

A WHITE PAPER

Theory Development and Historical Antecedents in the Field of Generational Family Matrix Research

Carl Edwin Lindgren, DEd, FCP (London), FRAI, FRSA
LaWanna Lease Blount, PhD, FCoIT

ABSTRACT

Genealogy as a field of study has made great progress in recent years in its educational programs and its research which is due to its strong and committed leadership. This paper calls for the development of theory and research to undergird the field of genealogy as a scientific study in higher education. The article also calls for the inclusion of historical antecedents of medieval heraldry and chivalry in the programs of study as they were the progenitors of genealogy. Finally the phrases, "Generational Family Matrix Research" and "Genealogical Funnel Principle" are introduced as concepts in 21st Century research methodology.

KEY WORDS: genealogy, heraldry, family matrix, generational, theory, genealogists, kinship, GFMD, generational family matrix development, anthropology, sociology, humankind, genealogical funnel principle

Introduction

Without a doubt, genealogical research has made great progress, both in its professional practice and teachings through its strong and committed leadership.¹ These strong commitments and the scholarly work of genealogists has been the engine of acceptance. Now genealogical research is being received as a legitimate field of study in post-secondary education and has prompted many to become professional genealogists.² In reflection, genealogy courses are no longer relegated to the hobby curriculum in continuing education class divisions at community colleges.

Genealogy with its own unique underlying theoretical perspectives, including Carolyn Billingsley's kinship theory³ takes its place with courses in topical areas of studies. This includes

¹ LaWanna Lease Blount, *Why I Became a Professional Genealogist: A Case Study [of 91 Professional Genealogists]* (Bloomington: iUniverse, 2009), pp. 74-76.

² *Ibid*; Donn Devine, "Defining Professionalism," in Elizabeth Shown Mills (ed.), *Professional Genealogy: A Manual for Researchers, Writers, Editors, Lecturers, and Librarians* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 2001), 12. Devine notes: "For success, the professional genealogist is expected to exhibit the characteristics of any professional. In sum: a mastery of a body of knowledge, expertise in applying it, a reasonable degree of business acumen, a commitment to intellectual growth, conformity to accepted conventions, observance of peer enforced standards of work and conduct, membership in professional organizations and pursuit of the professional credentials that represent the field."

³ Carolyn Earle Billingsley, *Communities of Kinship: Antebellum Families and the Settlement of the Cotton Frontier* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004). Billingsley developed a **theoretical framework** on the Keese kin family and their power in religion, economics, propinquity and settlement patterns. Note Sandra Bamford & James Leach (eds.), *Kinship and Beyond: The Genealogical Model Reconsidered* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2009). "The logic of genealogical tracing and the logic of kin-term productions" are discussed in Dwight W. Read, "Kinship Theory: A Paradigm Shift," *Ethnology* Vol 46, No. 4 (Fall, 2007), 329-364. As noted, Billingsley devised a FRAMEWORK, not a full blown theory. Some of the best

courses and programs at the certificate and diploma level, as well as in Bachelor and Master degree programs.

However, programs and courses in genealogy in higher education must be undergirded with theoretical substructures for this is what makes genealogy a credible scientific field of study. As research develops from theory, it will provide growth and expansion⁴ to the genealogical arena. We must start to work on more theory development in our studies in genealogy.

Secondly, there is an urgent need to include in our curricula in higher education historical background and antecedents. We need courses in heraldry and chivalry, as they are rooted in the historical foundations of our ancestors. We must remember that in the medieval times most people could not read nor write.⁵ The use of symbols and devices on shields, flags and institutions depicting the lineage of families and marital alliances were used to communicate to people the family pedigrees and lineage in addition to the number and the gender of children.

Purpose of the Paper

In this paper, the writers introduce the emergent concepts of the Genealogical Funnel Principle and Generational Family Matrix Development. These terms provide insight into potential expansion of genealogical studies in the 21st Century. The concepts are introduced, not as an alternative to current genealogical research, but rather as a potential enhancement and companion to current studies.

The authors of this article have also long been concerned that the notable antecedents of genealogy, which are the heraldic and chivalric substructures, occurring within the middle ages and later, have been sadly plundered from American genealogical curriculums, at all levels and in many publications. One has only to review seminars on pedigree studies to reveal a lack of any attention to these past precedents. In the writers' opinion, it is difficult to remove the study of genealogy from its ancestral academic roots. The granting and blazoning of arms, rules relating to protocol (as conducted by the herald or officer of arms) as well as nobility scholarship are in many cases, part of the disciplines of family history, genealogy and kinship. The science and art of armorial bearings have their foundation in the structure, organization and functioning of past society. The works and opinions of the 16th century social philosopher Thomas Hobbes⁶ describe and define the erosion of this social foundation. Hobbes possessed a view of absolute sovereign and levels of societal interaction. According to him, "[d]uring the early seventeenth century these authoritarian attitudes were having to compete with what can only be described, for lack of a better word, as the concept of individualism. . . . The ideal society in which every man has his place and stays in it was breaking down."⁷ Credit is given to Hobbes for identifying the basic question underlining sociological theory: "How and why is society possible?" or, "the

works of the 1800s on cultural anthropological kinship appear in the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* which is available at the library of the RAI - <http://www.therai.org.uk/anthropology-library/anthropology-library/> : accessed 15 April 2012.

⁴ D. H. Liles, Mary E. Johnson, Laura M. Meade and D. Ryan Underdown, "Enterprise Engineering: A Discipline" *Enterprise Engineering IE880I*, [Online]. Available: (<http://webs.twsu.edu/enteng/enteng1.html>) : accessed 28 October 2010), n.p.

⁵ "For in medieval times things were taught in such a way that only a few men had a chance of knowing how to read, write or cipher." *The Electrician*, Vol. 4 (November 9, 1900), 81.

⁶ Note Aaron Rosenberg, *Thomas Hobbes: An English Philosopher in the Age of Reason* (The Rosen Publishing Co., 2006).

⁷ Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of Aristocracy – 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 35; Laurie M. Bagby, *Thomas Hobbes: Turning Point for Honor* (Lexington Books, 2009), p. 55.

problem of order and how patterns of social structure develop.⁸ During the latter half of the 18th century with the advent of the Revolutionary War, many individuals living in the colonies epitomized Hobbes' earlier concerns in that they desired class and social equality and the removal of all class strata, including nobility, royalty and armorial bearings or heraldic status. As a democracy,⁹ citizens of the United States have throughout the 19th and 20th centuries retained their aversion to things that potentially questioned their egalitarianism while at the same time retaining their inquisitiveness of the British monarchy and European nobility.

Additionally, this paper reviews the six basic requirements of a discipline in higher education as set out by scientists Liles, Johnson, Meade and Underdown and point to the overwhelming need for more scrutiny based on scientific theory building in the field of genealogy, in order to expand and develop this field's growth as a sub-discipline of chronological research. As noted, this includes emphasis on genealogy's antecedents.¹⁰ With theory development and more practical expansion at the historical nexus of genealogy it may evolve in the future into a full discipline in higher education. The writers then offer some suggestions for genealogical research and theory building including the fundamental basics of what is termed "Grounded Theory,"¹¹ as appropriate for a generic qualitative approach to the topic. Glaser believes that

all research is "grounded" in data, but few studies produce a "grounded theory."
Grounded Theory is an inductive methodology. Although many call Grounded Theory a qualitative method, it is not. It is a general method. It is the systematic generation of theory from systematic research.¹²

Borgatti further states that "grounded theory" refers to theory that is developed inductively from a corpus of data.¹³

The Funnel Principle, A Potential Future to Genealogical Research

⁸ Jonathan Turner, *The Structure of Sociological Theory* (Dorsey Press, 1982), pp. 138 & 151. Relating to the problem of order, note Dennis Hume Wrong, *The Problem of Order: What Unites and Divides Society* (Simon and Schuster, 1994).

