DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 276 SO 007 974

AUTHOR	Burnett, Jacquetta H.
TITLE	Event Analysis as a Methodology for Urban Anthropology; Volume 2, Part 2. Anthropological Study of Disability from Educational Problems of Puerto Rican Youths. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Bureau of Educational Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Research and Demonstration Grants.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	51p.; A Paper presented at the Anthropology Colloquium (McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, March 1972); One copyrighted diagram has been removed from page 8
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Science Research; Classroom Observation Techniques; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Environment; Cultural Factors; Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Anthropology; Educational Research; *Field Studies; Interpersonal Relationship; Puerto Rican Culture; *Research Methodology; Sociocultural Patterns; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Ethnography; *Event Analysis

ABSTRACT

Cultural event analysis assists traditional social science methodologies--ethnographies and survey instruments--in the study of urban life. Testing a hypothesis--that educational problems arise and persist for Puerto Rican youth because of contrast, contrariety, and noncomplementarity between the cultural forms and patterns of their home life and school life in urban Chicago--requires interculturally comparable data. Applying cultural event analysis to test the hypothesis produces such data. By viewing a sample of 30 seventh grade, culturally mixed students as 30 "ego networks" with linkages to individual teachers, household adults, and peers, a context for the analysis is established. Analysis of events occuring within linkages between the students and the other members of their networks invites comparison of those events. Defining and characterizing "event" in the abstract is accomplished first, in order to accurately assess a real event. A sample event observation form indicates how the defining of "event" translates into collection of data in the field. By casting data in the form of comparable events, cultural differences can be isolated and tested. This is done, for example, in a question on students' interpretations of "joking relationships." Event analysis applied in this study is a useful conceptualizing tool. (JH)

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

EVENT ANALYSIS AS A METHODOLOGY FOR URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY

Volume II, Part II

of

Final Report

ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY OF DISABILITY FROM EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF PUERTO RICAN YOUTHS

---

by

Jacquetta H. Burnett, Director

Social and Rehabilitative Service

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Grant No. RD-2969 G 69

Fall, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVENT ANALYSIS AS A METHODOLOGY FOR URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY[1]

Introduction

As anthropologists have confronted the urban scene, and the necessity to do research there, they have had to invest a great measure of their energy toward developing methodologies better adapted to the complexity of that setting. At the same time concepts, too, have had to be reworked. In 1968 when I turned to urban research among Puerto Ricans in Chicago after doing studies in rural settings, my concern over new methodologies and new concepts intensified, with the results that I describe here as *event analysis*.

Anthropologists share with other scientists the concern over inter-subjective accountability and, ultimately, replicability. The enormous complexity of number, conditions, backgrounds, ethnicities, life-cycles, socio-structural relationships, ecological determinants, and people per square yard made knowing where to begin; where to end; and where we had been once we stopped, an unbelievably complicated problem. It forced us to recognize and admit that ordinary ethnography, supplemented with interviews and questionnaires was not enough. Actually, we tried to do that too, but we also tried the new tact of "cultural event analysis." True, we hedged our bets, so to speak, by pursuing both old procedures and new procedures. Reluctance to depend entirely on our new approach was not merely a matter of faint-heartedness; we were concerned with an applied, or better said, several applied, problems and outcomes. Those concerns brought stronger pressure on us to produce a relevant, usable outcome. Actually, in our

case this meant being very practical about a fundamental methodological concern, *intercultural comparability*. Our research had to do with educational problems that led to occupational disabilities, and the results were to be told to practitioners in such a way that it was usable to them. By the way, from the first we regarded our clienteleto be not only professionals of social agencies and schools, but also the Puerto Rican parents and youths with whom we worked in the Puerto Rican sector of Chicago.

Our problem dealt with not one, but with at least two cultures. Our key hypothesis was that educational problems arose and persisted because of contrast, contrariety, and noncomplementarity between cultural forms and patterns of Puerto Rican households and of Chicago urban schools.

Thus, the data collection had to be done in such a way that the *conditions* described in one setting could be compared at will with conditions in another setting. Our situation demanded that the data and the methodology should enable us not only to *find* results, but also to teach *amateurs* about cultural situations. We eventually will have to teach people, on the basis of those findings, to behave and cognize in new ways so problems will disappear or be reduced. These conditions are severe operational tests for social science theory, methodology, and research results.

Some improvements had to be made on our anthropological approach in order to meet our instrumental objective. Thus, the methodological problem I discuss is not merely that of combining ethnography with more generalizable research techniques such as interview schedules, questionnaires, surveys and samples; but also, of finding a way to improve the methodology of our ethnography for applied purposes.

The Study

In 1969 I initiated research in the Puerto Rican neighborhood of a large urban area, Chicago, that concerned educational problems of Puerto Rican youth. While we planned and began the research with ethnographic description, as we have said, the question of complementarity between school culture and household culture, forced us to consider methods by which we could move beyond the spatial-temporal boundaries of the school. The very size of the population, in the area, its apparent variety, and the fluidity of spatial boundaries prevented our using the traditional community study approach. For this reason we turned to the then salient network approach, as other anthropologists were doing.

We decided to undertake a study that combined network concept as a basis for sampling, and event as a basis for describing relationships, setting boundaries, and describing institutions (Mayer, 1966). We looked at school as a set of events that brought numerous ego centered-networks together in a co-ordinated way. Each ego network also has a characteristic set of event cycles that give order to his private life; but that set of event cycles may differ significantly from those of another ego-center. Actually, participation in events can be the data used to extend the lattice of a network, just as relationships of various sorts have been used to define the lattice, flesh it out, and provide criteria for setting its limits (or boundaries).

Our plan was to select a sample of students in middle school years to provide the base-point for a set of relational networks. We would select for observation and description settings and events that involved the following roles and grouping relationships with respect to our sample of egos: teachers, household adults, peers.

Our sample, then, was to be 30 networks, although we began with thirty individuals. The individuals were selected from one school grade, but further stratified according to the following characteristics:

1. sex
2. ethnicity: first in terms of Puerto Rican and Non-Puerto Rican. The Puerto Rican group was further divided into Puerto Rican-Puerto Ricans, (P.R. P.R.) youths who, by 7th grade had spent at least five years of their school life in Island Puerto Rican Schools, and Chicago Puerto Ricans, (C.P.R.) who had spent at least five years of their school life in mainland schools.
3. school track: high; medium; low

Since the students were organized into rooms, in part, according to reading scores, we simply distribute our choice over a top track, medium track, and a low track. Thus, our sample was stratified. Since we began with three part-time fieldworkers, we confined our sample choices to three 7th grade classrooms, one high, one medium, and one low on reading scores and "tracks". We intended to select from each equal numbers of male and female, Puerto Rican-Puerto Rican, Chicago-Puerto Rican, and Non-Puerto Rican youths. We found, however, there were no Non-Puerto Ricans in the lowest track room; we had to select all the Non-P.R.'s from the top and the middle room. Also there were no P.R.-P.R.'s at this time in the top track, so we selected P.R.-P.R.'s for the middle and lowest track rooms.

