INSTITUTO JOAQUIM NABUCO

Ao Sr. Péricles M. de Pinho:

Este projeto representa o 1º proj. do Centro Regional de Pesquisas Educacionais de Recife. Em 21/9/57

1. Ato ou port. instituindo o Centro, com as duas divisões iniciais de ciências sociais e pesq. educacionais

2. Previsão orçamentária — verba global de 1.500.000/

3. Design. de Gilberto Freyre para diretor, com a resp. da direta da Div. de Est. e Pesq. Sociais

4. Design. de Moreira de Souza para a Div. de estudos e prog. educ.

5. Aprov. do 1º proj. Leon Cruz — na Div. de Pesq. Sociais

6. Remessa de 25% da verba global para atender despesas de org. e custeio dos estudos iniciais

7. Projeto de estudo do Nordeste e orçamento

8. Coop. do C.B. e a pesq. do Nordeste

COOPERAÇÃO DO CENTRO REGIONAL DE PESQUISAS EDUCACIONAIS DE PERNAMBUCO COM O INSTITUTO JOAQUIM NABUCO DE PESQUISAS SOCIAIS, PARA CONTRATO DO SOCIÓLOGO LEVY PORFÍRIO DA CRUZ

HISTÓRICO

1.   Convidou o Instituto Joaquim Nabuco para integrar seus quadros especializados o Sr. Levy Cruz, ex-bolsista da CAPES e Escola de Sociologia e Política de São Paulo, recém-chegado dos Estados Unidos onde, durante três anos e meio, realizou no Departamento de Sociologia da Universidade de Chicago cursos e seminários pós-graduados com o objetivo de obtenção do grau de Doutor em Ciências Sociais (Ph.D.). Nessa Universidade, como anteriormente na Escola de Sociologia e Política de São Paulo, onde após obter o grau de Mestre em Ciências Sociais passou a exercer funções de professor assistente, desempenhou também o Sr. Levy Cruz atividades de pesquisa e ensino no campo de sua especialização.

2.   Consultada pelo Instituto Joaquim Nabuco, a Escola de Sociologia e Política concordou em ceder o Sr. Levy Cruz pelo tempo que se fizesse necessário.

3.   Retardando-se, entretanto, a efetivação do contrato, por dificuldades de ordem administrativa, segundo o depoimento do Diretor do Instituto Joaquim Nabuco, solicitou êste a colaboração do Prof. Anísio Teixeira, diretor do CBPE, no sentido de que o Centro Regional de Pesquisas Educacionais de Pernambuco se responsabilizasse pelo pagamento dos salários do Sr. Levy Cruz, até que se ultimasse o seu contrato pelo Instituto, com o que concordou o Diretor do Centro, promovendo em conseqüência o presente projeto de trabalho.

OBJETIVO

4.   Visa o presente projeto assegurar ao Insti-

tuto Joaquim Nabuco os serviços do sociólogo Levy Porfirio da Cruz, para a realização de um plano de pesquisa sôbre "Mobilidade Espacial e Estrutura Social em Pequenas Comunidades do Nordeste Brasileiro", até a efetivação do seu contrato com aquela Instituição. Para isso o Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Educacionais, pela dotação atribuida no corrente ano ao Centro Regional de Pesquisas Educacionais de Pernambuco, contratará o Dr. Levy Cruz, durante o período de 16 de setembro a 31 de dezembro do presente exercício, mediante o salário mensal de Cr$ 14.000,00 (quatorze mil cruzeiros).

PLANO

5.   A pesquisa planejada pelo Sr. Levy Porfirio da Cruz destina-se à elaboração da sua tese de doutorado, já havendo o respectivo projeto preliminar (cópia anexa) sido aprovado pelo Departamento de Sociologia da Universidade de Chicago.

