



DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

PONDICHERY UNIVERSITY

MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIOLOGY (M.A.)

First Year

Paper-I

SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS

UNITS: I – VIII

Copyright Reserved
For Private Circulation Only



DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

PONDICHERRY UNIVERSITY

MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIOLOGY (M.A.)

First Year

Paper-I

SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS

UNITS: I – VIII

Copyright Reserved
For Private Circulation Only

Master of Arts in Sociology - I Year
Paper - I — Sociological Concepts

Units I – VIII written by

Dr. G. Ramathirtham

Reader in Sociology

Department of Sociology

Pondicherry University

Pondicherry 605 014.

Gunasundari Modern Art Printers, Chennai - 600 021.

MASY 1001 - SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS

CONTENTS

UNIT I

- Lesson 1: Definition. Origin and Development of Sociology. Nature and Scope of Sociology. Sociology as a Science. Importance of Sociology.
- Lesson 2: Sociology and other Social Sciences. Sociology and History. Sociology and Economics. Sociology and Political Science. Sociology and Psychology. Sociology and Anthropology. Sociology and Demography.
- Lesson 3: Sociological Perspectives: Functionalism. Conflict Exchange. Symbolic Interactionism. Ethnomethodology. Phenomenology.

UNIT II

- Lesson 4: Society and Community. Differences between Community and Society.
- Lesson 5: Society. Definition. Features. Social Structure. Function. Individual and Society.
- Lesson 6: Community. Definition. Elements of a Community. Types of Community.

UNIT III

- Lesson 7: Culture Definition. Contents of Culture. Characteristics of Culture. Functions of Culture.
- Lesson 8: Theories of Culture: Sub-Culture. Cultural Lag. Acculturation.
- Lesson 9: Variability of Culture. Ethnocentrism.

UNIT IV

- Lesson 10: Socialization. Definition. Process and stages of Socialization. Agencies of Socialization.
- Lesson 11: Social Interaction. Definition. Nature of Social Interaction.

Lesson 12: Forms of Social Interaction. Co-operation, Competition, Conflict, Accommodation and Assimilation.

UNIT V

Lesson 13: Social Institution. Definition. Characteristics of Social Institution. Types of Social Institution. Association - Definition. Differences between Association and Social Institution.

Lesson 14: Major Social Institutions - Marriage, Definition. Types and functions. Family. Definition. Types and functions.

Lesson 15: Educational Institution. Definition. Forms. Functions and Changes. Religious Institution - Definition. Forms. Functions and Changes. The Government. Definition. Forms and Functions.

UNIT VI

Lesson 16: Social Groups. Definition. Characteristics. Functions.

Lesson 17: Primary and Secondary Groups. Definition. Characteristics. Importance and Differences.

Lesson 18: Major types of groups.

UNIT VII

Lesson 19: Social Stratification. Definition. Features. Functions.

Lesson 20: Processes Functions of Stratification: Differentiation, Ranking, Evaluation and Rewarding.

Lesson 21: Forms of Stratification. Caste, Social Class and other Criteria for Stratification. Differences between Caste and Class.

UNIT VIII

Lesson 22: Social Control: Definition. Forms - Formal and Informal. Agencies of Social Control.

Lesson 23: Social Change: Definition. Forms of Social Change - Evolution, and Progress.

Lesson 24: Factors of Social Change - Theories of Social Change. Linear and Cyclical Theories.

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
PONDICHERRY UNIVERSITY.
MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIOLOGY – I Year

Paper I – Sociological Concepts

TABLE OF CONTENTS		
	TITLE	Page No.
UNIT - I		
1	DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF SOCIOLOGY	3
2	SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES	25
3	SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES	33
UNIT - II		
4	SOCIETY AND COMMUNITY	54
5	SOCIETY	59
6	COMMUNITY	70
UNIT - III		
7	CULTURE	76
8	THEORIES OF CULTURE	86
9	VARIABILITY OF CULTURE AND ETHNOCENTRISM	96
UNIT - VI		
10	SOCIALIZATION	102
11	SOCIAL INTERACTION	112
12	FORMS OF SOCIAL INTERACTION	115
UNIT - V		
13	SOCIAL INSTITUTION	123
14	MAJOR SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS	130
15	EDUCATION - RELIGION - GOVERNMENT	137
UNIT - VI		
16	SOCIAL GROUPS	147
17	PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS	151
18	TYPES OF GROUPS	156

UNIT - VII

19	SOCIAL STRATIFICATION	161
20	PROCESSES OF STRATIFICATION	164
21	FORMS OF STRATIFICATION	167

UNIT - VIII

22	SOCIAL CONTROL	169
23	SOCIAL CHANGE	175
24	FACTORS OF SOCIAL CHANGE	180

UNIT - I**LESSON - 1**

DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF SOCIOLOGY

CONTENTS

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Definition
- 1.3 Origin and Development of Sociology
- 1.4 Nature and Scope of Sociology
- 1.5 Sociology as a Science
- 1.6 Importance of Sociology

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The study of human society is not recent. It is as old as human existence since people have contemplated their activities and relationships from time immemorial. Ideas and knowledge of human society were found in philosophy, an over-all approach to understand the problems and activities of mankind. Philosophy is an all-inclusive source of human knowledge and several sciences were regarded as branches of philosophy. Modern knowledge is classified into specific categories for purposes of precise and clear understanding. There are different sciences dealing with different aspects of nature and human experience. The classification of knowledge into various sciences is broadly under three categories – the physical sciences, the natural sciences and the social sciences.

The conditions which gave rise to sociology were both intellectual and social. It may be said that sociology has had a four-fold origin in political philosophy, the philosophy of history, biological theories of evolution, and the movements for social and political reform which found it necessary to undertake surveys of social conditions. The philosophy of history and the social survey were particularly important.

The philosophy of history as a distinct branch of speculation is a creation of the eighteenth century. It is reflected in the writings of Montesquieu and Voltaire in France, of Herder in Germany. In the early part of the nineteenth century the philosophy of history became an important intellectual influence through the writings of Hegel and of Saint Simon. From these two thinkers stems the work of Karl Marx and Auguste Comte. We may briefly assess the contributions of the philosophy of history to sociology as having been the notions of development and progress, and the concepts of historical periods and social types.

The second important element in modern sociology is provided by the Social Survey. It had two sources. One was the growing conviction that the methods of the natural sciences should and could be extended to the study of human affairs; that human phenomena could be classified and measured. The other was the concern with poverty – the social problem. In industrial societies, poverty was no longer a natural phenomenon, but was the result of human ignorance or of exploitation. Under these two influences, the social survey came to occupy an important place in the new science of society.

There, intellectual movements, the philosophy of history and the social survey, were not isolated from the social circumstances of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Western Europe. The new interest in history and in social development was aroused by the rapidity of social change, and by the contrast of cultures which the voyages of discovery brought to men's attention.

The philosophy of history was not merely a child of thought. It was born out of two revolutions – the industrial revolution in England and the political revolution in France. Similarly, the social survey emerged from a new conception of social evils. A social survey of poverty or any other social problem; only makes sense that something can be done to remove such evils.

The pre-history of sociology can be assigned to a period of about one hundred years, roughly from 1750 to 1850 or from the publication of Montesquieu's "De Vesprit des lois" to the work of Auguste Comte and the early writings of Herbert Spencer and Karl Marx. We can see from this brief survey of its origins some of the characteristics which early sociology assumed. In the first place, Sociology was *encyclopaedic*: it was concerned with the whole social life of man and with the whole of human history. Secondly, under the influence of the philosophy of history, reinforced later by the biological theory of evolution, it was *evolutionary*, seeking to identify and account for the principal stages in social evolution. Thirdly, it was conceived generally as a *positive science*, similar in character to the natural sciences. In the eighteenth century the social sciences were conceived broadly upon the model of physics. Sociology, in the nineteenth century, was modelled upon biology, as is evident from the widely diffused conception of society as an organism, and from the attempts to furnish general laws of social evolution. Fourthly, in spite of its claim to be a general science, sociology dealt particularly with the social problems arising from the political and economic revolutions of the eighteenth century; it was above all a *science of the new industrial society*. Finally, it had an *ideological* as well as a scientific character; conservative and radical ideas entered into its formation, gave rise to conflicting theories, and provoked controversies which continue to the present day.

