

1a) PROPERTY: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
control	<p><u>Achieved by shrewd investment.</u> Do people extend their property resources primarily by hard work? or compete for property by use of coercive measures, or manipulative behavior?</p> <p>0.0 - Shrewd, manipulative acquisition 0.2 - Acquired by hard work, investment 0.4 - Award for personal performance</p>	<p><u>Award for right behavior.</u> Do people reward for proper role behavior by granting control over valued property? Does one inherit from parents or kin by fulfilling certain duties to them?</p> <p>0.6 - Award for proper duty in assigned role 0.8 - Differential rewards by status 1.0 - Right of status, and role behavior</p>
value	<p><u>Only utilitarian.</u> Do people minimizing differences of property holdings? Do people emphasize the utilitarian aspects of property, so that holdings are primarily a means to an end?</p> <p>0.0 - Property merely a means to an end 0.2 - Accumulation to expand productivity 0.4 - Wealth used to expand social power</p>	<p><u>Attributed with symbolic value.</u> Does ownership of particular property hold symbolic value for the owners? Do some items of property have greater value than other? In what social ways are symbolic values expressed and reinforced?</p> <p>0.6 - Acquired to enhance social position 0.8 - Symbolic of status and well-being 1.0 - Elaborated symbols of social value</p>
risk	<p><u>Invested at risk.</u> Do people expend their property resources to provide for subsistence and wants? Do individuals risk their property holdings and seek satisfaction from the challenge of investment for uncertain but anticipated gain and competitive social rewards?</p> <p>0.0 - Expended for personal interest 0.2 - Invested at risk to expand holdings 0.4 - Invested for social wealth, influence</p>	<p><u>Secured for protection in crisis.</u> Do people seek to protect and secure property, through legal title, regular maintenance, attention to the visual impact, and securing against theft and vandalism? Do people manage their property to provide for themselves and their heirs at some future time?</p> <p>0.6 - Secured by legal means, maintenance 0.8 - Visual impact, quality of high value 1.0 - Security, protection of highest value</p>
access	<p><u>Right of labor/resources invested.</u> Do people assert their rights to property based upon their labor invested? Are distributions of and disputes about property settled in terms of equity of investment?</p> <p>0.0 - Access gained by labor invested 0.2 - Access defined as equitable share 0.4 - Access variable by competitive skills</p>	<p><u>Right of occupation/class identity.</u> Does one occupy certain space (land, home, office) because of election, appointment, or succession to a particular role? Are rewards of property given to those who occupy higher roles in the hierarchy?</p> <p>0.6 - Access linked to position, role 0.8 - Differential access justified by rules 1.0 - Access a reward of status, role</p>
self-esteem	<p><u>By exploiting/managing.</u> Is self-esteem gauged by success in exploiting/managing one's property resources in transactions with others? Do people recognize skill and daring in competitive investment of resources, win or lose?</p> <p>0.0 - Self-esteem by exploiting/managing 0.2 - Social esteem linked to competitive skill 0.4 - Distributing wealth confers prestige</p>	<p><u>By possessing/preserving.</u> Is an individual's self-esteem connected to the possession and preservation of property? eg. clothing, furnishings, or dishes for a woman? or automobile, tractor, or boat for a man?</p> <p>0.6 - Holding wealth confers prestige 0.8 - Social esteem linked to possessions 1.0 - Self-esteem by possessing/preserving</p>

1b) PROPERTY: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
title	<p><u>Individual title of ownership.</u> Do people assign ownership of land, water, and other resources to private individuals? Do people hold clear, individual title to durable structures and goods?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals hold title to key resources 0.2 - Individual titles, but defined public access 0.4 - Public title held for some key resources</p>	<p><u>Corporate title of ownership.</u> Are certain resources (land, water, forest, reef) or durable property owned corporately with title formally vested in an identifiable group? How does the group pass title to the next generation, and constrain transfer of title to outsiders?</p> <p>0.6 - Groups hold title for some key resources 0.8 - Group titles, but defined public access 1.0 - Corporate ownership of all key resources</p>
use rights	<p><u>Owner allocated.</u> Do individual owners have the right to use their property exclusively for their own interests, to rent the property, or neglect to use it at all? Do others have right to impose limits upon individuals about how their property should be allocated and exploited?</p> <p>0.0 - Exclusive owner allocated use rights 0.2 - Contracted use arrangements 0.4 - Collective public standards <i>re</i> use</p>	<p><u>Group dispersed use rights.</u> How do leaders of the group allocate the use of group property to individual members? For what time period? How does the group assert its rights beyond that time? What is expected in return for use rights? Does the group allow non-members access, and how do they regulate such access?</p> <p>0.6 - One-time corporate allocation of use rights 0.8 - Corporate oversight of allocation, use 1.0 - Corporate standards <i>re</i> allocation, use</p>
rights to produce	<p><u>Individual rights to produce.</u> To what extent do individuals exercise total control over the produce generated from their property (land, other real estate, stocks, royalties, or productive equipment)? Consuming, selling, investing, or discarding produce is an individual matter?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals control, invest, sell produce 0.2 - Negotiated sharing among co-laborers 0.4 - Partnerships, coalitions control produce</p>	<p><u>Corporate rights to produce.</u> To what extent does the group tax members for their produce from corporate land? Do kinship obligations include rights of ancestors or local leaders to first fruits? Do corporate rights take the form of tenant fees, taxes, shares or dividends gained from corporately owned property?</p> <p>0.6 - Members periodically contribute produce 0.8 - Leaders set shares of member contribution 1.0 - Corporate standards <i>re</i> fees, shares</p>
maintenance	<p><u>Individual maintenance, security.</u> To what extent is maintenance and security of property left to the discretion and motivation of individual owners?</p> <p>0.0 - Individual maintenance, security 0.2 - Reciprocally shared maintenance 0.4 - Occasional activity-group maintenance</p>	<p><u>Collective obligation-maintenance.</u> To what extent do the members of the group hold one another accountable for the security, maintenance and upkeep of their property?</p> <p>0.6 - Member organized periodic maintenance 0.8 - Leaders set maintenance schedule, roles 1.0 - Collective duty/sanction for maintenance</p>
disposal	<p><u>Individual decision to dispose.</u> To what extent are individuals free to sell or otherwise dispose of their property as they wish?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals sell or dispose at will 0.2 - Household members consult <i>re</i> sale 0.4 - Partnership or coalitions sell joint property</p>	<p><u>Collective control of disposal.</u> Are members constrained by the group from the temporary or permanent disposal of corporate property? What claims does the group exert upon individually owned property?</p> <p>0.6 - Individuals grant use, but not title 0.8 - Leaders decide <i>re</i> disposal of property 1.0 - Corporate decisions to sell or dispose</p>

1c) PROPERTY: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5)	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Property held for transactional value.	Property held for symbolic value.	
control	Outcome of individual effort.	Reward for right behavior.	
value	Utilitarian value only.	Attributed with symbolic value.	
risk	Invested at risk.	Secured for protection in crisis.	
access	Right of labor/resources invested.	Right of occupation/class identity.	
self-esteem	Self-esteem = management/exploitation.	Self-esteem = possession/preservation.	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5)	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Individual interests emphasized.	Corporate interests emphasized.	
title	Individual title of ownership.	Corporate title of ownership.	
use rights	Owner-allocated use rights.	Group dispersed use rights.	
right to produce	Individual rights to produce.	Corporate rights to produce	
maintenance	Individual decision to maintain, secure.	Collective obligation-for maintenance, security.	
disposal	Individual decision to dispose.	Collective control of disposal.	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