6.   Trata-se de um estudo sôbre Mobilidade Espacial e Estrutura Social em Pequenas Comunidades do Nordeste Brasilei - ro. A hipótese principal a ser verificada é a de que existe uma relação entre mobilidade espacial (composta de migração para fora das comunidades, migração de fora para as comunidades, e outros tipos de movimento no espaço, como movimentos de curta duração para fora e movimento de pessoas que retornam à comunidade, etc.) e a estrutura social das pequenas comunidades (1.000 a 2.000 habitantes), sujeitas durante certo período de tempo a êsses movimentos. (A estrutura social é tomada no estudo no sentido de "um conjunto de relações que, em determinado momento no tempo, ligam entre si os seres humanos". Mais especificamente, a idéia é a de que as comunidades sujeitas a tais movimentos tendem a apresentar uma estrutura social "fluida", ou "frouxa" isto é, em que as ligações entre os membros da comunidade são tênues. Ao lado dessa hipótese principal, oito sub-hipóteses serão também verificadas, cada uma delas tentando relacionar mobilidade espacial com uma determinada caracteristica da estrutura social "fluida". Outra idéia impor - tante da tese é a de que tais comunidades com estrutura "fluida" são mais receptivas às mudanças sociais e culturais do que outras comunidades, de estrutura social "rígida", aspecto de interêsse para os admi -

nistradores e educadores empenhados na introdução de mudanças nas co-
munidades brasileiras.

7.   A coleta de dados para o referido estudo se
rá processada em duas etapas. Na primeira, proceder-se-á a um inqué-
rito em certo número, ainda a ser determinado, de comunidades no Esta-
do de Pernambuco, através do qual, por meio de questionários, coletar-
-se-ão dados sôbre as duas variáveis em estudo, a saber, mobilidade e
estrutura social, com o objetivo de, mediante o adequado tratamento es
tatístico, tentar estabelecer a existência ou não de relações   entre
elas. Na segunda etapa, um número limitado de comunidades, talvez qua
tro, será estudado mais intensivamente, com o objetivo de descobrir o
funcionamento dos diversos fatores envolvidos e a sua influência sôbre
os fenômenos em estudo, bem como sua susceptibilidade à influência dês
tes.

8.   O tempo de duração da pesquisa será de, a-
proximadamente, um ano e meio para a coleta de material por intermédio
do inquérito inicial, o tratamento estatístico do mesmo e a realização
dos estudos mais intensivos, devendo a êsse período ser adicionados
mais seis meses ou mesmo um ano para a redação final do trabalho. Pre
vê-se, portanto, uma duração total de dois anos e meio para a termina-
ção do projeto. Êsse tempo poderá ser, naturalmente, reduzido, se o
Instituto Joaquim Nabuco puder fornecer assistentes ou auxiliares para
as diversas fases da pesquisa.

9.   Ao fim do período em que vigorará o contra-
to de que trata o presente projeto, enviará o Sr. Levy Cruz ao   Dire-
tor do CBPE circunstanciado relatório sôbre o desenvolvimento do plano
de trabalho, submetendo-o previamente à consideração do Diretor do Ins
tituto Joaquim Nabuco.

ORÇAMENTO

10.   Para custeio do presente projeto será desta
cada da dotação atribuida ao Centro Regional de Pesquisas Educacionais
de Pernambuco para o corrente exercício, a importância de Cr$ 49.500,00

(quarenta e nove mil e quinhentos cruzeiros), a qual fica desde já empenhada para ulterior aplicação, de acôrdo com a seguinte distribuição:

a) - três e meia mensalidades de Cr$ 14.000,00, correspondentes ao período de 16.9.57 a 31.12.57 .... Cr$ 49.000,00

b) - despesas bancárias .... Cr$ 500,00

T O T A L .... Cr$ 49.500,00

Findo o projeto, será submetido ao Diretor do Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Educacionais um têrmo de encerramento do qual constará um detalhado relatório sôbre o andamento do projeto e considerações sôbre os resultados do mesmo.

AC/lma.

MOBILITY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN SMALL

COMMUNITIES IN NORTHEASTERN BRAZIL

Ph. D. Thesis Proposal

by

Levy Cruz

Department of Sociology,
University of Chicago

Thesis Advisers:

Philip M. Hauser
James S. Coleman
Donald J. Bogue

MOBILITY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN SMALL COMMUNITIES

IN NORTHEASTERN BRAZIL

Ph. D. Thesis Proposal

Purpose of the Study

The focus of this study is upon the consequences of spatial mobility for the social structure of small communities. More specifically, it is our purpose to attempt a study of the relationship, if any, between mobility and loosely-structured (small) communities. To a lesser extent, the study will also touch on, since changing communities will be among those with loose structure, the problem of mobility and change.