The recent changes in the world situation have altered the attitude to the study of society. There is a change-over from the encyclopaedic conception of society to a segmental interest of societies. Instead of studying the entire social structure, sociological knowledge is directed to a specific approach of the types of society of microscopic and macroscopic phenomena.

1.2 DEFINITION

Sociology has been defined in a number of ways by different sociologists. No single definition has, yet been accepted as completely

satisfactory. In fact, there are as many definitions of sociology as there are sociologists. Some of the definitions of sociology are as follows:

Auguste Comte, the founding father of Sociology, derived the word sociology from the Latin word "Socius" meaning "Companion" or "Associate" and the Greek word "logos" meaning word or study or science. The etymological meaning of sociology is thus the science of society.

William F. Ogburn and M.F. Nimkoff define sociology as "the scientific study of social life".

Alex Inkeles defines sociology "as the study of systems of social action and of their inter-relations".

R.E. Park and F.W. Burgess: "Sociology is the science of collective behaviour".

Kingsley Davis says that Sociology is a general science of society.

Emile Durkheim defines sociology as the science of social institutions.

Kimball Young says that "sociology deals with the behaviour of men in groups".

John F. Cuber says that sociology may be defined as a body of scientific knowledge about human relationships.

L.F. Ward - "Sociology is the science of society or of social phenomena".

Max Weber - "Sociology is the science which attempts the interpretive understanding of social action".

Arnold Green - "Sociology is the synthesizing and generalising science of man in all his social relationships".

These definitions indicate the different methods of approach with an underlying common principle of human relationships - the main subject matter of sociology. Its main emphasis is on the "Social" aspect of these relationships. MacIver has classified that whatever topic may be included

in the subject-matter of sociology, its real subject-matter is social relationships. Sociology is the science of social life of man and his society. These are the central objects of all sociological studies. Sociology has for its field the whole life of man in society. The whole base of sociology is to determine the nature and character of human society and social institution.

1.3 ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Study of society is as old as human nature. Even centuries ago, men were thinking about society and how it should be organized. They were thinking about the pattern or design of the universe around. Though they were thinking in sociological terms they were called philosophers, historians, social thinkers, law-givers, seers and so on.

Plato was the first western philosopher who attempted a systematic study of society. He held the view that a society was a reflection of individual and it could be organised in a rational manner. In a way, he was the first exponent of the organic theory of society. Aristotle in his "Politics" analysed political system by keeping social realities in view, just as Kautilya in his Arthashastra. Aristotle, too, subscribed to an organic theory of society. Similarly in the writings of Manu, Confucius, Cicero and others we find major attempts to deal methodically with the nature of society, law, religion, philosophy etc.

In the medieval ages, Ibn Khaldun pointed out that the people are united together because of solidarity. In the renaissance period, the thinkers presented ideal societies. On the other hand, Machiavelli approached society in a realistic manner and set aside the organic view of classical and medieval ages. The French writer, Montesquieu deserves special mention for his notable contribution towards the scientific investigation of social phenomenon. The Italian writer, Vico in his famous book "The New Science" contended that society was subjected to definite laws.

In the 17th century, the thinking about the society was dominated by the view that social institutions were stable and fixed. The idea of change

as well as the idea aiming at a better society constituted the hallmark of the speculations of intellectuals in the 18th century. Locke makes out a case for a civil society and a government to protect social life of man which is often made insecure because of their absence. Rousseau portrays an idyllic society of man, how it has been ravished, and how it ought to be restored through the free will of each and every individual. Voltaire finds fault with religious institutions and argues against them. Such an argument means that social institutions are artificial and social phenomena should be made free.

The views of the economists also pointed out that there existed positive laws relating to society. Adam Smith maintained that economic activity was sustained by spontaneous behaviour of people and thus it was the natural order of things. Adam Ferguson classified societies into savage, barbarian and civilized. In brief, the 18th century was a century of probing and questioning.

Sociology appeared when it was recognised that the fields of economics, history, philosophy and political science did not fully explain man's social behaviour. Sociology as a science and particularly as a separate field of study was born with Auguste Comte (1798-1853), the French philosopher and Sociologist. Auguste Comte is traditionally considered the Father of Sociology. Comte introduced the word sociology for the first time in his book "Course de Philosophie Positive" which was published in French in Six Volumes. To be more exact it was in the Fourth Volume of this famous book published in 1839 Comte used the term sociology. Comte had coined the term sociology from the Latin word Socius, meaning society or companion and the Greek word Logos, meaning study or science. Thus, the meaning of sociology is the science of society. He defined the scope of this social science and the methods which it should employ. Comte defined sociology as the science of social phenomena "subject to natural invariable laws, the discovery of which is the object of investigation". He advocated the use of the positive method for sociology. He further believed that social evolution went hand in hand with progress in accordance with the "Law

of Three Stages" which were - the theological stage, the metaphysical stage and the positive stage. The last stage was the most advanced and the one in which we are living.

Another pioneer of sociology was one of the most brilliant Englishmen called Herbert Spencer (1820-1903). His sociology is essentially evolutionistic. Evolution begins in the inorganic world of matter, goes through the organic or living world of plants and animals, and ends in the human and social world of men. The fundamental processes of evolution are differentiation and integration. The most significant contribution of Spencer is the so called organic analogy, in which society is compared with the human organism. Spencer occupies the foremost place in the biological school of sociology.

The Frenchman Frederic Le Play (1806-1882) exerted great influence on future generation. He first applied to his research the case-study method. In his main work "The European Workers" in six volumes, he took the family budget as the main tool for sociological analysis, and introduced the survey method and the concept of "participant observer".

Besides these writers, others like Karl Marx, Charles Durkheim and later on, Sigmund Freud, exerted deep influence on sociological thought, but none of them was properly a sociologist. The first was an economist, the second a biologist, and the third a psychoanalyst. Yet some of their ideas will be dealt with in the present work.

The Frenchman, Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) and the German, Max Weber (1864-1920) have become very prominent and influential sociologists. Emile Durkheim emphasises that the ultimate social reality is the group, not the individual. He thinks that the social life has to be analysed in terms of "social facts", which are the most basic concepts of his system. He insists that these social facts are the proper study of sociology. Max Weber's approach is the opposite to that of Durkheim. For him the individual is the basic units of society. He propounded a special method called the method of understanding (Verstehen) for the study of

social phenomena. His influence on contemporary sociologists especially those of the analytic school is rapidly increasing.

Other authors such as L.H. Morgan (1818-1887) and E.B. Tylor (1832-1917) may also be included among the pioneers in sociological thought though they were mainly anthropologists. Their theories and methods were evolutionistic, though instead of the term evolution, Tylor used that of "Stages of Culture".

The evolutionary school owes its origin mostly to the works of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer. Its central tenet is that society is made up of social groups, each of which follows the laws of evolution in the same way as the zoological world is made up of organisms in the process of evolution. Therefore, the key to social change is of a biological nature. Marxist authors think nevertheless that the determining factor of social change is the economic factor, while for Thursten B. Veblen, it is the technological, and for B. Kidd, it is the religious factors.

The organismic theories were mostly inspired by Herbert Spencer. These theories conceive of society as a biological organism with nerves, tissues, cells etc., subject to evolutionary change. The biological organismic theory is a further elaboration of the evolutionary theory.

E. Westermarck and L.T. Habhouse, mark in their works the period of transition from pure evolutionism to the following theories which were commonly accepted in modern times. The Naturalistic or Positivistic School derives its inspiration mostly from the works of Comte, Durkheim and Pareto. This school essentially consists of an attempt to equate the methods of sociology to those of the natural sciences such as physics, chemistry and biology by using external (objective) observation and measurement or quantification. The main advocates of naturalism were F.H. Giddings, W.F. Ogburn, and above all G.A. Lundberg, who nevertheless adopted also methods different from the positivists.