2a) LABOR: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
organization	<p><u>Organized by task/goal requirements.</u> Is work organized by the objective requirements of the task, and the laborers change their activities as the tasks change?</p> <p>0.0 - No specialists, task/goal organization 0.2 - Work leader, voluntary organization 0.4 - Skill recognized, skilled are task leaders</p>	<p><u>Organized by rule, role assignment.</u> Do people organize their work in terms of clearly defined roles, ie. a job title and job description? Can people outline a series of written or unwritten rules which govern the practice of a particular role?</p> <p>0.6 - Some specialist roles, negotiable rules 0.8 - Most roles specialized, flexible rules 1.0 - Strict job specialization, roles, rules</p>
schedule	<p><u>Scheduled by goal considerations.</u> To what extent is the time of work a product of environmental concerns, consideration of work objective, and disposition of the workers? How variable is the work routine in response to such considerations?</p> <p>0.0 - Schedule completely negotiable 0.2 - Schedule re environmental constraints 0.4 - Schedule re ritual constraints</p>	<p><u>Scheduled by standard and routine.</u> To what extent is the time of work is determined by social rules? How is the routine of work established by calendar and daily schedule?</p> <p>0.6 - Explicit social standards for work routine 0.8 - Public calendar, daily schedule 1.0 - Schedule precisely defined, inflexible</p>
productivity	<p><u>Productivity = effort and goals achieved.</u> To what extent do people measure productivity in terms of effort expended and goals achieved? How do they evaluate whether or not the products have been worth the expenditure?</p> <p>0.0 - Productivity situationally defined 0.2 - Gauged against project goal 0.4 - Gauged against goal, labor expended</p>	<p><u>Productivity = time and product rule.</u> To what extent is productivity linked directly to time limits or product quotas? How are these limits measured?</p> <p>0.6 - Measure social, economic cost/reward 0.8 - Measure time, labor cost, product goals 1.0 - Precise measures of time and labor costs, and production goals and pay-off</p>
motivation	<p><u>Motivation = self-defined interests.</u> Is the worker motivated primarily from personal interest, self direction, or basic subsistence goals?</p> <p>0.0 - Labor motivated primarily by self-interest 0.2 - Mutual interests motivate cooperation 0.4 - Skill competition spurs labor effort</p>	<p><u>Motivation = role and reward.</u> To what extent is the worker motivated by promises of promotion in role and increased economic compensation, or by threat of punitive action?</p> <p>0.6 - Role competition spurs labor effort 0.8 - Rank and career incentives employed 1.0 - Rank, career, and recognition are primary</p>
objectives	<p><u>Objectives are self-determined.</u> Are the expected outcomes of labor defined and the labor directed by those who do the work?</p> <p>0.0 - Self-defined objectives 0.2 - Laborers/leader define goals, work pace 0.4 - Workers employ standards of skill, task</p>	<p><u>Objectives are authority-determined.</u> To what extent do institutional authorities direct labor activities and people who do not work set objectives for those who do?</p> <p>0.6 - Leaders consult laborers re goals, process 0.8 - Boss, foremen set goals, direct labor 1.0 - Management defines total labor agenda</p>

2b) LABOR: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
initiation	<p><u>Individually initiated and planned work projects.</u> Are work activity groups recruited by independent individuals, drawing upon their personal networks or institutional authority? Is the planning of domestic and public labor projects and recruitment of supporting laborers left to the persons initiating or supervising them?</p> <p>0.0 - Individually initiated, accomplished 0.2 - Individual plans, friends help as asked 0.4 - Individually contracted work partners</p>	<p><u>Group-initiated and planned work projects.</u> Are projects initiated by group discussion and consensus or majority decisions? Are individuals drafted to work in community or corporate work projects? Must individuals consult with group elders or leaders when they need the help of others for a domestic or public work project?</p> <p>0.6 - Group calls members for occasional work 0.8 - Group drafts members for seasonal tasks 1.0 - Group demands periodic communal labor, sanctions no-shows</p>
focus	<p><u>Activity-focused cooperation.</u> Is cooperative work focused primarily on an activity agenda, rather than a consensus agenda? Is planning primarily in the hands of entrepreneurial individuals? Is the work contracted out to partners in such a way as to profit the cooperating parties?</p> <p>0.0 - Cooperation strictly self-interest 0.2 - Repeated contracts of cooperating parties 0.4 - Long term multiple partnerships formed</p>	<p><u>Corporately organized cooperation.</u> Are public and domestic cooperative work projects organized by majority or consensus leadership? Do the group leaders seek consensus on the work activities and schedule? Do they assign tasks and responsibilities according to group tradition and interests?</p> <p>0.6 - Majority/leader coordination of projects 0.8 - Consensus leadership of communal work 1.0 - Tradition of collective labor and process</p>
interaction	<p><u>Interaction and work are separated.</u> To what extent do the parties emphasize work at the expense of social interaction? How is the activity organized to constrain and separate social interaction and promote the work activity above social interests?</p> <p>0.0 - Work excludes social interaction 0.2 - Social interaction only for needed rest 0.4 - Social interaction valued after work</p>	<p><u>Interaction and work are co-mingled.</u> To what extent are relationships between people working together as important as the work activity? How is the activity organized to promote social interaction as well as the emphasis on work?</p> <p>0.6 - Work and social interaction blended 0.8 - Social interaction integral to work activity 1.0 - Social goals have priority over economic</p>
integration	<p><u>Integration of labor is by functional utility.</u> Is cooperative work an "all business" affair in which people throw themselves wholly into their tasks, and cooperate with others only to the extent it is required by the technical demands of the work?</p> <p>0.0 - Cooperation rare and strictly functional 0.2 - Relationships restricted to workplace 0.4 - Relationships encouraged after work</p>	<p><u>Integration of labor is by symbol (food/ritual).</u> Is cooperative work facilitated by seemingly peripheral social activities such as corporate eating, drinking, rituals to begin work, or other symbolic action as part of the work process?</p> <p>0.6 - Team building includes family, community 0.8 - Work includes planned social interaction 1.0 - Corporate eating, drinking, and rituals deemed essential to cooperative work</p>
payment	<p><u>Individual celebration and payoff.</u> Is celebration a private affair, or the effort of an individual to mark a project completion as a personal achievement? Are pay-offs private, individual, and according to terms of agreement or contract?</p> <p>0.0 - Personal wages or profit, no celebration 0.2 - Reciprocal labor, meal for workers 0.4 - Personal wages, bonus and recognition for exceptional achievement</p>	<p><u>Group celebration and reward.</u> Do the members hold a collective celebration at the culmination of the project? Do people receive reward primarily by fulfilling their duty to the group? How does the group distribute shares (publicly?) of benefits gained from the labor?</p> <p>0.6 - Wages and profit sharing among members 0.8 - Collective earnings, public distribution 1.0 - Labor a duty of membership, rewarded by celebration, occasional distributions</p>

2c) LABOR: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5) Labor by goal, task.	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0) Labor by rule, goal..	SCORE
organization	Organized by task/goal requirements.	Organized by rule, role assignment.	
schedule	Scheduled by goal considerations.	Schedule by standard and routine.	
productivity	Productivity = effort and goals achieved.	Productivity = time and product rule.	
motivation	Motivation = self-defined interest.	Motivation = role and reward.	
objectives	Objectives are self-determined.	Objectives are authority determined.	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5) Individually directed labor.	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0) Corporately directed labor.	SCORE
initiation	Individually initiated and planned work projects.	Group-initiated and planned work projects.	
focus	Activity-focused cooperation.	Corporately organized cooperation.	
interaction	Interaction and work are separated.	Interaction and work are co-mingled.	
integration	Integration of labor is by functional utility.	Integration of labor is by symbol (food/ritual).	
payment	Individual celebration and pay-off.	Group celebration and reward.	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