The field work for the purpose of collecting the data necessary to test the hypotheses developed below will probably take place in northeastern Brazil, which has been, for many years, an area of great spatial mobility, and so, it seems, suitable for the type of study we suggest here, at least so far as one of the variables is concerned.

The problem seems to be sound both from a purely scientific standpoint as well as from the point of view of social engineering. Some of the possible gains for sociological knowledge will be indicated later. Almost nothing has been established on the subject, so far; both demographers and sociologists seem to be too busy with other aspects of migration, particularly problems of meas-

urement. From the standpoint of social engineering, it
will be very helpful to Brazilian authorities if such study
can furnish them with new data on the subject - since both
the Government and the public tend to look at migration
within, or from, that area, as a problem to be solved for
the sake of the economy and the social organization of the
region, if not of the whole country.

Relevant Literature and Research

As has been indicated above, studies on migration
have tended to be concentrated on aspects other than re-
lationships between it and social organization. This fact
is reflected in The Determinants and Consequences of Pop-
ulation Trends, which has only one paragraph that is re-
lated to the subject.[1] The citations related to this
paragraph refer to works by Lively and Taeuber,[2] the
National Resources Committee,[3] and Dudley Kirk.[4] When we
examine these sources, however, we discover very little.
Lively and Taeuber, for instance, say only:

> The effect of rural-urban migration upon rural or-
> ganizations and institutions is not thoroughly under-
> stood. Obviously, the effects are greatest where
> rural depopulation is most severe and where it oc-
> curs most rapidly. Rural institutions, like all insti-
> tutions, are not sufficiently flexible to adjust
> readily to rapid population movements. Where heavy
> depopulation occurs, institutions are disrupted,
> services must be discontinued for lack of support,
> and taxes become intolerable. Such maladjustments
> are inevitable, however, until a greater degree
> of stabilization of the rural population occurs.[5]

The National Resources Committee's study on population

changes in the United States says that:

> in many places migration has intensified malad-
> justment in rural institutions and organizations. The
> reduced number of people and the transfer of wealth
> have made the support of local institutions possible
> only at an increased cost per person. Instead of
> abolishing unnecessary services, rural communities
> have usually retained all those inherited, adding
> to them the new services required by changing condi-
> tions. The general result has been maintenance at a
> lower standard of efficiency.[6]

Finally, of the three works cited, Kirk's is the one which

is closer to our interest here:

> the shift of population to urban areas implies a re-
> duction in total fertility. At the same time the con-
> tinued contacts of migrants with their native communi-
> ties speeds the dissemination of small family patterns
> in rural communities. Rural-urban migration unquestio-
> nably accelerated the demographic transition.
>
> Modern technological civilization has had its greatest
> flowering in the cities. On the other hand, the mobile
> society characterizing modern urban life has led to
> the disintegration of traditional values in the rural
> environment. It is commonly asserted that economic and
> political instability are the inevitable consequence of
> excessive urbanization.[7]

Clearly, the studies above are interested in the effects

of out-migration only and, more particularly, in whether the

communities of origin will, or will not, be able to support

its schools, churches, stores, etc. A number of more recent

studies, however, deal with either one or both of the variables

we are interested in.

Even Vogt's study,[8] for instance, has to do with a very

small community in New Mexico - only about two hundred people.

This community was formed by people coming from different pla-

ces in the states of Texas and Oklahoma and, on the other hand, the group is characterized as possessing a "loosely structured atomistic social system."[9]

John Embree seems to have been the first to use the concept of loose structure systematically in empirical research, e.g., in his paper "Thailand - A Loosely Structured Social System",[10] which provoked the interest of other social scientists in the concept. In his paper, Embree talks about "loosely structured" or "loosely integrated" cultures, "loosely integrated' signifying a culture in which considerable variation of individual behavior is sanctioned."[11] Embree's conclusions were based on observation of several aspects of Thai society and culture. This looseness, Embree maintains, "does serve a social function":

> A loosely integrated structure such as the Thai may adjust to external cultural influences with less drastic overall changes than a more rigid structure...[12]

Embree conceives the loosely structured culture as being only one of the two poles of a continuum, the other being cultures that are "tightly woven", examples of which would be Japanese and Vietnamese societies.

