somewhat of a classic in the field of small group research. This type of study has been repeated many times, with various types of groups. In order to be as concrete as possible, a very brief account of the Bank Wiring Room study will be given.

The Bank Wiring Room was a unit within the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company, in which fourteen previously unrelated workers were located in an observation room, and were studied for five months by analysts. The fourteen men constituted one unit of production, but their tasks were of three types: nine of the men were wiremen, three were solderers, and two were inspectors. The work of each wireman was his own individual responsibility, and he was paid personally for his individual output. The solderers and inspectors, of course, could not do their work until the wiremen had done theirs, but there were no other ways in which any operators depended on others in the room.

The trained observer, knowing the factors which other studies of group behavior had shown to be important, watched for and recorded acts of co-operation in physical work, the amount of verbal interaction (conversations) between and among workmen, any tendencies of workmen to form themselves into cliques, and any group sentiments which might develop in the group as a whole, in sub-groups, and toward management or others outside their workroom.

Stated in the order of their significance in the group relations which developed during the five months' duration of the study, the observer noted that workmen very soon began helping each other in their assigned tasks, this in spite of the fact that such behavior was not encouraged, in fact was discouraged, by plant officials, and although they received no additional income for this volunteer assistance. He observed carefully and recorded every instance of such assistance, and carefully noted who helped whom and was helped by whom. What later developed showed the significance of the following facts: (1) The wireman who was helped more often and by the greatest number of others was the second highest producer in the room, and therefore did not need help. (2) The workman who most often helped others never received help from others. (3) Two others who often helped others never received help from others. Apparently, these acts of physical assistance were based neither on need for assistance nor on sentiments of mutual aid. The same could not be

said concerning interactions and relationships which had nothing to do with production attainments or income received. They related rather to friendships which were formed and facilitated by conversations and grew into satisfactions enjoyed in non-work relationships.

The plant authorities did not approve of conversations between workmen while they were on the job. They frowned on persons supposed to be skilled in doing one job helping or taking over for a time one of the other skilled jobs. But considerable exchanging of jobs did occur, and a great amount of conversation, even group discussion, was engaged in. In fact, it was on the basis of these types of forbidden behavior that internal group relationships were formed. The wireman who was helped most often, and by the greatest number of others, engaged in and stimulated more conversation and group discussion than anyone else in the room. He became the central person in one of the two cliques that developed, but developed no antagonisms with either the members, or the central person in the other clique.

The two cliques, or sub-social groups, which developed in the room were based mostly on individual emotional attractions and separated mostly on the basis of individual emotional antagonisms. Membership in the cliques was practically identical with the two groups that ate their luncheons together and played games together during the lunch period. Membership in the cliques had nothing to do with the work regimen; it was based purely on preferences and likes of the persons who were drawn together in the room. The observer recorded manifestations of these attractions and antagonisms and was able to record not only their effects, but also their causes.

The workman to whom the greatest antagonism was evidenced was older than the other workmen. He was the only workman who had some college education. He was literally an isolate in all group activities. Another person toward whom a great deal of antagonism was evidenced was an exceptionally efficient worker, but so concentrated on his work that he was considered "unsocial." Another was an exceptionally efficient workman, but he was critical, even contemptuous, of others. Another, although a sort of in-and-out member of one of the cliques, was resented because he was apparently striving for leadership.

One workman's production output, in his individual day-by-day and week-by-week production, almost perfectly fit the production norm which the group set for itself. He became the central persons in one of the cliques, was friendly with the members of the other cliques, and even friendly with the workman whom others disliked most heartily. He was the emerging group leader when this study had to be terminated. The directors of the study said, "If, as we have seen, the output rates of the wiremen could not be correlated with their intelligence or dexterity, they could clearly be correlated with clique membership."

The detailed report on this study and those which led up to its launching is hundreds of pages in length. The chief purpose of the few findings pointed out here has been to show that the significant things about group behavior can be learned if the observer is sufficiently aware of the various components of, or elements which constitute, groups, and if he carefully records what he observes about the play or functioning of each of these components in the functioning of groups.

Before the discussion of the findings of this study is dropped, however, some broader, significant findings, which have provided the springboard for other, similar studies, should be cited. Probably the most important fact is that, although each wireman was permitted to work at his own pace and was paid according to his product, the group as a whole established its own work norm and brought pressure on workmen to conform to that norm. The workman whose production was continually almost identical with the norms which the group itself had established, was the most popular person in the workroom. Not only were all others friendly with him, but he was the person on whom they counted to represent them in their complaints or requests to the management. This emerging leader of and for the group had no hierarchical authority whatsoever.

The understanding of group formation and group behavior that emerged from this series of studies has been the springboard for the study of other groups of industrial workers, of old and new neighborhood and community groups, and of other groups not formed solely for clinical analysis. They cannot be described in even the slight detail of that for the Bank Wiring Room study. Only a synopsis of their findings can be recorded. The reason for citing each of the remainder in this section is largely to emphasize one or more of the specific findings which will be used in the summary of this section. Some space will be given to a description of one other study.