The Analytic school stands in striking contrast with the naturalistic school. Its main source of inspiration is Max Weber to whom Ferdinand Tonnies, George Simmel and Charles Horton Cooley could be added. One of the main principles of this school is that the differences between the natural and the social sciences is qualitative. In these the individual person is the ultimate element, not the group as such. P.A. Sorokin, F. Znaniecki, Talcott Parsons, R.M. MacIver, M. Ginsberg, R.K. Merton and P.H. Furfey, also belong to this school of thought.

The Structural-functional theory or simply Functional theory is one of the most widely followed in modern times. It draws its inspiration from the writings of most of the classic sociologists such as Comte, Spencer, Durkheim and Pareto. They insisted on the interdependence of the different elements of society as parts integrated into a whole. But in modern times, this theory has received a special impulse from the works of Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942) and A.R. Radcliffe - Brown. Its central point is that all parts of a culture or group are integrated into the whole or are interdependent on each other, and that social phenomena are functions or effects of determinate social structure such as class system, economic or kin systems, etc. Hence the approach to the study of cultures or societies must be functional, namely, by investigating the function of the interrelated parts of the whole. Radcliffe Brown laid special stress on the structural - functional analysis. S.F. Nadel, Evans Pritchard, Kingsley Davis, R. Redfield, and with certain reservations, R.K. Merton are the followers of this school.

Many promising branches of sociology have appeared also in modern times such as the sociology of knowledge (Karl Mannheim), the sociology of religion (H.H. Gerth), and industrial sociology (Elton Mayo, G. Friedman, Wilbert Moore, J. Woodward etc.)

So far as sociology in India is concerned, it was initiated by Sir Patrick Geddes in the first half of the present century. Some prominent sociologists of our country like R.K. Mukherjee, G.S. Ghurye, R.N. Saxena,

K.M. Kapadia, Mrs. Iravati Karve, D.N. Majumdar, M.N. Srinivas, M.S. Gore, S.C. Dube, P.N. Prabhu, A.R. Desai, I.P. Desai, Y.B. Daniel and others have contributed to the enrichment of the discipline. Sociology is now taught in almost all universities in India and it is becoming more and more popular among the students.

1.4 NATURE AND SCOPE OF SOCIOLOGY

Nature of Sociology

If we look at sociology from the point of view of its internal logical characteristics, we can understand the nature of the subject. First, sociology is a social and not a natural science. This is a distinction in content and not in method. It serves to distinguish those sciences that deal with the physical universe from those that deal with the social universe. It particularly distinguishes sociology from astronomy, physics, chemistry, geology, biology, and all of their sub-divisions.

Secondly, sociology is a categorical, not a normative, discipline. It means that sociology confines itself to statements about what is, not what should be or ought to be. As a science, sociology is necessarily silent about questions of value; it cannot decide the directions in which society ought to go, and it makes no recommendations on matters of social policy. This is not to say that sociological knowledge is useless for purposes of social and political judgement, but only that sociology cannot itself deal with problems of good and evil, right and wrong, better or worse, or any others that concern human values. Sociology can and does, in a categorical fashion, state that at a certain time and in a certain place a particular group of people adhered to certain values; but it cannot, in normative fashion, decide whether these people ought to have held these in preference to others. It is this canon that distinguishes sociology, as a science, from social and political philosophy, and from ethics and religion.

Thirdly, sociology is a pure science, not an applied science. The immediate goal of sociology is the acquisition of knowledge about human society, not the utilization of that knowledge. Physicists do not build

bridges, physiologists do not treat people affected with some illness, and chemists do not fill prescriptions at the corner drugstore. Similarly, sociologists do not determine questions of public policy. Sociology, as a pure science, is engaged in the acquisition of knowledge that will be useful to the administrator, the legislator, the teacher, the foreman, the social worker, and the citizen. Sociology stands in the same relation to administration, legislation, diplomacy, teaching, supervision, social work, and citizenship, as physics does engineering, physiology to medicine, jurisprudence to law, astronomy to navigation, chemistry to pharmacy, and biology to plant and animal husbandry. These comments mean only that there is a division of labour involved and that the persons who acquire sociological knowledge are not always those who use it best, and that those who use it are not usually those who have the time, the energy and the training to acquire it.

The relations between the pure and applied sciences can be seen more clearly, perhaps, if we juxtapose them in the following fashion:

Pure Sciences	Applied Sciences
Physics	Engineering
Astronomy	Navigation
Mathematics	Accounting
Chemistry	Pharmacy
Physiology	Medicine
Political Science	Politics
Jurisprudence	Law
Zoology	Animal Husbandry
Botany	Agriculture
Geology	Petroleum Engineering
History	Journalism
Economics	Business
Sociology	Administration, Diplomacy, Social Work

The relations between these two groups of sciences are not always as direct as the table indicates and not always quite the same in a logical sense. In addition, each of the pure sciences has many more applications than are represented in the right-hand column and each applied discipline draws from more than one pure science on the left. Nevertheless, the table is useful in showing that sociology clearly belongs to one of these groups of sciences and not to the other.

A fourth characteristic of sociology is that it is a relatively abstract science and not a concrete one. This does not mean that it is unnecessarily complicated or unduly difficult. It means merely that sociology is not interested in the concrete manifestations of human events but rather in the form that they take and the patterns they assume. For example, in distinguishing sociology from history, that sociology was concerned, not with particular wars and revolutions, but with war and revolution in general as social phenomena, as types of social conflict. Similarly, sociology is not interested in any particular concrete organization, such as the Salem Steel Corporation, Pondicherry University, the Indian Navy, Rotary International, or The Sociological Society, but rather in the fact that men organize themselves into associations of this kind in order to pursue certain interests.

A fifth characteristic of sociology, is that it is a generalizing and not a particularizing or individualizing science. It seeks general laws or principles about human interaction and association, about the nature, form, content, and structure of human groups and societies, and not, as in the case of history, complete and comprehensive descriptions of particular societies or particular events.

A sixth characteristic of sociology is that it is both a rational and an empirical science.

Finally, a seventh characteristic of sociology is that it is a general and not a special social science. Social relationships and social interactions between people occur in all the affairs of human life, whether these affairs

are primarily economic or political or religious or recreational or legal or intellectual, and that there is no separate category of the social apart from all of these others.

In the broadest sense, Sociology is the study of human interactions and interrelations, their conditions and consequences. Thus, ideally, Sociology has for its field the whole life of man in society, all the activities whereby men maintain themselves in the struggle for existence, the rules and regulations which define their relations to each other, the systems of knowledge and belief, art and morals and any other capacities and habits acquired and developed in the course of their activities as members of society. But this is too wide a scope for any science to deal with properly. An attempt has, therefore, been made to limit [and demarcate] the field of Sociology. There are two main schools of thought among sociologists on this issue.

Scope of Sociology

One group of writers headed by George Simmel, [German Sociologists], demarcate Sociology clearly from other branches of social study and confine it to the enquiry into certain defined aspects of human relationships. They regard sociology as pure and independent. The other group maintains that the field of social investigation is too wide for any one science and that if any progress is to be made, there must be specialisation and division. They also insist that in addition to special Social Sciences such as Economics, Anthropology, History etc., there is need also of a general Social Science, i.e., Sociology whose function it would be to inter-relate the results of the special social sciences and to deal with the general conditions of social life. Let us discuss these two different views about the scope of Sociology in detail.

1. Specialistic/Formalistic School

According to George Simmel, the distinction between Sociology and other special Social Sciences is that it deals with the same topics as they but from a different angle – from the angle of the different way, manner,

modes of social relationships. Social relationships such as competition, subordination, division of labour etc., are shown / illustrated with e.g., exemplified in different spheres of social life such as economic, the political and even the religious, moral or artistic but the business of Sociology is to disentangle these forms of social relationships and to study them in abstraction. Thus, according to Simmel, Sociology is a specific social science which describes, classifies, analyses and delineates the forms of social relationships.

Max Weber also makes out a definite field for Sociology. According to him, the aim of Sociology is to interpret or understand social behaviour. But social behaviour does not cover the whole field of human relations. Indeed, not all human interactions are social. For instance a collision between two cyclists is in itself merely a natural phenomenon, but their efforts to avoid each other or the language they use after the event constitute true Social behaviour. Sociology is thus, according to him, concerned with the analysis and classification of types of social relationships.