Ryan and Straus, in a little monograph on the integration of Sinhalese society,[13] tried to refine the concept of loose structure. These authors state that

> loose structuring is not to be conceived of as normlessness, but its behavioral manifestations are a product of conditions which qualify norms and their subsidiary codes. Behavior itself is not loosely structured, but looseness in social structure gives rise to behavior

which is underlined unstructured, or unpatterned, lacking in routinization and normatively deviant.[14]
They specify three conditions the presence of which justify
that " a society, its institutions, and consequently the behavior of the participants, may be termed 'loosely structured'".[15]
These three conditions are: predominance of flexible cultural values which allow wide ranges in the specific norms implementing
those values, condonation of behavioral deviance and violation
of norms, and a lack of group cohesiveness.[16] Finally, they
call attention to the fact that it is not the whole society
which is loose; we have to know "which specific institutional
systems within the society are loose."[17]

Of these last three authors, Embree seems to be the only
one to pay some attention to the variable, mobility, to which
he refers two or three times in his paper, always in relation
to looseness. But these references are rather casual, no systematic attempt being made in the direction of relating the
two variables, mobility and looseness.[18]

The idea of loose structure has been present in the
work of authors with more interest in theory. Robert Merton
uses the phrases "relatively small and relatively tightknit
non-literate groups" and "more highly differentiated and perhaps more loosely integrated societies" in his "Manifest and
Latent Functions."[19] Talcott Parsons has written that

> there is a final point to be made in connection with social integration and nonintegration. No social system
> can be completely integrated; there will, for many
> reasons, always be some discrepancies between role-
> expectations and performances of roles. Similarly

> at the other extreme, there is never likely to be a
> completely disintegrated society.... Even societies
> ridden with anomie ... still possess within them-
> selves considerable zones of solidarity.[20]

The same sociologist, in The Social System, has also characte-
rized the system of social stratification in the United States
as a "loose" one;[21] and the phrase "loosely integrated" (refer-
ring to social systems) appears in other places of that book.

Other studies dealing with loose structuring are those
by Gallagher,[22] reporting on the family in a French community;
Willems,[23] who characterizes the structure of lower class fa-
mily in rural Brazil as a loose one; and Holmberg,[24] on the
Siriono Indians of Bolivia.

A Frame of Reference

In this section we will try to make explicit at least
the most important concepts we are going to use. The first
of them are mobility and migration. Purposely, we want
to avoid the idea of change - i.e., social and cultural
change as a result of new experiences, etc. - implied in
the concept of mobility, as Burgess does.[25] Its use would
be confusing if we want to relate mobility to social change,
since for that author the concept of mobility already has
change as one of its characteristics.

Mobility, however, must be, for our purposes, broken
down in its componentes, which are:

1. Out-migration of those who were born in the
community but are now living in other places.

2. In-migration of those born in other places but who are now living in the community.

3. Other spatial movements:

a. Movements of people who return to the community of origin after having lived in other place (s).

b. Movements of short duration (longer than one day) to outside of the community (either for purposes of business, recreation, health care, religion, etc.).

In other words, we will be interested in most of the spatial movements, and not only in in- or out-migration (and much less in net-migration).

To other crucial concepts are structure and looseness in the structure. Structure has been defined by the Department of Sociology of the University of Chicago as "the set of relationships which, at a given moment in time, link together certain human beings."[26] In our case, the human beings living in a community. Accordingly, a community with a loose structure would be one in which:

1. There is a low degree of participation in community affairs

2. The people do not feel attached to the community

3. Family disintegrates easily

4. Kinship is relatively unimportant

5. Cliques are not common, but each person's associations are diffuse

6. Social ranking is not definite

7. Authority is not taken seriously

8. Associational pattern is underdeveloped.

Integration is, following Parsons and associates, the "complementarity of roles and clusters of roles."[27] There must be, say Parsons and Shils, enough of this complementarity