The Norton Street Gang was a group of thirteen self-organised young men in a slum area of a city in the eastern part of the United States. There are many such gangs in American cities, generally organised for companionship which is focussed on given types of activity in which the members engage. They, however, do other things together and, if they continue to exist, develop a specific group functional structure.

The analyst of this group, a sociologist, attained membership in the group and studied the factors of its normal operation for three years. A definite group leader and two sub-leaders developed. As a matter of fact, in the absence of the leader, the group generally functioned in two groups, each carrying on its own chosen activities. In the larger group's activities, the two sub-leaders were used as lieutenants of the leader, and willingly served as such. The chief activities of the gang were bowling and boxing, and the group's ideas about proficiency in these activities

became established group values. This proficiency did much to determine the relative status of the individual members of the group. With an understanding of these few basic facts, it is possible to point out some significant characteristics of this group's behavior.

First was the fact that the gang's idea of how proficient a bowler was, and how he would behave in a bowling match, definitely influenced his bowling performance. No matter what he had demonstrated as an individual in bowling, in team play he lowered or raised his performance toward the level which the group expected of him. In paired competition with the leader of the gang, another member with demonstrated superior skill could not beat the leader. In the few instances where he did, he refused to capitalize on this accomplishment or diminish the general high standing of the leader. Instead, he offered excuses for the leader's performance. Apparently he did this because the leader performed other functions of more importance to the group's survival and standing than proficiency in athletics. The two most important of these were: (1) All, or most, of the things about which members were concerned were communicated to him and through him to other members, either privately or in groups; and (2) he was the accepted and effective channel of communication between the group and the larger community in which it lived and operated. Thus he was better informed than any other member about the problems and purposes of each and all members of the gang, and he was better informed about the attitudes and beliefs of others toward the gang. The leader gained sufficient status in his own group, and with those outside of the group, that he became a candidate for election to the state legislature.

Some other studies have been made of the occupants of new housing developments, where members of the groups had until recently been strangers to each other. They were not mobilized for purposes of an experiment, but studied as groups which formed for purposes of their own. The findings of the most outstanding of these were: The group formed because of the attractiveness of individuals and families for certain other individuals and families; on even short acquaintance, they had come to like and prefer each other. They had the same or common objectives, and agreed on tasks that needed to be undertaken. Once formed, the groups struggled together to maintain and enhance their prestige in the larger community.

A few studies have been made of small groups in old, established communities where the status of all groups had become fixed "by tradition", where leadership had been long established, and where the class structure was fairly rigid. Some important findings of these studies are: (1) Separateness of groups was not so much because they were conflicting "factions" as it was that they had different levels of desires and expectations. (2) Leaders of lower-status groups were hesitant about joining hands with leaders of higher-status groups which represented

different standards and values. (3) Thus, leadership of lower-status groups was non-functioning, or not used, in large group undertakings. (4) There was some tendency for lower-status groups to imitate higher-status groups in behavior, and gradually to adopt higher group's values, but still retain their own group integrity. (5) The "social distance" between status groups maintained by traditional social structure tended to be kept, with the consequence that total community mobilization was difficult.

There is another series of studies which makes a contribution to an understanding of the relations between groups in a hierarchical organisations. These studies were made of human relations in large industrial plants where, as always, the top management not only makes policy, but also directs the whole enterprise. Between top management and the laborers, there are intermediate echelons-middle management, foremen, specialists, and official leaders of labor groups. The studies were focussed on types of relations between these groups and their effects on both the laborers and their hierarchical organisation. Some of their findings are: (1) When the laborers are not organised, top management dictates to, and rigidly controls, the whole hierarchical structure and dictates the way it shall function. When the laborers are organized, this tight control and direction doesn't work well, and management for a time feels frustrated. Management is reticent about giving up any of its previous powers; feels that with each concession to laborers it is less capable of gaining its objectives. This period of confusion continues until a way is worked out, and understood by both top and bottom groups and all intermediate echelons, by which the laborers are satisfied with their roles and the managements sees that the enterprise is strengthened by intelligence co-operation between all the groups which compose the complex and complete organisation. (2) Under such complete understanding, each group initiates action with the knowledge and agreement of the other. As one author says, "Each has favourable sentiments toward the other." (3) Those persons in the hierarchy who are in direct and constant contact with the laborers, and who before the laborers were organised directed all their actions by orders, play the most difficult roles in the whole new set-up. Their roles are crucial in carrying out the objectives of the whole enterprise, and they are therefore beholden to, in fact are a part of, top management. They, however, are the only persons in the hierarchy in a position to understand the purposes of top management and also to appreciate the daily needs and desires of the workers. (4) Another important finding is that specialists and staff consultants tend to impose their suggestions at any and all points of operation and at any time. In doing this, they often introduce disturbance in the smooth operation of the organisation. Especially are they likely to disturb the working relations between parts of echelons of the organisation by giving directions which others are supposed to, but are unable to, carry out. (5) The highest potentials of all groups or echelons, and the

maximum satisfactions of all persons involved in the common enterprise, are accomplished when the lines of communication are open and operate smoothly from bottom to top and from top to bottom, and when interactions between all groups are free and frequent.