Our sample was selected during the Spring term, in the second half of the 7th grade. We followed them the next year into 8th grade, where they were distributed more widely among six classrooms. One boy just disappeared

Table 1. Composition of Sample

		TRACK		
		High	Medium	Low
NON-PUERTO RICAN (NON-PR)				
	M	3	2	
	F	3	2	
CHICAGO-PUERTO RICAN (CPR)				
	M	2		3
	F	2	3	
PUERTO RICO-PUERTO RICAN (PRPR)				
	M		1	4
	F		2	3
TOTALS		10	10	10

(we assume he dropped out, but this was never officially verified). One Non-Puerto Rican girl was not promoted. Several of our PRPR sample returned to Puerto Rico. We picked up other PRPR to replace them. But following our sample of network origin points now meant covering many places, many of which "occurred" at the same time. (Please note I said "places" occurred at the same time.) We continued to follow our sample set of networks into high school, although fewer than half the original set were accessible to us, then. Thus, the sample is clearly not a random one, although we began with an effort to make it so. In the beginning it was at least a fair sample, i.e. we were not selecting for observation merely the lowest achievers or the worst discipline problems, in order to build a bad view of the school and its efforts. Nor was our sample of networks biased toward the most successful students. Yet, within a year, it was biased in that direction, not by intention, but because of the selective effects of failure, adaptation, and "external" circumstances.

THE SAMPLE AS EGOCENTRIC NETWORKS

This paper is mainly concerned with event analysis, but some attention to network analysis is necessary to show the special nature of the methodological linkage between the two areas. The concept of network or egocentric network as developed by Barnes (1954), Bott (1957), Epstein (1961), and Mayer (1966) is based on the image of points connected and interconnected by lines in lattice-like patterns. If you will think of an ego-centered sociogram, this will give you a quick idea of the imagery involved. Given a field of persons represented as points in two dimensional space, select one point as an ego; then draw a line to represent a primary linkage to every person-point with whom he has face-to-face and *regular* contacts. The points represent persons (Epstein, 1961; Barnes, 1954) or household groups or other groups (Bott, 1957).

The lines represent relationships of some sort such as person-contacts, friendship, or even a range of several different sorts of relationships. Barnes emphasized the linkages of friendship, acquaintanceship, and kinship of persons with other persons; Bott emphasized whether other persons or households in a network were acquainted or connected with one another, as well as with the family of origin--i.e. the point-of-origin of the network; and Mayer used the concept to depict and explore linkages of political support for three different egoes as the relationships were enacted or manifested in an election in Madhya Pradesh State in India. (See Figure 1.)

When we began our study we drew on this development of egocentric network concepts to define where and with whom we should begin our study. So, in the early stages of the research, in the spring of 1968, we selected thirty seventh-grade children, or thirty egocentric networks. We wanted to study their networks, in particular, that part of each network that manifests itself in the household, in the school and classroom, and in relations with peers outside the classroom and school.

After selecting our sample, we followed the plan of the network and contacted the household adults. Moreover, then we went only into those classrooms which our sample of egos attended where we then did regular participant observation and took ethnographic accounts of events. In the households we did interviews and tried to establish close enough relations to do participant observation. In our store-front, neighborhood research center we kept up with peer ties.

In our observations and interviews with household adults and teachers we could, and did, follow out certain secondary linkages, where we could, into the area of the network that is unbounded from ego's point of view. Beginning with links from ego to teacher and then following these secondary

Figure 1
Network Diagram of the Pattern of the Congress Candidate's Linkages,
Reprinted from A.C. Mayer "The Significance of Quasi-Groups in The Study of Complex Societies," in Michail Banton, ed., The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., p. 107, removed to conform with copyright regulations.

linkages of the teacher to other teachers carried us into the study of school culture. The secondary linkages of parents led us to relatives, leisure-time companions, and on-the-job relationships. The question of whether the linkages of the household are close-knit or loose-knit networks (Bott, 1957) might interest one from the point of view of acculturation of household patterns to North American patterns, to maintaining Island patterns, or to developing idiosyncratic family practices. We study the linkages and their social contexts through more than interviews; we use participant observation and ethnographic description of *observed events* to explore the linkages.

While our network sample defined who and where we were to begin our study, it still left us with the question of how and what we planned to observe and study. The problem of being explicit on this point loomed larger for us than for most ethnographic studies, since the research was being carried out not by a single ethnographer, but by a team of fieldworkers. Moreover, the style of the division of labor led to ethnographic accounts that were interdependent, rather than merely parallel or related. We faced a serious problem of clear intersubjective communication in comparing one classroom with another, a household with a classroom, and life in peer groups with life in a household and in school. We were looking at numerous streams of behavior in various different locales. From the point of view of our egos, we were observing egos and their networks in events--human behavioral events.

Events as Segments

Regarding the classroom--where we began the research on our sample of networks--as a stream of behavior, we could perceive phases or segments of that stream that seemed to have natural breaks, at least in temporal dimension. Although the concept of event has had a different emphasis and a somewhat more macrocosmic meaning in anthropological literature, the author thought, for initial observer purposes, that we would label as "event" that segment with a certain "natural" or "easily developed" sense of integrality

to it, and thus preserve what Barker (1963) regards as the primary attribute of the behavior stream--its arrangement in time. The event we speak of here is a microevent; but our unit of description can logically and with theoretical significance, be linked to macroevents of the order of a festival, a community ceremonial, a health survey, or longer and more complex constellations of human behavioral processes and elements. (Kimball and Pearsall, 1955; Mayer, 1966.)

An event begins at a certain time with the entry into a specific place by a person, or sets of persons, and their engagement there in actions, including interactions. The event ends when the person, or at least one complete set of the various sets of persons engaged in behavior, changes his place, either by departing from that place, or by manipulating the place defining objects so that the location is transformed from one place-type to another (Harris, 1964).

In Puerto Rico, for example, I saw classrooms of students transformed into a partial school assembly by simply moving the partitions between four classrooms and reorienting the chairs toward the stage on one end. On the other hand, the mere movement of personnel or part of the personnel in and out of a place where an event is occurring, does not necessarily constitute the end point of an event, from either an emic or etic point of view except for the individual who is moving in or out and thus is changing events. This is clearly the case in our urban classrooms where students move in and out of the classroom at a bewildering rate for special classes, monitor duties, service to the school, safety patrol duties, etc. But when one teacher goes out and another teacher comes in, one has completely changed the membership of one person-type set, although there is no change in the actor-type of the set. This then may or may not amount to a *new* event, from the point of view of individuals although the observer may tend to count it so. Whether it is a change in event type depends on whether the change in personnel leads to changes in the standards and rules by which behavior meanings are "encoded" and "decoded."

This requires observer knowledge of participants' point of view, the emic perspective. In like manner, keeping the same teacher in the same place, but changing the class of students entirely, constitutes a likely ending of one event and the beginning of another, from an etic point of view. Our etic definition for the beginning and the ending of an event, which has proved to be usable so far is: The beginning of an event is defined as the entry of a set of persons of one, or more, socially recognized category on a socially defined place to act and interact. The event ends with departure from the scene of a person representative of a significant category, or a significant proportion of the representatives of a given relevant category who had been present.