3a) EXCHANGE: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
relationships	<p><u>Relationships are instrumental (use-focused).</u> To what extent are the relationships of exchange left to the negotiation of individuals and/or to instrumental ties such as middlemen, brokers, trading partners, etc.?</p> <p>0.0 - Relationships are primarily means to ends 0.2 - Individuals contract exchange with others 0.4 - Middlemen, brokers, partners assist</p>	<p><u>Superior/inferior relationships.</u> To what extent is the social structure characterized by prescribed superior/inferior relationships between which exchange of goods and services transpire?</p> <p>0.6 - Patrons/clients negotiated exchange 0.8 - Rank, social class limit resource access 1.0 - High/low patterns of obligation and duty defined in social structure</p>
asking	<p><u>Asking is negotiating.</u> To what extent is the potential giver an equal competitor, and is the act of asking a negotiable demand? Does the act of asking for goods or services signal the opening of the process of negotiation?</p> <p>0.0 - Asking is negotiating for personal gain 0.2 - Asking incurs reciprocal obligation 0.4 - Asking incurs economic debt</p>	<p><u>Asking is humiliating.</u> To what extent is asking for material goods or services a humiliating experience for a person in this social environment? Does the act of asking for goods or services signal a role of humility and vulnerability?</p> <p>0.6 - Asking implies weak personal capital 0.8 - Asking confers socially humiliating debt 1.0 - Asking signals low status, vulnerability</p>
giving	<p><u>Structured by competition for profit.</u> Is the structure of giving framed around competition and the potential for profit in some future exchange? What material or perhaps a social or political advantage might the giver obtain at a future time?</p> <p>0.0 - Give only when personal gain is certain 0.2 - Give to enhance personal capital, power 0.4 - Give with the expectation of reciprocity</p>	<p><u>Structured by duty of role.</u> Is giving structured as duty attributed to one's place in the social structure? Is giving a strategy for social climbing or to gain favor from a superior. Does the denial of a legitimate request diminish the stature of the "giver" in the public eye?</p> <p>0.6 - Give with expectation of equal return 0.8 - Give from a sense of duty, role 1.0 - Give to enhance one's status, power</p>
repayment	<p><u>In kind with interest.</u> Do participants expect payment of similar or equivalent material value? Must debt obligations be repaid with interest?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals exchange for profit 0.2 - Interest negotiated for each exchange 0.4 - Interest usually fixed, equally applied</p>	<p><u>In service, respect, different kind.</u> To what extent does payment include service, respect, prestige, or gifts of a different kind from that received?</p> <p>0.6 - Payment varies with social status 0.8 - Lower status may repay in service, respect 1.0 - Payment delineated by status preferences</p>
value	<p><u>Exchange value is negotiated.</u> Are the values of commodities exchanged open to negotiation?</p> <p>0.0 - Value negotiated in every exchange 0.2 - Value fluctuates in marketplace 0.4 - Value controlled by power interests</p>	<p><u>Exchange value is prescribed.</u> To what extent is the value of goods or services exchanged in the social environment prescribed in the social structure?</p> <p>0.6 - Value set by customary rules 0.8 - Value set by public authorities 1.0 - Value prescribed by authority, custom</p>

3b) EXCHANGE: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
social value	<p><u>Calculate economic gain/cost.</u> To what extent is asking, giving, and repayment restricted to material considerations of gain and loss? Do participants minimize the social factors in economic exchange?</p> <p>0.0 - Economic gain/loss is the only concern 0.2 - Competition serves to regulate exchange 0.4 - Social pressure moderates drive for gain</p>	<p><u>Calculate social gain/debt.</u> Does membership in group require one to calculate the potential social gain or debt when engaging in transactions with outsiders? Are there different kinds of outsiders? If so, how do these differences affect economic exchanges?</p> <p>0.6 - People calculate social and economic gain 0.8 - Social values regulate insider transactions 1.0 - Social gain/debt is of greatest concern</p>
debt	<p><u>Maximize personal debt.</u> To what extent are individuals willing to extend their personal debt to the maximum possible as part of their economic exchanges?</p> <p>0.0 - Debt is strategy for personal gain 0.2 - Debt is limited by competition only 0.4 - Debt is limited by public pressure</p>	<p><u>Minimize group debt.</u> Are group leaders cautious about putting themselves and members in debt to outsiders? Are they careful to manage indebtedness and have procedures to erase this debt in a timely manner?</p> <p>0.6 - Debt reflects badly on family and group 0.8 - Members carefully track debt to others 1.0 - Members minimize debt to others</p>
symbolism	<p><u>Exchange is private, material.</u> Do individuals generally conduct their business on a one-to-one private basis? Is ceremony considered a nuisance and an impediment to good business?</p> <p>0.0 – exchange is typically private and between individuals; no symbolism is involved; “ceremony” is considered a nuisance 0.2 – others in group expect prior notice of exchange with outsiders, but approval is neither required nor expected 0.4 – others in group deeply offended if not given prior notice of exchange with outsiders</p>	<p><u>Exchange is public, symbolic.</u> To what extent is inter-group exchange a public activity and to what extent does it confer symbolic meaning and significance upon the participants?</p> <p>0.6 – group approval expected, but not required 0.8 – exchange between groups requires group approval; “ceremony” involved in the exchange is retained from tradition, but symbolic meaning is not remembered by most group members 1.0 – exchange between groups requires group approval, is considered to obligate the groups, and has explicit symbolic meaning</p>
parity	<p><u>Negotiate openly for profit.</u> To what extent do individuals negotiate openly the cost of goods, loans, or the value of an item to be exchanged?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals negotiate openly for profit 0.2 - Personal standards of fair gain 0.4 - Public standard of fair gain</p>	<p><u>Negotiate privately for parity.</u> Are the public transactions negotiated privately so that the competing groups exchange in parity with one another?</p> <p>0.6 - Gain or loss is a group (family) agenda 0.8 - Loss creates shame for group members 1.0 - Privacy, parity the ideal between groups</p>
sharing	<p><u>Self-interest is expected.</u> To what extent do participants in an economic exchange expect self-interest on the part of the participating parties?</p> <p>0.0 - Self-interest is presumed 0.2 - Negative reciprocity is the ideal 0.4 - Balanced reciprocity is preferred</p>	<p><u>Sharing/generosity highly valued.</u> Is sharing and generosity highly valued for exchanges with members of ones group and with outsiders who are members of competing groups? Is the concept of generosity extended to other ethnic groups and foreigners?</p> <p>0.6 - Balanced reciprocity is the rule 0.8 - Generosity is highly valued 1.0 - Out-giving others is the ideal</p>

3c) EXCHANGE: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5)	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Instrumental, negotiated exchange.	Superior/inferior, prescribed exchange.	
relationships	Relationships are instrumental (use-focused)	Superior/inferior relationships.	
asking	Asking is negotiating.	Asking is humiliating.	
giving	Structured for profit.	Giving is structured by duty of role.	
repayment	In kind, with interest.	Repaying includes service, respect, kind.	
value	Exchange value is negotiated.	Exchange value is prescribed.	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5)	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Individually regulated exchange.	Corporately regulated exchange.	
social value	Calculate economic gain/cost.	Calculate social gain/debt	
debt	Maximize personal debt.	Minimize group debt.	
symbolism	Exchange is private, material.	Exchange is public, symbolic.	
parity	Negotiate openly for profit.	Negotiate privately for parity.	
sharing	Self-interest is expected.	Sharing/generosity highly valued.	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

4a) DOMESTIC AUTHORITY: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
parental role	<p><u>Parents take motivating role.</u> Do members emphasize equal rights of individuals to participate in household decisions re resources, space, organization of household activities? To what extent do parents provide motivation for members to participate.</p> <p>0.0 - Parents provide no direction 0.2 - Parents engage children in family affairs 0.4 - Parents coach children re expectations</p>	<p><u>Parents take directive role.</u> To what extent is authority in the household designated to senior individuals? Is authority a matter of rule and right to which members are required to conform?</p> <p>0.6 - Parents set clear boundaries, roles 0.8 - Parents define duties, responsibilities 1.0 - Parents demand obedience, conformity</p>
children's role	<p><u>Children are co-laborers.</u> Are children invited early to participate in adult labor and activities of the household? Are children encouraged to work along side of adults as co-laborers? Do adults of differing generations, residing in the same household, relate as peers?</p> <p>0.0 - Children are free of adult responsibility 0.2 - Children accompany parents in routines 0.4 - Children work side-by-side with adults</p>	<p><u>Children have subordinate roles.</u> Are children expected to be seen and not heard? Do parents give the word and children run to do it? Are children's roles seen as subject to authority of adults and structured so as to define specific responsibilities and duties?</p> <p>0.6 - Children have assigned duties, roles 0.8 - Children's roles structured by age/sex 1.0 - Children serve at the bidding of adults</p>
siblings' roles	<p><u>Siblings are co-equals.</u> Are age distinctions among siblings insignificant, particularly as children approach adulthood? Are siblings co-equal in their authority and responsibility for domestic activities?</p> <p>0.0 - Age/sex distinctions insignificant 0.2 - Siblings follow interests, giftedness 0.4 - Older responsible to assist younger</p>	<p><u>Elder siblings have authority over younger.</u> To what extent is relative age an important factor in the hierarchy of authority in the domestic group? Do elder siblings have authority over younger for economic and social activities?</p> <p>0.6 - Elder/younger distinction emphasized 0.8 - Elder directs economic, social activity 1.0 - Elder inherits, exercises family authority</p>
structure	<p><u>Relations are unstructured, person directed.</u> Do members of the domestic group exchange or vary responsibilities for domestic labor, food production, and authority over domestic activities? Are relations unstructured, so that persons with specific interests and abilities may perform roles according to their interests?</p> <p>0.0 - Domestic duties negotiated by parties 0.2 - People exchange tasks, roles over time 0.4 - Roles tend to be static, but not rigid</p>	<p><u>Appropriate behavior is structured, prescribed.</u> To what extent is the division of labor between male and female in the domestic unit strictly defined and imbued with authority? Are roles for household members structured, with expected behaviors clearly defined, and are persons channeled into those roles regardless of personal abilities or interests?</p> <p>0.6 - Male/female duties are sharply defined 0.8 - Domestic roles are uniformly prescribed 1.0 - Deviation from roles is not tolerated</p>
correction	<p><u>Correction is by reference to grief, joy, others.</u> Do parents correct children by reference to how pleased, hurt, disappointed, ecstatic, or angry they will be? Do parents define appropriate behaviors in terms of their positive or negative affect on others? Do people learn to conform by person-oriented appeals, and the development of ethical sensibilities?</p> <p>0.0 - Parents rarely correct children 0.2 - Parents correct by personal appeals 0.4 - Parents define positive and negative behavior by affect on others</p>	<p><u>Correction is by reference to rules, roles, self.</u> Do parents correct children by reference to social rules and relationships? Do parents define appropriate behaviors for children in terms of role categories which structure patterned relationships? Do people learn to conform by measuring self against the socially defined, standard role?</p> <p>0.6 - Parents define rules, correct deviance 0.8 - Parents define roles, appropriate behavior 1.0 - Self defined re role, rules, performance</p>