A great many studies of well-established communities have been made to ascertain who participates, and to what extent, in community affairs, and what factors are associated with such participation. Unfortunately for our purpose many, if not most, of these studies were concerned with participation in "formal" organisations, which are a part of the large secular society. A few of them, however, contribute information on the existence and behavior of primary groups, and the relationship of participation in primary groups and participation in formal and larger associations. Some findings from these studies germane to the issue here under consideration follow: (1) All members of families more often participate in the same informal groups than they do in the same formal groups. (2) There are marked differences in the amount of participation of various age groups in formal organisations. Children participate little, those in the middle age groups participate most, and their participation declines from that point on. (3) Relative educational status conditions the amount of social participation in formal organisations. (4) In all participation studies, it has been shown that those with high "socio-economic," local community status participate more in formal organizations than do those with low socio-economic status. (5) Participation in informal groups is almost universal, whereas only from sixty to eighty per cent of all members of local communities participate in formal organisations. (6) Participation in informal groups connotes actual group affiliation, whereas a great deal of participation in formal groups is only nominal. (7) The more isolated a local community, the relatively greater the comparative dominance of informal group participation. (8) Participation in informal groups tends to decrease when a local community increases the number of its formal groups. This does not occur if informal groups continue to do things which create satisfactions for their members.

CHAPTER V

LABORATORY OR CLINICAL STUDIES OF SMALL GROUPS

It has been related how the impulse to study small groups came almost by accident when it was discovered that primary group behavior showed up, as it were, on the assembly line of great modern factories. What little was known about these interesting phenomena has, since the middle 1920's, led to studies of almost every conceivable type of small group—children and youth groups, families, athletic teams, clubs and camps of all kinds, gangs, cliques and factions, fraternities and sororities, religious groups, political groups, work groups, business and factory organisations, well-established neighborhoods and communities, new neighborhoods and communities, and even groups of mentally disturbed persons. The articles reporting the findings of these studies would constitute a bibliography of more than five hundred titles.

It is needless to state that neither the titles nor the objectives of each of these studies can be cited here. The research method of most of them was to break group behavior down into its component elements and, as carefully as possible, observe and analyse the operation of each element. Karl Pearson, the great German mathematician and scientist described this method of isolating component elements as the first step in scientific analysis. It must, of course, be recognised that isolation of the components of a human group cannot be as complete as is possible as with the elements of a chemical compound or a physical construct. Sociologists and psychologists have, however, approximated this as nearly as possible. Knowing the basic elements in group behavior, they have done two things: made careful observations of each of these elements in many different groups under various and varying conditions; and they have induced many kinds of group behavior by experimentally manipulating these various known elements.

In discussing the findings of as many of these studies as is feasible in a document of this length, two foci of interest have been used as guides to the selection of research findings to be reported. One of these is the matter of issues at stake in India's Community Development Programme; the other concerns the problems which the researchers themselves posed for their analyses. Many of the findings cited will at first blush sound trivial. Many of them will be recognised as corroborating what is already widespread common sense knowledge. But major contributions of all social research are, objectively to validate what is uncritically assumed to be true; and to raise to higher levels of significance many things which are disregarded because they are common place.

It is, of course, not possible to order the findings of these many researches in such a fashion as to make them direct answers to practical questions which arise in all action programs involving small group behavior. We are, however, cataloging as many as possible of their findings on the basis of six questions which we believe arise in any community development program such as India's. The six questions are as follows:—

- (1) Why do persons join groups, join some groups and not others?
- (2) How does membership in a group change or influence a person's behavior and thinking?
- (3) What factors and processes develop group disruption?
- (4) What are the functions of group objectives, and how do group objectives and standards influence the objectives and standards of individual group members?
- (5) How does group leadership develop, and what are the conditions for its successful functioning?
- (6) Are there other group roles besides leadership which are essential to successful group functioning?

I. Why do persons join groups, join some groups and not others?

Experiments in this field naturally had to be made under conditions which permitted individuals to choose whether or not they would become members of given groups. To the findings of these experiments, however, can be added some observations of situations in which individuals had little or no choice. They were members not by volition but by circumstance. But members, both verbally and by their behavior, expressed their pleasure or displeasure about their membership in the groups.

Where membership is by choice, research studies show that individuals join groups for the following reasons: (1) They are personally interested in the objectives for which the group was organized and which it seek to gain. (2) They are friends of other persons who are members of the group. (3) The friendly relations and the effective cooperation among members which the group has manifested attracts other persons. (4) Persons with a common culture—common values and purposes—form into groups because members are congenial and want to promote common values and purposes.

II. How does membership in a group change or influence a person's behavior and thinking?

The first experiments in this field attempted to ascertain whether children, when working at the same tasks, and when in competition or in cooperation with others, learned more rapidly when working alone or in the presence of others. The experiments were simple, but the findings

were unequivocal. They were: (1) Individuals all working at the same task accomplished more if they were in the physical presence of others who were working at the same task. (2) Individual performance was heightened when these same individuals worked together in small groups. (3) The performance of those who had been lowest when working alone was raised more than others in the group. (4) The performance of those who had ranked highest in the individual tests was not lowered, was in fact often heightened, in the group. (5) Leaders emerged in these simple groups. They were those individuals to whom other children in the group responded, whom they sought to imitate. (6) These leaders were not always those who had ranked highest in individual performance.