Thus, according to the "formalistic" School, Sociology studies one specific aspect of Social relationships, ie., their forms and its scope is limited to them: (1) It has narrowed the scope of sociology. The formalistic school has limited the field of Sociology to merely abstract forms. Sociology besides studying the general forms of social relationships should also study the concrete contents of social life. (2) Abstract forms separated from concrete relations cannot be studied. Marris Ginsberg is of the view that a study of social relationships would remain barren if it is conducted in the abstract without full knowledge of the terms to which in concrete life they relate. For example, the study of competition will be hardly of any use unless it is studied in concrete form in economic life or in the world of art and knowledge. He is of the opinion that the scope of Sociology should not be limited to the study of social relationships in general but it should be widened by the addition of the study of these relationships as embodied in the different spheres of culture under special sociologies like Sociology

of Religion, Sociology of Art, Sociology of Law and Sociology of Knowledge etc. (3) The conception of pure sociology is impractical: The formalistic school has conceived of pure Sociology but none of the Sociologists has so far been able to construct a pure sociology. As a matter of fact, no social science can be studied in isolation from other Social Sciences. (4) Sociology alone does not study Social relationships: Sociology is not the only science which studies social relationships. Political Science, Economics and International Law also study social relationships.

2. Synthetic School

The Synthetic School wants to make Sociology a synthesis of the social sciences or a general science. According to *Emile Durkheim*, Sociology has three principal divisions, viz., (1) Social Morphology, (2) Social Physiology and (3) General Sociology. *Social Morphology* is concerned with geographical or territorial basis of the life of people and its relation to types of social organisation and the problems of population such as its volume and density, local distribution and the like.

Social Physiology is divided into a number of branches such as Sociology of Religion, of Laws, of Economic Life, of Language etc. Every one of these branches of Sociology deals with a set of social facts, that is, activities related to the various social groups.

The function of the *General Sociology* is to discover the general character of these social facts and to determine whether there are any general social laws of which the different laws established by the special social sciences, are particular expressions.

Hobhouse also holds a view similar to that of *Emile Durkheim* regarding the functions of Sociology. Ideally, for him Sociology is a synthesis of numerous Social studies but the immediate task of the sociologist is threefold. *Firstly*, as a sociologist, he must pursue his studies in his particular part of the social field. But *Secondly*, bearing in mind the interconnection of social relations he should try to interconnect the results

arrived at by the different Social Sciences and, *Thirdly*, he should interpret social life as a whole.

[Karl Mannheim divides Sociology into two main sections - (i) Systematic and General Sociology and (ii) Historical Sociology. Systematic and General Sociology describes one by one the main factors of living together as far as they may be found in every kind of society. The Historical Sociology deals with the historical variety and actually of the general forms of society. Historical Sociology falls into two main sections: Firstly, *Comparative Sociology* and secondly, *Social Dynamics*. Comparative Sociology deals mainly with the historical variations of the same phenomenon and tries to find by comparison general features as separated from Industrial features. *Social dynamics* deals with the inter-relations between the various social factors and institutions in a certain given society, for instance, in a primitive society.]

Marrus Ginsberg has summed up the chief functions of Sociology as follows: *Firstly*, Sociology seeks to provide a classification of types and forms of social relationships especially of those which have come to be defined institutions and associations. *Secondly*, it tries to determine the relation between parts or factors of social life, for example, the economic and political, the moral and the religious, the moral and the legal, the intellectual and the social elements. *Thirdly*, it endeavours to disentangle the fundamental conditions of social change and persistence and to discover sociological principles governing social life.

Thus, the scope of sociology is very wide. It is a general science but it is also a special science. As a matter of fact, the subject-matter of all social sciences is society. But Economics studies society from an economic viewpoint; Political science studies society from political viewpoint; while history is a study of society from a historical point of view. Sociology alone studies social relationships and society itself.

1.5 SOCIOLOGY AS A SCIENCE

A science may be defined in at least two ways: (1) a science is a body of organised, verified knowledge which has been secured through scientific investigation; (2) a science is a method of study whereby a body of organized, verified knowledge is discovered.

If the first definition is accepted, then sociology is a science to the extent that it develops a body of organised, verified knowledge which is based on scientific investigation. To the extent that sociology forsakes myth, folklore, and wishful thinking and bases its conclusions on scientific evidence, it is a science. If science is defined as a method of study, then sociology is a science to the extent that it uses scientific methods of study. All natural phenomena can be studied scientifically, if one is willing to use scientific methods. Any kind of behaviour – whether of atoms, animals, or adolescents – is a proper field for scientific study.

As a method of approach to the investigation of any phenomenon whatever, science implies primarily an attitude of mind, an attitude distinguished by adherence to several principles. Among these principles are objectivity, relativism, ethical neutrality, parsimony, skepticism, and humility, which we shall discuss in order.

1. *Objectivity* means that the conclusions arrived at as the result of inquiry and investigation are independent of the race, colour, creed, occupation, nationality, religion, moral preferences, and political predispositions of the investigator. If his research is truly objective it is independent of any subjective elements, any personal desires, that he may have.

2. *Relativism*, the second of our characteristics of the scientific attitude, means merely that the conclusions the scientist arrives at, are never considered permanent, universal, and absolute truths. He is never tempted to spell "truth" with a capital "T"; he knows that the propositions with which he operates today are subject to question tomorrow and that new evidence can wreck the most cherished notions. Because science, for this

reason, is the only self-correcting discipline, it is the most reliable method of acquiring knowledge. Science, in other words, has no notions so sacred, no propositions so privileged, no truths so absolute that they are not subject to change when new evidence arises to challenge them. A scientific truth is true only until further notice.

3. *Ethical neutrality*, means that the scientist, in his professional capacity, does not take sides on issues of moral or ethical significance. Sociology is a categorical science and not a normative one, and this distinction, is the same point that we wish to make here. The scientist, as such, has no ethical, religious, political, literary, philosophical, moral, or marital preferences. That he has these preferences as a citizen makes it all the more important that he dispense with them as a scientist. As a scientist he is interested not in what is right or wrong or good or evil, but only in what is true or false.

No science can tell a man whether to vote for a Republican or a Democrat, whether to join a Catholic or a Protestant Church, whether to move to the country or remain in the city, whether to make a hydrogen bomb or not to make it.

4. *Parsimony* has something to do with simplicity. It means that when one explanation is adequate to explain a phenomenon, two or more are superfluous. When the movement of the branches of a tree in a wind storm can be explained by natural forces, it is unnecessary and undesirable to explain the movement also by supposing that a spirit lives in the trunk of the tree and agitates its branches when he is angry. This principle of parsimony was stated in the Middle Ages by William of Occam.

5. A fifth characteristic of the scientific attitude of mind is *scepticism*. This does not mean scepticism for its own sake, which would lead to inaction and absurdity, but simply a willingness, if not indeed an eagerness, to question everything before accepting it and especially those things for which there is insufficient evidence. The scientist, in popular parlance, is always "a man from Missouri". He has to be shown. One of the most

important questions that the scientist can ask is, "Where is the evidence?" If there is none, or if it is inadequate, the theory is discarded or held in abeyance. Scepticism, in short, as George Santayana has so eloquently reminded us, is the chastity of the intellect and should be preserved through a long youth. It is an attitude of mind without which science cannot maintain its self-correcting features.

6. There is one final attitude that should be associated always and everywhere with the scientific method, and that is *humility*, a humility indeed that takes two forms. The first of these is humility before the limitations of the human mind, and the second, humility before the magnitude of that which is not yet known. What we know in fact is pitiable and frail in comparison with what we do not know.

Special difficulties appear in attempts to apply the scientific method to the study of social phenomena. The sociologist stands in a peculiar relationship to his material.

Physical scientists are seldom a part of the problem they investigate. The stars have no sentiments, the atoms no anxieties that have to be taken into account.

The sociologist, on the other hand, stands in no such fortunate relationship to his material. He is from the beginning completely immersed in his data. He is always in some sense a part of the phenomenon he is investigating. He is always, in the same sense, a participant observer of the processes he studies. He himself is a product of his society and conforms, consciously or unconsciously, to its folkways and mores, its institutions and laws, its customs and ideologies, its canons of evidence. This is one of the reasons why not even the past is stable and why history needs continuously to be rewritten.