4b) DOMESTIC AUTHORITY: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
generations	<p>Bi-generational (1, 2 generations) households. To what extent do members of domestic groups prefer independent nuclear family households? Are three generation households formed only under socially exceptional circumstances? How and when do a newly married couple assume independent authority and separate from their natal households?</p> <p>0.0 - Husband/wife independent households 0.2 - Adult children excluded from household 0.4 - Unmarried adult children in household</p>	<p>Multi-generational (3, 4 generations) households. To what extent are three and four generation families encouraged and idealized by members of the society? Are newly married couples encouraged or required to live with parents? Do multi-generational families persist until the death of the senior generation or do other factors cause them to divide?</p> <p>0.6 - Newly married couple in household 0.8 - Grandchildren in household 1.0 - Four generations in household</p>
dyad in focus	<p><u>Husband/wife</u>. Do husband and wife make economic and social decisions on domestic matters, with the input of parents and siblings peripheral? Are the strongest bonds in the household between husband and wife so that in situations of conflict the couple stick together against the contrary interests of parents or siblings?</p> <p>0.0 - Spouses make decisions independently 0.2 - Hus/Wife jointly make domestic decisions 0.4 - Hus/Wife consult with resident children</p>	<p><u>Parent/child or sibling dyad in focus</u>. Do parents and children, or siblings, make economic and social decisions on domestic matters, with the input of spouses peripheral? Are the strongest bonds in the household between parents and children, or between siblings so that in situations of conflict children or siblings side with kin rather than their spouse?</p> <p>0.6 - Parent/child consultation expected 0.8 - Parents/adult children jointly decide 1.0 - Corporate sibling decisions are common</p>
control	<p><u>Individual control of capital, income, labor</u>. Are members of a household expected to meet their needs independently of other kin? Are members reluctant to call upon kinsmen for mutual labor or financial support in times of crisis, fearing obligation and loss of independence?</p> <p>0.0 - each individual controls income, labor 0.2 - husband/wife pool income, capital 0.4 - parents/children share capital needs</p>	<p><u>Pooling of capital, income, labor</u>. Does the domestic unit call upon its members periodically to share capital or income, or to perform collective labor? Is organized labor a part of subsistence production of the family unit? Do members of the household turn to an extended family group for mutual economic support?</p> <p>0.6 - parents/children pool income, capital 0.8 - extended family shares for capital needs 1.0 - extended family pools labor, income</p>
residence pattern	<p><u>Residence by personal choice</u>. To what extent is residence a matter of the personal choice of the couple marrying? Does the pattern of choices reflect the interest of individuals or the pressure of ties of kinship and group?</p> <p>0.0 - couple live at distance from both parents 0.2 - couple choose to live near parents 0.4 - parents pressure couple to live near-by</p>	<p><u>Co-residence with group members</u>. Is residence prescribed by customary practice or rules in the group? Does residence on group property confer rights and obligation of to participate in group activities? Does contiguous residence bring together more than one married couple?</p> <p>0.6 - couples live for a time with parents 0.8 - residence prescribed by group 0.9 - property conferred by group to couples 1.0 - couples obligated to support group</p>
marriage	<p><u>Marriage an individual agenda; ritual of separation</u>. Are marriages contracted by the couple, and planned in accord with their interests and wishes? Does marriage constitute a rite or a process of separation in which the couple ultimately leave their natal domestic groups to form a household of their own?</p> <p>0.0 - elopement 0.2 - families celebrate marriage, separation 0.4 - families set up couple for housekeeping</p>	<p><u>Marriage a group agenda; bridewealth or dowry</u>. Are marriages arranged by or planned in cooperation with the couple by the leadership of the domestic families involved? Is bridewealth or dowry a primary consideration, and controlled by the heads of families? Does marriage constitute a rite of membership bringing the spouse into an existing group?</p> <p>0.6 - parents approve, plan marriage 0.8 - bridewealth, dowry essential to marriage 1.0 - marriage arranged by parents of couple</p>

4c) DOMESTIC AUTHORITY: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5)	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Family is personal/egalitarian.	Family is positional/authoritarian.	
parental role	Parents take motivating role.	Parents take a directive role.	
children's role	Children are co-laborers.	Children have subordinate roles.	
siblings' role	Siblings are co-equals.	Elder siblings have authority over younger.	
structure	Relations are unstructured, person directed.	Prescribed structure and behavior	
correction	Correction is by reference to grief, joy, others.	Correction by reference to rules, roles, self	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5)	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Independent domestic units.	Corporate domestic units.	
generations	Bi-generational (1,2 generations) households.	Multi-generational (3,4 generations) households.	
dyad in focus	Husband/wife.	Parent/child or sibling dyad in focus.	
control	Individual control of capital, income, labor.	Pooling of capital, income, labor.	
residence pattern	Residence by personal choice.	Co-residence with group members.	
marriage	Marriage an individual agenda; ritual of separation.	Marriage a group agenda; bridewealth or dowry.	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