> for collective and private goals to be effectively pursued. Although conflict can exist within a social system and, in fact always does, there are limits beyond which it cannot go and still permit a social system to exist. By definition the complementarity of roles is destroyed by conflict. Consequently, when conflict becomes so far reaching as to negate the complementarity of expectations, there the social system has ceased to exist."[28]

Social systems are "systems of interaction of a plurality of individual actors oriented to a situation and where the system includes a commonly understood system of cultural symbols."[29] Society is a total, as distinguished from a partial, social system. Community is "that collectivity the members of which share a common territorial area as their base of operations for daily activities."[30]

A cultural system is "a pattern of culture whose different parts are interrelated to form value systems, belief systems, and systems of expressive symbols."[31] Or, more concretely, a cultural system is constituted "by the organization of the values, norms, and symbols which guide the choices made by actors and which limit the types of interaction which may occur among actors."[32]

Social control consists of the mechanism which act against deviance in order to re-equilibrate the interactive system (which is in danger of being changed by that deviance).[33]

The relationships between these concepts and the

theory that we are attempting to formulate and from which specific hypotheses will be derived to be tested through our field work, will be made more clear in the next section.

Leading Ideas

In this section a number of statements will be made on what is known on some aspects of mobility and structure rigidity, and some problems will be pointed out for further research.

It seems to be accepted in sociological theory that societies vary in the degree of rigidity in the social structure. This has been acknowledged by empirical investigators, e.g., Embree and others; by persons engaged both in research and in theorizing, e.g., Robert Merton; and by theoreticians, like Talcott Parsons. It is asserted here that mobility can be the immediate cause of this relative looseness. It is further asserted that some societies are permanently loosely structured and without a rigid culture, as seems to be the cases of Thai and Sinhalese societies, as described by Embree, Ryan and Straus; and, on the other hand, that in other societies looseness can be only a stage in the whole process of social and cultural change. If we add that "even in a relatively stabilized society, process of structural change are continually going on in many sub-systems of the society",[34] or, in other words, that there is no society in which there is no change, then the situation gets more complex, and the problem arises, when studying a system, of what is change,

on one hand, and what is permanent, though loose, on the other
hand. The solution can be found only in historical terms; e.g.,
in a comparison of the present with the past. If the so-
ciety is now different, it is changing, or has already changed;
but if the general nature of the society in the past is also
one of looseness, it is not changing, so far as looseness is
concerned. In this latter case, it should be considered as one
of those permanently loosely structured societies.

Putting aside the more complex and possible case of
change in the content of the social and cultural systems, with
or without change in the looseness-rigidity pattern, we have
four theoretically possible cases, so far as looseness is con-
cerned:

Before	After	Change	Type of society
Loose	Loose	No	Loosely structured
Loose	Rigid	Yes	Loosely structured, but changing
Rigid	Rigid	No	"Traditional"
Rigid	Loose	Yes	"Traditional", but changing

"Change without movement is impossible", says Hawley.[35]
And we assert that mobility can be the immediate cause of
1) change and 2) looseness. In the latter case, mobility pro-
bably has started earlier in the history of the community,
and might still be in action. In the former case, however,
its occurrence is more recent - and its effect is change.
Communities whose populations have been subjected to mobility
over a considerable period of time, then, will tend to present
a loose structure, either with a permanent nature or as a

stage of change.

This looseness - either permanent or temporary (change) - can present itself in at least two areas: the social system and the cultural system. Looseness in the social system is the one characterized above in those eight items (pages 6-7). Looseness in the cultural system is characterized by a lack of a rigid system of rules and symbols. This work will be focused in the first aspect.

These two phenomena need not be concomitant. That is, the social system may be loosely structured, as defined above, or even disintegrated, without this being necessarily accompanied by a loosely structured culture; and vice-versa. Mobility can not be said to disrupt preferentially one system or the other; e.g., if newcomers to the community have approximately the same culture of the recipient actors, there probably will be no disruption in this cultural system; but that does not guarantee that there will be no disruption in the social system; and vice-versa: newcommers can establish with the natives a strong web of relationships and get along very well with them despite the fact that their respective cultures are different - though the occurrence of the later makes the former less likely to occur. It is not rare that disruption of both the social and cultural system go together.

In addition, different institutions are affected in different degrees by looseness in the community.