Since these earliest experiments on the influence of groups on learning and problem-solving performance, there have been many others which attempted to ascertain how participation in small groups influence individuals' ideas, attitudes, and sentiments. Some of the significant findings are: (1) A member's loyalty to the group is in direct relationship to the extent of his participation in group discussions and activities. (2) As the extent and frequency of an individual's interactions with other members of the group increased, he became more tolerant of, and more friendly with, others and with the objectives of the group. (3) Each individual lowered or heightened his participation in a group's activities in accordance with his conception of the status he himself had in the group. (4) The zest and constancy with which an individual played his role in a group depended upon the degree of honorable recognition the group gave to the role he played.

III. What factors or processes develop group solidarity or cohesion, and what factors and processes develop group disturbances and disruption?

(1) Group cohesion or solidarity increases with each succeeding objective or goal the group reaches.

(2) The greater the solidarity of a group, the more capable it is to withstand outside pressure and to triumph over incipient internal factions.

(3) Optimum adjustment to outside forces, directions, or situations is made at the cost of a degree of the internal solidarity of the group.

(4) Factions develop in a group when any large portion of the members disagree with the objectives of the group.

(5) Factions need not disrupt the group unless they work counter to group objectives. They can be welded into the group by being permitted to gain sub-objectives, if need be under the leadership of sub-objectives, if need be under the leadership of sub-group leaders.

(6) Group solidarity on different and new levels of thinking and action cannot be attained too quickly, or the change be too great, without weakening the group's cohesion. It is most easily accomplished by elaborate, democratic group discussion of what will be gained and what lost by the new objectives.

(7) If and when group sentiment is developed for a line of action or type of endeavor in which the group has not had experience, it demands a skilled leader, to organise the group and lead it into action.

IV. What are the functions of group objectives and group standards, and how do they influence the objectives and behavior of members of a group?

Researches in the field of group objectives and standards have not been concerned with the worthiness or unworthiness of objectives, but only with the influence of objectives and standards on group behavior and group survival. Quite often findings in this field were incidental to the main focus of the researches. The following findings can be reported: (1) The behavior of a group cannot be predicted without taking into account not only its goals, but also its values and standards. (2) Both the goal or objective of the group and the standard of conduct of the group must be well understood and accepted by its members in order to guarantee that vigorous attempts to gain the goal do not jeopardise or destroy the solidarity of the group. (3) Neither directives from outside the group nor lectures to the group is as effective in developing group understanding and purpose as free democratic discussion within the group. (4) The more cohesive a group, the more it influences the opinions and behavior of its members. (5) New group standards once accepted have much greater influence in raising the aspirations of individual members than does any individual innovator. (6) Gaining its objectives is imperative to a group's growth and survival. (7) A group motivated to reach a desired goal quickly dilutes and often disregards blocks to action which rest only on traditional beliefs and values.

V. How does group leadership develop, and what are the conditions for its successful functioning?

(1) Well-defined status always develops in groups. Each member plays, or participates in, some role. Some members have greater influence, are listened to, imitated, and followed more than some others.

(2) The nature of the group's task determines the roles to be played, and thus determines the functions which leadership performs.

(3) Those persons are accorded influence who, the group believes, can best initiate group-determined action.

(4) Leadership is therefore not so much a personal attribute as a social or group role.

(5) A few, but not all, leaders can lead various types of groups. But in most groups, the type of leader required is determined by the type of group membership and the groups objectives.

(6) An "imposed" leader very often talks a great deal in order to demonstrate his status, instead of promoting communication between members of the group.

(7) Because the network of interactions among members constitutes the social structure of the group, it is imperative that a leader encourage, stimulate, and promote interaction—chiefly exchange of opinions and judgments between and among members.

(8) Where structured action is required to gain a group objective, the leader must either be a skilled technician as well as a group leader, or he must share leadership with others who are skilled technicians.

VI. Are these group roles other than leadership which are essential to successful group functioning?

(1) Everyone in a group influences the group's behavior; no one can be disregarded. If he is to be "counted on", he must be "counted in". If he isn't counted in, the group solidarity suffers.

(2) None of the studies discovered that more followers were accorded any group status.

(3) A leader, whether group-chosen or imposed, gets group accomplishment when every member is accorded a recognized role.

(4) Leadership itself can, and often is, participated in by a number of different group members.

(5) The number of natural leadership roles depends upon the complexity and diversity of the things undertaken by the group. Quite frequently a number of sub-leaders are required, each leading in one line of activity.

VII. Additional findings of these studies which do not fit readily under the six above questions are:

(1) Free and uninhibited actions between all members of a group is the social fabric of group organization.

(2) Group discussion of all proposals, objectives, and methods of action is the easiest way of developing within—group interactions.

(3) Group discussion develops group motivation, willingness to act, better than lecturing or issuing instructions.

(4) The amount of change in thinking and purpose resulting from discussion is greater when discussion is conducted in a democratic fashion.

(5) An innovator is a disturber of group harmony unless his proposals are thoroughly discussed and somewhat modified by the group.

(6) An avowed "pace-setter" is more resented by the group than a "laggard".

