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Abstract
This study aimed to analyze the phenomenon of change theoretically, by evoking the concept within its epistemological contexts, from the perspective of researchers and academics, who devoted their studies to develop a clear conception of the concept of change. There have been many perspectives that have studied the subject with the efforts of scholars and researchers affiliated with different theoretical ideologies. We find functional interpretations of change as a vital process, and Marxism as a picture of contradictions, while other theories emphasize the role played by the conflicting elites over social power, or cultural and technological factors, especially the factor Invention in the process of change.
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1. INTRODUCTION
From a systems perspective, it does not examine the objectivity of the phenomenon, but rather its phenomena, and taking into account that politics, economics, and other factors that flow into what is social - from the principle of unity of social sciences approved by Anthony Giddens in 1998 - are created in their interaction under the principle of "récursion" The foundation of our analysis of this sociological heritage. We can also look at it from the viewpoint of "Sorokin," who believes that change can only occur when all of its component parts are brought together around a "basic principle," penetrating into them to give them meaning, and it is a "primary and pivotal value" that determines the prevailing culture's perception of the absolute truth of this change.

2. THEORETICAL APPROACH TO CHANGE
Because everything in our lives is constantly changing and every second is a brand-new event in a lifetime, social change is challenging to define. According to the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus, one cannot take a bath in the same river twice because it changes depending on the flow of the water, just as a person change depending on how they feel or interact with the river's water. Despite the accuracy and factual truth of this observation, we frequently have a tendency to imbue ourselves and those around us with the character of stability and permanence, even for brief periods. we continue to believe that the river has a fixed form and that man and his personality have characteristics that never change, regardless of the aspects of change, whether minor or major (Anthony Giddens, with the help of Karen Birdsall, 2005, p: 105). To transition from the belief in immutability to change, one must evoke the first manifestations of the changing existence of things, their material and immaterial forms. What causes social change, is the question at hand. Social change, according to Weber, can happen for a variety of reasons. In more precise terms, Weber's analysis shows that social change is multifactorial. War, the development of fresh concepts and innovations, the rise and fall of powerful organizations and figures, and other factors all play a role in historical change. By focusing on the class struggle as a driver of change, which is the fundamental tenet on which most of Marx's theses were based in his interpretation of all social phenomena (Abdel Jawad, 2008, p. 56).
Both Gerth and Mills are exposed to the nature of social change, and they both believe that social change is the alteration of how people perform their social roles as well as the changes that take place in social systems and the social control laws over a specific period of time. Additionally, Ginsberg (1972, Ginsberg) asserts that social change refers to any alteration to the social structure of the social system as a whole, a component, or in its form. Therefore, if we attempt to analyze society, people no longer play the same social roles they did during a particular period of time. We must examine it through the lens of a particular historical period in order to fully understand the social change it underwent in light of its current structure. (Malhas, 2008, P. 21)

Social change is therefore a change in the fundamental components of a social group or society. It has always been a phenomenon that coexists with social life, but it has become particularly acute in the modern era. Modern sociology has its roots in efforts to comprehend the abrupt changes that upended traditional societies and prompted the emergence of new types of social order (Anthony Giddens, op. cit., p.: 743). In what seems to be a stable image.

The broadest definitions of change refer to an object's development over time. Modern sociology frequently uses the concept of the social sphere, which denotes fluid networks of actions, interactions, social relations, and social institutions, to highlight the dynamic nature of this specific entity known as a society. Constancy is a temporary state of individual or collective representations that fail to understand the process of transformation except in its logical, relative, representative form, as all coherent entities, such as groups, federations, organizations, and states, are temporary results of a particular arrangement of actions and activities (John Scott, 2009, p. 97).

