

Marienthal: The Sociography of an Unemployed Community, by Mari Jahoda, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and Hans Zeisel, translated from the 1933 German version by the authors with John Reginald and Thomas Elaesser (Chicago, Aldine-Atherton, 1971), xvi, 128 pages, US\$5.95 cloth.

MARY R. HOLLNSTEINER

September 15, 1972

When one finds a small book on an unemployed community authored by three giants of sociology — Jahoda, Lazarsfeld, and Zeisel — he knows that it certainly merits scanning, and probably a complete reading as well. The decision to read is well-rewarded for two reasons.

First, *Marienthal* gives us insights into the meaning of unemployment and therefore poverty, in an Austrian factory village far removed from us in time and space, and yet in many ways similar to present-day poor communities in its responses to deprivation. Second, the book puts the researcher in community organization through a humbling experience. The flood of literature on community poverty in the past decade has led us to believe that research in this area represents a recent scholarly interest. *Marienthal* therefore comes as a mild shock. For this careful investigation of the effects of unemployment on one community was undertaken fully 40 years ago! We are not pioneers after all. The result is an increased respect on our part for the contributions of our prewar predecessors and a broader comprehension of the long-term development of empirical research and theory-building in the sociology of community poverty.

First published in German in 1933, *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal* was undertaken by a University of Vienna group interested in the application of psychology to social and economic problems. Their focus was an industrial community in the Steinfeld district of Austria, near Vienna. At the time of the fieldwork, begun late in 1931 and extended through the first half of 1932 (Lazarsfeld unaccountably gives 1930 as the time of the study in his 1971 introduction despite contradictory statements in the original text; cf. pages vii and 9, respectively),

Marienthal was already deep in the throes of the great depression gripping most of the world. The textile factory which had been the village's life blood had phased out its various plants in 1929–30, leaving unemployed 367 out of 478 households. Although three out of four families qualified for government unemployment relief, the financial benefits were minimal and often of temporary duration. Setting aside the few still working or receiving pensions, the rest had to manage somehow without even this meager form of welfare aid.

The authors were interested in immediate and long-range attitudes toward unemployment and the behavior associated with it. Their methodology included objective observations, family case studies, written records and reports, historical accounts, questionnaires, interviews, and unobtrusive measures. Insisting that "none of our researchers should be in *Marienthal* as a mere reporter or outside observer," the authors created projects that would be useful to the community and installed themselves and their assistants as staff members. These projects included used-clothing distribution, political involvement, a pattern-design course, medical treatment, a gymnastics course, and a parent guidance program. The interesting narrative reporting of the resulting data is punctuated by the admirably simple and lucid tabular presentations we have come to associate with Zeisel's work.

While there is no doubt that this kind of participant-observation did indeed enable the researchers to get to know the people better and to study their behavior in natural settings, one wonders what effect this strategy had on the validity of data provided them by the respondents. Nonetheless, taken in the context of the times, when social scientists generally contented themselves with the gathering of statistical data, the research team's actual immersion in the community did bring about a deeper understanding of the meaning of unemployment. Certainly, this conviction of the need for a total view was a forerunner to many of the postwar in-depth studies appearing in the literature.

The effects of unemployment are examined through various indicators. The fortnightly payment of unemployment relief determined not

construction, and when and how it was re-modeled. In some cases such information is given. With respect to architecture, one wishes that the book were more informative and analytical on the ordering of space and light, the structural composition, the method of construction, and, if possible, the history of the design. Such data might help in justifying conclusions that the author draws, for example, on Muslim influence in the churches of the Santo Niño, Carcar, and Naga in Cebu and of Malate in Manila. The author suggests that Muslim influence in the aforementioned Cebu churches is due to the proximity of Mindanao and Sulu. In the case of Malate, trefoil arches and niches, twisted columns and other features are seized upon as evidence of Muslim influence.

More historical and technical data would have been helpful in relating colonial churches to the broader reality of Filipino culture. But was the author interested at all in such a relation? To insist on identifying and presenting the colonial churches as Spanish churches is to further alienate by reason of national origin what are already alienated by reason of age.

The book is commendable for its abundance of photographs, the extent of its coverage — rather broad, though still incomplete for a book whose title claims nationwide scope — and the author's enthusiasm for the subject matter. Such enthusiasm should, and perhaps could, have been matched by the persevering curiosity and professional thoroughness of scholarship and by an outlook more sympathetic to Filipino culture.

Reference

- Legarda, Benito, Jr.
1960 Colonial churches of Ilocos. *Philippine Studies* 8(1): 121-58.

Forthcoming in PSR

POPULATION ISSUE

Volume 21 Number 2

April 1973

Cultural Anthropology: Its Dimensions, Its Applications, by Mario D. Zamora (Manila, MCS Enterprises, 1972), 120 pages, ₱7.90.