We can maintain, finally that sociology belongs not only to the sciences but also to the realm of humane letters. Indeed, the attributes we have assigned to the scientific method - objectivity, scepticism, humility, and

the rest - will appear, upon reflection, to characterize any kind of responsible inquiry, whether in the sciences or in the humanities. Sociology, dealing as it does with human affairs and humane concerns, can help to bridge the gap between two kinds of inquiry and contribute to both kinds of knowledge. Methods and concepts are important and necessary, especially in the empirical discovery and logical construction of a body of knowledge.

1.6 IMPORTANCE OF SOCIOLOGY

Sociology is concerned primarily with the acquisition of knowledge, not its utilization; sociology as such is a pure and not an applied science. However "pure" a science it may be, sociology has intellectual consequences for anyone who studies it.

In the first place, like all of the liberal arts and sciences, sociology is a liberating discipline. It liberates the student from the provincialisms of colour and class, of region and religion. It encourages him to consider society as a natural phenomenon, as natural as any other phenomenon in the universe. It helps him to take an objective view of his own society, to learn that it is one among many, to see the manner in which his own groups interact and combine with others to form the great society in which he lives. Sociology thus gives a perspective to history and an insight into the life of man on earth. Man, as Aristotle noted long ago, is a social animal. Everything he is or does or thinks is related in some fashion to the fact that he lives with other people and is never wholly isolated from society.

In the second place, sociology can help the student to recognize and to appreciate the social factors in the environment that surrounds him - his relations with his fellows, the life of the community in which he lives, and the nature of the greater community in which he finds himself at this particular juncture of historical circumstances. Society, after all, is no local phenomenon. It is universal, and as permanent as the life of man itself.

Sociology is a profession in which technical competence brings its own rewards. Sociologists, especially those trained in research procedures, are in increasing demand in business, government, industry, city planning, race relations, social-work, supervision, advertising, communication, administration, and many other areas of community life. A few years ago all a sociologist could do with his sociology was to teach it. Although teaching, especially in colleges and universities, will always draw sociologists, sociology has now become "practical" enough to be practised outside of academic halls. Careers apart from teaching are now possible in sociology, and expertly trained people are needed to work in many of its sectors and subdivisions. The various areas of applied sociology, in short, are coming more and more into prominence on local, state, national, and international levels.

Sociology increases our store of knowledge about the world we live in. This is not only valuable in itself but essential to modern civilization.

It might seem that since most sociologists are located in colleges and universities, their work is separated from the world of business and politics. There are many connections between sociology and the "real world".

The first connection to be noted is that sociology – as well as other sciences – requires a certain kind of political climate in order to develop and thrive. To obtain knowledge, one must have freedom of inquiry, freedom to publish research – no matter how unpopular the results might be – and freedom from religious or political persecution. The development of sociology and other social sciences in totalitarian societies has been crippled by periodic intervention and repression by the authorities.

The development of sociology is directly affected by the social problems and crises in the surrounding society. During the Great Depression of the 1930s, many sociologists focussed on unemployment and its impact on family life; during World War II, many turned to the study of propaganda and its effects on a population's morale; and during the turbulent 1960s, sociologists' interest in social movements, such as the student movemen'

and the civil rights movement, increased. Currently, one of the most lively areas of sociological interest is sex and gender inequality. All of these examples show how sociology mirrors problems in the larger society. Many of the subfields of sociology – such as criminology, the sociology of poverty, and the sociology of mental health and illness – show this close connection.

Sociological knowledge finds its way into the larger society in a variety of ways. First, increasing numbers of people apply their sociological training in government agencies such as the Bureau of the Census, as well as in agencies that deal with such problems as alcohol and drug abuse.

Second, the techniques generated by the sociologists and other social scientists are adopted by others. A striking example is the social survey. Developed and used mainly by sociologists and statisticians, it has become an essential tool of market research and political polling.

The work of sociologists and other social scientists provides a great deal of information that is helpful in making decisions on social policy. For example, when Department of Health was considering whether to distribute literature designed to reduce the rate of births, sociological research would have something to say about the groups in society that show the highest rates of birth, the likelihood that those groups would be reached by such a campaign, and the likely effectiveness (or lack of it) of distributing literature on birth control.

Finally, sociological research can help in assessing the impact of social policies after they have been put into action.

LESSON - 2

SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES

CONTENTS

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Sociology and History
- 2.3 Sociology and Economics
- 2.4 Sociology and Political Science
- 2.5 Sociology and Psychology
- 2.6 Sociology and Anthropology
- 2.7 Sociology and Demography

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Sociology is first of all a social science, and not a natural science. Sociology studies the social phenomena as natural as they are, like the physicist studies. There is nothing artificial, preternatural, or supernatural about social phenomena. Social phenomena are, as natural as the phenomena like the electricity and a modern city.

It is a fact that for administrative convenience, the sciences are divided into two large areas: those that deal with the physical universe, including astronomy, physics, chemistry, geology, biology and others; and those that deal with the social universe. In this division, sociology clearly belongs with the social sciences, along with history, economics and political science. This division is more administrative than logical because some sciences do not clearly fit into one or the other of these categories, but rather cut across them – for example, psychology, geography and anthropology. All these three subjects consider both physical and social facts. There are, for example, both physiological and social psychology, both physical and cultural geography, and both physical and cultural anthropology. But there is no physiological or physical sociology, so that in this sense sociology is clearly a social science.

It is more difficult to distinguish sociology from the various social sciences because the distinction is concerned not only with the differences in the content, but also in the degree of emphasis given to certain aspects of the same content. And, more specifically, the differences are in the ways in which the same content is approached and investigated. Some would say that sociology is the basic social science and all the other social sciences are sub-divisions. There are others who claim that sociology is a specialized science of social phenomena like economics, political science, and others. There are still others who see the closest possible relations with psychology and anthropology and logically relations are just as close, if not closer, with history, economics, and government. Let us consider the relationship of sociology with other social sciences in the following pages.

2.2 SOCIOLOGY AND HISTORY

Sociology and history are social disciplines and both are concerned with human activities and events. Therefore, both are very closely related and more or less considered by some thinkers as identical studies. It is often pointed out that the beginning of sociology is historical. The writers like G. Von Bulow have refused to acknowledge sociology as a science distinct from history. The history provides material for sociology. The comparative method and historical sociology always requires data which only the history can supply. Similarly, the historian also uses sociology. Until recently, the historian took his clues to important problems and his concepts and general ideas from philosophy. Now, these are drawn from sociology. History is a record of notable events of man in different societies during different periods of time. Sociology is concerned with the study of the historical development of the societies. Sociology studies the various stages of life, modes of living, customs, manners and their expression in the form of social institutions. Both are interested in the study of social phenomenon. Sociology makes use of historical data for the interpretation of human social behaviour. History recognizes the social conditions in which notable events have taken place. This level of mutual dependence

of history and sociology has made G.E. Howard to mark that "History is past sociology, and sociology is present History".

But inspite of the close relationship between sociology and history, they are different branches of knowledge. History is concerned primarily with the record of the past. The historian wants to describe, as accurately as possible, what actually happened to man during the long period he has lived on earth. Thus the historian wants an accurate description of events. Then he relates them to one another in a time sequence so that he can have a continuous story from the past to the present. He is not satisfied with mere description; he seeks also to learn the causes of these events, to understand the past not only how it has been but also how it came to be. Nevertheless he is, in a sense, interested in events for their own sake.

The Sociologist, on the other hand, is not interested in events but in the patterns that they exhibit. The historian is interested in the unique, the particular, and the individual; the sociologist is interested in the regular, the recurrent, and the universal. For example, the historian is interested in the Napoleonic Wars, the First and Second World Wars and all of the other wars within recorded time. The sociologist is interested in none of these wars as such, but in war itself as a social phenomenon, as one kind of conflict between social groups. Similarly the sociologist is not interested in the American Revolution, the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution, but in revolutions in general as a social phenomenon, as another kind of conflict between social groups. Finally, as a third example, the historian and biographer are both interested in the lives and careers of famous men - military, political, religious, scientific, and other leaders - whereas the sociologist is interested not in the men themselves but in the phenomenon leadership, because it is a phenomenon that appears in almost all social groups.