⁹ "The United States is, indeed, a republic, not a democracy. Accurately defined, a democracy is a form of government in which the people decide policy matters directly--through town hall meetings or by voting on ballot initiatives and referendums. A republic, on the other hand, is a system in which the people choose representatives who, in turn, make policy decisions on their behalf. The Framers of the Constitution were altogether fearful of pure democracy. Everything they read and studied taught them that pure democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths." This Nation.com: American Government and Politics Online [Online]. Available: <http://www.thisnation.com/question/011.html> Note James Madison, "The Same Subject Continued: The Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection From the New York Packet." *Federalist No. 10* (Friday, November 23, 1787).

¹⁰ Carl Edwin Lindgren and LaWanna L. Blount, "What Every Genealogist Should Know About Heraldry." [unpublished manuscript]

¹¹ Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strass, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory Strategies for Qualitative Research* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co, 1967).

¹² Barney Glaser, Grounded Theory Institute. "What is Grounded Theory" [Online]. Available: <http://www.groundedtheory.com/what-is-gt.aspx>

¹³ Steve Borgatti, "Introduction to Grounded Theory" [Online]. Available: <http://www.analytictech.com/mb870/introtoGT.htm>

What we have learned in sociology and anthropology is that everyone is different, every family is different and each society (societal unit) is different. Anthropologists draw conclusions about certain behaviors in a society and develop a theory accordingly.

However, the writers believe that anthropologists and now professional genealogists should consider approaching the issue from humankind down to the individual rather than the individual or society upward, in order to create a broad construct or remark about civilization. An example would be that everyone is different, but everyone is the same. How can both be true? With the use of computers, statistic programs and genetics, scientists should look for underlying constructs or sub-structures that are the same in all societies and all individuals. They could then build on this research paradigm.

Do all people strive for happiness, yes or no? If true or false, show it based on a humankind matrix, NOT a sample of only one family or social group leading to a general theory. Do all people wish to be free? Some people may wish to be controlled, if this means security. If this is the case, perhaps the closest an anthropologist could get to the underlying sub-structure would be statistical, based on the majority of the sample. When one derives a construct based on humankind, not a societal structure (one unit), they can then go back to an earlier time (meta-generational retrogression), based on historical and genealogical norms that can be proven through documentation and earlier behavior of society, not individuals, to create a model of what behavior norms have been constant through time. Through this scientific construct of showing how ALL mankind has certain traits, behaviors and norms, individuals will be more attuned to their place and connection in humankind evolution.

As our paper will note, there are unified relationships found in groupings of people that until only recently were seen as non-existent, but due to the advent of scientific research in DNA, have been proven systematically. This has been pointed out by Henry Louis oSkipö Gates, Jr.,¹⁴ Alphonse Fletcher University of Harvard Professor. Also we are finding that sociologists and anthropologists, in their studies of families, point to theories where many peoples can be described as genetically related or kinsmen.

Thus we believe that our beginning work in the development of generational family matrix research should originate with types of humankind found to have similar characteristics as seen by anthropologists. These should be large groups of humankind, which in turn is researched by large groups of scientists (anthropologists, sociologists and now genealogists working in union. The researchers should focus on family historical lineage work and its generational family matrix relationships with clusters of other related family lineages. In effect, we should consider starting our research at both ends and moving toward a center. Today, for the first time in history, we have this technology. Individual scholars can continue their relevant research from the individual, extended family and societal groupings, while working in union with other scientists to map humankind events, both past and future. The project is daunting as researchers must start back over 195,000 years ago with the advent of the human race and the first **Mitochondrial Eve**.¹⁵ As

¹⁴ Note the excellent work by Marylou Morano Kjelle, *Henry Louis Gates, Jr.* (Infobase Publishing, 2003).

¹⁵ Note "Female and Mitochondrial Ancestry," *Wikipedia* [Online]. Available: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mitochondrial_Eve "One of the misconceptions of mitochondrial Eve is that since all women alive today descended in a direct unbroken female line from her that she was the only woman alive at the time. Nuclear DNA studies indicate that the size of the ancient human population never dropped below tens of thousands. Other women alive at Eve's time have descendants alive today, but sometime in the past, each of their lines of descent included at least one male, thereby breaking the mitochondrial DNA lines of descent. By contrast, Eve's lines of descent to each person alive today include precisely one purely matrilineal line." This research was originally taken from N. Takahata, (January 1993), "Allelic genealogy and human evolution, *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 10 (1): 2622. Dr. Takahata is professor at the National Institute of Genetics, Graduate University for Advanced Studies, Mishima, Japan.

noted, the writers do not advocate that these researchers abandon the methodology of genealogical research in proving genealogical lineages, but expand their scholarly endeavours.

Generational Family Matrix Development (GFMD)

What is GFMD and what relationship does it have to genealogical research? Actually, the term denotes the full ramification of genealogy with its antecedents within the social and human sciences. The term symbolizes an effort to integrate anthropological theory, historical scholarship and biochemical research with genealogical studies in an attempt to formulate an encompassing theoretical framework. Elizabeth Shown Mills was one of the first genealogists to utilize the term "generational history,"¹⁶ in her article "Genealogy in the Information Age: History's New Frontier." Mills notes that generational history is "an interdisciplinary study of the development of individual families across generations – analyzing the dynamics of ethnicity, intermarriage, status, and migration in economic, legal, and social contexts . . ."¹⁷ She states:

Genealogical scholarship—more appropriately called generational history—is by nature finely analytical. Other branches of history interpret through synthesis and generalization, so that errors in detail rarely affect overall conclusions. Generational history, on the other hand, requires almost scientific precision. Every research step is one link in a descriptive chain that, like twists of DNA, ultimately establishes identity. Invariably, that chain is riddled with broken links—between individuals and within each life. . . . Moreover, the continuum of generational history holds no tolerance for errors, because mistakes in one generation multiply with each new generation.¹⁸

If one is to utilize this concept, i.e., "of or relating to a generation . . . all of the offspring that are at the same stage of descent from a common ancestor,"¹⁹ it is logical to also combine the term with "family matrix development" where "each family faces the others in a manner homologous to the individual facing others according to the dramaturgical model that Goffman ([1959] 1981) applied to the presentation of the self in daily life."²⁰ Lindgren, states, that by so doing, one is allowed to create the term "generational family matrix"²¹ to denote all of the sociological, anthropological, psychological and cultural integration that appears between the genealogical interpretation of data relating to societal development and its individual subsets, i.e., individuals.

Contributing Influences of Reference Disciplines

¹⁶ Elizabeth Shown Mills, "Genealogy in the Information Age: History's New Frontier," *National Genealogical Quarterly* (December 2003), 260-277. Some examples of prior use of the term was by Anthony Esler, *Generations in History: An Introduction to the Concept* (A. Esler, 1982); William Strauss and Neil Howe, *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069* (HarpersCollins, 1992), 109.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 260.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ "Generational," "Generation." *The Free Dictionary*. [Online]. Available:

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/generational>

²⁰ Katya Mandoki, *Everyday Aesthetics: Prosaics, the Play of Culture and Social Identities* (Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2007), p.198. Also note Kiyoshi Hiroshima, *Family Matrix: Its Theory and Application* (Institute of Population Problems, Ministry of Health and Welfare, 1990). Read Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Doubleday, 1959) regarding the dramaturgical model.

²¹ The terms "Generational Family Matrix Development" and "Funnel Principle" (as it relates to genealogy) was coined by one of the writers, Dr. Carl Edwin Lindgren.