FRANK LYNCH

December 5, 1972

This collection of articles and addresses, most of them published previously, is not what its main title, *Cultural anthropology*, might lead one to believe it is. Far from offering, or even promising, a coverage of that subdiscipline, this thin volume is rather nine papers by Dr. Mario Zamora, one of the Philippines' better known cultural anthropologists.

After 11 pages of front matter, we find an outline of anthropology (pages 1-13), two papers based on Dr. Zamora's 1957-58 study of the *panchayat*, or Indian village council (pages 15-22 and 32-39), and a comparison of Redfield's *Chan Kom* and Embree's *Suye Mura* (pages 23-31). Five additional papers on disparate subjects (educational anthropology, anthropology and diplomacy, the United Nations, the Barrio Charter, and "forest anthropology") fill pages 41-108. Two appendixes follow: the first (pages 109-111) lists questions for a review of the text contents; the second (pages 112-114) is a beginner's reading list in anthropology. A detailed curriculum vitae of the author and an index close the volume (pages 115-20).

A major problem with the collection is its outdatedness: the median first-publication date of the nine papers is 1966, and the median latest bibliographic entry, 1965. Indeed, if the author did not cite his own previous publications as often as he does, one might think that the printing and distribution of writings on Philippine and world anthropology had ceased five years before Dr. Zamora wrote the "Introduction to this volume (it is dated January 1, 1972).

A case can be made, of course, for the publication of dated papers, but such materials must be classics of a sort, possessed of an intrinsic significance that will not be lost with the passage of time. By this norm the durability of the present collection is not that clear to me.

only the level of living of the affected households but also the whole rhythm of the community. Family menus and school lunchboxes were more plentiful and nutritious immediately after payday. Consumption patterns shifted significantly as more and more belt tightening became mandatory. The result was what the authors term a "weary" community. Weeds took over the public park. The nursery school organized by the workers closed down. Library usage and newspaper reading declined, as did membership in political party activities and other associations not offering direct financial advantages. Family morale deteriorated, running the gamut of despair to moderate optimism. Time lost its value, especially for the men now forced to lead unaccustomed lives of idleness. A "fading resilience" is the phrase used by the authors to convey the mood of the community.

The book concludes with an afterword on the history of sociography. The authors saw it as "an effort to trace the spiritual and methodological ancestors of Marienthal, so that our study could be seen in historical context" (p. 99). It was the first attempt to survey the developments of the last three centuries. Like the main text the authors have left it unchanged except for footnotes on developments not recognized 40 years earlier. In itself this appendix should prove useful to sociologists interested in the history of empirical research.

Assessing the 1971 edition of *Marienthal* poses a problem. Should one evaluate it in the context of the 1930s? In retrospect, the book was clearly an important contribution to research methodology and the then scarce literature on community poverty. Or should one see Marienthal primarily in the setting of the 70s, ranged alongside similar empirical studies? If so, it would have to admit to being overshadowed by other reports derived from far more sophisticated techniques and theoretical frameworks — many of them developed by Jahoda, Lazarsfeld and Zeisel themselves in the interim period!

A third alternative for assessing the 1971 *Marienthal* stems from Lazarsfeld's own account as to why he finally authorized a translation after years of resistance:

The combination of quantification and interpretative

analysis of qualitative material is today in the forefront of the research fraternity's interest. It is therefore worthwhile to trace the origin of our position in more detail. The history of our research procedure will help to explicate the characteristics of our specific position . . . it is no coincidence that the original book had a historical appendix. In a way the following remarks can be considered as extending it by treating our own work as an episode in the history of empirical social research (p. xii).

This perspective asks that the book be taken for what it is — a monograph originally written in 1931–32 but republished for the non-German-speaking sociological world in 1971, mainly for its historical interest with respect to research methodology. The authors acknowledge its methodological naivete and the neglect of standards which they later insisted upon in their teaching. Honoring the authors' explanation, one would judge the book's current value not so much in terms of its substantive information on poverty, but as an early model of the desirability of combining the quantitative and qualitative interpretation of data. Their leaving the original text unchanged despite its occasional weaknesses gives further evidence of their sincerity. Clearly their aim is to trace the development of empirical research using *Marienthal* as a case in point. Rewriting the report might update its substance; but it would also defeat the main reason for republication. Without invoking a false modesty, Jahoda, Lazarsfeld, and Zeisel imply, quite correctly, that to understand their early efforts at forging new approaches is equivalently to understand in general the progress of sociological research.

Causal Models in the Social Sciences, edited by Hubert M. Blalock, Jr. (Chicago, Aldine-Atherton, 1971), xi, 515 pages, US\$15.00 cloth, US\$9.75 paperback.

SUSAN M. BENNETT

November 24, 1972

This volume was designed as a sourcebook on the main developments in the use of causal