Finally, it is assumed that looseness in the social structure is not only, as Embree has suggested, functional

for the community - e.g., it facilitates social and cul-
tural change, perhaps particularly the introduction of tech-
nological innovations - but also that it may be dysfunctional -
e.g., by making loosely structured societies more subject
to internal conflicts than rigidly structured ones.

Hypotheses

Several hypotheses are going to be tested in the
field work we are contemplating. These hypotheses are all
extracted from the ideas presented in the previous pages,
but they do not exhaust the number of hypotheses that can
be derived from them. For instance, since the study of
change requires that at least two points in time be taken
as reference, and since, furthermore, due to limitations of
time, funds, etc.[36] we have no intention of doing this at
this time, no hypotheses is stated here on change. The ones
we are particularly interested - and suggesting here - are
those more related to mobility and looseness in the society.
Their testing, then, will provide only a partial verification
of the theory.

The major hypothesis relates mobility and looseness in
the social structure - under the assumption, of course, that it
will be possible to get an overall measure of looseness. Eight
sub-hypotheses relate, on the one hand, mobility, and, on the
other hand, one of the eight characteristics of loose structure,
presented above. Accordingly, the hypotheses are as follows:

1. The higher the mobility, the higher the looseness in the social structure.

    1a. The higher the mobility, the lower the degree of participation in community affairs.

    1b. The higher the mobility, the less the people feel attached to the community.

    1c. The higher the mobility, the more common is the disintegration of the family.

    1d. The higher the mobility, the less important is kinship.

    1e. The higher the mobility, the less common are the cliques.

    1f. The higher the mobility, the less definite is the social ranking.

    1g. The higher the mobility, the less seriously is authority taken.

    1h. The higher the mobility, the less developed is the associational pattern.

Other important relationships will be possible to measure by dealing with the components of mobility, each one separately, as well as by differentiating between the mobile and the non-mobile parts of the population. Specific hypotheses are not presented here, but the following questions are asked: Will the non-mobile population present characteristics of looseness too? Will out-migration alone be responsible for a high degree of looseness in the community? How do moves of short duration affect the nature of the social structure? (It is recognized that movements of short duration are part of the structure, and what we are going to do in this respect, essentially, is to show the relationship between two aspects of the structure).

Regarding functional aspects, answers will be sought for questions like the following: To what extent does looseness facilitate the introduction of new techniques? To what extent does the adult (and even the old) population is willing to accept changes not only in technology but also in beliefs and values? Do communities with loose structure really present a greater tendency for conflict than non-loose societies? What institutions are preferentially affected by looseness? Why? Etc.

Collection of Data

Under the assumption that "the techniques of partici-pant observation and the sample survey are not competitive, but, in the well-conducted community study, will be complementa-ry",[37] it is part of our project to make use of both these tech-niques, as follows. First, we will make a survey of the towns in the state of Pernambuco, in Northeastern Brazil, of, say, 1,000 to 2,000[38] in population. There were fifty-four places of this size in that state, in 1950, and a sample will probably be taken. Material will be collected, in the communities in the sample, from families, of which a sample will be taken in each community. A questionnaire will be used to get data on those aspects of community life that bear on the topics of mobility and looseness.

Regarding the first topic, mobility, information will be obtained on the following:

number of persons born in other places but
now living in the community

number of persons born in the community, but
now living in other places

number of persons from the community who have
ever lived in other places but are now
living in the community

number of those who have ever travelled
to outside the community

Regarding the second topic, looseness, Appendix A gives
some prototype questions to be asked of the interviewees.

The data so obtained will be statistically analysed
in order to discover and to measure the association between
those two variables.

The second part of the research will consist of a more
intensive study of a few communities, so that we can look more
deeply at the factors that possibly are, or are not, related
to mobility and looseness. We hope to have, by then, with the
results of the first part of the study at hand, very specific
propositions on these factors. It is here that participant
observation will be made. Additional questionnaires, however,
will also be used. Furthermore, our participant observation
will be selective; that is, we will not be interested so much
in all aspects of the community life, as it tends to be done
in this type of study, but will try to concentrate on those
aspects that are supposed to be more related to our variables.