3. SOCIAL CHANGE FROM A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Sociologists study specific change processes in great detail and scrutinize definitions in order to track issues of social change in general. In their conceptual framework, theories of social change now account for a very large number of phenomena, both short- and long-term, as well as those with a broad impact and a narrow scope. It also encompasses phenomena that take place at all scales, from the cosmic to the familial. One aspect of this research area is the profound structural and economic changes that occurred in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union in the early 1990s. Social scientists are also interested in changes that affect social relationships, cultural meanings, behaviour, norms, and values. One aspect of Saint-Simon and Comte's legacy, which is reflected in the functionalist theory attributed to well-known figures like Talcott Parsons and Wilbert Moore, is reflected in Emile Durkheim's work. In contrast to competing interpretations of change that see change as an imbalance brought on by class conflict, it is possible to explain social change as a secondary phenomenon that is accompanied by society's ongoing search for balance if society is seen as a complex and interconnected pattern of functions (Gordon Marshall, 2000, p. 432).

In his analysis of the phenomenon of change, Emil Durkheim began by highlighting the need to distinguish between causes and functions and held that the factors that give rise to phenomena are unrelated to the purposes they serve. Things do not exist because we need them; rather, they exist because of unrelated factors. In the same context, Durkheim believed that in order to fully explain a significant phenomenon, it is necessary to ascertain not only its cause but also the extent to which it contributes to creating social harmony (Mohamed Bou Al-Nana'a, 2017, p.: 88). In his book The Division of Social Labor, Durkheim emphasized that the transition from the mechanical solidarity that characterizes traditional society to the organic solidarity that characterizes modern society depends on a major factor, which is the high demographic density in society (Lahbib Maamri, 2005, p: 91), and on this, he presented his explanation of the phenomenon. Durkheim believed that social change could be explained by reference to the demographic factor.

According to Johnson (1970), social change is nothing more than a change in the way the social system is built from a situation in which it is essentially constant. These structural changes are primarily brought about by functional changes in the social structure, which result in a structure that is more effective and capable of carrying out tasks (Dalal Istitiyeh Malhas, previous source, p.
Most functional approaches concentrate on the functional nature of change in or to the social system. The American sociologist Talcott Parsons believed, within the same functional orientation, that in order to understand the state of change, one should first consider the state of no change, or the time of stability and equilibrium. When there is no relative background of non-change that can be connected to it, he notes, "The characteristics of change cannot appear." According to Parsons, "A social system's structure and environment must be distinguished from the internal process of progress and from the reciprocal change between the system and its environment." Although this distinction is undoubtedly relative, it is nonetheless fundamental and well-organized (Bou Al-Nana'a, previous reference, p. 88).

The need to explain two enormous waves of change that were sweeping Europe at the time—industrialization and democratic development—led to the first attempts at sociological analysis. This problem was one of the central sociological issues that gave rise to these first attempts. Following the French and American Revolutions. In his theory of social dynamics, Comte proposed that societies develop through a sequence of predictable stages, with the passage from one stage to the next depending on the level of advancement of human knowledge. Spencer's evolutionary theory of change was based on structural variation and population expansion. The nineteenth-century theories of social change in general were dominated by a tendency to historical tendency and a utopian character (Marshall, op. cit., p.: 431).

The most significant social changes, in contrast to what Karl Marx claimed, were revolutionary in nature, which he attributed to the class struggle, which is based on the pursuit of dominance and control.

4. SOCIAL CHANGE AND THE MULTICLITY OF APPROACHES

Does social change follow a pre-established, distinct, and special model? This hypothetical question preoccupied philosophers and sociologists, so Hegel and Marx went on to say that change is the result of contradictions, and others, like Nisbet, went on to consider it a major product of external causes. The change was explained from two different hypothetical angles: the first is the angle of those who say that the overall Societies are necessarily oriented towards a better ideal state, and the second is the angle of those who say that the Societies are necessarily oriented towards a state of greater imperfect. Additionally, some have viewed particular social dimensions or factors as concrete causes of change, such as the expansion of global trade (Montesquieu), the economic structure of societies (Marx), the advancement of science and technology (Comte), or religion (Fustel de Colange) (Khalil, 1984, p. 74).