5a) COMMUNITY AUTHORITY: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
authority	<p><u>Aggregate interest clusters.</u> Do people reject authority , and resist the formation of power units? Are larger social units primarily aggregate interest clusters, dispersing when those interests are satisfied or diverge? Do individuals re-group according to their competing interests for that situation?</p> <p>0.0 - Complete individual autonomy 0.2 - Temporary authority granted to others 0.4 - Authority granted to situational leaders</p>	<p><u>Hierarchy of power units.</u> To what extent do people distribute authority and power through sub-units within the centralized hierarchy?</p> <p>0.6 - One given an authority role over many 0.8 - Authority distributed in hierarchy of roles 1.0 - Complex bureaucracy of power units</p>
decisions	<p><u>Negotiated situationally.</u> Do members retain independent power, forcing a negotiation process? Must people engage in considerable bargaining and dialogue to reach collectively significant decisions?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals make decisions alone 0.2 - People collaborate from common interests 0.4 - An influential few negotiate for many</p>	<p><u>Central unit decisions.</u> Are people empowered to make decisions for others? To what extent is the locus of decision making reserved for or controlled by the central power units?</p> <p>0.6 - One makes decisions representing many 0.8 - Decisions controlled by central hierarchy 1.0 - Decisions embeded in bureaucracy</p>
delegated power	<p><u>Leaders exercise aggregate power.</u> Is the leader’s power comprised of individuals who personally grant support? Is the leader’s control limited by individuals who may withdraw granted power at any time?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals grant support separately 0.2 - Leader attracts cohort with like interests 0.4 - Leaders extend network of influence</p>	<p><u>Leaders delegate power.</u> How much power is delegated to subordinates, and in what specific ways? Are subordinates free to exercise power within a structure of accountability?</p> <p>0.6 - Leader delegates to loyal subordinates 0.8 - Leaders institutionalize delegated power 1.0 - Power delegated broadly in hierarchy</p>
independent power	<p><u>Members retain independent power.</u> Are people able, and practice, independent control over their labor, finances, and other resources, reserving a significant part of their independent power for personal use?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals hold power independently 0.2 - People exchange power reciprocally 0.4 - Leader’s power checked by prowess in reciprocal exchange</p>	<p><u>Leader exercises power independently.</u> To what extent do the highest leaders exercise independent power, and how is that power limited, if at all?</p> <p>0.6 - Leader’s power checked by majority 0.8 - Leader’s power checked by subordinates 1.0 - Leader holds unchecked power</p>
allocated power	<p><u>Power granted reciprocally.</u> Is personal reciprocity expected when a person gives another control over resources or labor? Do individuals grant resources and labor to their leaders with expectation of reciprocal return?</p> <p>0.0 - Reciprocity expected in power exchanges 0.2 - Individuals grant power to ‘elders’ 0.4 - Individuals grant power to ‘big men’</p>	<p><u>Members allocate power centrally.</u> To what extent do members participate willingly and supportively with the central authority without expectation of a personal return?</p> <p>0.6 - Majority allocates power to one 0.8 - Majority allocates power to hierarchy 1.0 - Members and hierarchy share common power interests, identity, purpose</p>

5b) COMMUNITY AUTHORITY: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
beliefs	<p><u>Variant faith/beliefs.</u> To what extent do people deny the value of heritage, and promote as many versions of belief or unbelief as there are individual participants? Is nominalism typical of participants and do they reject any attempt to promote a common faith or belief as imposition upon others?</p> <p>0.0 - Every person holds own version of belief 0.2 - Tolerance of wide variation in belief/faith 0.4 - Shared heritage, individual interpretation</p>	<p><u>Heritage of common faith/beliefs.</u> To what extent are heritage and tenants of faith given high value and profile among participants?</p> <p>0.6 - Core beliefs shared, with variance in detail 0.8 - Authoritative system of belief, faith 1.0 - Uniform doctrine, exclusion of dissidents</p>
symbolic unity	<p><u>Brittle, isolating structure.</u> Are symbols weak, rituals of marginal value, and group integration like brittle glass? Do people build relationships upon mutual identities? Does conflict of interest lead to fragmentation and the isolation of individuals from one another?</p> <p>0.0 - Conflicting interests, fragmentation 0.2 - Weak identity and interest ties 0.4 - Ritual celebrates individual cooperation</p>	<p><u>Affirmation of unity by ritual/symbol.</u> Do people build relationships upon corporately held interests? How do people employ ritual and symbol as means to affirm group unity and identify?</p> <p>0.6 - Ritual marks membership, group identity 0.8 - Corporate interests played out in ritual 1.0 - Ritual, symbol define boundary, unity</p>
decisions	<p><u>Segmented, personal power decisions.</u> Do individuals or interest groups impose or power decision in spite of opposition of others?</p> <p>0.0 - Personal power overrides decision process 0.2 - Participants maneuver to gain advantage 0.4 - Power of influence directs decision process</p>	<p><u>Group decision by majority or consensus.</u> Are decisions for the group controlled by a majority at least, and by consensus at best?</p> <p>0.6 - Decisions by majority with minority voice 0.8 - Discussion ongoing until members agree 1.0 - Decisions by consensus, binding on all</p>
support	<p><u>Conditional upon satisfaction of interests.</u> To what extent are claims of loyalty and conformity rejected on the basis of the right of the individual to personal freedom? To what extent do individuals give support to leaders conditional upon the satisfaction of their personal interest?</p> <p>0.0 - Support conditional upon obtaining interest 0.2 - Support negotiated, compromising interests 0.4 - Loyalty built upon interest based relationships</p>	<p><u>Obligation of membership.</u> To what extent does authority for leaders, and the collective grow out of reciprocal consensus agreements? If members fail to support or to reciprocate, are group relations damaged? To what extent is support for leaders expected because of membership?</p> <p>0.6 - Loyalty from collective reciprocal agreements 0.8 - Support expected, even of dissenting minority 1.0 - Members obligated to give support, regardless</p>
social links	<p><u>A means to an end.</u> Do people minimize the obligations of social links, and use them only to the extent that they enhance personal goals and interest? Do individuals, belonging to kin, class, and belief collectives, find them of value only to the extent that they sustain personal goals?</p> <p>0.0 - Social links enhance personal goals, interests 0.2 - Useful social links acquire personal meaning 0.4 - Valued social links continue when utility is lost</p>	<p><u>Reinforce community authority (kin, class, etc).</u> What social linkages mark relations to others? Do people cultivate multiplex ties through different forms of overlapping relationship? Do people submit personal interest to valued relationships of kinship, community, and social class?</p> <p>0.6 - Social links mark socially valued relationships 0.8 - Multiplex ties create overlapping relationships 1.0 - Communal ties submerge personal interests</p>

5c) COMMUNITY AUTHORITY: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5)	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Aggregation (Individual interests).	Centralization (hierarchy, norm).	
authority	Aggregate interest clusters.	Hierarchy of power units.	
decisions	Negotiated situationally.	Central unit decisions.	
delegated power	Leaders exercise aggregate power.	Leaders delegate power.	
independent power	Members retain independent power.	Leader exercises power independently.	
allocated power	Power is granted reciprocally.	Members allocate power centrally.	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5)	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Fragmentation (individual dyads).	Coordination (group).	
beliefs	Variant faith/beliefs.	Heritage of common faith/beliefs.	
symbolic unity	Brittle, isolating structure.	Affirmation of unity by ritual/symbol.	
decisions	Segmented, personal power decisions.	Group decisions by majority or consensus.	
support	Conditional upon satisfaction of interests.	Obligation of membership.	
social links	A means to an end.	Reinforce community authority (kin, class, etc.).	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

6a) CONFLICT AND POLITICAL INTERESTS: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
channels	<p><u>Informal channels.</u> What alternatives, other than formal channels, are available to individuals for the settling of disputes? Do people create personalized networks and utilize these to manage interpersonal conflict?</p> <p>0.0 - Only informal channels 0.2 - People use personal networks for disputes 0.4 - People use influence brokers for disputes</p>	<p><u>Formal, institutional channels.</u> To what extent can/do people define institutional channels through which communication must effectively proceed?</p> <p>0.6 - Institutional roles at hand to manage conflict 0.8 - Leaders use formal channels to manage conflict 1.0 - Institutional channels govern the process</p>
outcome	<p><u>Finessing the outcome.</u> To what extent do people rely on stratagem rather than structure to accomplish their objectives?</p> <p>0.0 - Personally finessing the outcome 0.2 - Using one's network to negotiate the outcome 0.4 - Using influential leaders to broker the outcome</p>	<p><u>Powering the outcome.</u> Do people attempt to power the outcome by the use of the institutional structure? Do people turn to courts, judges, supervisors, or other authorities to seek restoration and to achieve a win-lose decision?</p> <p>0.6 - Appealing to formal process, powering outcome 0.8 - Using authorities to power the outcome 1.0 - Institutional structure, all win-lose outcomes</p>
code	<p><u>Sense of the public good.</u> To what extent do people use relationships, "work the network," to subvert the powerful? Are individuals constrained by the aggregate interest of others with whom they compete, or by an uncoded "sense of the public good?"</p> <p>0.0 - Personal good the sole measure of legality 0.2 - Constraint by pressure of network of relations 0.4 - Constraint by shared sense of "public good"</p>	<p><u>Codification of rules.</u> Do people have written or oral codes (custom law) against which legitimacy or relationships and action are measured? Do officials and leaders use customary code to legitimize dominant relationships in the society?</p> <p>0.6 - Customary code guides actors, decision makers 0.8 - Leaders appeal to legal code to support decision 1.0 - Authoritative code defines (un)lawful action</p>
process	<p><u>Personally directed process.</u> To what extent are people limited to only those strategies which individuals can control, such as posturing or negotiation?</p> <p>0.0 - Personally directed process 0.2 - Peer network negotiated process 0.4 - Influential leader guided process</p>	<p><u>Institutional process.</u> Do people settle disputes predominantly by the processes of adjudication or arbitration?</p> <p>0.6 - Known arbitor/mediator directed process 0.8 - Arbitor/mediator employ legal processes 1.0 - Arbitor bound by institutional law, process</p>
time	<p><u>Personal time/agenda.</u> Is the time agenda of dispute settlement usually set by individuals, following their interests, needs, and convenience?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals set time and agenda 0.2 - Time and agenda negotiated among parties 0.4 - Time and agenda guided by influence brokers</p>	<p><u>Institutional time/agenda.</u> To what extent is the time factor in the settling of dispute defined by the institutional context? Do authority figures in the structure place individual cases on the agenda?</p> <p>0.6 - Arbitors/mediators set time 0.8 - Time frames set by code and presiding judges 1.0 - Time/agenda circumscribed by legal code</p>