Listed under the seven headings above are forty-seven specific findings out of the elaborate research in small groups which has been done over the last few decades. Two books listed in the selected bibliography present descriptions of a greater number of these studies than can be found in easily available documents. They are listed in the selected bibliography in the final pages of this bulletin.

CHAPTER VI

IDEAS ABOUT THE APPLICABILITY AND USE OF THE FINDINGS OF COMMUNITY AND SMALL GROUP RESEARCH IN INDIA'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

India, for thousands of years, has been primarily a society of villages. She probably will be such far into the future. If and when her population has increased to 60,00,00,000, there will still be 36,00,00,000 people living in villages, unless industrialization has advanced so far that more than forty per cent of all her people— 24,00,00,000—are then living and working in cities and large towns. No society in the world is as likely as India to telescope the development through which other advanced societies have passed. But it would seem to me to be unrealistic to expect a more rapid industrial and urban development than that just stated. This is, however, in no sense a prediction that the development will be this rapid.

There can be no doubt that village life and work will become steadily more secular and steadily less folk-like. But I understand that it is the desire and purpose of India's leaders and planners that in this development not all of the values of local community life shall be sacrificed; furthermore, that village dwellers shall not only participate in the economic and social dividends which will accrue from national development, but will, by organized local community effort, play a large part in the tasks of national development. It seems to me not only laudable but reasonable that a society which still has a village economy and village culture should seek to retain as much as possible of its folk values while it changes in the direction of complexity and secularity.

It has been typical of societies which have advanced rapidly not to be too much concerned with the declining importance of local communities and primary group values. But it is probably also significant that the greatest amount of research in the fields of local communities and small groups has been done in countries whose life has become highly secularized. I interpret this fact as the result of a growing concern about the unnecessary decline, or loss, of primary group values. India, in her programs of development can, and probably will, demonstrate the extent to which such a loss is not inevitable. As I understand the purpose of the Community Development Programme, it is to preserve primary group values by working with, implementing, developing, and strengthening local communities and small groups.

It has been pointed out that social scientists, for approximately one hundred years, have been attempting to analyse the vital mechanisms and processes of group life. They have discovered that there have always been

communities in all societies, and there have always been smaller than community-wise groups in these communities. Universally, there have been families and in all but the simplest communities, there have been other small groups. Elaborate recent research has discovered that primary groups are not merely group structures which become fixed by tradition. They are products of functional and functioning relationships of persons who have many interests common to all of them. These persons automatically and inevitably constitute a primary group if they systematically and repeatedly, together, undertake to do things. Persons who have not before constituted a primary group develop new primary groups all the time. But they do so only when, on the basis of their common interests and desires, they themselves accept the responsibility for implementing these interests and desires. No one can commandeer them to regiment them. To attempt to do so begets their antagonism, and to insist on doing so destroys them. Quite unconsciously, dependence on the secular services of highly organised and highly commercialized relationships of all kinds has tended to usurp the responsibilities which primary groups at one time quite universally exercised and cherished.

With the increased knowledge about, and understanding of, local community and small group behavior, it should be possible for a society which still has a large percentage of its people living in small communities, and which desires to conserve and promote community and primary group values, to develop and use many of the boons of secular development without sacrificing or losing all the values of local community life.

Thus far, the greatest practical use made of research findings concerning small groups has been in military and industrial operations. I should suspect that India, in her Community Development Program, will make maximum use of these findings in the development and operation of a rural program. I believe that anything and everything that is known, or can be learned, about the mobilization of local communities for self-improvement will be welcomed and used by those who are planning, guiding and operating this program.

In addition to listing ten pertinent questions, to the successful answering of which information recorded in this document should make a contribution, it should again be pointed out that the two human groups that are universal in all societies, and which have been and still are the generators and preservers of primary group values, are families and local communities. To strengthen, and in program development to use to the maximum, these two basic social institutions as vehicles of program promotion and operation is, I am sure, the part of greatest wisdom.

The ten practical questions in the program of Community Development, to the successful answering of which I hope this synthesis of sociological research findings will contribute, are as follows:

(1) How can the maximum number of villagers be mobilized for undertaking both village and national improvement projects?

(2) How can village communities be helped to develop into self-perpetuating units of social action, many of which will become permanent units of local governments?

(3) How can solidarity of, and loyalty to, local groups and local communities be developed without developing resistance to outside guidance and possibly resistance to outside assistance?

(4) How can old established local groups be used to further the prescribed objectives of national development?

(5) How can the levels of aspiration (the *standard* of living) of both individuals and local groups be raised?

(6) How can the local group participation of traditionally low-status persons be increased in local improvement undertakings?

(7) How dissolve, or in some way make constructive use of, local factions or other divisive local community groups?

(8) How develop hundreds of thousands of local small groups and leaders who can help develop local responsibility and initiative?

(9) How can over-head (Centre and State) governments make maximum contributions, of money and personnel, to local group undertakings without diluting local group initiative and responsibility?

(10) To what extent, and by what means and methods, can the highest degree of traditional "village culture" be preserved, and at the same time can a concern on the part of villagers develop for problems and issues which in the past have been beyond their social and mental horizons?