Isolating events in temporal terms in an urban school is often an easy matter. For example, the warning bell ending lunch recess rings, students line up, by room and sex, outside the building and enter together by classroom groups. If the teacher is not there, they assemble around the door until the teacher comes with the key and they enter to take their seats. After the final bell, as regular as morning prayers in a nunnery, one teacher says, "Girls put up your wraps," (pause while girls get up and hang up wraps they do not want to wear); "Boys, hang up your coats;" (pause while boys who have wraps put them in the cloakroom); "Now get out your homework papers," and so the new event proceeds. Most *regular, recurrent* events in the school begin and end with a ritual phase. Other events, like school assemblies, are highly ritualized throughout.

Let us follow the stream of behavior over a period of time. After morning recess and the assembling ritual described above, in a given classroom there will be minor changes in personnel from time to time and day to day, but the place is the same and the set of actors and actor-types is common from event to event. As time moves through its cycle, objects, actions, and messages interrelate to produce what we can abstract as *activities*. Some activities become salient and so the event comes to be named after them--"the Spelling Hour."[2]

A bell near noon initiates a series of actions that begin with "Put your books and things away," from the teacher. Pause. Teacher: "Girls get your wraps and form a line, by twos." Action by girls. "Now boys, get your wraps and form a line by twos." The girls and boys form a line at a 90° angle to one another, at the corner of the room where the door is. (I never observed a class in this school where the door is in any other position than in the corner.) The teacher stands near the origin of the angle, waiting for the bell to signal time to lead them out. They move out in a line of twos, usually girls first, then boys. The teacher moves out last and closes the door, and checks to see that it is locked. They move on, stopping at the top of the stairs, then down two flights of stairs, pausing at every landing, and around to the door. As they get near the double door their line disappears into a sea of students surging through the double doors. This happens the same way when school is out. At noon, however, the teacher walks them to the door, <u>then</u> turns to her right and goes into the cafeteria.

I compared these events day after day for one classroom I observed regularly. Then I observed another room, another place (but the same place-type) and another teacher (but the same actor-type), etc. Usually there was a ritual episode to begin an event and a second ritual episode to end an event. The particular event I discussed above was continuous from recess to noon. Other events during the day began with the same ritual episode of entry and later terminated with the ritual episode described above. Sometimes new instances of events were initiated by a change in the teacher, and often the teachers exchanged places. On other occasions a class group terminated one event and began another by shifting from classroom to gym, or to library, or to home mechanics room.

I compared my fieldnote accounts of events with the accounts of two other field observers. It became clear that while all events in the day did not begin and end in the same way, beginnings and endings were highly regularized for some events that recurred at the same time, in the same place, and with the same actor

sets, and, if we looked at other sets of people, they seemed to be experiencing similar actions and objects in similar places among similar actor sets at similar times.

Elements and Coordinates of Events

We described an event by describing where it was; what objects were involved; what actions and what interactions occurred; who participated; and when these elements appeared, in the order of their appearance. (See Figure 2 for the observations.) Actions are carefully distinguished into verbal action and non-verbal action. The messages of the verbal action are recorded, either in English or in Spanish depending upon which code is used. To get a fuller verbal account in the classroom, however, at least a tape recorder is necessary. In addition to using actions, verbal and non-verbal, as elements in the microanalysis of an event, we used some coordinates of the actions, that is, the elements that set the scene for the action which include actor-types, place-space-types, object-types and absolute and relative time. (Harris, 1964.) Actor-types are defined by physical features, behavioral features, and combination of both types of features. Object-types, too, can be defined by physical or behavioral features, or a combination of both. But object types also help to define place-space. So, for example, the difference in a classroom and a school library may be based on the differences between types of objects present rather than in macro-place features such as room size. However, providing an inventory of all objects or artifacts before entering into descriptions of behavior is probably unnecessarily tedious. This was really a question of what etic features must be included in order to begin to record the essential distinctive features of at least two emic systems: Puerto Rican and American-Anglo. Note also, that you can either follow a person to observe events or you can wait at a particular place for events to occur.

We have included on our observation form a place for entering rule-guides or paradigms that apply to the action and relations that take place in the event.

This was not to be recorded during the observation since such statements are often several logical steps and a few inductive leaps away from direct accounts of the behavior stream. These could be supplied from later interviews with event participants. These emic constructions on events, however, do provide for the logical, structural account of the system. The provision on the form for placing these formulations in juxtaposition with the descriptive account of the event, readily allows us to index the empirical bases for those constructions. This association suggests that we should draw our information on "codes" from interviews with participants of the events about meanings they decoded and encoded. We do interviewing from a behavioral record to discover the cognitive dimension of the cultural event.

Cultural Event Analysis

Let me now begin to explain further the meaning of"event"as I use it. I have in mind the concept of cultural event, in which the construct culture refers to the fact of a coordinated relationship among several unit systems, sometimes described as two "levels" of phenomena: cognition in the sense of standard,rule, category,precept; and behavior, such as action, speech, feeling, material objects, and place. This dicotomy, drawn in analogy with the distinction between language and speech, is a very important one. It has been suggested that culture be used to refer only to the "conceptualized level;" I may at times operate as if that were the case, particularly when I emphasize the model of a culture system mainly as an information system. But I also see culture as referring to the coordinated relationship between the two (or in a more complicated vein, among the several unitary systems). As a researcher I must have an intersubjective way of giving account of both conceptualization and behavior, and a means of locating these two levels in appropriate events. Both observation and interview are absolutely necessary to ethnography and to scientific anthropology.

Figure 2
Event Observation Form

Date_____

Day_____

Observer_____

General Location_____

General Context or Comments_____

Time	Types			Actions	Messages (cont
Hr./M	Pl.	Obj.	Actor	Interactions	English Code

15 B

EPIC

Form 13
Observation
Event Analysis
11/68 Rev. 3/69
Rev. 1/70

ages (contenc)

	Spanish Code	Rule Guide or Governing Paradigm

16A

YOUR EMPIRICAL OBJECTIVE IS TO RECORD WHO DID WHAT, WHE

Col.

2 *Place Types:* Refers to those items of material culture and their organized patt chairs placed in rows before a blackboard help to define a given p. detailed maps of often-used places may be referred to on this form entered on the form.

3 *Object types;* Refers to material objects of material artifacts used in connectio books (specified in detail where relevant) to the perfume used by

4 *Actor Types:* The "type" here refers to the definition of personnel used in the know the person system as this is defined, be specific about the p you to supply person type later, when you do learn the local categ identify it with an asterisk.