The number of communities to be studied intensively
through participant observation can not be ascertained at the
present stage of the research. It is suggested here, however,

that they should number at least four; that is, the number
of possible combinations of the mobility situation (high
and low) with the looseness situation (high and low), in the
following fashion:

Community A: High mobility and high degree of looseness

Community B: High mobility and low degree of looseness

Community C: Low mobility and high degree of looseness

Community D: Low mobility and low degree of looseness.

Contributions to Knowledge

It is hoped that this study will contribute to so-
ciological knowledge in the following ways:

1. It will demonstrate, as clearly as possible, that
a relationship exists between mobility and loosely struc-
tured (small) communities, as well as between mobility
and the particular aspects of loose structure.

2. It will show the functions and dysfunctions of
looseness for the community.

3. By studying a relatively great number of com-
munities, we expect to show that loosely-structured com-
munities, at least in northeastern Brazil, are more common
than is usually thought and, consequently, that there have
been an overemphasis on the existence of rigidity and its
role in small societies.

4. It will make at least a preliminary distinction,
or indicate ways in which the distinction can be made,

between permanent looseness and looseness as a stage of social change.

5. By showing that rural communities - and not only communities in process of industrialization - can present a loose structure.

6. Investigating whether it may not be true that communities in underdeveloped areas have mobility perhaps as high as communities in highly developed countries, simple means of transportation not being the great hindrance to migration that it is usually thought to be.

Appendix A

Prototype Questions
(rough draft)

A. Participation in community affairs:
Has this person visited another family in the community in the past month) (or week)_____ How many times?
Have you taken part in any collective work in the past year?_____
Does this person usually participate in any form of mutual aid (through exchange of equipment or appliances, exchange of service, etc.)?_____ How many times in the past month?_____
Has this person been in any "social" gatherings (party, picnic, etc.) in the past month?_____ How many times?_____

B. Attachment to the community:

Is this person planning to leave the community?_____ (If Yes):
When?_____
If opportunity arises, is this person willing to migrate?_____
In case of a dispute between this community and others, which side does this person take?_____

C. Family (dis)integration:

Is this person married?_____ (If Yes): In the civil_____
In the church_____
In both_____
Does this person live maritally with another person?_____
Do they have children?_____ How many?_____

Has this person been married to still another person?_____
(If Yes): In the civil_____
In the church_____
In both_____
Lived maritally_____
Do they have children?_____
How many?_____

D. Relative importance of kinship:

Do you feel a person should help a relative of hers instead of a non-related person?_____

Among the families you visited in the past month, how many are related to you?_____

E. Cliques:

Are you member of some small group for certain purposes?_____
How many?_____ For what purposes do you meet these people?_____ How often do you see them?_____

Do you discuss things that are important to you with other
members of the group(s)? _____ Do you, usually follow
their advice? _____ To whom do you ask for advice more
commonly: family _____ clique _____ person of pres-
tige in the town _____ other (specify) _____

F. Social ranking:

Name the ten persons of high prestige in this town:

Person	Occupation
_____	_____
_____	_____

(Etc.)

Name the ten persons of low prestige:

_____	_____
_____	_____

(Etc.)

Name ten persons of "middle" prestige:

_____	_____
_____	_____

(Etc.)

What is it that makes a person important in this town: _____
_____

G. Authority:

Are there people in this town who usually disobey:
        a. public authorities
        b. employer's orders _____

How does the community feel about that?

H. Associations:

Is this person a member of any association? _____ How many? _____
        Purposes of the association(s): _____ _____

Have you been in the three last meetings of these associa-
        tions? _____

Have you ever held some office in these associations? _____
    Specify how often and how long: _____

Do you have interest in continuing being a member of these
    associations? _____

Would you like to be a member of associations other than the
    ones you belong to now? _____

I. How do you feel about having changes (for better) intro-
    duced in the local agriculture?

                The earlier the better _____
                Should come at its "proper" time _____
                We don't need them _____

    (If third choice is checked):

    Why do you feel that way? _____

Do you think this town should have some industry?

        Yes _____   No _____   Don't know _____

    (If answer is no):   Why? _____

Do you think this town should have new means of recreation
    (movie house, etc.)?

        Yes _____   No _____   Don't know _____

  Why? _____

Do you think this place should have electric light?