However, History and Sociology are different disciplines. History is a particularizing or individualizing science. Sociology is an analytical science. History investigates the unique and the individual; Sociology investigates

the regular and recurrent. Thus, it was remarked, that history describes events, whereas sociology evaluates and produces generalisations. History describes the event as it is due to some causes. But sociology studies the event as one of the items related to other social facts. For example, war is a historic event. Sociologist recognises it, not as it occurs but as related to modes of living and institutions; as it generally affects social structure. However, historical knowledge is essential to understand the present. History is more useful to sociology in the study of the development of society and the comparative study.

2.3 SOCIOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

There is close relationship between sociology and economics. Economics is the science of wealth in its three phases of production, distribution and consumption. As the economic process develops in society, it influences and is influenced by the social life of man. Sociologists like Max Weber, Vilfredo Pareto and others interpret economic change as an aspect of social change. It was also held that the study of economics would be misleading and incomplete apart from its social setting. Economics is concerned with material welfare of the human beings. The economic welfare or the material welfare is only a part of human welfare and it can be sought only with the proper knowledge of social laws. At the same time economic forces also exercise a great influence on the social life. So economic factors are considered as fundamental social processes in social interaction. An economist who wants to find a solution to the economic problems or unemployment, poverty, business cycle or inflation has to take into consideration the social phenomena existing at the particular time.

Thinkers like Max Weber, Emile Durkheim and Talcott Parsons emphasised sociological approach to the study of economic activities. On the other end, environmentalist writers like Karl Marx and Veblen emphasised that the social reality is determined by economic or technical forces. They tend to transform sociology into a part or aspect of economics. In particular cases, it still remains a difficult task to define the limits of

both sciences. It has given rise to various specialised branches of sociology as Political Sociology, Economic Sociology, Educational Sociology etc.

2.4 SOCIOLOGY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Political Science deals with social groups organized under the sovereignty of the state. This may also be studied as a social institution. The state is a structure within which other lesser societies such as the family, the commercial world or the university develop; but as a social group and as an institution, it is also the object of sociology. The relation between sociology and political science is quite intimate from the historical viewpoint. There are many common points between sociology and political science. Both are concerned with the study of society from different points of view. Sociology is concerned with the scientific study of society, whereas political science deals with a particular portion of society viewed as an organised unit.

There are, however, certain points of differences between sociology and political science. Sociology is concerned with the study of all forms of social associations. Political science is concerned mainly with a particular type of social association, viz., the state. It would not be accurate to consider political science as a part of sociology, for, it has special topics of its own such as the nature and systems of law, the methods of political representation, the sphere of the legislative power etc., with which no other science is concerned directly. But certain political questions such as the relation between law and freedom, or the nature of political allegiance, in as much as they are related with the whole of social life, may also fall within the scope of sociology. In short, the ground covered by sociology and political science is largely common, but their viewpoints are different; political science looks upon the state as a social institution or association; sociology looks upon the state as the supreme regulating power of the community and the source of political law.

The correlation between these two branches of the social sciences is such that Giddings once wrote: "To teach the theory of the state to men

who have not learned the first principle of sociology, is like teaching astronomy or thermodynamics to men who have not learned the Newtonian laws of motion".

2.5 SOCIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Psychology, as the science of behaviour, occupies itself primarily with the individual. Psychology is the positive science of human experience and behaviour. Psychology is interested in his intelligence and his learning, his motivations and his memory, his nervous system and his reaction, his hopes and his fears, and the order and disorder of his mind. Sociology as a scientific study of human society studies the human interactions in social situation. It is a study of human social behaviour resulting from the interaction of human minds. All social relationships are basically psychological. Both are positive sciences dealing with human experience and behaviour. Social psychology serves as a bridge between psychology and sociology. Social psychology maintains a primary interest in the individual. It concerns itself with the way in which the individual behaves in his social groups, how he behaves collectively with other individuals, and how his personality is a function both of his basic physiological and temperamental equipment and of the social and cultural influences to which he is exposed.

Sociology and Psychology have become controversial in the light of several sociological and psychological theories. Emile Durkheim distinguished sociology and psychology by pointing out that sociology is the study social facts which are external to individual minds. He also held that whenever social phenomenon is explained by psychological terms, it becomes invalid. Marries Ginsberg is of the opinion that sociological theories are based on psychological interpretation. In the words of R.M. MacIver, "Sociology in special gives aid to psychology, just as psychology gives special aid to sociology."

2.6 SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Anthropology is the science of man. It is very closely related to sociology. They are frequently indistinguishable. In a number of Universities anthropology and sociology are administratively organised into one department. Both sciences concern themselves with human societies. Anthropology, however, traditionally directs its attention to uncivilized societies, to societies whose members cannot read or write, to primitive societies. In studying these societies, anthropology investigates not only their forms of social organization and social relationship, which are of primary interest to the sociologist, but also their economics, religion, government, language and customs, as well as the personalities of their inhabitants.

Sociology on the other hand, has limited its direct attention to historical societies, to societies that are complex rather than simple, to societies, in short, whose members can read and write. Since these societies are complex, the sociologist is concerned more about their social organization, the social structure, and the social matrix within which these various phenomena appear than their economy as such, nor their religion, nor their government, nor their language and literature and science. The anthropologist has had to do the work with respect to non-literate societies that all social scientists – sociologists, economists, political scientists, students of religion, law, science, philosophy and so on – have done together with respect to modern civilized societies. There is thus a division of labour involved in the study of literate societies that would be neither practicable nor necessary in the study of nonliterate.

2.7 SOCIOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHY

Demography can be explained by pointing out that the term demography is derived from the Latin word 'demos' meaning people. Hence demography can be defined as the science of population. It is confined to a study of the components of population variation and change. It studies the interrelationships between population and socio-economic, cultural and other variables, whereas sociology studies the interrelationships between

the individuals in the social environment. Davis has referred certain areas which require a combination of demographic and sociological skills: (1) Fertility in connection with attitudes and social institutions; (2) Population changes in relation to social and economic change; (3) The labour force with respect to population structure and social organization; and (4) The family with regard to demographic behaviour. International and internal migration are two other areas of study mentioned by Davis, where both these disciplines are to be combined. Even in the study of mortality, age and sex differentials may have sociological bases and therefore are to be recognised as such.

Broom and Selznick treat population as one of the nine principal elements of sociological analysis for the discussion of six special topics, that is, family, city minorities, industrial sociology, political sociology and criminal behaviour. It, therefore, appears that along with social organization, culture, socialisation, primary groups, social stratification, association, collective behaviour, and ecology, population is an important element in Sociological analysis.

LESSON - 3

SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

CONTENTS

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Functionalism
- 3.3 Conflict
- 3.4 Exchange
- 3.5 Symbolic Interactionism
- 3.6 Ethnomethodology
- 3.7 Phenomenology

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The founding fathers of sociology have contributed various theoretical perspectives to the study of man and society. The term perspective literally means the view of the thinkers about the social order or the order of the society. Perspective has another meaning as orientation. So in the theoretical perspectives, the thinkers explain their orientation about the man and society. In fact perspectives are sometimes not considered theories at all. The term perspective may be used to differentiate a theory from a lesser set of ideas or point of view. But since perspectives and theories are both employed for the purpose of trying to explain social events, Perspective will be considered to be one type of theory. Perspectives are collections of concepts which are important basically as sensitizing agents. They point out important isolated aspects of reality. But perspectives are relatively less coherent and developed internally. Perspectives usually specify certain general process. When Marxism is taken as a perspective, the general process is conflict between naturally opposed groups. We need not ask too searching a theoretical question about the nature, origin, kinds and conditions of conflict in order to understand Marxism as a body of perspectives based on conflict. However Marxism might be used as a theory

if the appropriate theoretical questions mentioned above were answered. This lesson will examine the important theories of society, in the perspective levels.