6b) CONFLICT AND POLITICAL INTERESTS: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
networks	<p><u>Aggregate factions.</u> In the matter of disputes, do the resources become the high priority rather than the relationships? Do individuals easily break a relationship and re-align their interest to another leader and faction? Do disputes focus upon factions around individual leaders? Do these factions have as their objectives specific political or economic gains?</p> <p>0.0 - Resources the priority, alignments re interest 0.2 - Factions advance resource interests of parties 0.4 - Factions and leaders seek political gains</p>	<p><u>Multiplex network of relations.</u> Do decisions settling disputes show a higher priority given to relationships than to resources? Do individuals sustain economic losses in order to support valued relationships within the group? Do people resolve conflict with the objective of sustaining multiplex relations and advancing group interests?</p> <p>0.6 - Preserving relationships has priority 0.8 - Individuals sustain losses for relationship 1.0 - People resolve conflict to sustain multiplex relations and group interests</p>
consensus	<p><u>Independent decision making.</u> To what extent do individuals make decisions independently of others? How commonly are disputes settled by private bargaining?</p> <p>0.0 - Individuals make independent decisions 0.2 - Factions bargain for interests of associates 0.4 - Faction leaders bargain for faction interests</p>	<p><u>Consensus decision making.</u> To what extent does the group demand consensus decision, limiting the authority of individual leaders?</p> <p>0.6 - Leaders resolve conflict to benefit the majority 0.8 - Leaders submit decision to group for approval 1.0 - Leaders bound by consensus will of the group</p>
vulnerability	<p><u>Exposing vulnerability.</u> Is exposing vulnerability accepted as part of the game? Do faction leaders publicly challenge and undermine competitors by exposing their weaknesses and challenging their credibility?</p> <p>0.0 - Exposing vulnerability shows personal strength 0.2 - Undermine competitors by exposing weakness 0.4 - Participants take sides in open conflict</p>	<p><u>Protecting vulnerability.</u> To what extent do the participants carefully safeguard the vulnerability of the litigants? Do people cover their group vulnerability by placing blame on a deviant member of their group?</p> <p>0.6 - Participants safeguard vulnerability of litigants 0.8 - Covering weakness protects individual & group 1.0 - Only deviants expose vulnerability of members</p>
mediation	<p><u>Display of personal power.</u> Is public display and contest part of dispute? Are these contests as win/lose struggles? Do parties withdraw from or delay a confrontation to a time more advantageous? Do parties calculate personal or collective power and use strategy to accomplish their goal?</p> <p>0.0 - Parties display personal power, open conflict 0.2 - Litigants seek to win by strategic confrontation 0.4 - Parties gauge collective power, frame strategy</p>	<p><u>Broker/mediation.</u> What role do mediators play in social disputes? Are plea bargaining and compromise the primary strategies of mediation? Who are the mediators — persons of senior status in the community, of high respect, and articulate?</p> <p>0.6 - Parties engage mediator to broker dispute 0.8 - Plea bargaining, compromise primary strategies 1.0 - Elder(s) of group serve to mediate all conflict</p>
confrontation	<p><u>Open confrontation.</u> Do people value open confrontation in routine social life? Is confrontation valued as the social "fuel" that facilitates dispute resolution? Is confrontation open to all or restricted to equals?</p> <p>0.0 - People value open confrontation in social life 0.2 - Confrontation fuels conflict resolution 0.4 - Confrontation is restricted to equals</p>	<p><u>Confrontation avoidance.</u> Do people work to avoid confrontation in disputes? Does the non-disputing public view confrontation as disruptive and to be avoided? Do individuals value public decorum even under the most aggrieved circumstances?</p> <p>0.6 - People avoid confrontation when possible 0.8 - Confrontation viewed as socially disruptive 1.0 - Public decorum required for most aggrieved</p>

6c) CONFLICT AND POLITICAL INTERESTS: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5) Working the network.	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0) Going through channels.	SCORE
channels	Informal channels.	Formal, institutional channels.	
outcome	Finessing the outcome.	Powering the outcome.	
code	Sense of the public good.	Codification of rules.	
process	Personally directed process.	Institutional process.	
time	Personal time/agenda.	Institutional time/agenda.	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5) Preserving resources.	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0) Preserving relationships.	SCORE
networks	Aggregate factions.	Multiplex network of relations.	
consensus	Independent decision making.	Consensus decision making.	
vulnerability	Exposing vulnerability.	Protecting vulnerability.	
mediation	Display of personal power.	Broker/mediation.	
confrontation	Open confrontation.	Confrontation avoidance.	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

7a) RITUAL: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
spiritual power	<p><u>Unstructured, malevolent/benign.</u> Is power viewed as broadly available and potentially malevolent or benign? Do people see spiritual power as something sought to improve personal or collective life? Do personal spirits take command of one's life?</p> <p>0.0 - Spiritual power (good/bad) pervades all things 0.2 - People can access power for personal welfare 0.4 - Spirits take command of human partners</p>	<p><u>Hierarchical and dangerous.</u> Is power structured as high and low? Are people distant from power deemed "dirty, impure, " and people close "clean, pure?" Are the "high" dangerous, requiring mediation?</p> <p>0.6 - Spiritual power is structured as high and low 0.8 - People classed as clean/pure to dirty/impure 1.0 - High, pure is dangerous, requiring mediation</p>
leaders	<p><u>Commoner leaders of ritual.</u> Are common people free to carry out rituals according to the felt needs of individuals or the group? Are ritual specialists equal with and ordinary economic and social members of the community? Or must they acquire special knowledge?</p> <p>0.0 - Common people carry out rituals 0.2 - Ritual specialists are otherwise ordinary people 0.4 - Ritual specialists must acquire knowledge</p>	<p><u>Hierarchy of ritual specialists.</u> Do ritual specialists have formal roles and responsibilities? Do these leaders serve as brokers of knowledge and ritual for individuals or the group? To what extent do leaders constitute a hierarchy of specialists with access to spiritual power?</p> <p>0.6 - Specialist has formal role and responsibility 0.8 - Leaders serve as brokers of knowledge, ritual 1.0 - A hierarchy of specialists lead public ritual</p>
focus	<p><u>Vision and power.</u> Does ritual mark a personal quest for supernatural vision or power to benefit individuals or a group? To what extent is ritual power used to serve other individuals or groups? Is ritual focused upon public, as well as private, power quests for crops, health, etc.?</p> <p>0.0 - Marks personal quest for vision or power 0.2 - Ritual power is used to serve others 0.4 - Ritual power is focused on public outcomes</p>	<p><u>Social transition.</u> Does the ritual process "mark" social transitions (e.g., birth, marriage), and prepare people for re-entry into new social roles? Does ritual focus on social power and mark public transitions? Does ritual signal transition into higher spiritual power and social status?</p> <p>0.6 - Ritual marks personal life-cycle transitions 0.8 - Ritual marks social power, public transitions 1.0 - Transition into higher spiritual/social status</p>
outcome	<p><u>Curing, restoration.</u> Is the outcome of ritual the simple curing of physical, psychological, or spiritual maladies? Or, the correction of evil causes of illness and restoring persons to health and/or relationships in a group? Or, restoration of human/spirit harmony essential to well-being?</p> <p>0.0 - Simple curing of maladies of all kinds 0.2 - Addressing evil causes of illness 0.4 - Restoration of human/spirit harmony</p>	<p><u>Outcome of atonement, purification.</u> Is the outcome of ritual the atonement for personal or collective sin? Or, purification for personal or collective worship? Or, purification, or restoration of a specialist to a spiritually "pure" role in the social environment?</p> <p>0.6 - Atonement for personal or collective sin 0.8 - Purification for personal or collective worship 1.0 - Purity for a specialist to take leading role</p>
function	<p><u>Punish by curse, sorcery.</u> Do individuals use ritual power to obtain their personal goals in competition with others? Do they seek to punish dangerous rivals by cursing, sorcery? Do they act on their own behalf or on the behalf of others to resolve or mediate danger through the rituals of cursing, or sorcery?</p> <p>0.0 - Achieve personal goals by cursing, sorcery 0.2 - Punish dangerous rivals by cursing, sorcery 0.4 - Mediate danger to self, others through ritual</p>	<p><u>Protect by mediation and reversal.</u> Do they protect persons from supernatural dangers through rituals of sacrifice, exorcism? Do they set apart leaders through rituals of ordination, anointing? Do people relieve the tension inherent in a hierarchical social and spiritual world by rituals of mediation and reversal?</p> <p>0.6 - Protect persons by rituals of sacrifice, exorcism 0.8 - Set apart leaders by ordination, anointing? 1.0 - Relieve tension by rituals of mediation, reversal</p>