H. Daniel Wagner summarizes the scientific advancements made in the hard sciences that have made significant contributions to the field of genealogical understandings.²² These essential sciences include: computer science which has been developing sophisticated software to handle genealogical databases; genetic research and findings in deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), which provide the genetic instruction for organisms, showing new kinds of relationships that have hitherto never been explored and how studies have demonstrated that Mitochondrial DNA (as found in the organelles i.e., eukaryotic cells) can be used to investigate human relationships.²³ Research has also been advanced as to how the use of DNA can identify conceptual history of ethnicity. DNA analysis can resolve historical and genealogical puzzles. Wagner suggests a peer reviewed genealogical journal to inform the public of the results of academic research in the field and how it has advanced and is sophisticated and academically sound.²⁴

Because of rapidly transforming technological advances, other new fields are also advancing into the level of a *disciplinatory* status in higher education as they evolve toward fulfilling the six basic requirements of a discipline as analyzed by Liles et al.²⁵

The Six Basic Requirements of an Academic Discipline

The six basic requirements that define a field of disciplinary study are as follows:

(1) a focus of study, (2) a world view or paradigm, (3) a set of reference disciplines used to establish the discipline, (4) principles and practices associated with the discipline, (5) an active research or theory development agenda, and (6) the deployment of education and promotion of professionalism.²⁶

Liles, et al. maintain that these requirements set the stage, and bring sound principles and practices to an educational discipline. The purpose of research generated from any field has as its goal to expand the growth and development of scientific knowledge generated within the area.²⁷ Theory undergirds all scholastic disciplines, for the theories of a field generated by its research give the discipline growth and focus. The principles then become practical and can be implemented. When there is no undergirding theory and conclusions to build on, isolated research becomes stale and empty of meaning. Likewise without theory much of the research of investigating and finding individuals of a family, no matter how scholarly and meticulous, may not contribute to scientific²⁸ knowledge or create an academic discipline.

Disciplines in Higher Education

²² H. Daniel Wagner, "Genealogy as an Academic Discipline." *Avotaynu: The International Review of Jewish Genealogy*, 7 (June 2006), unpaginated HTML copy archived at *Avotaynu*. (<http://www.avotauvnu.com>: Accessed 3 November 2010.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Liles et.al., "Enterprise Engineering: A Discipline," 2005.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Note "Science," *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, 1961, 757, "science . . . [is a] branch of study concerned with observation and classification of facts, esp. with the establishment of verifiable general laws, chiefly by induction and hypotheses . . ."

An academic discipline is a branch of learning or scholarly instruction.²⁹ The disciplines in higher education provide the framework for the student's major degree program of coursework in the structure of college and university studies. The organization of post secondary schools revolves around these disciplines, and they are often grouped together.³⁰ These disciplines develop as cultural systems and the cultures then assume the socialization of control of the specific scholarly behaviors of the faculty. Thus, a university differs from other organizations in society as the primary loyalties of faculty members are to their disciplines and not to the institution or company. Indeed, the "community of scholars," refers realistically to the disciplinary loyalties.³¹ In many large universities faculty members often do not associate with faculty outside of their disciplines. In addition, there is a status structure within the different disciplines, the most powerful being in the high level academic specialties. Educationist Tony Becher comments on the importance of history as an academic discipline,

History, with other subjects in the humanities owes its relatively strong prestige within and outside the academic world to its established scholarship traditions; perhaps its prestige is also related to the accessibility of many of its products to members of the public.³²

As previously noted, Liles, et al. define six characteristics of an academic discipline.³³ These six distinctions provide a framework the leaders in genealogy may wish to think about in the development of the field. These authors state that "disciplines are recognized after there are many professional researchers and practitioners in the field."³⁴ The following six characteristics follow those set out by Liles, et al.³⁵

1. All disciplines must have a focus of study that makes it a distinctive discipline.

Academic disciplines have a definable area of study and knowledge that sets each distinct from the other. This scholarly area defines the expressed requisite of society and requires that the discipline is fulfilling this societal need. The focus of the area therefore should be unified and articulated well to people for their understanding and recognition of the discipline as being useful and beneficial in the advancement societal norms.³⁶ Unfortunately, this focus in the field of genealogy is weak in its scholarly articulation. However, through theory building and the validation of scholarly research the knowledge base becomes expanded; and with the rapid changes developing in technology and other areas through time, it could be said that genealogy will predictably evolve into a scholarly discipline of its own.

2. Disciplines have a Paradigm or World View.

²⁹ Marietta del Favaro, "Academic-Disciplines, Disciplines and the Structure of Higher Education, Discipline Classification Systems, Discipline Differences," *Education Encyclopedia* [Online]. Available: (<http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1723/Academic-Disciplines.html>: accessed 15 November 2010).

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Tony Becher, "The Disciplinary Shaping of the Profession," in Burton R. Clark, ed., *The Academic Profession, National Discipline and Instructional Settings* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), 288.

³³ Liles, et.al., 2005. "Enterprise Engineering: A Discipline," n.p.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

All disciplines must have their unique perspective on the way which they view the world. This is a Kuhn paradigm³⁷ or exemplar and it fulfills three functions: It suggests new puzzles, it suggests approaches to solving those puzzles, and it is the standard by which the quality of a proposed puzzle or solution can be measured.³⁸

This paradigm is the framework in which an academic discipline develops through its research. There does not seem to be agreement or consensus on what constitutes the world view or theoretical basis for genealogy. Some leaders in the genealogical field may think that the historical importance of heraldry, chivalry and documentary sciences as antecedents to genealogy are irrelevant to be included in the framework of genealogical studies.

However, including these antecedents would give the field of genealogy as it is now, a needed foundation and perspective. Historical and anthropological relevance in a time and space framework, as it relates to other disciplines of inquiry, certainly it provides a greater understanding of genealogy as a science and as a growing discipline.

3. There are certain reference disciplines.

Reference disciplines, or allied disciplines, are used to define new academic fields. They are involved as integral parts, but separate and distinct. These other fields are used to help establish developing academic programs. They contribute knowledge, insights, ideas and even new theories.³⁹ J. L. King explained that

Reference disciplines are critical for an evolving field for three reasons . . . First, reference disciplines are a well-established source of intellectual capital; second, they provide the [new academic] community with an "appeal to authority"; and finally, reference disciplines are an excellent way for identifying pockets of research that are uncharted.⁴⁰

Reference disciplines in the field of genealogy would be most of the social sciences — anthropology, sociology, economics, archeology, and history—and from the applied fields, such disciplines as international law and computer technologies would be included. Recently contributions exist from the hard sciences of physics, microbiology, and mathematics as outlined by Wagner⁴¹ There is a vast amount of rich resources and fertile ground that can support and enhance the development of genealogy into a science.

4. There are definite principles and practices for disciplines.

These principles and practices are important to the building of the discipline. These practices form the bases of a discipline and promote the development of more research as ideas are tested. It is theory from which the development of the principles and practices flow.⁴² The Genealogical

³⁷ Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* 3rd ed. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

³⁸ Alexander Bird, "Thomas Kuhn," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* [Online]. Available: (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/thomas-kuhn/>: accessed 3 December 2010). Note Thomas S. Kuhn, 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago).

³⁹ Liles et.al., *Enterprise Engineering: A Discipline*.

⁴⁰ Eli Cohen, "Reconceptualizing Information Systems," in T. Grandon Gill and Eli Cohen, (ed.), 2009. *Foundations of Informing Science: 1999-2008* (Informing Science Press), p. 9.

⁴¹ Wagner, "Genealogy as an Academic Discipline," n.p.

⁴² Liles et.al., *Enterprise Engineering: A Discipline*, n.p.

Proof Standard,⁴³ developed by the Board for Certification of Genealogists, is one of the principles and practices in the field of genealogy.

5. Disciplines have an active research and theory agenda.

This requirement is most important in expanding the knowledge base and credibility of the field. Research can address the fundamental questions of the discipline and generate new ones giving life and purpose to the much needed creation of a worldview. A research and theory agenda is essential to this end, but the sub-discipline of genealogy lacks in general theory building.⁴⁴ It is important to note that some of the ongoing scholarly research found in the journals is not linked to theory. This is one of the major reasons why genealogy has not developed the credibility that it has sought in higher education. As genealogy adds theoretical research, and links itself up to history and other related fields, it will contribute significantly to the scientific knowledge of mankind.