5 *Actions:* Describe at as low-level of abstraction as possible the flow of ac may be the verbal messages entered in the next two columns, where

Interactions: Involves actions that serve as stimuli for further action among ot who acts when by the following shorthand: person name --------→ p cates who initiates and who responds, and the order of response. of the same interaction between or among individuals without a sim upward point arrow indicates undirected action (in-so-far as you c

6 *Message Content:* Make notes on the content of messages exchanged in the interaction. nearly impossible to keep a complete record, but key phrases shoul is used the language code should be specified by a careful placeme

7 *Rule-guide or governing paradigm guide:* The rule, norm, or "paradigm" that guides the behavior recorded in note whose formulation you are presenting (the researcher's, a part cipant in the event that the formulation holds.

Microevent: *The beginning of an event is defined as the entry of a set of perso socially defined place to act and interact. The event ends with d a significant category, or a significant proportion of the represen present.*

AT, WHEN, WHERE, AND HOW

ed patterns that have place-defining qualities. For example,
given place as a classroom in Western culture. Separate
is form in order to reduce the amount of written material

nnection with action described. These can range from text
sed by the girls as they go to refresh themselves at recess.

in the cultural system you are observing. If you do not yet
t the person, using his name or some tag code that will allow
l category system. If you must use your own category system,

of action as it occurs on the scene. Part of this action
where the question is what is said in addition to what is done.

mong other people. You can specify the important information on
----→ person name. The order before and after the arrow indi-
ense. A ↓ before this horizontal arrow indicates continuation
t a simultaneous pause or change or addtion of persons. An ↑
you can see it), like "commentaric al aire."

raction just discussed. Without elaborate equipment, it is
should be recorded verbatim. If more than one language
placement in its own column.

ded in the other columns, may be specified here. Be sure to
a participant's, or some other party's) and for which parti-

of persons of one, or more, socially recognized category on a
with departure from the scene of a person representative of
representatives of a given relevant category who have been

While there is little time to do it here, I must digress somewhat in order to place this methodological approach in the context of recent arguments between the ethnosemanticist such as Goodenough, Frake, D'Andrade, and the cultural behaviorists such as Harris. Put in simple terms, the arguments seem to be that, on the one side, interviewing the informant about what he does and how he thinks about it is sufficient and preferred, versus the view that observing what he does and what he says while he is doing it is necessary and sufficient, ethnography.

D'Andrade and Romney put it as follows:

> "...if the ethnographer must choose between watching a game, without being able to ask for interpretations or comments, and interviewing an informant not actually playing a game, he will probably find that interviewing is somewhat more informative than observing, provided he knows something about how to ask appropriate questions." (D'Andrade and Romney, 1964, p. 232.)

Referring to this procedure, Harris suggests that the semantic rules elicited only permit one to predict when a given informant "will say that he will say" a particular person is, for example, a given kin-type. Thus, Harris goes on to insist that in <u>actual</u> behavior the actor-types in question may never in fact be called by the kin-term, for example uncle, in question.

> "But, this is an empirical question, involving the observation of actor-types in multi-actor scenes, and the development of indices of referential argument." (Harris, 1964, p. 162.)

Frake in reply to criticism of the methodology of ethnosemantics as hocus-pocus, says that,

> "Given two competing ethnographic statements (the operational derivation of each from an ethnographic record being equally clear), the best statement is the one which most adequately accounts for the widest range of behavior." (Frake, 1964, p. 432.)

If, however, two statements differ in their "implications" for behavior, then says Frake, a choice between them can only be made through reference to behavior, "by testing them against the behavior of the people being described."

Our recommendation is to interrelate them all, with respect to given types of events. A controversy of this sort seems inevitably to lead to some programmatic procedure for relating not only verbal utterances and behavior, but also the rules, to "situated contexts." A look at Figure 2, the ethnographic record sheet, indicates our solution. We want time ordered observations and description to be done. But also we want that record to be used to query informants about their "conceptualizations of the situations" described. Several procedures may be used. One can interview from the paper and pencil account; one can reconstruct them into stories of "critical incidents;" or with recent technological advances, video-tape recordings of "critical incidents" can be so used.

Even from the point of view of "intracultural contrasts" (Goodenough, 1956), one also needs to type situations intraculturally, and to "locate" situations vis-a-vis other situations. People predict, anticipate, and expect situations, and they also *anticipate* in time-ordered relationship. When one's concern is only for one culture, one may get by without ordering the context of semantic or behavioral components, for the accounts can be based on intracultural constrastive analysis. But intercultural situations involve one squarely in intercultural contrastive analysis, because, presumably the participants themselves in these cultural situations make intercultural contrastive analysis. I suggest, that this is managed not only by responding to situated cues, but also because participants can learn to order, and therefore anticipate, situations where there will be intercultural contrast that must be read by different codes than are used with intracultural contrast. I am here, only suggesting that cultural events which are described

in terms of temporal occurrence provide us with a needed description adequacy of a somewhat different character than is suggested by "holistic" account, getting a "feel" for the culture, or "total round of life description."

Perhaps an example can be used here to illustrate our approach. On a particular Wednesday morning in November, I had entered the classroom at 10:45 a.m., as the class returned from recess. My commentary was as follows:

> The boy in the blue shirt wads a sheet of paper up in his hand, swings his knees around under the edge of the desk, gets up, walks to the front of the room, then turns left across the front of the room in front of the desks over to the wastebasket under the windows. He walks leisurely and deliberately. He unhurriedly drops the wad of paper into the wastebasker, turns and walks slowly back across the front of the room in front of the desks, apparently on his way back to his desk. At this point the teacher says to him, "Julio, WHAT are you DOING?" "Taking that scrap paper to the wastebasket, Teacher." Teacher says, "You KNOW you are not to get up and WANDER around the room. REMEMBER that!" Boy in blue shirt (Julio) returns to seat in a less leisurely, but still not completely hurried fashion, puts his hands on his desk and whirls himself around them, throwing himself into the seat and stares up at the teacher momentarily (I can't see his face nor the expression on it). Then he picks up his pencil and begins writing on a sheet of paper at his desk.

This account includes two activities, one of which interrupted the other. Julio stated his purpose was to throw away waste apper. The teacher may have had a different idea of his purpose. Her actions also follow a definite procedure, a "verbal-spear" with purpose, apparently, of controlling his behavior, and of explicating rule of behavior.

In the account please note that the actions are described not only in terms of when each occurs relative to other actions, but also how it occurs; that is, for example, in terms of the volume of voice with which certain parts of the message are emphasized. All this is the procedural part of an activity. In giving attention to the procedure we are well within the cultural realm; that is, specifying a style or a rule for the style of a set of actions that

are interrelated with respect to a purpose. One can move on in the cultural realm here and talk about the conceptualization or cognition of purpose. The teacher, on being interviewed, could specify her notion of Julio's purpose, a statement of purpose that predictably will differ very radically from his. She might have said, "He got up because he seems unable to concentrate, and wanted to pass the time." The observer may specify certain goals or a goal that he thinks the behavior leads to; but in addition, he must derive from the verbal messages, or from accounts in interviews, what the actors regard as the explicit goal-objectives of the activity's procedure from the actor's point of view. Within his own analysis and concept of a dynamic activity, the observer may have some theory of implicit or latent purposes or objectives which could be served by the procedure of the activity.