The theory developed by Valfredo Pareto, which emphasizes the influence that competing elites have on social power, and William Ogburn's theory, which focuses on cultural and technological factors, especially the invention factor in the process of change, are two examples of single causal explanation models used in contemporary sociology (by Habib Maamari, Previous reference, p.: 92). There has always been a search for the "main driver" of change, and there has been a change in modern sociology that transcends its traditional scientific forms to reject the notion that there is a dominant cause of social change. Specifically, it acknowledges the multiplicity and abundance of patterns of change: internal patterns, external patterns, mixed patterns, and the paths of change can be unilinear or circular, repetitive, and some of them can be expected to repeat (Khalil Ahmed Khalil, previous reference, p.: 74), There are (paradigms) that refer to theories that are sometimes complementary to each other and competing in methodological terms at other times. This is true for the analysis of social change, as it is true for other fields in sociology because no single theory can explain everything. Most sociologists today are content in a more modest way with medium-term theories rather than searching for laws that govern the history of societies. This is why Raymond Beaudon's book, which he dedicated to, gave the impression of a relative disorder (Philippe Caban, Jean Francois Donett, 2010, p.: 311), and what Raymond Boudon came up with in his book "La place du désordre" (1984) is his monitoring of most theories of social change and presenting them in the following form:
5. **FORMS AND VARIABLES OF CHANGE**

The Greek philosophers were well aware that society is in constant change, and Heraclitus believed that society is in constant movement and change affects everything, as he says (‘You cannot jump twice in the same river”). Many philosophers and thinkers also believed that societies move in accordance with fixed and unchanging laws, suggesting that there is a driving force that propels society forward. The references to change have changed, their interpretations have varied, and they have emerged from the unilateral interpretation (A group of authors, 2018, p: 33), such as that put forth by Durkheim by connecting it to the demographic factor. This is due to the development of rational and scientific thought. Robert Fail and Jean-Pierre Duran offer a comprehensive analysis (see: Jean-Pierre Durand, Robert Fail, 2012, pp.: 550-555), we can condense the elements that contribute to social change as follows:

**Figure No. 01: Factors of Social Change**

Source: Prepared by researchers based on:

---

**Table No. 01: The programmatic picture of the theories of change according to Raymond Boudon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Selections</th>
<th>Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type One</td>
<td>Searching for tendencies</td>
<td>Parsons: The tendency to universalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comte: The Law of the Three Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosto: stages of growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Two</td>
<td>A - Conditional laws</td>
<td>Torsk: the vicious circle of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b - Structural laws</td>
<td>Baduri: Reproduction of semi-feudal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Three</td>
<td>Forms of change</td>
<td>The Hegelian Triad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohn: Scientific Revolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Four</td>
<td>Reasons for change</td>
<td>Weber: Protestant Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McClelland: The Achievement Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As for the forms of social change, it is related to the issue of trends and goals of change. Change is not of one style as long as its goals and civilized environments are different. Change can be classified into the following forms (Ihsan Muhammad Al-Hassan, 2005, p.: 302):

a- circular social change;
b- Linear or longitudinal social change;
c- evolutionary social change;
d - the diffusion of civilization;
e- Planned social change.

6. CONCLUSION

According to "Antonian Konderste," every change is a change, every stability is a view of death or an illusion, and every change is a step towards perfection and the best. What a change reduces in us makes us better able to understand and move toward the better, taking into account the momentum of the experiences we amass in this book from generation to generation. If not, then the problem lies with us rather than "change."

In order to predict what should be, change must actually be understood in the context of what has already changed, what it was, and how it was. It is enhanced by numerous scientific, explanatory, and futuristic theses, some of which we have attempted to evoke and extrapolate into our environment. This leads to numerous new theses and attempts to understand, which necessitate a great deal of opinion and analysis from specialists and academics. Because science is cumulative and evolving, it is unavoidable that our understanding will change, possibly in the direction of perfection.
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