6. Deployment of Education and Promotion of Professionalism.

The deployment of education and the promotion of professionalism are important to the advancement of any discipline. This mechanism of a discipline includes professional societies, peer reviewed journals, curriculum in accredited universities and colleges and conferences. Maintaining these mechanisms of deployment will provide information to people about a scholarly discipline. These mechanisms are associated with the building of a disciplinary image. However, it is the writers' opinion that genealogists may be overtly preoccupied with this mechanism rather than with leadership in theory building research. Yet this technology is generally seen as dependent upon research theory. It is theory development that we should work on as a priority in developing the field of genealogy into a strong sub-discipline.

Kinship Theory and the Sciences

In the following two sections, the writers will present a short introduction to anthropological and sociological kinship theories and their potential ramification relating to other interrelated disciplines as well as the GFMD and the Genealogical Funnel Principle. The sections will also deal with research pertaining to relationship theory, feminist theories of kinship, kinship by milk, motherhood kinship, social structures and kinship data, anthropology as a scientific discipline, as well as developmental cycle of domestic groups and analysis of matrilineal cross-cousin marriage,⁴⁵ to name a few.

Sociological Theories of Kinship and the Family

Tamara Hareven, in *Families, History, and Social Change* provides a historical summary of various theories of kinship and their significance in social history.⁴⁶

Before the 1970s the focus of a family according to the literature consisted of those that lived in a household.⁴⁷ Perhaps it was the manner in which the American society developed and their

⁴³ Board for Certification of Genealogists, *The BCG Genealogical Standards Manual* (Ancestry Publishing, Orem, UT), 2000.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ Refer to previous footnote 15.

⁴⁶ Tamara Hareven. *Families, History, and Social Change: Life-Course and Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (Westview Press 2000).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 32.

early living patterns in the colonial years of nuclear families living in a household that caused historians to overlook the functions of kin and kinship structures⁴⁸ outside of the home. According to Hareven historians have contributed to the image of the "isolated nuclear family" which was apparent in sociological theories.⁴⁹

However, along in the 1960s sociologists Eugene Litwak (1960)⁵⁰ and Marvin Sussman and Lee Burchinal, (1962) challenged this notion of the independent nuclear family and documented the apparent kin relationships which existed in families outside the American home.⁵¹ Litwak established the notion of the "modified extended family," which allowed nuclear families to develop coalitions to exchange services with each other.⁵² Marvin B. Sussman's "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning" (1962) examined the cooperative assistance among the parents and their married children.⁵³

The sociological research of the family and the impact of industrialization were based on the theory of social breakdown, as sociologists maintained that the industrialization affected the family to the extent that it caused a breakdown of the traditional family life patterns and lifestyles. In effect it broke down the family group relationships as a primary group in society. The Chicago School of Thought⁵⁴ in particular offered this argument. This school of thought maintained that as people migrated from the rural to the heavy industrial centers they were uprooted from their kinship relationships and patterns. Thus, they were stripped of their culture and the family resulted in disintegration.⁵⁵ Simultaneously there was the modernization theory⁵⁶ which declared the "fit" of the nuclear family and the new industrial system.⁵⁷

In addition, William Goode (1963), who looked at the requirements of the industrial system stated that the occupational system is based on achievement and not ascription thus an individual was detached from the rigid rules of the kin system resulted in them being more adaptable to the demands of the industry.⁵⁸ Goode further maintained that the "conjugal family" integration with the industrial system as one that serves industry but at the same time places workers at the mercy of the factory system.⁵⁹

Michael Anderson (1972) investigated family structure and kin functions in nineteenth-century Lancashire showing indeed, kin functions among industrial workers in Preston, with the

⁴⁸ Carol R. Ember and Melvin Ember. "Marital Residence and Kinship." *Anthropology: A Brief Introduction* 5th ed. (NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003), ch 17. This chapter provides an interesting section of kinship structure.

⁴⁹ Hareven, *Family History* . . . , 32.

⁵⁰ Eugene Litwak, "Geographical Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," *American Sociological Review* (1960) 25: 385-394.

⁵¹ Hareven, *Family History* . . . 32.

⁵² Vern L. Bengtson and Ariela Lowenstein. *Global Aging and Challenges to Families* (Aldine, 2003), ch.2 & p. 56.

⁵³ Marvin B. Sussman and Lee Burchinal. "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning" *Marriage and Family Living* (1962) 24: 231-240.

⁵⁴ Turner, *The Structure* . . . , 1998, 87.

⁵⁵ Hareven, *Family History* . . . , 32; Original information is derived from the five volumes written by William Isaac Thomas and Florian Znaniecki. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America: Monograph of an Immigrant Group*, 1-5 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1920).

⁵⁶ "Modernization theory," *Wikipedia* [Online]. Available: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modernization_theory and "Modernization Theory." In *edu.LearnSoc.org - A Insight to Human Social Relations*. [Online]. Available: <http://edu.learnsoc.org/Chapters/3%20theories%20of%20sociology/11%20modernization%20theory.htm>

⁵⁷ Hareven, *Family History* . . . , 33 as originally noted in Talcott Parsons, "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States," *American Anthropologist* (1943) 45: 22-38.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* Note William Goode, *World Revolution and Family Patterns* (NY: Free Press, 1970).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

continuation of family involvement with textile factories during the period 1630-1850.⁶⁰ Anderson also provides the documentation for the role of kin during their migration and the adaptation to industrial conditions. However, his study only illustrates the role of kin assistance in emergency life situations and not continuing active involvement with their kin in the workplace. Hareven maintains that there no comparable historical analysis of kinship in industrial communities have been done at this date in the United States.⁶¹

Psychologist William H.R. Rivers⁶² founded the genealogical method of anthropology, a method based on the insights that the hub of non-Western social organization is kinship and that kinship can best be understood through the study of cultural history and psychology.⁶³

Anthropological Theories and their Relevance to Kinship

American Anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan,⁶⁴ was one of the first modern researchers to create a theory of relationship. Morgan shaped the concept of Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family⁶⁵ in 1871. In this theory, Morgan emphasized the differences between classificatory kinship⁶⁶ and descriptive kinship.⁶⁷ The theory situates broad kinship classes on the basis of imputing abstract social patterns of relationships having little or no overall relation to genetic closeness but do reflect cognition about kinship, . . .⁶⁸

Works of kinship, during the late 1880s, placed consider emphasis on research relating to Arab kinship.⁶⁹ William Robert Smith, Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic at the University of Cambridge, wrote relating to male kinship and corresponding laws relating to tribal organization and marriage at the time of the prophet Mohammed. Smith discussed

the available evidence as to the genesis of the system of male kinship, with the corresponding laws of marriage and tribal organisation, which prevailed in Arabia at the time of Mohammed; the general result is that male kinship had been preceded by kinship through women only, and that all that can still be gathered as

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, as noted in the work by Michael Anderson, *Family Structure in Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge University, 1971).

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² W.H.R. Rivers, *Wikipedia* [Online]. Available: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/W._H._R._Rivers

⁶³ Paul Erickson and Liam D. Murphy, *The History of Anthropological Theory*, 3rd ed. (University of Toronto Press, 2008), 124.

⁶⁴ Bernhard Joseph Stern, *Lewis Henry Morgan, Social Evolutionist* (Russell & Russell, 1931).

⁶⁵ Lewis H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington City: Smithsonian Institute, 1871).

⁶⁶ Rev. Lorimer Fison, "The Classificatory System of Kinship," In *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria*, X (Melbourne, Vic., Royal Society of Victoria, 1874), 154-79.