SUMMARY STATEMENTS

The following are, in part, simple statements of facts which have been validated by detailed research. They are, in part, interpretations of research findings and of observations of local communities and other types of groups in a fairly large number of countries. They are statements which attempt to synthesize the findings of both research and observations. Karl Pearson was earlier quoted as saying that the isolation and detailed analysis of the various components of a situation is the first step in scientific method. He said the final step in scientific method is the synthesis or integration of the findings of analysis concerning the components of a situation. Such a synthesis or integration is attempted in the following statements. They are dogmatic in order that their possible usefulness to action program leaders may be clear and sharp.

(1) Sociologists have, for a long time, recognized the uniqueness of primary groups in society. Professor Homan calls them "Human Groups" to emphasize the differences between them and other systems or forms of social relations. Such groups are universal. They are found in all societies, from the simplest to the most complex. It is therefore apparent that small groups and local communities are not merely traditionally fixed groups, although they are that. They are, however, more than that. They are formed and they live because participation in face-to-face, mutual relations with others is a personal, emotional necessity.

(2) The Human Group is a social entity different from a mere organization of persons. The family is a Human Group. Its organization consists of systematically practiced inter-actions between and among its members. The cement of the group is the cluster of sentiments about these relationships. Small, intimate, face-to-face groups of all kinds, and well-integrated small communities tend to develop the same types of sentiments and values as prevail in family groups.

(3) Primary group values are not merely values fixed by tradition. Although they are strongest in folk-type societies, they are sought after and cherished in the most secular of societies. Persons thrown constantly together by necessity tend to form primary groups and enjoy the satisfactions of primary group values. Persons, when confused or defeated by the complexities of societies, seek refuge in primary groups to which they belong or once did belong.

(4) As societies develop in the direction of secular relations and secular organizations, the factors which most frequently dilute local community cohesion and solidarity, and most frequently jeopardize primary group values, are newly-developed trade relations and new government

services. Both of these dilute old, local community self-sufficiency and tend to lessen what was once complete local community responsibility. Gradually, other factors tend to do this same thing.

(5) Various types of small groups continue to exist and function after over-all community life has been considerably diluted—families, children's play groups, various types of work groups, etc. Sentiments about the old community solidarity live long after they no longer effectively cement community solidarity. Because of this, it is possible to mobilize members of special small groups for over-all community action.

(6) In a highly secular society, whole communities mobilize for action on relatively few occasions, chiefly in cases of emergency. In most local communities, action is initiated by one or a number of small groups which can and do act with purpose and surety because they are primary-type groups. Such groups develop leaders who can mobilize members of their own groups, and together they can mobilize most of the residents of the whole community.

(7) Among other things, small groups expect their leaders to be effective in relations with other local group leaders, and effective in relations with those who live outside the local community but who can in some way assist in community improvements.

(8) In his relationships with other groups and agencies, a local leader can maintain his natural group leadership only if his chief loyalty is to his group and its purposes. Any attempt on the part of other groups or agencies to use natural group leaders as tools for their purposes immediately jeopardizes the loyalty of the group to the leader.

(9) Natural leaders arise naturally or automatically out of group activities. They come from the group and from no other source. They are those members of groups who, the members of the group believe, are deeply dedicated to the purposes of the group, who possess superior skills in the group's activities, and who are capable negotiators with sources of outside assistance which the group desires.

(10) As necessary as local leaders are, in the carrying out of local community improvement projects and as liaison with outside agencies, their chief asset is their capacity to mobilize the members of their group for such undertakings. Nothing is more important than to recognize that the greatest underdeveloped potential, for both local community development and national development, is the willing and effective participation of the millions of followers of group-chosen, natural leaders.

(11) In a changing society, there is always the problem of the rigidity of a community's old group situation. But the evidence is that when persons are freed from restraints which have been imposed by a rigid class structure, they re-group themselves in such a way as to implement their

common desires and purposes. They become purposeful, aspiring, self-perpetuating, self-motivated groups. They choose their own natural leaders and loyally assist these leaders to carry out the obligations they have imposed on them.

(12) There is, of course, no escape from the penetration of new influences into local community life, if those who live in these communities are to share in the social dividends which flow from change and progress. It is also impossible to sabotage secular trends in a progressing society. It is possible, however, to believe that not all the results of secularization which have appeared in other societies need for develop in India. The knowledge now available about what has happened to local communities and primary group values, and how it happened, should make it possible, by planning, to forestall some of the things that have happened elsewhere.

(13) There is considerable evidence that small, primary-type group tend to develop, in fact can be purposely created, in highly secular societies. There is also knowledge of how to mobilize and coordinate their interests for over-all community action.

(14) The knowledge about group and community processes cannot be passed down to others in terms of gadgets, which they can use like material tools. The only common denominators to various and varying types of groups are the social processes of group formation and group functioning. In the use of technical sociological knowledge, each person who attempts to catalyze and guide group behavior must understand these processes. Elton Mayo, a great production efficiency expert, describes the capacity to apply sociological knowledge "social skill". Each director of a program, who works, with and through human groups, should possess this skill. He cannot, as is done with scientific material knowledge, depend on engineers. He must himself be a social engineer.