An observer's view of purpose, however, should take into account the full course of activity that took place throughout the event that he was describing. For example, having observed the activity we have just mentioned in the context of the full event--from the point at which the whole class and the teacher entered the room--I knew that an earlier episode had begun with a "public" remark by the teacher: "Who is using Susan's desk as a wastebasket?" Susan, who was absent that day sits in the desk behind Julio. On top of her desk, around the old-fashioned ink well, several wads of paper were piled. Very obviously Julio was the culprit. As the teacher stared at him with a pursed-lip, accusing expression, Julio gathered up the wads of paper and quickly walked over to the wastebasket, threw them in and walked back to his desk. When later in the course of the same event, Julio got up to take <u>one</u> piece of paper to the wastebasket, he may have been responding to the

earlier episode. In an interview with Julio one might establish that the earlier episode was part of the context of the episode that we related here.

It can be said then that if culture is presumed to be like an information, or communication system, then it might be said to be a stream of co-ordinate elementary systems that includes not only a linguistic unit system, but also others that we know also have information value, such as the kinetics, or action-gestural system. Culture is a construct referring not just to one, but to several message systems, that are, or may be concurrent, congruent, and can be interdependent, i.e. interpenetrated. The question is, how many such message systems, with their separate codes etc., are there? Ed Hall has suggested ten other than language that are primary (Hall, 1959). Goodenough distinguished all culture into two phenomenal levels: the cognitive and the behavioral-artifactual. He then uses language to think about both levels, but he does not discuss the problem of their further differentiation (Goodenough, 1963; 1971). Some elementary message systems may be found in all cultures; some in some cultures, and some in only one culture. But this cheerful vagueness puts us at some disadvantage at an ethnic interface, when the problem is to discover how all these message systems sometimes succeed but usually fail to produce the desired communication outcome; i.e. to communicate information so that people can compose their behavior in the way a set of others expect them to compose it, and such that that set of others in turn compose their behavior as the people in the first instance expect them to behave.

We are using a time co-ordinate to mark off the beginnings and endings of contexts in which interrelated cultural components occur. So culture is a stream of human behavior and of co-ordinated conceptualization (i.e. cognition) about that behavior. Cultural events are marked off segments, or sectionings

of that stream, when the segments are designated in time. Thus, even places happen. They occur in time, or in temporal space.

The other characteristics of the event are spelled out in terms of a variety of units. In most general terms the units have been specified as "distinctive features" by Ward Goodenough, and as "isolates" by Edward Hall. There, of course, should be both etic and emic versions of every class of isolate; some etic "features" necessarily having to be in one to one correspondence with emic features because a range of emic versions must be mapped on to the etically distinguished features, since the scientist's categories conform to the rule of parsimony.

These features are combined in ordered ways into the ordered sets of forms which are the "integrals" in terms of which we usually experience the unit system. The parameters at the level of distinctive features, of course, must be biologically discriminable, or discernible. Any ordinary child, must be able to recognize or identify any distinctive feature, with eyes or other senses, as separate and distinct. The ordered sets of distinctive features or forms, also must be discriminable by any ordinary child.

The forms or integrals are further combined into a level of order called pattern in accord with certain rules, or standards (Goodenough, 1963, 1971; Hall, 1959). The rules, or standards should at minimum cover the relationships of order, selection (inclusion-exclusion), and congruence (accord or agreement) (Hall, 1959). With these classes of "leveled" items one produces a system, actually a code system, which is defined as a complex set of interrelated rules or categories which cannot be mixed randomly with rules or categories of another code or system.

A cultural event includes the operation of at least two, or more,"message systems" as Hall labels it, along a time dimension. (Hall, 1959) The following are a set of proposed primary, or component dimensions, that can be structured into message systems.[2] Higher level systems are based on combinations of these systems into structured sets of distinctive features, forms, and patterns or standards.

Figure 4

Suggested Primary Information Systems[3]

1. Language system
   - rule/pattern = grammar-syntax
   - forms = morphemes
   - distinctive features = phonemes

2. Material artifacts system (includes environmental features)
   - designs, styles
   - objects
   - traits

3. Affective system
   - emotion
   - feelings
   - tropism

4. Social interaction system
   - interactions
   - actions
   - nodes (See Harris)

5. Ideological system
   - logic
   - beliefs/concepts
   - semantic features

6. Person system
   - roles
   - actor types
   - actions, artifacts

7. Spatial-proxemics system (See Hall)

8. Temporal system (intrensic)
   - orientation
   - periods, cycles
   - intervals, recurrence

Other message systems are produced by combining these primary ones. We postulate that at least these will be components of all cultural systems for which, at a minimum, adequate etic units of description must be developed.

Event Types

We need to consider now the relation of cultural events to egocentric networks and to institutions. Actually, both can be specified in terms of event types. (Note descriptions can be in terms of aforementioned message systems, or by Harris behavioral scene coordinates and model chains.) While there are several useful ways to type events, we are recommending that typing by temporal scheduling of events is an extremely efficient way of keeping frameworks clear and intersubjective.

We have adopted temporal scheduling of an event as a basis for our first typology. (See Figure 5) *Recurrence* refers to the fact that an event type *recurs* on a cyclical basis such that one can specify its occurrence in that cycle, and perhaps at what point in the cycle it will occur--diurnal, weekly, monthly, seasonally, etc. *Regular events* are predictable events, but predictable within stated limits, e.g., from precise timepoint, to sequencial order, to likely frequency. Speaking in terms of the typology, events are *recurrent-regular* in that they are highly predictable and have a very specific, sequencial place in a cycle. There are events that are *recurrent, but irregular* in that one knows they will happen within the interval of a temporal cycle, but just when they will take place in the cycle is uncertain. *Nonrecurrent-regular* events cannot be anticipated in terms of cycle, but are predictable within an interval period ("It's been seven years since the last ice storm, it is about time for another occurrence.") Finally, nonrecurrent-irregular events are happenings which are unpredictable from within the system An example of this nonrecurrent-irregular event in our school system was the death of the principal and the memorial event held in his memory. His death with respect to the social system of the school is a nonrecurrent-irregular event.

Figure 5

Temporal Typology Of Cultural Events And Examples

Regularity	Recurrence +	Recurrence −
+	Recurrent Regular	Non-recurrent Regular
−	Recurrent Irregular	Non-recurrent Irregular

Regularity	Recurrence +	Recurrence −
+	Spelling Hour	Disciplining Students
−	Auditorium Program*	Death of Principal

*In this instance an auditorium program occurred *sometime* during a weekly period, but the precise day and hour was not set prior to the beginning of the week, and might be changed even then.

Using as our basic dimension a schedule of events by cycles of time and by absolute time we can provide proper time orientation to our model of the behavior stream. We may subdivide any given one of these types according to varieties of place types, actor types, and activity types. Under the general recurrent-regular types events, we might have subtype of events that could be labeled *daily-morning/teacher-student/in-classroom/doing-math event*. Interrelated subtype events might be discriminated. Thus subtype *daily-afternoon/STUDENT/playground/recess* could be scheduled at the same time as a complementary subtype *afternoon/TEACHER/cafeteria/drinking-coffee event*. Thus a given recurrent-regular events, such as subtypes *b* and *c*, are related to one another in complementary terms via the complementary relationship of actor-types, teacher and student.