⁶⁷ Alfred Louis Kroeber (ed.), "Arapaho Dialects," *American Archaeology and Ethnology*, XII (Berkeley: University of California, 1916-17), 385-86 states "customary discrimination between 'classificatory' and 'descriptive' kinship systems was erroneous and misleading; that a truer and more useful distinction between these two kinds of consanguineal terminology could be found through a consideration of the differences of method employed by various nations in handling certain groups of concepts, in short, through an analysis of psychological factors; and that in general such psychological factors were chiefly determinative of kinship designations. This position has been reviewed and combatted by Dr. W. H. R. Rivers in his admirable little book, *Kinship and Social Organization*, devoted to the thesis that kinship nomenclature is shaped chiefly by social institutions."

⁶⁸ "Kinship," *Wikipedia* [Online]. Available: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinship>

Note Michael Houseman and Douglas R. White, "Network mediation of exchange structures: Ambilateral sidedness and property flows in Pul Eliya," in Thomas Schweizer and Douglas R. White. *Kinship, Networks and Exchange*. (Cambridge University Press, 1998), 59-89.

⁶⁹ William Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (London: C.J. Clay & Son, 1885).

to the steps of the social evolution in which the change of kinship law is the central feature . . .⁷⁰

In a lecture on Arab Tribes, delivered at the University, Professor Smith reiterates his position on kinship by stating

how closely the facts of the case correspond with the theory propounded in the well-known work of the late J. F. McLennan on *Primitive Marriage*. This work, where the task is essayed of tracing the steps of social evolution effected in respect of marriage and kinship, was based on a comprehensive study of modern rude societies; . . . the backbone of the system being the highly apocryphal pedigree of the Prophet, and the common ancestor of the tribe having very clearly proves that male kinship in early Arabia had been preceded by a system of kinship through women only; . . .⁷¹

During this period, concepts like milk-kinship (kinship by milk) sprung up in articles written by Europeans on Arabic kinship.

To admit a stranger into the family circle they made him suck a few drops of milk at the breast of the lady of the house, or one of her sisters, or one of her nearest female relatives, and with the milk thus drawn, the stranger became a member of the family. . .⁷²

Relating to Arab motherhood-kinship, an interesting article appeared in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*⁷³ relating to the proposition that motherhood-kinship proceeded kinship through the father in the Arabian tribal system . . . and the claim that the system . . . was founded upon a basis of totemism⁷⁴ [kinship with a spirit-being]. With the theory of mother-kinship, shown by the use of terms such as *ōrahim* and *batn* (both meaning *womb*) for blood-relationship and sub-tribe respectively . . . appears the use of male-kinship relationships terms of *ham*, *kannah* and *amm*.⁷⁵

American cultural anthropologist Margaret Mead did her anthropological research with adolescents on the island of Taḍ in the Manus Islands Group. Her work was concerned with the psychological passage from childhood into adolescent and drew the conclusion that these

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, v. Note Grey Hubert Skipwith, "Letter Section," *The Academy* (47:1189, Feb. 16, 1895), 151 - Smith in the same issue on p. 117 remarks "as to the primitive meaning of *ab* (*abu*), the Semitic word for "father," not originally implying physical paternity, with the remarks of Fustel de Coulanges (*La Cité Antique*, II. viii. I, *ad fin.*) on the primary significance of *pater* and its equivalents. Quite independently the Classical and the Semitic scholar arrive at analogous conclusions in their respective subjects (Sohrader, *Prehistoric Antiquities*, Eng. trans., p. 373)." See F. McLennan. *Primitive Marriage*, 45 (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1865).

⁷¹ "Arab Tribes," in [John Douglas Cook, et al.], *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* (London, May 29, 1887), 750-51.

⁷² *Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes*, I (Calcutta: Calcutta University, 1921), 172.

⁷³ The *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* is one of the best sources for Near Eastern and Asian kinship documents and the noted *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* is considered one of the best references for all aspects of kinship theory.

⁷⁴ C. J. Lyall, "Book Notices of a review of William Robertson Smith's *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Royal Asiatic Society - London: Black, 1903) 587. Note Julius Wellhausen, "Marriage Among the Arabs," *Nachrichten Von Der Konigl. Gesellschaft Der Wissenschaften Und Der Georg-Augusts - Universitat Zu Gottingen*, (1893).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 588.

individual transverse this stage of development less psychological, emotional anxiety and distress than their American counterparts.

In her work *Growing Up in New Guinea: A Comparative Study of Primitive Education*, she states that

Kinship is counted bilaterally, but a child usually belongs to his father's clan, unless, as is often the case, he is adopted by his mother's own or clan brother. The children of two sisters call each other by the same term as do the children of two brothers adding, if it is necessary to be explicit, of a different house [Father's clan].⁷⁶

Mead's *Sex and Temperance: In Three Primitive Societies* emphasizes that each culture or society has its own interpretation of what is considered manly and womanly. In this work, Mead believed that being considered manly or womanly depends on which society is doing the considering.⁷⁷ While children are still very small, four or five years of age, they are taught to classify their kin, the boy being taught by his mother, and the girl by her father.⁷⁸

It is well known that most theories in anthropology often neglect aspects of gender when discussing analytical category, in fact, women often appear as merely pawns of men's exchanges in kinship theory (where at least they were mentioned!)⁷⁹ Henrietta Moore believes that division of society and male domination i.e. into public (male) and domestic (women) spheres are embedded assumptions of anthropological kinship theory.⁸⁰

British anthropologist, primatologist and ethnologist Jane Goodall, CBE,⁸¹ was one of only eight individuals who were allowed to study for the University of Cambridge doctorate program, without first receiving a bachelor degree. Her fame is based on her work in Gombe Stream National Park, Tanzania which consisted of a four-to-five year investigation of family and social interaction of chimpanzees.⁸² Goodall felt, after her many years of research, that animals were capable of expressing emotions and rational thought like humans.⁸³ Her theory was based on direct observation of chimpanzees expressing emotion through physical contact (tickling, hissing, hugs and pats). She was convinced that physical gestures expressed "the close, supportive, affectionate bonds that develop between family members and other individuals within a community, which can persist throughout a life span of more than 50 years."⁸⁴ One of Goodall's achievements was discovering that the chimps could emulate human adaptation to tool making. Anthropologist Louis Leakey wrote, "We must now redefine man, redefine tool, or accept

⁷⁶ Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea: A Comparative Study of Primitive Education* (HarperCollins, 2001), 216. Also note her work Margaret Mead. *Kinship in the Admiralty Islands* (Transaction Publishers, 1934).

⁷⁷ Ester Newton, *Margaret Mead Made Me Gay* (North Carolina: Duke University, 2000), 230.

⁷⁸ Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperance: In Three Primitive Societies* (HarperCollins, 2001), 188.

⁷⁹ Bonnie G. Smith, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Women in World History*, 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 9; Sandra Morgen. *Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching* (American Anthropological Association, 1989), 9.

⁸⁰ Anthropology, in Lorraine Code, *Encyclopedia of Feminist Theories* (Taylor & Francis, Sep 19, 2000), 32.

⁸¹ Dale Peterson, *Jane Goodall: The Woman Who Redefined Man* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2008).

⁸² Meg Greene, *Jane Goodall: A Biography* (Greenwood Publishing Group, 2005).

⁸³ Jane Goodall, *Through a Window: My Thirty Years with the Chimpanzees of Gombe* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2010).