7b) RITUAL: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
ideology	<p><u>Ideology and power focus on heroes, success.</u> Do stories tell the exploits, success, and failure of heroes from the past? Do people point to the heroics of past players as a model for their hope for success? Is power located in persons and private ritual and symbol?</p> <p>0.0 - Stories tell exploits of heroes, success 0.2 - Heroics of past set models for present 0.4 - Power focus in rituals, symbols of success</p>	<p><u>Ideology and power focus on group.</u> Do the stories reflect group identity, interests, conflicts with outsiders, and control over errant individual behavior? Are the morals of the stories recited to members? Is power located in group-focused ritual and symbols?</p> <p>0.6 - Stories reflect group identity, interests, control 0.8 - Morality of past sets standards for present 1.0 - Power located in group-focused ritual, symbol</p>
experience	<p><u>Ecstatic individual experience.</u> Do individuals engage in private or public quest for personal power or ecstatic experience? Do people define private symbols, rituals, and acts of worship? Are fasting and rituals of denial part of a personal spiritual quest?</p> <p>0.0 - Personal quest for power, ecstatic experience 0.2 - Private symbols, rituals, worship 0.4 - Fasting, self-denial part of spiritual quest</p>	<p><u>Collective consecration re gods or ancestors.</u> Is fasting and prayer a group activity to seek direction from God, gods, or ancestors? Do members engage in group rituals which focus on ancestral origins and group identity? Do they engage in rituals of consecration, worship to gods, ancestors?</p> <p>0.6 - Fasting, prayer a group activity for direction 0.8 - Group rituals of ancestral origin, identity 1.0 - Group consecration/worship to gods, ancestors</p>
knowledge	<p><u>Personal knowledge and competitive ambivalence.</u> Do individuals control ritual and its knowledge, using it for personal ends, often at odds with the interests of others? Does the ambivalence about knowledge lead to both optimism and fatalism?</p> <p>0.0 - Individually controlled knowledge 0.2 - Ambivalence leads to optimism and fatalism 0.4 - Knowledge that "works" attracts a following</p>	<p><u>Divination provides authoritative knowledge for group.</u> Do people share a history which defines them? Are gods, ancestors authoritative sources of knowledge? Do rituals of divination, or some other "approved" methodology provide authoritative knowledge for a group?</p> <p>0.6 - Members share core of historical knowledge 0.8 - Gods, ancestors – sources of group knowledge 1.0 - Divination yields authoritative knowledge</p>
identity	<p><u>Symbol and ritual serve the individual performers only.</u> Do people define their relationship with the supernatural by private symbols and means (fetish, rite, etc.) to serve their personal lives? Do they use offerings to bargain for blessing on their family and enterprises? When they are successful, do their powerful symbols attract a wider following?</p> <p>0.0 - Private identity, private symbols 0.2 - Personal offerings as bargain for blessing 0.4 - Powerful symbols, rituals attract following</p>	<p><u>Symbol, ritual and sacrifice serve as covenant for a group.</u> Do people pray for blessing and give offerings as duty to ancestral deities? Are sacrifices required to stay the wrath of gods, or ancestors for sins committed by the members of the group? Do people define symbols of collective covenant identity with god or ancestors?</p> <p>0.6 - Pray for blessing, offerings as duty to deities 0.8 - Sacrifices to stay wrath for members sins 1.0 - Symbols of collective covenant identity</p>
response	<p><u>Responses framed as personal or collective celebration.</u> Do people emphasize celebration for personal fortune? Worship to deity for blessings? Fellowship with others in their celebration of good fortune and worship?</p> <p>0.0 - Response celebration for personal fortune 0.2 - Response of worship to deity for blessing 0.4 - Response of fellowship in celebration, worship</p>	<p><u>Responses framed as confession, sanction, restoration.</u> Do people expect moral duty and responsibility among peers? Do they demand confession for sin or deviance from group norm? Are deviants subjected to public ordeals to determine guilt or innocence? Is restoration a group action?</p> <p>0.6 - Response of moral duty, responsibility 0.8 - Response of confession for sin, deviance 1.0 - Response of ordeals, penitance, restoration</p>

7c) RITUAL: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5)	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Rites for personal power.	Rites for control (purity, passage).	
spiritual power	Unstructured, malevolent/ benign.	Hierarchical and dangerous.	
leaders	Commoner leaders of ritual.	Hierarchy of ritual specialists.	
focus	Vision and power.	Social transition.	
outcome	Curing, restoration.	Atoneent, purification.	
function	Punish by curse, sorcery.	Protect by mediation and reversal.	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5)	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Success ideology and ecstasy.	Group ideology and control.	
ideology	Ideology and power focus on heroes, success.	Ideology and power focus on group.	
experience	Ecstatic individual experience.	Group consecration <i>re</i> gods or ancestors.	
knowledge	Personal knowledge and competitive ambivalence.	Divination provides authoritative knowledge for group.	
identity	Symbol and ritual serve the individual performers only.	Symbol, ritual and sacrifice serve as covenant for group.	
response	Responses framed as personal or collective celebration.	Responses framed as confession, sanction, restoration.	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