Recurrent-irregular types of events might have subvarieties such as the subtype *weekly/sixth, seventh, eight, teacher-student-administrator/auditorium/having-program*. The point is that this event subtype will happen some time during the week, but specification of when it will occur on a smaller time scale or relative time within the daily time schedule is impossible. Within the nonrecurrent-regular event type one might have such subvarieties, *teacher-student/adjustment-office/for sanctioning*. This type happens often and regularly, but not on a recurrent cycle. Several days go by without the occurrence of this type of event and then three such events like this could occur in one morning.

Nonrecurrent and nonregular events such as the appearance of a crew of research workers on the scene to do ethnographic research, of course, are important types of events that can't be predicted from internal knowledge of the organization. Another example of this type of event might be a student demonstration that has not as yet become regular, nor recurrent in the school in which we are doing a study. High school students

in some of the predominantly Black high schools in Chicago did try to put demonstrations on a recurrent weekly basis for a period, but they were not able to maintain recurrent rhythm to the occurrence.

The contour of events in the school is based on a basic pattern of four types of events that are very similar in beginning and ending episodes, and three other periods in which there is a diffusion of events into different place-types and among the actor-types in the system. The first four we ordinarily call "class," the other three periods are "recess." Weekly recurrent variations are introduced into the daily cycle, in the form of weekly events in the library, in the gymnasium, in the home mechanics shop, and in the form of a special teacher for art and for music.

While the school work-processing events and their cyclical variations are repetitive with respect to beginnings, endings, place-types, actor-types, and even *procedures of activities*, there is great variety in interaction and particularly in the verbal messages that make up the information flow. There is some indication already that household and peer behavior are characterized by proportionately fewer recurrent-regular events. Seemingly there is more recurrent-irregular scheduling of events, and many nonrecurrent-regular events in household and peer relations. One can anticipate, however, less complexity and variability in messages and code, and perhaps even less variation in interaction.

We emphasize that we are working toward a useable typology of events by working inductively Even our four-member typology based on schedule came about inductively because it is important to develop the capability of predicting events in order to be there to observe them, or even to make work plans. We began with regular recurrent, and irregular,

nonrecurrent types and we rounded out our typology beyond our inductive recognition of these two types by generating four types and discovering real events that fit the theoretical categories. We could develop a theoretical typology based on our event coordinates types and activity-types, but by this procedure we would have a grid with many thousands of cells and types. The most fruitful strategy seems to be that of working from our four schedule types, and on an inductive basis make further decisions about types of event characteristics that can usefully be ordered into types.

Continuing with event-focused descriptive ethnography, we now turn to the questions of the relationships among events and to questions of other bases for classes and types of events. While events are described and characterized by the elements we have just discussed, the *'relationships* among events can be of several varieties.

One way of comparing events other than in terms of temporal character, is through *feature overlap,* or the amount of common features among events which can be specified in terms of either the message systems we discussed earlier or the behavioral categories of actors and actor-types; place and place-types; actions, interactions, or their abstractions as activities, particularly customary activities; and relevant object-types.[5] It is through feature overlap that we decide whether one instance of an event is sufficiently like another instance of an event to be classed as the "same" event. Events may be *complementary* to one another with respect to features; i.e., they complete one another in some fashion. Thus, the actor composite of the school may be divided up among simultaneous events; e.g., teachers in the cafeteria and pupils on the playground during recess.

Events are often *contingent* upon one another, one being instrumental to another. The contingency relationship is of special interest to us because some of our proposed explanations for commonly known educational problems suggest that some events in the households have contingencies with some events in the school and one of our problems is to discover those contingencies. In order for the school to attain certain goals, certain outcomes, it depends on and requires certain contingent conditions to exist in the homes of its students, in the form of certain activities or procedures for carrying out activities. When the conditions are not present, or when carried out by different procedures than those assumed in schools which the children attend, then schools find themselves unable to meet their goals. They may rationalize the failures by viewing the home as deprived or disadvantaged when in actuality it should be more properly regarded as *different* customary events.

From the point of view of the event typology, contingency of events in different domains points up the practical applications of a typology that includes this relationship.

Procedures

Procedurally, we begin our work etically, desiring, of course, etic categories that are isomorphic with a range of emic categories. We then use emic categories to develop emic accounts; and because of the nature of our research problem we have certain events, or situations, with at least two emic versions. (One important question is how some people skillfully handle two different emic systems in the same event.) But we then move back to etic accounts, of processes and explanations.

In my own ethnographic accounts of classroom events I often saw recurrence of certain episodes; but it often required very careful comparison among events to sort out common, versus variable conditions. Thus, for example, I noticed that one woman teacher's joking behavior with young male students sometimes led to a pleasurable interlude, at others to serious conflict. I compared events in which joking-teasing occurred, with several different boys; and for three different teachers. I interviewed two boys and two teachers about the events. After this we felt we had a conflict in custom sufficiently well grounded to check our observations in our questionnaire. (See Table 6 through 12 for the summary of the responses to questions presented in Appendix A).

With respect to the question of conflicts between Puerto Rican boys and North American teachers, our research task is to select a sample of events, *not a sample of individuals*. The events varied by individual actors of a give type. Theoretically we could have taken a random sample of Type I recurrent-regualr events; e.g., math in the morning, and then stratified that sample by the sex of the teacher; e.g. male and female. Or we could have collected descriptions of the nonrecurrent-regular event, *teacher-student/adjustment-office/behavior sanction*, that took place over a given period of time; for example, a four-week period, and analyzed them for actor-type characteristics and for the event-type that just preceded the nonrecurrent-regular type that we are sampling. By checking back on the event-type that just preceded this nonrecurrent-regular event, we are checking out event contingencies, of course.

As we establish the plausibility of this type of interaction and contingency in the school, our next step is to follow the network of those Puerto Rican boys in our principle sample who fit the age range of boys

involved in this type of event. We turn to their households and to events in that household in order to see whether the pattern of interaction and the procedural aspect of activities directed toward sanctioning and toward inhibiting violations of behavior rules seem to follow the same procedures as those we have seen in school. In particular, we would want to look at the same activity sequences involving Puerto Rican adult women and Puerto Rican boys in some recurrent event-type in the household to find out if there is a sharp contrast between the procedures in their interactions, with the procedures in activities involving the same Puerto Rican boys and their female teachers.

If one observes sharp contrast and finds different standards operating in household events then one can pursue the question through interviews and questionnaires with informants concerning the rules governing these behaviorial procedures, and how their differences affect and strike informants in emotive and value terms. Thus, in this instance we move from the account of joking relationships, that we had observed in intraschool events, to a questionnaire.* Tables 2 through 6 give an account of the response to the questions about who may joke with whom. We found through interviews with participants that joking to the point of teasing on the part of female teachers toward some (i.e., Puerto Rico-Puerto Rican) male Puerto Rican boys was read by the latter as message of negative feeling. As a matter of fact, however, the teachers encoded it as a sign of positive feeling. The boys thought she was picking on them; she thought she was being "friendly" even though correcting the boys' behavior. The tables indicate the standards or rules Puerto Rican, other Latin, and Non-Latin eighth grade youth use to guide joking behavior with differing actor-types, in different places.