(15) The use of these social skills is needed in all societies because in no country is it the solution to the problem of preserving community values to let, or help, local communities to revert to their old isolated local community self-sufficiency. The solution is to understand and use the known methods by which people who live and work in small communities can, by organised effort, exercise responsibility for the improvement of every aspect of personal and community living. If encouraged and assisted to do so, local leaders will emerge; effective, purposeful re-grouping of local residents will occur; and communities will grow rather than stagnate or be completely lost in secular organisations and interests. Such a broad statement could not be made with confidence if it were not being proven true by the accomplishments of many communities in the very countries that are so frequently called "underdeveloped".

(16) No country has so definitely planned that its national development shall be accomplished by community development methods as has India. No country, therefore, has greater need for all that is known about

methods of group formation and community mobilization. It is not only my hope, but my confident belief, that in her community development program, India will make maximum use of the type of knowledge so briefly surveyed in this bulletin. If she does, she will not only facilitate the success of her own national development and that of many other developing countries, but will make a much-needed contribution to so-called "highly developed countries" which also desire to preserve or rebuild their old cherished values of local community life.

Selected Bibliography

This highly selective bibliography is in two parts. The first is a list of documents, mostly books, presented under the chapter headings of this bulletin. This is done in order that the reader may, if he chooses, read a few of the research documents upon which are based the necessarily broad statements contained in each of the chapters. The second part lists a few of the hundreds of research studies of rural communities and small groups. The selection of the titles listed was restricted to those which can be found in only three scientific journals. This was done because copies of these journals are fairly easily available. There are many other articles in these three journals and a number of others which have published research findings in these fields. The articles were selected to cover as many aspects as possible of community and small group research. It should be remembered that there are only a few of the hundreds of titles which would be listed in a comprehensive bibliography.

CHAPTER I

LOCAL COMMUNITIES ARE UNIVERSAL HUMAN GROUPS

Becker, Howard, *Man in Reciprocity*, Fredrick A. Praeyer, N.Y. 1956. Although the title of this book may not indicate it, it is the best survey of the development from folk to secular society.

Wirth, Louis, *Community Life and Social Policy*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1956. Part II, "The Human Community", contains six exceedingly good chapters.

For persons especially interested in the institution, the village communities of many societies, the following two books are recommended:

Maine, Sir Henry, *Village Communities in East and West*. There are many editions, the first one in 1871.

Kropotkin, A., *Mutual Aid*. Published in 1920 as one of the Extending Horizons Books, 11 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

The contents present Kropotkin's studies and observations over a period of 40 years.

Murdock, G. P., *Social Structure*, The Macmillan Co., N.Y. 1948.

This book reports the author's and his colleagues' analyses of 150 societies, ranging from the most primitive to the most modern societies.

CHAPTER II

LOCAL COMMUNITY AND PRIMARY GROUP VALUES

Durkheim, E., *De la Division du Travail*, Paris, 1893.

Cooley, C. H., *Social Organisation and Human Nature*, Charles Scribners & Sons, 1918 and 1920, N.Y.

These two books contain an extensive discussion of primary groups and primary group values.

Heberle, Rudolf, "The Application of Fundamental Concepts in Rural Communities" in *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 6. No. 3, 1941, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

This is but short exposition of Tonnies' *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* analysis.

Loomis, C. P. and Beegle, J. A. *Rural Social Systems*, Prentice Hall, Inc., N.Y. 1950.

Presents an exceptional description and analysis of rural life by use of the *gemeinschaft-gesellschaft* dichotomy. It is a basic book.

CHAPTER III

SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH STUDIES OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES

The first four books listed below present the concrete findings on peasant communities reported in this chapter.

Ammar, H., *Growing Up in Egyptian Village*, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., Broadway House, 68-74 Carter Lane, London, 1954.

Dube, S. C., *Indian Village*, Routledge and Kegan Ltd., London, 1955.

Fals-Borda, O., *Peasant Society in the Columbian Andes*, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., 1955.

Yang, Martin, *Chinese Village*, Macmillan Co., New York and London, 1947.

To these could be added dozens of monographic reports of studies of contemporary rural communities. We list only two, both dealing with India. Others are listed in the second part of this bibliography.

Indian Villages, by Professor M. N. Scivinas and others, West Bengal Government Press, Calcutta, India.

Village India, studies in the little community, edited by McKim Marriott, American Anthropological Society.

Mercer, B.E., *The American Community*, Random House Ins., 457 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.

CHAPTER IV

FIELD AND SHOP STUDIES OF GROUP FORMATION

Mayo, Elton, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Society*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1945.

Roethlisberger, E. J. et al., *Management and The Worker*, Harvard University Press, 1947. This is a complete report on the General Electric Company's studies in which, almost by accident, primary-like groups were found in factories.

Homans, G. C., *The Human Group*, Harcourt Brace and Co., N.Y. This is probably the best book in existence in this field. The reader may not find the first two chapters easy reading, but he should not let this deter him from carefully reading this excellent book.

CHAPTER V

LABORATORY AND CLINICAL STUDIES OF SMALL GROUPS

It is in this field that there are reports of hundreds of small groups. Summaries of more of these studies will be found in the following two books than in any other easily available sources.