8a) COSMOLOGY: Research Questions for Grid

ISSUE	LOW GRID	HIGH GRID
boundaries	<p><u>Supernatural accessible and benign.</u> Is the spirit world open to manipulation and potentially beneficial to humans? Is relationship with the spirits something that one can negotiate and access by human effort? To what extent is the power of spirits ambivalent, potentially harmful?</p> <p>0.0 - Spirit world accessible to humans, benign 0.2 - Human/spirit alliances negotiable, beneficial 0.4 – Spirits’ power ambivalent, potentially harmful</p>	<p><u>Boundaries separate God(gods), spirits, humans.</u> Do people make sharp distinctions between god(s), spirits, and the human world? Is the social world of people similarly graded <i>re</i> spiritual power? Is it dangerous or impossible to cross the boundaries?</p> <p>0.6 - Sharp distinctions--gods, spirits, humans 0.8 - Social world also graded <i>re</i> spiritual power 1.0 - Crossing boundaries dangerous, death</p>
male vs. female roles	<p><u>Ambivalence.</u> Are the life roles and identities of men and women negotiable and flexible, so that they may sometimes do the same task or exchange tasks? Are there circumstances where a woman may lead men? Or are some roles restricted to one sex or another?</p> <p>0.0 - Flexible, negotiable male/female roles 0.2 - Most roles, including leadership, open to women 0.4 - Some tasks are restricted by gender roles</p>	<p><u>Strong boundaries.</u> Do people restrict most tasks by gender role assignments? Are certain tasks prohibited to either men or women? Are the life roles and identities of men and women sharply defined and symbolically and socially separate?</p> <p>0.6 - Most tasks are restricted by gender roles 0.8 - Certain tasks are prohibited to men or women 1.0 - Male/female identities symbolically and socially separate</p>
transactions	<p><u>Material, and benign or unpredictable.</u> Are social exchanges between people primarily material, and interest focused? Are exchanges conducted on the basis of personal relationship in which value, trust and credit are negotiated? Do differential exchanges of power and influence create social distance?</p> <p>0.0 - Transactions are material, individual, open 0.2 - Value, trust, credit are negotiated 0.4 - Social distance created by differential exchanges of power, influence</p>	<p><u>Symbolic, and dangerous.</u> Do high/low exchanges cross socially defined boundaries? Are such exchanges governed by customary rules of reciprocity and are thus predictable? Are such exchanges deemed dangerous, threatening to the social order, and therefore of symbolic significance?</p> <p>0.6 - High/low exchanges cross social boundaries 0.8 - Transactions governed by rules of reciprocity 1.0 - Transactions bounded, symbolic, dangerous</p>
structure	<p><u>Cosmos unstructured.</u> Do people feel free to speak to persons regardless of title or position without formality or perceived difference? Are children free to approach parents or other adults? Is respect based primarily upon reputation and relationship, without emphasis on symbolic identity?</p> <p>0.0 - Persons structure their daily world 0.2 - People negotiate relationships, space, order 0.4 - Structures of age, reputation, power hold sway</p>	<p><u>Cosmos structured by sacred/profane.</u> Do people create symbols of power and authority? Do people single out places and people that are holy, and to which everyone should give deference and respect? Are the social, natural, and supernatural worlds defined in terms of sacred and profane?</p> <p>0.6 - People create symbols of power, authority 0.8 - Deference, respect granted to people and places 1.0 - Cosmos structured by sacred/profane</p>
moral standards	<p><u>Ambivalent, negotiable.</u> To what extent are social standards open to negotiation? Are people ready to defend their character and integrity even though others may have caught them in wrong doing? Are standards for social behavior a matter of personal conscience rather than rule or group expectation?</p> <p>0.0 - Standards are personal, negotiable 0.2 - Personal conscience subject to peer feedback 0.4 - Public accord <i>re</i> character, integrity</p>	<p><u>Violation viewed as sin, guilt, pollution.</u> Are social standards shared, not negotiable, and violation is morally wrong? Do people expect discipline and punishment for violation? Do people have a sense of loss and guilt when they break the standard? What is needed for a people to restore purity in their daily life?</p> <p>0.6 - Standards are shared, violation breaks norm 0.8 - People expect discipline & punishment of wrong 1.0 - Violation produces sin, guilt, pollution</p>

8b) COSMOLOGY: Research Questions for Group

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP	STRONG GROUP
supernatural	<p><u>Impersonal forces.</u> To what extent is God or the supernatural defined as distant, transcendent? Is supernatural power largely impersonal, and capriciousness for human welfare? Do people look to spirits and heroic human figures for power and spiritual direction?</p> <p>0.0 - Supernatural distant, transcendent 0.2 - Power impersonal, capricious 0.4 - Spirits, heroes provide power, direction</p>	<p><u>Power and authority of ancestors.</u> To what extent is their spiritual identity tied to heroes of the faith, founding fathers, ancestors? Do people revere, venerate, and honor ancestors or historical figures? What authority do these ancestors, heroes, dead fathers have? In what ways are these people remembered, honored, consulted?</p> <p>0.6 - Identity tied to founding fathers, ancestors 0.8 - Veneration of ancestors, historical figures 1.0 - Ancestors authoritative for life in present</p>
categories	<p><u>Categories focus on self.</u> Is the individual quest for spirituality, access to higher power, highly valued – more so than a corporate faith? Is personal power and spiritual fulfillment the essence of faith? Do people share common experiences and categories of spiritual fulfillment?</p> <p>0.0 - Categories of self, others, spiritual power 0.2 - Personal power and meaning the spiritual goal 0.4 - Share mutual categories of spiritual fulfillment</p>	<p><u>Categories focus on dualism between inside/outside, good/evil.</u> Do people have a strong sense of collective identity, based upon the traditions of the “fathers” and the approval of God? Are outsiders suspect, and even evil? Do people define themselves by symbols, rituals, or statements of faith?</p> <p>0.6 - Strong collective identity, traditions of fathers 0.8 - Outsiders suspect, evil 1.0 - Identity upheld by symbols, rituals, doctrine</p>
emphasis	<p><u>Incipient millennialism, revival.</u> Do people focus on renewal in relation to God(or the gods) for each individual in society? Is achieving one’s fullest potential part of the goal of life? Is progress essential? Do people develop common accord re the pathway to renewal & revival?</p> <p>0.0 - Emphasis on renewal of spiritual power 0.2 - People seek to progress in power, spirituality 0.4 - Common accord re pathway to renewal</p>	<p><u>Emphasis on control, conformity.</u> Do people control their personal and collective lives? Does the group discipline its membership and exclude those who violate its rules? Is conformity essential to the daily well being of the social group?</p> <p>0.6 - Emphasis on personal and collective control 0.8 - Group disciplines members, excludes deviants 1.0 - Conformity essential to group welfare</p>
symbols	<p><u>Weak symbols.</u> Is symbolic behavior relatively absent in daily and ceremonial life? Do individuals have the freedom to define symbols in their own terms and according to their own interests? Do people share in symbols that reflect mutual interests?</p> <p>0.0 - Symbols absent from routines of life 0.2 - Individuals create personal symbols as desired 0.4 - People share in symbols of mutual interest</p>	<p><u>Powerful, efficacious symbols.</u> Do people refer to symbols and mark appropriate behavior in relationship to them. Are symbols crucial to the daily life of people, reinforced in a ceremonial calendar? Do people employ symbols to mark collective identity, and enhance power for social life?</p> <p>0.6 - People link symbols and right behavior 0.8 - Symbols crucial to daily life and calendar 1.0 - Symbols mark identity, confer power for life</p>
participation	<p><u>Personal ritual, religion.</u> Is religion a personal matter, in which individuals set their own worship, prayer, or other practical agendas? Is religion limited to the goals and activities of individual families, friends? What variability is tolerated in collective religious commitment and expression?</p> <p>0.0 - Ritual, religion strictly personal 0.2 - Ritual, religion shared with family or friends 0.4 - Collective religious life is open, variable</p>	<p><u>Collective ritual, religion.</u> To what extent is religion a collective action and consensus belief? What specific rituals do the participants emphasize as critical to group membership and identity? High commitment to participation and unity of doctrine and practice distinguishes members from non-members?</p> <p>0.6 - Ritual, religion involves mutual belief, action 0.8 - Performance of ritual marks group membership 1.0 - Unity of doctrine and practice required</p>

8c) COSMOLOGY: Analysis

ISSUE	LOW GRID (0.0-0.5)	HIGH GRID (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Unstructured ambivalence.	Boundary and opposition.	
boundaries	Supernatural accessible and benign.	Boundaries separate God (gods), spirits, humans.	
male vs. female roles	Ambivalence.	Strong boundaries.	
transactions	Material, and benign or unpredictable.	Symbolic, and dangerous.	
structure	Cosmos unstructured.	Cosmos structured by sacred/profane.	
moral standards	STANDARDS negotiable, ambivalent.	Violation viewed as pollution, sin.	

AVERAGE OF GRID VARIABLES _____

ISSUE	WEAK GROUP (0.0-0.5)	STRONG GROUP (0.5-1.0)	SCORE
	Success cosmology and personal power.	Group cosmology and group power.	
supernatural	Impersonal forces.	Power and authority of ancestors.	
categories	Categories focus on self.	Categories focus on dualism between inside/outside, good/evil.	
emphasis	Incipient millennialism, revival.	Emphasis on control, conformity.	
symbols	Weak symbols.	Powerful, efficacious symbols.	
participation	Personal ritual, religion.	Collective ritual, religion.	

AVERAGE OF GROUP VARIABLES _____

References

Lingenfelter, Sherwood G. 1996. Grid/Group – Diagnostic Criteria. Handout distributed at Culture Change Workshop, 8-30 July 1996, at Nasuli, Malaybalay, Bukidnon, Philippines.

area of culture	group	grid
property		
labor		
exchange		
dom. auth.		
comm. auth.		
conflict resolution		
ritual		
cosmology		
OVERALL		