⁸⁴ PBS: Nature, "Jane Goodall's Wild Chimpanzees, 1996, in "Gombe Stream National Park," Wikipedia. [Online]. Available: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gombe_Stream_National_Park#cite_note-PBS-2

chimpanzees as human!"⁸⁵ Anyone who reads Goodall's descriptions of the relationship between [the] chimpanzee mother Flo and her offspring . . . cannot help but see a bond that many human mothers and children feel.⁸⁶

Social scientist and noted anthropologist George P. Murdock in his work on social structure systems⁸⁷ analyzed kinship data

to test a theory about universals in human kinship in the way that terminologies were influenced by the behavioral similarities or social differences among pairs of kin, proceeding on the view that the psychological ordering of kinship systems radiates out from ego and the nuclear family to different forms of extended family . . .⁸⁸

Later, French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss in his *Les Structures Elementaires de la Parente* (1949) and *Structural Anthropology* (1983) defines ethnological theories and his approach to anthropology as a scientific discipline⁸⁹ as well as his general theory of society.⁹⁰ Levi-Strauss,

í [b]egan with the proposition that reciprocal exchange among social groups promote alliances which facilitate social interaction and make society cohere. . . . [i.e.,] through the reciprocal exchange of women as gifts.ø . . . [He] observed that kinship groups who exchange women create a form, or relationship, among themselves.⁹¹

Levi-Strass stated that "A kinship system does not consist in the objective ties descent or consanguinity í between individuals. It exists only in human consciousness; it is an arbitrary system of representations."⁹²

In 1958, British social anthropologist Sir John (Jack) Rankine Goody developed his theory of the "developmental cycle of domestic groups"⁹³ In his *The Character of Kinship*, Goody explains his theory relating to kinship, family and marriage. In this work and several others, Goody attempts the "reconsideration of some central problem areas including those examined by an earlier generation of anthropologists and still raised by scholars outside the discipline itself."⁹⁴ In particular, emphasis is on social structure and change. Goody emphasized three points:

⁸⁵ Jane Goodall and Philip L. Berman, *Reason for Hope: A Spiritual Journey* (Hachette Digital, Inc., 1999), n.p.

⁸⁶ Catherine Salmon, Todd K. Shackelford, *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Family Psychology* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 3.

⁸⁷ George Peter Murdock, *Social Structure* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1949).

⁸⁸ George Peter Murdock's social structure concept as defined in "Kinship," *Wikipedia* [Online]. Available: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinship>.

⁸⁹ Claude Levi-Strauss, *Les Structures Elementaires de la Parente* (1949) and *Structural Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1983, 66.

⁹¹ Paul A. Erickson and Liam D. Murphy, *A History of Anthropological Theory* (University of Toronto, 2008), 113-14. Compare Levi-Strass theory to Emile Durkheim, "The Elementary Forms of Religious Life [1915].

⁹² Claude Levi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, I (Basic Books, 1963), 50.

⁹³ Jack Goody, *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups* (Dept. of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University Press, 1969), 69.

⁹⁴ H. Leon Abrams, Jr., "Paperback Re-issue," in Jack Goody, *The Character of Kinship* (ed.) (Cambridge, Cambridge University, 1975). Also note Jack Goody. *Comparative Studies in Kinship* (Psychology Press, 2004).

1. intensive agricultural methods leading to surplus, this he believed led to cultural patterns between Eurasia and Africa societies;
2. social change based on urbanization and bureaucratic institutions that constructed a shift from family identity to the culture of cities;
3. the implementation of communication technology which impacted social and psychological change.⁹⁵

He also placed considerable emphasis on the growth of surplus, management of such surplus and beginnings in writing⁹⁶ as well as the advancement of philosophy and science and their correlation to the written art.

Edmund Leach's *Rethinking Anthropology* (1961) and Lévi-Strauss, in his work *Les Structures Elementaires de la Parente* (1949) provided insight into the aspects of fluid languages of exchange as they related to kinship. Leach, criticized previous research in structural-functional stability, emphasizing the importance of kinship as it related to concepts of network, meaning and language fluidities. In his work *Pul Eliya, A Village in Ceylon: A Study of Land Tenure and Kinship*⁹⁷ he had espoused an empiricist framework, and had provided detail recordings of directly observed, face-to-face behaviors of members of a local community. . . .⁹⁸ Although anthropological scholars internationally have limited their attention of Leach's *Pul Eliya* kinship theory, it has been received by Sri Lankan academics, in all scholarly fields, as a noble achievement within the field.⁹⁹

Louise Lamphere notes that David Schneider in his paper "Some Muddles in the Models or How the System Works"¹⁰⁰ (1965) felt that anthropologist Rodney Needham's analysis of matrilineal cross-cousin marriage¹⁰¹ was too rigid and inflexible.¹⁰² Schneider further noted in the essay that anthropologists need to be clearer about whether the theory is advanced to cover the structure of a social system, or whether it is about how the individual finds his way in that

⁹⁵ Jack Goody, *Wikipedia* [Online]. Available: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jack_Goody

⁹⁶ Note David R. Olson and Michael Cole (eds.), *Technology, Literacy, and the Evolution of Society: Implications of the Work of Jack Goody* (London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associated, Publishers, 2006). One such example of this relationship would be Genesis 41:49, *Bible* (New International Version, 1984) which states "Joseph stored up huge quantities of grain, like the sand of the sea; it was so much that he stopped keeping records because it was beyond measure."

⁹⁷ Edmund Ronald Leach. *Pul Eliya, a village in Ceylon: A Study of Land Tenure and Kinship* (University Press, 1961).

⁹⁸ Stanley J. Tambiah. *Edmund Leach: An Anthropological Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 350. Note with considerable interest Edmund Leach, *The Structural Study of Myth and Totemism* (Psychology Press, 2004).

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 150.

¹⁰⁰ As Richard Feinberg and Martin Ottenheimer, *The Cultural Analysis of Kinship: The Legacy of David M. Schneider* (University of Illinois Press, 2001), 43 notes "the catchy title of one of Schneider's most influential articles, "Some Muddles in the Models: Or How the System Really Works" (1965) may have been an unacknowledged appropriation from a statement by Robert Redfield in "

¹⁰¹ Rodney Needham, *A Test Case for Social Anthropology* (University of Chicago Press, 1984). This refers to Lévi-Strauss's theory of matrilineal cross-cousin marriage. Needham takes issue with this by stating "the preferred marriage results, not so much from a prescribed and precise degree of relationship, but from a general relationship between all the men of a lineage and [another] lineage in respect of all of its daughters and sisters." Note Jan Peter Benjamin de Josselin de Jong, *Lévi-Strauss's Theory on Kinship and Marriage* (Brill, 1970).

¹⁰² Louise Lamphere, "Whatever Happen to Kinship Studies," In Linda Stone ed. *New Directions in Anthropological Kinship*, (2001), 22.

system.¹⁰³ In *American Kinship*, Schneider expressed the belief that the European model of kinship was flawed as it was biased on our own Western interpretation of kinship models, and other cultures did not hold the same values and social relations.¹⁰⁴ Later, during the 1970s Schneider announced to the anthropological world that the term kinship was a misnomer and did not exist in humankind culture. Needham was during this period abandoning his former position in favor of the belief that kinship indeed was not a unique phenomenon and therefore did not exist, at least as a distinct theory.¹⁰⁵ Further, Schneider (1984), in his work *A Critique of The Study of Kinship*, placed considerable importance on the aspect of symbolic kinship in anthropological research.

Janet Carsten, Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh, was of great importance in re-established the idea of "relatedness" in kinship theory through the use of research work with the Malays in Pulau Langkawi.¹⁰⁶ In her study, she noted the kinship relationships as it related to relatedness, feedings and personhood. Carsten utilized the concept of relatedness (as noted) to diverge from the pre-constructed analytic opposition which exists in anthropological thought between the biological and the social. í [she believed] that relatedness should be described in terms of indigenous statements and practices, some of which fall outside what anthropologists have conventionally understood as kinship.¹⁰⁷

A resurgence of the terms relating to kinship also surfaced in the work of British feminist anthropologist Marilyn Strathern, CBE whose research work dealt with the gender roles of natives in the Papua New Guinea. She served as Mistress of Girton College (University of Cambridge) until 2009. In her works, including *Self-Decoration in Mount Hagen* (1971); *Women in Between* (1972); *No Money on Our Skins: Hagen Migrants in Port Moresby* (1975); *Kinship at the Core: an Anthropology of Elmdon, Essex* (1981) *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia* (1988) and *After Nature: English Kinship in the Late Twentieth Century* (1992) she allotted much of her studies to issues relating to feminist gender, the social constructs of gender norms, social equality and ontologically multiple theory.¹⁰⁸ In *English Kinship in the Late Twentieth* she establishes permanence between anthropological kinship theory and middle-class folk models of kinship.¹⁰⁹

Ladislav Holy, former Prof. of Social Anthropology at St Andrews, notes that information pertaining to relatedness, collected through genealogical methodology, was not objective. Holy states that he has become critical of almost every aspect of the received kinship theory í

¹⁰³ Michael Banton, *The Relevance of Models For Social Anthropology* (Psychology Press, 2004), xxxi.