3.2 FUNCTIONALISM

Functionalism was the dominant theoretical perspective in sociology during the 1940s and 1950s. The Key points of the functionalist perspective may be summarised by a comparison drawn from biology. If a biologist wanted to know how an organism such as the human body worked, he might begin by examining the various parts such as the brain, lungs, heart and liver. However, if he simply analysed the parts in isolation from each other, he would be unable to explain how life was maintained. So he would have to examine the parts in relation to each other since they work together to maintain the organism. Thus he would analyse the relationships between the heart, lungs, brain and so on to understand how they operated and appreciate their importance. From this viewpoint, any part of the organism must be seen in terms of the organism as a whole. Functionalism adopts a similar perspective.

The various parts of society are seen to be interrelated and taken together, they form a complete system. To understand any part of society, such as the family or religion, the part must be seen in relation to society as a whole. The functionalist will examine a part of society, such as the family, in terms of its contribution to the maintenance of the social system. Functionalism begins with the observation that behaviour in society is structured. This means that relationships between members of society are organized in terms of rules. Social relationships are therefore patterned and recurrent. Values provide general guidelines for behaviour. The structure of society can be seen as the sum total of social relationships which are governed by norms.

After establishing the existence of a social structure, functionalist analyses how that structure functions. This involves an examination of the relationship between the different parts of the structure and their

relationship to society as a whole. From this examination, the functions of institutions are discovered. At its simplest, here, function means effect. Thus the functions of the family is the effect it has on other parts of the social structure and on society as a whole. In practice the term function is usually used to indicate the contribution an institution makes to the maintenance and survival of the social system. Thus a major function of the family is the socialization of new members of society. This represents an important contribution to the maintenance of society since order, stability and co-operation largely depend on learned, shared norms and values.

The functions of various parts of the social structure are determined by the functionalists on the basis of the following ideas. Societies have certain basic needs or requirements which must be met for their survival. These requirements are sometimes known as functional prerequisites. For example, a means of producing food and shelter may be seen as a functional prerequisite since without them members of society could not survive. A system for socializing new members of society may also be regarded as a functional prerequisite since without culture social life would not be possible. Having assumed a number of basic requirements for the survival of society, the next step is to look at the parts of the social structure to see how they meet such functional prerequisites. Thus a major function of the economic system is the production of food and shelter. An important function of the family is the socialization of new members of the society.

The functional perspective regards society as a system. A system is an entity made up of interconnected and interrelated parts. So each part will in some way affect every other part and the system as a whole. If the system is to survive, its various parts must have some degree of fit. Thus a functional prerequisite of society involves a minimal degree of integration between the parts. This integration is based largely on 'Value Consensus', that is on agreement about values by members of society. Thus if the major values of society are expressed in the various parts of the social structure,

those parts will be integrated. For example, in the modern industrial society the value of materialism integrates many parts of the social structure of this society. The economic system produces a large range of goods and ever increasing productivity is regarded as an important goal. The education system is partly concerned with producing the skills and expertise to expand production and increase its efficiency. The family is an important unit of consumption with its steadily increasing demand for consumer durables such as television, washing machine, and vacuum cleaner. The political system is partly concerned with improving material living standards and raising productivity. To the extent that these parts of the social structure are based on the same values, they may be said to be integrated. Thus value consensus integrates the various parts of society. It forms the basis of social unity or social solidarity.

Alex Inkels treats functionalism as a perspective which 'stops the motion of the system at a fixed point in time, in order to understand how, at that moment, it works as a system'. The history of functional analysis may be traced to Auguste Comte's Consensus Universalis, Herbert Spencer's organic analogy, Vilfredo Pareto's conception of society as a system of equilibrium and Emile Durkheim's causal-functional analysis. Durkheim elaborates the logic of functionalism by systematically explaining the causes and consequences of social facts and establishes functionalism as a viable methodological and theoretical tool for sociological analysis.

The two British anthropologists, A.R. Radcliffe - Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski elaborated and codified functionalism as the basis of anthropological and sociological thinking. Malinowski's functionalism is often treated as individualistic functionalism because of its treatment of social and cultural systems as collective responses to fundamental biological needs of individuals modified by cultural values. Radcliffe - Brown rejected Malinowski's view and following the Durkheim's tradition, emphasized structured social relationships. Radcliffe - Brown chose social structure as the unit of analysis.

Functionalism became more concrete and less dogmatic in the writings of American sociologists like Talcott Parsons and Robert K. Merton. Talcott Parsons has stated that the main task of sociology is to examine the institutionalization of pattern of value orientation in the social system. More than any other sociologist, Robert K. Merton has contributed to the codification and systematization of functional analysis. Merton sets out to redefine current conception of 'function'. Functions are those observed consequences which make for the adaptation or adjustment of the system. Non-functions are those which are simply irrelevant to the system under consideration. Manifest functions are those which are intended and recognized by participants in the system. Latent functions are those which are neither intended nor recognized.

In summary, society, from a functionalist perspective, is a system made up of interrelated parts. The major functions of social institutions are those which help to meet the functional prerequisites of society. Since society is a system, there must be some degree of integration between its parts. A minimal degree of integration is therefore a functional prerequisite of society. Many functionalists maintain that the order and stability they see as essential for the maintenance of the social system are largely provided by value consensus. An investigation of the source of value consensus is therefore a major concern of functional analysis.

Functionalism has been subjected to considerable criticism. Part of this criticism is directed to the logic of functionalist inquiry. In particular, it is argued that the type of explanation employed is teleological. The main objection to this type of reasoning is that it treats an effect as a cause. An effect cannot explain a cause since causes must always precede effects. For example, the effects of stratification cannot occur until a system of social stratification has already been established. It may be argued that members of society unconsciously respond to social needs and so create the institutions necessary for the maintenance of society. However, there is no evidence of the existence of such unconscious motivations.

Functionalism is on stronger logical ground when it argues that the continued existence of an institution may be explained in terms of its effects.

Functionalists such as Parsons who see the solution to the problem of social order in terms of value consensus have been strongly criticized because the consensus is assumed rather than shown to exist.

Functionalism has been criticized for its deterministic view of human action. Human behaviour is portrayed as determined by the system. It tends to ignore coercion and conflict. In focussing on the contribution of norms and values to social order, Parsons largely fails to recognize the conflicts of interest which tend to produce instability and disorder. Conflict is not simply a minor strain in the system which is contained by value consensus. Instead it is a central and integral part of the system itself.

3.3 CONFLICT

The conflict theoretical perspective offers a radical alternative to functionalism. It became increasingly influential during the 1970s. This approach has developed partly due to the decline of functionalism and partly to its promise to provide answers which functionalism failed to provide.

Secondly, social system represents a number of functions in a pattern maintained with norms which bind the individual to society.

Thirdly, there are four important sub-systems in society - Social community with norms, Pattern maintenance with values, Social policy with goals, and Social economy with adaptation. The focus of social system is internal normative integration.

Fourthly, the society is grounded in the essential nature of living systems at all levels of organisation and evolutionary development. Talcott Parsons thereby adopts biological analogy in his theory of Structure-functionalism.

Fifthly, the four sub-systems are inter-related like the natural or biological system. Social system is highly integrated and equilibrium oriented.

Sixthly, society is not static. It possesses capacity for adaptative evolution, with differentiation and specialisation.

Parsons views society as a system with features common to living systems. It is an organic approach elaborated with Western historical development and represents a mechanical application of the biological model to society.

The theory of structure-functionalism inspite of modernity from other theories is subjected to a lot of criticism and limitations. It assumes that all social forms are functional. But there are many dysfunctional aspects which indicate latent or pathological conditions of society. The biological interpretation is a traditional anomaly subjected to critical analysis. The theory is conservative and does not provide empirical and demonstrative explanation. As an evolutionary process, it is static and less developmental. It fails to explain the dynamic nature of society. It is ethnocentric due to Parsons' notion of Western society as most modern.

Conflict Theory

The Conflict theory views social phenomena of the past, present and future as a result of conflict. According to this theory the social process is viewed primarily not in terms of the co-operation of social groups but in terms of man's aggressiveness. Here the emphasis is placed on conflict as a creative or at least an inevitable fact of social life rather than as merely a destructive and avoidable deviation. There have been many conflict theorists throughout history, including Thomas Hobbes, David Hume, George Hegel, Karl Marx, the Social Darwinists and others.