Cartwright D. and Zander, A., *Group Dynamics*; Row, Peterson and Co., Evanston, Illinois.

Hare, Bogatta, Bayles, *Small Groups*, Alfred Knopf Co., N.Y., 1953.

To these titles selected because they directly document what has been reported in this bulletin, we add a number of other research reports to assist persons who desire to pursue further detailed reading. We are restricting the list to articles which can be found in a relatively few publications and are grouping them per publication.

In Rural Sociology, the Official Organ of the Rural Sociological Society:

Ensminger, D., *The Missouri Standard Community Plan*, Vol. 4, No. 1, March, 1939.

Heberle, Rudolph, *Fundamental Concepts in Rural Community Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 3, September, 1941.

Galloway, R., *Rural Social Organisation*, Vol. 13, No. 4, Dec. 1948.

Leonard, O. E., *Bolivian Locality Groups*, Vol. 14, No. 3, Sept., 1949.

Mayo, S., *Rural Locality Groups*, Vol. 14, No. 4, Dec., 1949.

Mayo, S., *Social Participation*, Vol. 15, No. 3, Sept. 1950.

Vazquez-Calcerrada, P. B., *Rural Communities in Puerto Rico*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Sept., 1953.

Barth, F., *Norwegian Mountain Valley*, Vol. 17, No. 1, March, 1952.

Miller, Paul A., *Decision Making Within Community Organisation*, Vol. 17, No. 2, June, 1952.

Alexander, F. D., Locality Group Classification, Vol. 17, No. 3, Sept., 1952.

Ryan, B., Primary and Secondary Contacts in Ceylon, Vol. 17, No. 4, December, 1952.

Van der Kroef, J. M., Rural Organisation in Bali, Vol. 18, No. 2, June, 1953.

Mogey, J. M., Characteristics of Rural Community in North Ireland, Vol. 18, No. 3, Sept. 1953.

Gross, N., Contemporary Rural Life, Vol. 18, No. 3, Sept., 1943.

Sanders, I. T., Village Social Organisation in Greece, Vol. 18, No. 4, December, 1953.

Bertrand, A. L., Rural Locality Groups, Vol. 19, No. 2, June, 1954.

Lionberger, H. F., Informal Social Groups and Diffusion of Farm Information, Vol. 19, No. 3, Sept., 1954.

Brown, E. J., Informal Participation of Formal Participants, Vol. 19, No. 4, Dec. 1954.

In the **American Sociological Review**:

Tannous, A. I., Social Change in an Arab Village, Vol. 6, No. 5, Oct., 1941.

Smith, T. L., The Locality Group Structure of Brazil, Vol. 9, No. 1, Feb., 1944.

Provinse, J. and Kimball, S., Building New Communities During War Time, Vol. 11, No. 4, Aug., 1946.

Mukherjee, R., Economic Structure of Rural Bengal, a survey of six villages, Vol. 13, No. 6, Dec., 1948.

Tumin, M., Reciprocity and Stability of Caste in Guatemala, Vol. 14, No. 1, Feb., 1949.

Caplow, T. and Forman, R., Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community, Vol. 15, No. 3, June, 1950.

Murdock, G. P., Feasibility and Implementation of Comparative Community Research, Vol. 15, No. 6, December, 1950.

Riley, M., Group Relations as a Variable in Communication Research, Vol. 16, No. 2, April, 1951.

Swanson, G. E. Some Problems of Laboratory Experiments with Small Populations, Vol. 16, No. 3, June, 1951.

Hare, A. P., A Study of Interaction and Consensus in Different Sized Groups, Vol. 17, No. 3, June, 1952.

Steiner, I. D., Primary Group Influences on Public Opinion, Vol. 19, No. 3, June, 1954.

Watson, J. B. and Samora, J., Subordinate Leadership in a Bicultural Community, Vol. 19, No. 4, August, 1954.

Rosen, B. C., Conflicting Group Membership, Vol. 20, No. 2, April, 1955.

Gross, E., Symbiosis and Consensus as Integrative Factors in Small Groups, Vol. 21, No. 2, April, 1956.

Theodorson, G. A., The Relationship Between Leadership and Popularity Roles in Small Groups, Vol. 22, No. 1, Feb., 1957.

In Human Organization:

Loomis, C. P. and Ensminger, D., Government Administration and Informal Local Groups, Vol. 1, No. 2, Jan.-Mar., 1942.

Richardson, F. L. W., Indian Peasants: Thirty Years of Rural Reconstruction, Vol. 2, No. 3, June, 1943.

Embree, J. F., Japanese Administration at the Local Level, Vol. 3, No. 4, Sept., 1944.

Hughes, E. C., Leadership and Inter-Group Cooperation, Vol. 4, No. 1, Winter, 1945.

Hansen, A. T., Community Analysis at Heart Mountain Relocation Centre, Vol. 5, No. 3, Summer, 1946.

Lindeman, E., Individual Hostility and Group Integration, Vol. 8, No. 1, Winter, 1949.

Lane, R., Change and Organisation in Rural Ireland, Vol. 14, No. 2, Summer, 1955.

Tannous, A. I., Dilemma of Elite in Arab Society, Vol. 14, No. 3, Fall, 1955.