¹⁰⁴ David Murry Schneider, *American Kinship: A Cultural Account* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1980). Note book description, "American Kinship is the first attempt to deal systematically with kinship as a system of symbols and meanings, and not simply as a network of functionally interrelated familial roles." [Online]. Available: <http://www.amazon.com/American-Kinship-A-Cultural-Account/dp/0226739309>

¹⁰⁵ Lamphere, 2004, 22.

¹⁰⁶ Janet Carsten, "Analogues or Opposites - Household and Community in Pulau Langkawi, Malaysia," in C. MacDonald (ed.), *De la hutte au palais. Societies 'a maison' en Asie du Sud-Est insulaire* (Paris: Éd. du CNRS, 1987), 153-58.

¹⁰⁷ "Kinship," Wikipedia [Online]. Available: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinship> Additionally nearly the same quote appears in Sylvia J. Yanagisako, "Bringing it All Back Home: Kinship Theory in Anthropology," in David Warren Sabeau, Simon Teuscher and Jon Mathieu. *Kinship in Europe: Approaches to Long-Term Developments (1300-1900)* (Berghahn Books, 2007), 36. The original concept is from Janet Carsten, "Introduction," in Janet Carsten (ed.), *Culture of Relatedness: New Approaches in the Study of Kinship* (Cambridge, 2000), 1-36.

¹⁰⁸ Strathern's ontologically multiple theory is expressed in her works: "Self-Interest and the Social Good: Some Implications of Hagen Gender Imagery," in Paul A. Erickson and Liam Murphy, (eds), *Readings for a History of Anthropological Theory*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 2010), 370-391; *Dealing with Inequality: Analyzing Gender Relations in Melanesia and Beyond*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); and *Kinship, Law and the Unexpected: Relatives are Always a Surprise* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

¹⁰⁹ Marilyn Strathern, *English Kinship in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[having] abandoned the once fashionable formulations, reformulations and refinements of the basic analytical concept in the study of kinship.¹¹⁰

Although this section does not cover all of the theories or leading anthropologists of the age, it does provide some insight into the goals and achievements of certain anthropologists over the past 140 years relating to theories of kinship.

Specific Theory Development in Genealogy

Professional genealogist Bruce D. Despain, MA, AG, CG notes that

ō . . . the central theoretical basis of genealogy lies in the process of familial reconstitution. . . . Beginning with a family the investigator uses certain principles and laws (the theory) to posit a possible source of additional relevant information. Through instrumentation (the source) and experimentation (searching it out), the researcher discovers an actual source fitting the criteria posited. By using the theory again the investigator is able to establish the evidence as justifying an extension to the family and pedigree.ō¹¹¹ . . . He is obligated to accept findings of scholars in anthropology, economics, geography, psychology, sociology, demographics, and history. Certainly he should be well versed in some of those related disciplines.¹¹² . . . There is [also] the search for new data, the establishment of its relevance, the creation of hypotheses, and a proper consideration for previous research and for the findings of related disciplines. Genealogical research has four facets: (1) heuristic, (2) knowledge of area, (3) research analysis, and (4) compilation.¹¹³

Theory development is an important skill in genealogy and the scholars in the field must address its implementation. The work of Billingsley,¹¹⁴ although the theoretical kinship framework built is temporal and spatial which eliminates predictions, is still a possible theoretical structure for explanation and is one avenue of work that genealogy needed for a place in higher education. Billingsley states:

Kinship's role in shaping political and economic power has long been recognized. In fact, it was imported from England and other European societies. Most societies and cultures have long been founded on a system of kinship; family has always the first and longest-lasting type of societal organization until after the Industrial Revolution and the founding of modern states. Because kinship's role in gaining and holding political, economic, and social control has long been recognized, the data on this topic is particularly rich and is of great significance to genealogists. Because the individuals and families genealogists are tracing

¹¹⁰ Ladislav Holy. *Anthropological Perspectives on Kinship* (University of Alberta, 1996). 172.

¹¹¹ Bruce D. Despain, "Section 5 ó Scientific Theory," [Online]. Available:

<http://bdespain.org/gencol/indgen/science/scie015.htm>

¹¹² Id. "Genealogical Research," [Online]. Available:

<http://bdespain.org/gencol/indgen/occapapr/occapapr11.htm>

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ Billingsley, *Communities of Kinship*, 2004.

were parts of kinship groups, it's important for the genealogist to be aware of the details of kinship group formation in America.¹¹⁵

Such frameworks can help in starting us off on our developmental disciplinary journey. Alas there have been few studies to develop theoretical frameworks, or of providing other alternatives in theory development at national conferences.

In 2003, on the discussion forum of the Association of Professional Genealogists (APG), a participant asked whether genealogy had underpinnings and whether any group was formalizing genealogical theory. The inquirer then asked if there was such thing as genealogical theory. Billingsley responded by indicating that she had developed a formal theory of kinship¹¹⁶ in her book which would be published in 2004 for historians and it would also apply to genealogy. She stated:

as professionals asking for wider recognition in the academic world, we need to understand and formalize as well as articulate these concepts [i.e.] the theoretical underpinnings BEFORE we employ genealogical practices and methodology to assemble the pieces of the puzzles of our families or communities. Only then will genealogy meet the criteria as a valid field of academic inquiry.¹¹⁷

Students must wrestle with theoretical concepts, issues and problems at conference skill building sessions, in certificate and diploma classes, but most especially in degree courses at the graduate level. In other words, the curriculum must be more than just a string of courses on how to do genealogy. There must be framed some method of standard organization for a curriculum that provides an avenue for the future. Scholars must continually offer opportunities for participants to build skills in conceptualization, which are important skill sets necessary for theory development. Students at all levels of learning must understand what a theory is and work with these concepts, so they understand how theoretical models provide insight into such things as classification, prediction and in understanding the big picture and the various phenomena they will encounter.

Elizabeth Shown Mills, in her article "Genealogy in the Information Age, History's New Frontier" asked a critical question about the field of genealogy and its place in higher education. "Obviously, genealogy is a serious study. Why then, does our field still fight an uphill battle for recognition as a legitimate field of social study?"¹¹⁸

The answers to this question likely lie in the need for genealogy to articulate its focus, its paradigm and to embrace the historical roots of its ancestors in the genealogy of the past ages. Most importantly it must relate its research to theory in order to create and expand this sub-

¹¹⁵ Carolyn Earle Billingsley, 2007, "The Formation and Significance of Kinship Groups in Early America" [Online]. Available: http://www.cebillingsley.net/lecture_topics/kinship_groups.htm

¹¹⁶ We would, as previously noted, state that this initial step, although promising, was merely a framework that would need considerable more work to evolve into a full blown theory. Regarding research methodology in inductive methodology the framework must evolve through the stages of Observation, Patterns, Hypothesis and finally Theory. Carl Edwin Lindgren, 2012. "Education as a Scientific Discipline" (unpublished) is inclined to follow the deductive method of "top-to-bottom research utilizing initial Theory, Hypothesis, Testing, Observation, Testing and finally Confirmation or Refutation of the initial Theory. However, deductive reasoning also has potential faults. "While many errors in deduction are due to making unjustified inferences from premises, the vast majority of unsound deductive arguments are probably due to premises that are questionable or false." as found in Christian Popa, "The Concept of Validity," [Online]. Available: <http://www.skeptdic.com/refuge/ctlessons/lesson2.html>

¹¹⁷ Carolyn Earle Billingsley, "Genealogical Theory," APGL@rootsweb.com (November 15, 2003. Accessed 12 October 2010), n.p.