        Yes _____   No _____   Don't know _____

Why? _____

Notes

1. United Nations, The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends (New York: United Nations, 1953), p. 305.

2. C. E. Lively and Conrad Taeuber, Rural Migration in the United States, Research Monograph XIX (Washington: Works Progress Administration, 1939).

3. National Resources Committee, The Problem of a Changing Population (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1938).

4. Dudley Kirk, Europe's Population in the Interwar Years (Geneva: League of Nations, 1946).

5. Lively and Taeuber, op. cit., p. 121.

6. National Resources Committee, op. cit., p. 111.

7. Kirk, op. cit., pp. 160-161.

8. Evon Z. Vogt, Modern Homesteaders: the Life of a Twentieth-Century Frontier Community (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1955).

9. Ibid., p. 172.

10. John F. Embree, "Thailand - A Loosely Structured Social System", American Anthropologist 52:2 (April-June, 1950), pp. 181-193.

11. Ibid., p. 182.

12. Ibid., p. 191.

13. Brice F. Ryan and Murray A. Straus, "The Integration of Sinhalese Society", Research Studies of the State College of Washington, Vol. 22, Nº 4 (December, 1954), pp. 179-227.

14. Ibid., pp. 201-202.

15. Ibid., p. 199.

16. As phrased by Richard D. Lambert in a "book note" on Ryan and Straus' monograph, American Sociological Review 20:6 (December, 1955), p. 774.

17. Ryan and Straus, op. cit., p. 224.

18. These references are in relation to specific items.

For instance, when writing on the backgrounds of Thai society, Embree says that "the present Thai people of Indochina appear to have come into the southern area from Yunnan, spreading out into Thailand, northern Burma (Shan), and the upper valleys of Tonkin..." (p. 181). On credit associations: "in Thailand, with its mobility of population and lack of emphasis on long term obligations, we do not find the financial credit association." (p. 185). Finally, on loose integration itself: "the loose integration is a functional one, allowing not only variation in individual behavior but also in national behavior. It has a survival value which may well go back to the early days of extensive Thai migrations..." (p. 191). We almost get the impression, from these references, that the author had in mind some relationship between the characteristics of loose-ness of Thai society and migration. But, as we said in the text, this is never explicitly stated.

19. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Revised and enlarged edition (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957), p. 28. In fact, Merton also suggests that the "central idea of 'rigid' and 'flexible' social structures" can be found in the writings of George Simmel. But, he adds, "the re-emerging concepts of loose and tight social structures", despite the fact that they "resemble the Simellian observations... are nevertheless significantly different in their implications." (Merton, op. cit., pp. 404-405, footnote.)

20. In Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils (eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 204.

21. Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), p. 515.

22. O.R. Gallagher, "Looseness and Rigidity in Family Structure", Social Forces, 31 (1953):332-339.

23. Emilio Willems, "The Structure of the Brazilian Family", Social Forces 31(4):339-345, May 1953.

24. A. R. Holmberg, Nomads of the Long Bow: The Siriono of Eastern Bolivia (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication 10, 1950).

25. "Mobility", says Burgess, "involves change, new experience, stimulation." Ernest Burgess, "The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project", in Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess and Roderick D. McKenzie, The City (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925), p. 58.

26. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, The Field of Social Organization: A Syllabus (Chicago: no

date), p. 10. It is interesting to note here that practically the same definition is given for society (page 7).

27. Parsons and Shils, op. cit., p. 198.

28. Ibid., p. 198.

29. Parsons, op. cit., p. 5.

30. Ibid., p. 91.

31. Parsons and Shils, op. cit., p. 55.

32. Ibid., p. 55.

33. Paraphrased from Parsons, op. cit., p. 250.

34. Parsons, op. cit., p. 503.

35. Amos H. Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1950), p. 324.

36. A solution would be to follow Donald Bogue's suggestions in his article "The Quantitative Study of Social Dynamics and Social Change", American Journal of Sociology 57(6):565-568, May, 1952.

37. Arthur J. Vidich and Gilbert Shapiro, "A Comparison of Participant Observation and Survey Data", American Sociological Review 20(1):28-33. Quotation is from page 33.

38. This size is chosen only because of being relatively easily manageable for field work purposes.