*See Appendix A for questions on which the tables are based

Table 2. Is joking around (se relajar) between peers who are friends acceptable or unacceptable, according to eighth grade students? ($P_3S_2Q_{ss.1-3}$)

		Puerto Ricans[1]		Other Latins[2]		Non-Latins[3]		Others[4]	
		Two Boys	Two Girls	Two Boys	Two Girls	Two Boys	Two Girls	Two Boys	Two Girls
Acceptable		57	50	41	39	23	23	13	11
	%	79.17	69.44	85.42	81.25	80.65	74.19	68.42	57.89
Unacceptable		13	17	4 4	6	5	5	4	5
	%	18.06	23.61	8.33	12.50	15.13	16.13	21.05	26.32
No Answer		2	5	2	3	11	3	2	3
	%	2.78	6.94	4.17	6.25	2.86	9.68	10.53	15.79
Totals		72	72	48	31	31	31	19	19
	%								

N=170

[1] Latin surname born in Puerto Rico

[2] Latin surname, not born in Puerto Rico

[3] Non-Latin surname, place of birth in the U.S., or Non-Latin area

[4] Non-Latin surname, place of birth unknown

Table 3. Is joking around (se relajar) between teachers and students of the same sex acceptable or unacceptable? ($P_3S_2Q_{28.1-2}$)

		Male teacher and Male student				Female teacher and Female student			
		PR	Latin	Non-Latin	Other	PR	Latin	Non-Latin	Other
Acceptable		34	24	24	8	39	25	19	9
	%	47.22	50.00	77.42	42.11	54.17	52.08	61.29	47.37
Unacceptable		34	19	6	7	23	14	8	6
	%	47.22	39.58	19.35	36.84	31.94	29.17	25.81	31.58
No Answer		4	5	1	4	10	9	4	4
	%	5.56	10.42	3.23	21.05	13.89	18.75	12.90	21.05
Total		72	48	31	19	72	48	31	19

N=170

Table 4. Is joking around (se relajar) between teacher and student of opposite sex acceptable or unacceptable, according to eighth grade students? $P_3S_2Q_{28.3-4}$)

		Male teacher and Female student				Female teacher and Male student			
		PR	Latin	Non-Latin	Other	PR	Latin	Non-Latin	Other
Acceptable		27	11	16	6	37	15	18	4
	%	37.50	22.92	51.61	31.58	51.39	31.25	38.06	21.05
Unacceptable		39	27	9	8	28	22	9	10
	%	54.17	56.25	29.03	42.11	38.89	45.83	29.03	52.63
No Answer		6	10	6	5	7	11	4	5
	%	8.33	20.83	19.35	26.32	9.72	22.92	12.90	26.32
Total		72	48	31	19	72	48	31	19
N=170									

Table 5. Is joking around (se relajar) between parent and child acceptable or unacceptable, according to eighth grade students? ($P_3S_3Q_{43.1 \& 3}$)

		Father and Son				Father and Daughter			
		PR	Latin	Non-Latin	Other	PR	Latin	Non-Latin	Other
Acceptable		17	23	19	10	12	8	12	6
	%	53.13	69.70	76.00	71.43	37.50	24.24	48.00	42.86
Unacceptable		11	6	2	2	12	19	9	6
	%	34.38	18.18	8.00	14.29	37.50	57.58	36.00	42.86
No Answer		4	4	3	2	8	6	4	2
	%	12.50	12.12	12.00	14.29	25.00	18.18	16.00	14.29
Total		32	33	25	14	32	33	25	14

N=104

Table 6. Is joking around (se relajar) between Mother and Son acceptable or unacceptable, according to eighth grade students? ($P_3S_3Q_{43.2}$)

		PR	Other Latin	Non-Latin	Other
Acceptable		17	17	15	9
	%	53.13	51.52	60.0(	64.29
Unacceptable		11	10	8	1
	%	34.38	30.30	32.00	7.14
No Answer		4	6	2	4
	%	12.30	18.18	8.0)	28.57
Total		32	33	25	14

N=104

One could carry on the analysis of these two event components and of other components in the same event, but I think this example carries the burden of expressing part of our rationale for using cultural events. As we have specified, it is a segment of the stream of behavior that we can use as an *integral context* for the behavioral and cognitive items we are interested in--from the distinctive features of object types to the semantic analyses of the concepts, or forms, in messages that occur in the event.

Conclusion

I think, of course, that ethnographers have been doing this sort of thing for years. I have simply tidied up the description of the process.

Actually, the technology of video taping is being used in a wide variety of settings, including schools, to investigate kinetic message systems. Recently Erickson reported an even more elaborate analytic approach using video taped personnel interview sessions as his behavioral record with which to analyze and from which to do interviews. He is investigating inter-ethnic behavioral interactions, including the concepts of "cycles of situational frames," a concept very close to this one of event analysis.

I think the approach to cultural events that I outline here is nomothetic, not just idiographic. The careful exploration of an event is for the purpose of establishing values of a rather complex set of variables, from which event types can be developed, and about which generalizations can be made. It might be said, then, that we study culture by sampling events, rather than individuals, and their characteristics are studied in the context of those events.

I think that by this point my intentions are clear. I must communicate my findings to practitioners, which makes intersubjective communication extremely critical. They may, after all, try to restructure their behavior and thinking in terms of my advice. I must be able to refer the descriptions of conceptualizations, or codes, to an unambiguous behavioral context. This can be done in several ways, but I think it is most efficient to think about context in terms of temporal scheduling. People "expect" not only behavior; they expect a schedule of contexts of behavior. Life is not totally scheduled, but a great deal of it is.

I propose to describe the culture of people through describing components and variables of behavioral and informational systems in scheduled contexts, which I have called cultural events. I could describe a person in terms of the schedule of events in which he participates. I could describe classes of persons in terms of the schedule of events in which they participate. And, viewing institutions in a Malinowskian sense of an organized set of people, as well as the rule-guides for behavior, I can describe an institution in terms of schedules of events.

Some, of course, may see the use of event as not helpful in describing, comparing, measuring, predicting, and theorizing about culture. It may seem too particularistic; too confining. I argue here, however, that to handle the obligation of intersubjective replicability in complex urban settings, and the complex interpenetration of formerly separate and more readily separable cultural systems, the event analysis approach is extremely helpful. While I have used the approach in a limited way in research referred to here, its use was incomplete and I cannot as yet argue on the grounds of full demonstration that it works. I hope to have persuaded you it is promising. But we hope to be putting it to full test again soon in a study of Mexican-Americans in rural Illinois.