¹¹⁸ Elizabeth Shown Mills, "Genealogy in the Information Age: History's New Frontier?" *National Genealogical Society Quarterly*, 91 (December 2003): 265.

discipline into a highly recognized academic field. Work should be done on various valid theoretical frameworks so they may become full-blown theories outside of initial spatial and temporal existence. Or, in addition, create new theories that will guide the research in the field. All disciplines in higher education have undergirding theories. Genealogy should as well in order for it to contribute and reach its potential. By expanding its focus and research, new patterns of understanding will emerge.¹¹⁹ What remains, is to recommend a scientific methodology of developing theory that fits the need of genealogy. Such development is needed for the articulation of the "Focus of Study" and clarification for developing the paradigm.

Grounded Theory as a Method of Qualitative Research

Grounded Theory was first developed in 1967 by two sociologists, Dr. Barney G. Glaser and Dr. Anselm Strauss in their study of hospital deaths.¹²⁰ This theory is not intended for a specific discipline but rather it is a comprehensive method in qualitative research that can adequately provide a model for theory development of the genealogical matrix. According to Glaser many disciplines use it in the social sciences and in business, nursing, sociology, art, education, and psychology.¹²¹

Glaser sets out the guidelines for grounded theory as a specific methodology, from the data collection process, to actually develop the theory in his keynote address at a 1997 health conference in Vancouver.¹²² Glaser maintains that all theory, is grounded in some way in the data and this mode of grounded theory methodology is one option for researchers. Grounded Theory can be used in whole or a part of it can be adapted.¹²³ It is a scientific method of research but one which may not work for all researchers.¹²⁴ Glaser maintains that there are several reasons for the spread of grounded theory:

First, the disciplines that use and support grounded theory deal with important, highly relevant dependent variables, for which grounded theory gives answers to their variation. These variables are involved in pain, cure, social psychological fates, profits management problems, learning, and so forth.

Second, the spread of grounded theory is following on the tail of globalization. Globalization is occurring by communication, spread of business and manufacture, and travel. The core variable in this process is that people, including researchers are constantly running into the multitude of ways in which diversity affects the worlds of business, health, and education as globalization continues. í

Third, as a consequence of cultural diversity, more and more researchers and users of the more evidentiary, preconceived formulated research have become disaffected with their data collection, their findings, what they should find, and

¹¹⁹ Samuel P. Hays, "History and Genealogy: Patterns of Change and Prospects for Cooperation," in Robert M. Taylor, Jr., and Ralph J. Crandall, *Generations and Change: Genealogical Perspectives in Social History* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986), 29-51.

¹²⁰ Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction), 1967.

¹²¹ Barney G. Glaser, "The Future of Grounded Theory," *The Grounded Theory Review*, 9 (2) (2010), 1-14.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 1. The aforementioned article is an edited version of an address presented by Dr. Glaser at the 4th Annual Qualitative Health Research Conference in 1998.

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 4; Odis E. Simmons, "Is that a Real Theory or Did You Just Make it Up? Teaching Classic Grounded Theory," *The Grounded Theory Review*, 9 (2) (2010), 1-14.

whatever hypotheses should be tested. Smoldering disaffection has grown as findings are seen to be beside the point, irrelevant, moot, and unworkable.¹²⁵

The Billingsley framework, as previously stated, is ðtemporalö and ðspatialö¹²⁶ that is, it is within a particular period of time (antebellum years) and a particular space (southern states). Because it is temporal and spatial, it is not useful in making predictions. There is more work to be done with this theoretical framework. That is, other similar studies could be developed on groups of families in migrations to further develop this concept so the predictions can be used in a general sense about migrations. Theoretical statements must be abstract to make predictions.

Essentially Grounded Theory is starting with collecting data and analyzing it simultaneously. The researcher then codes and categorize. At that point, theoretical categories are formed. Further on the researcher continues to develop his/her theoretical categories in the coding process. As the researcher works to develop theory he/she is constantly comparing and also writing his/her thoughts.

As the data is collected the scholar analyzes and works on conceptual categories and theoretical codes to build the theory. Data is collected until the categories are saturated with data. The researcher then writes relevant memos about ideas as they work through the process. The writers of this article suggest that everyone who is interested in Grounded Theory as a method and wishes to understand and possibly use it , to read Kathy Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory*.¹²⁷ According to Charmaz, the researcher begins with a question to find out about something¹²⁸ - i.e. ðI want to build a theory on using indirect evidence, what can I predict?ö

Genealogist Tom Jones in his article ðThe Road Less Traveledö explains how indirect evidence was assembled to form a proof conclusion.¹²⁹ On page 25 (Table 5) of that article Jones cites recent articles from the *National Genealogical Society Quarterly*, because each issue contains case studies that illustrate how conclusions can be drawn that meet the standard deductions built from indirect evidence.¹³⁰ Jones list six articles as well as additional scholarly genealogical journals that regularly contain articles, which illustrate how indirect evidence was used to prove an ancestral linkage and how to use that evidence to come to some useful proof conclusions.

An interested researcher can begin by going through all the journals suggested in Jones' article of case studies and for all the preceding years that would have cases in which indirect evidence is used to successfully locate a missing ancestor. Categorize that data. Then look at those journals for the previous years, looking for other cases in the use of indirect evidence. The researcher would need around 800-1000 instances of indirect evidence to build his theory. Some cases have never been published. The researcher could ask on the various e-list for people who have done studies using incidences of indirect evidence and determine if they wish to submit their data for the study.

The researcher then starts coding the data by using what indirect evidence was used in each situation and codes these and places them in categories. After the researcher has about 200 of these he goes back and see if he can determine conceptual categories.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 4-6; Barney G. Glasser, The Future of Grounded Theory, *Qual. Health Research*, 9(6) (6 Nov. 1999), 839.

¹²⁶ Paul D. Reynolds, *Primer in Theory Construction* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon: 1971), 13-14.

¹²⁷ Kathy Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis* (Introducing Qualitative Methods series) (Los Angeles, Sage Publications Ltd, 2006).

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 9-11.

¹²⁹ Tom Jones, ðThe Road Less Traveled,ö *Association of Professional Genealogists Quarterly*. Vol. XX, No. 1 (March 2005): 21-26.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 25.

Conclusions

In this paper the writers have:

First, suggested two potential new terms for genealogy, that being "generational family matrix development" (GFMD) and the "genealogical funnel principle" (GFP).

Second, set out the six basic characteristics of a discipline in higher education: with the preconceived view of genealogy as a sub-discipline of history. We have indicated that this view must be clearly articulated and that the practice of genealogy embraces more genealogical-historical studies. We have called for more research and theory development in genealogy. We have also recommended that genealogy embrace its nexus with history and undertake more studies of communities with social genealogical perspectives as a way of focusing the field of genealogy with its disciplinary host.

Third, suggested that the general methodology of "grounded theory" be used as a qualitative method in building genealogical theory.

Fourth, indicated that the field of genealogy needs to articulate its genealogical antecedents and the historical work of the European medieval heralds. As a White Paper,¹³¹ we look forward to your comments and suggestions.

¹³¹ A White Paper, according to Wikipedia, "is an authoritative report or guide that helps solve a problem. White papers are used to educate readers and help people [make decisions](#), and may be a consultation as to the details of new [development in a particular scientific discipline]. It is hoped that this paper will generate comments, potential controversy and resolutions to various problems facing genealogy. It is not hoped that this paper meets only with silence.