Appendix A

The following questions were asked of students, in order to clarify the cultural meaning of joking around. (Part 3, Section 2)

22.0.0 Is "to joke around with one another" acceptable or unacceptable between the following people?
Es "se relajaban uno al otro" aceptable o inaceptable entre las siguientes personas?

22.1.0 Two boys who are friends: Yes No
Dos muchachos que son amigos: Si No

22.2.0 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

22.3.0 Two girls who are friends: Yes No
Dos muchachas que son amigas Si No

22.4.0 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

22.5.0 A boy and a girl: Yes No
Un muchacho y una muchacha: Si No

22.6.0 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

23.0.0 Is "to joke around with one another" acceptable or unacceptable between the following people?
Es "se relajaban uno al otro" aceptable o inaceptable entre las siguientes personas?

23.1.0 A male teacher and a male student: Yes No
Un profesor con un alumno: Si No

23.1.1 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

23.2.0 A female teacher and a female student: Yes No
Una profesora y una alumna: Si No

_____

28.2.1 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

28.3.0 A male teacher and a female student: Yes No
Una profesora y una alumna: Si No

28.3.1 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

28.4.0 A female teacher and a male student: Yes No
Una maestra y un alumno: Si No

28.4.1 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

28.5.0 A teacher and a parent: Yes No
Un maestro y un padre: Si No

43.0.0 Is "to joke around with one another" acceptable or unacceptable between the following people?
Es "se relajaban uno al otro" aceptable or inaceptable entre las siguientes personas?

43.1.0 A father and a son: Yes No
Un padre y un hijo: Si No

43.1.1 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

43.2.0 A mother and a son: Yes No
Una madre y un hijo: Si No

43.2.1 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

43.3.0 A father and a daughter: Yes No
Un padre y una hija: Si No

43.3.1 Explain under what circumstances
Explique bajo que circunstancias_____

_____

NOTES

[1]This paper was given at the Anthropology Colloquium, March 1, 1972, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. The funds to support the research on which this paper is based were provided by Social Rehabilitation Service, HEW SRS RD-2969 G 70, and by the Bureau of Educational Research.

[2]At the first level of abstraction on action, one can distinguish interaction; which is, of course, interdependent, ordered actions of two or more persons. Thanks to early, careful work on the part of Chapple and Arensberg (1940) to develop a data language and system of notation for interaction, we can be fairly precise when we wish to focus on the interaction dimension of the event. We can include a fairly precise account of interaction in the direct observation of events.

The conceptualization of activities is another reconstruction of descriptive data several logical steps removed and, therefore, at a further level of abstraction from the coordinates of the scene and the stream of action. Goodenough (1963) suggests that since activities are organized with reference to intended goals, they like sentences in speech, have recognizable beginnings and endings, which make them readily isolable as natural behavioral entities for analysis. Plainly, they are likely to be behavioral entities that have significance and meaning in the minds of members of a culture. The concept of activity bridges the level of description involved in microevents with the level of symbolic meaning and manifest function of the culture in which the events take place. Thus, we adopt Goodenough's (1963: 324) formulation, that whether the activity is customary (that is, "designed to accomplish recurring purposes... where the same means for accomplishing the purpose continues to be available ...") or whether the activity is ad hoc (that is, "designed to accomplish unusual ends or to deal with conditions where common means are unavailable ...") all activities involve these three features: (a) actors of certain types; (b) a set of procedures that can be formulated as recipes and rules; and (c) one or more purposes or goals from the views of the actors. Actors and other people are aware that the effects of goals and purposes contribute to the activity's meaning to them. The effects of purposes, however, whether or not the people are aware of all of them, produce the activity's functions in their lives and in the event. (See the final column of the Event-analysis Observation Form, Figure 2.)

Making sense out of activities involves relating the action to intended consequences, usually by asking, "Why are you doing that that way?" (Goodenough, 1963: 325). For a given cultural group, finding purpose for activities give one a picture of the cognitive maps the members of a group have of their physical, social, and even historical environment. These maps are what Levi-Strauss calls "folk-models" (Levi-Strauss, 1964). In earlier behavioral science terms, they were labeled the desires and values of a people. So beyond the descriptive account of the events themselves for our Puerto Rican and non-Puerto Rican egos and their networks in the domains of home, school, and peerdom, we have been inquiring about peoples' procedures and purposes in their activities and about their perceptions of their own and others' purposes. We have been comparing them with one another to reveal culture differences and unrecognized sources of conflict.

[3]The idea of Primary Message Systems is borrowed directly from Hall, but the Systems as presented are in large part my own selection. In each case I suggest the three levels of distinctive feature, forms, and pattern appropriate to that system.

[4]The emphasis here on information, may obscure the possibility that there is an ecological system external to the culture system, but in part determinant of it. Such things as population ratios, population mobility etc. are examples at ecological variables that are not part of the cultural information system, although actions controlled through human information may contribute to the ratios, rates, etc. In my view ecology and culture must be distinguished, not combined, for the distinguishing allows us to understand and measure their interdependence, but combining them leads to confusion in our understanding.

[5]See footnote 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Roger B. Barker

1963 — The Stream of Behavior. New York, Meredith Publishing Company

J. A. Barnes

1954 — Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish, Human Relations 7:39-58

Elizabeth Bott

1957 — Family and Social Network. London, Tavistock Publications

Eliot Chapple and Conrad Arensberg

1940 — "Measuring Human Relations." Genetic Psychology Monograph 22

Eliot Chapple and C. Coon

1947 — The Principles of Anthropology. New York, John Wiley and Sons

R. D'Andrade and K. Romney

1964 — "Summary of Participants Discussion," in K. Romney and R. D'Andrade, eds., Transcultural Studies in Cognition. American Anthropologist, Pt. 2, Vol. 66, 1964

A. L. Epstein

1961 — The Network and Urban Social Organization. Rhodes-Livingstone Institute Journal 29:29-62

Charles Frake

1969 — "Further Discussion of Burling" in S. Tyler, ed., Cognitive Anthropology. New York, Holt Rinehart, Winston, 1969, p. 432

Frederick Erickson

1971 — "The Chicano in a Black Mask," Paper read at the Society for Applied Anthropology, Miami, Florida in April, 1971

1971 "The Cycle of Situational Frames; A Model for Microethnography in Urban Anthropology," n.d.

Ward Goodenough

1956 Componential Analysis and the Study of Meaning. Language, Vol. 32, pp. 195-216.

1963 Cooperation in Change. New York, John Wiley and Sons

1970 Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology, Chicago, Aldine Press

Edward Hall

The Silent Language. Garden City, Doubleday Company, Inc., 1959

Marvin Harris

1964 The Nature of Cultural Things. New York, Random House

Solon T. Kimball and Marion B. Pearsall

1955 "Event Analysis as an Approach to Community Study," Social Forces, 34

Claude Levi-Strauss

1953 "Social Structure" in Anthropology Today, A. Kraeber, ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press

A. C. Mayer

1966 "The Significance of Quasi-Groups in the Study of Complex Societies," M. Banton, ed., The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc.

A. R. Radcliff-Brown

1922 The Andaman Islanders. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press