Conflict is an ever present process of social interaction and several thinkers have formulated the theory on the social functions of conflict. Conflict theory views society as system of competing groups in a struggle

to achieve basic material needs. It is naturalistic and evolutionary indicating the relation of human needs to social change. The most important exponents of this theory are Karl Marx, Robert Park, Vilfredo Pareto and Thorstein Veblen. Further, there are modern conflict theorists like Lewis Coser and David Riesman who propounded neo-Marxian ideology in the theory of conflict. Conflict theory is not uniformly radical; there are conservative forms of conflict. Karl Marx and Robert Park are radical in their implications of societal problem whereas Pareto presents a naturalistic view which is conservative. Marx and Park viewed economic and ecological conditions as causes of conflict behaviour, while Pareto and Veblen had a normative approach through ideas and values.

According to Karl Marx the economic and ecological conditions account for the incidence and development of social conflict. His main aim was to analyse the life conditions and ideas through changing historical development of society. It is the corruption of "natural man" to an "alienated man" through industrialisation and capitalistic exploitation.

Conflict is the result of economic development, a revolutionary change by class struggle between labourers and capitalists. Changing economic structure is the basis of social conflict. Marx attempted a historical society concentrating on the radical relationship between a mode of production and social structure. His ideology was final socialism.

Robert Park unlike Marx focussed his attention on ecological conditions in his analysis of social conflict. His conflict theory is based on humanity's ecological struggle for existence.

Robert Park conceived society as an ecological order and a natural process of competition and evolution. His ecological-conflict theory is similar to Marx's emphasis on conflict as natural and universal social control. Both Karl Marx and Robert Park are radical thinkers aiming at revolutionary changes by the functions of conflict.

In contrast to Karl Marx and Robert Park, Pareto and Veblen have propounded conservative theories of social conflict based on psychological traits accounting for competition, conflict and social change. Pareto developed a naturalistic-inductive theory of social conflict. He viewed society as based on particular ideas and norms controlled by particular classes or elites. Conflict and change are based on norms controlled by elites and as such social equilibrium is conservative.

Thorstein Veblen developed conflict theory on the basis of technological evolutionism. He concentrated more on the influence of economic factors on social change. He saw the basic human traits leading to technological change, which is the prime mover of social evolution. His theory is a pragmatic reaction to the effects of industrialisation. He developed a naturalistic, evolutionary and economically deterministic theory of social conflict.

Modern conflict theory is concerned with social conditions under which conflict emerges. The chief exponents of this theory are Lewis Coser and David Reisman. Conflict, for Coser, is "a struggle over values and claims to status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponent are to neutralise, injure or eliminate their rivals".

David Riesman propounded neo-Marxian ideology in the theory of conflict. He interpreted conflict in terms of social behaviour in significant social groups. He observed that the real social character is based on conformity to regulations of behaviour. Social experience is the chief proponent of social change. The degree of conformity depends on the conflicting tendencies between characters and social structure. He gave importance to demographic factors of birth and death ratio in population as a supplementary approach to the role of conflict.

The theories of conflict are partial explanations of the pattern of human behaviour. Many sociological theories emphasise the regulation of behaviour in terms of social norms and values. Social harmony is supposed to result from social conformity. Non-conformity is considered as deviance. Complex

societies have different social groups with different social norms leading to conflict between social classes, political parties, religious groups, ethnic groups and nationalities. The concept of conflict cannot be considered as mere deviance. It is a product of social situations creating new conditions instead of simply leading to clash of interests. Conflict may be an inevitable feature of society. But it is not constant and all-inclusive. However, it is not a negative force. It is a positive tendency to create new situations by renewed activity. In the cyclical process of social life, conflict and co-operation are interrelated and functions as two sides of the same coin.

3.4 EXCHANGE

The exchange perspective is not one coherent theoretical system. It contains strains of British individualistic orientation and French collective orientation in theory construction. It is a mixture of utilitarian economics, functional anthropology, and behavioural psychology. The classical traditions of the exchange theory are attributed to James Frazer, Malinowski, Marcel Mauss and Levi - Strauss; its contemporary variations were developed by George Homans and Peter Blau.

Sociology as a scientific study of society is of great importance for a clear understanding and planning of society. Social policies in a complicated modern society cannot be carried out on the basis of custom and sentiment. Sociological knowledge is necessary to understand the diverse social experiences of a large variety of institutions, and policies for social betterment are made on that basis. It is of great importance in the solution of several social problems. It traces several social problems and suggests remedies. It provides a knowledge which is necessary for every individual to realise his intrinsic worth and dignity in relation to his fellow-beings. Human understanding between individuals and different cultural groups is obtained by the scientific study of society. The knowledge of society is not simply descriptive. Sociology analyses, classifies and interprets a variety of social experience and promotes social discipline among individuals and human groups.

Exchange Theory

It is a theory of social structure based on the concept that social exchange is a fundamental process in social life. Although the importance of social exchange has been discussed by many sociologists and cultural anthropologists, the concept has been most thoroughly and systematically developed in a theoretical approach to the analysis of social organization by Peter M. Blau. Blau defines social exchange as consisting in "voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others". He excludes actions based on coercion or solely on internalized standards with no expectation of any sort of return. He relates social exchange to other sociological concepts such as expectations, social norms, values, power, authority, etc., in an attempt to develop the basis for a theory of social structure.

George Homans introduced exchange theory as a sociological concept but was made popular in its psychological interpretation by John Thibaut and Harold Kelly. The roots of Exchange Theory are in Hobbes, Smith and Bentham and in some degree in Spencer, Toennies, Durkheim, Simmel and Weber. It is also found in the economic interpretations of primitive social organisations by Malinowski. In recent times, it is found in the writings of Homans, Goode and Buckley. In the process of exchange, relationships of mutual trust and self-interest are involved. Norms are secondary in exchange theory and reduced to utilitarian rewards. Accordingly, exchange theory instead of being too normative or individualistic, is interactional and utilitarian-based on attraction between persons.

The components of exchange:

1. Reward
2. Cost
3. Outcome
4. Comparison level

Reward may be popularly defined as any transaction that gratifies persons through friendly relationships. It may be fun, love, sympathy or similarity of interests.

Cost refers to effort, anxiety and other emotions by which the negotiation is realised or rejected. At times, it may be strain and sacrifice. It is, however, in expectation of reward; the Exchange Theory depends on cost.

Outcome is the subtraction of cost from rewards. If the cost is more than the reward, it is negative outcome. The positive outcome is the profit or reward over and above the cost. It is basically the individual's feeling about what is costly and what is rewarding. It depends on the process of interaction in terms of expectation.

The expectations are at some minimum level in relation to cost and reward and such level in Exchange Theory is known as Comparison level. There are certain standards by which the outcome is evaluated in terms of what individuals feel and deserve.

Exchange transactions are mostly the effects of similarities.

Similarity alone is not the direct cause. It is only a condition - a contributing factor for exchange. Similar social background is usually associated with similar social values. These values confirm the views of each other in terms of attitudes, beliefs, usages, folkways and tradition. There are different types of similarities. Similarities in individual abilities and personality traits produce attraction between persons and permits them to engage in activity which is mutually rewarding. Individuals have a need to compare their abilities with others who have similar abilities irrespective of social background. Attraction between people depends on various factors. One may not like his neighbour in spite of frequent and continued interaction. One's best friend may differ in social background or personality traits. Exchange theory therefore does not depend merely on similarity of social context of desirable tasks.

There are important similarities between exchange theory, interactionism and organizational theory. All these theories emerge from stable reciprocal expectations. They emphasise current situations and are applicable to almost all areas of social life. Exchange theory applies in principles to altruistic and love relationships at one extreme and to coercion on the other. However, it is more utilitarian.

Many thinkers have tried to formalise exchange theory by critical and logical analysis. Homans has repeatedly advocated the relevance of this theory to all types of social relationships – Sociology as a whole. Thibaut and Kelly have offered socio-psychological formalisation of this theory. Blau has organised exchange theory in terms of macro propositions under a variety of topics. Recently sociologists have tried to identify exchange theory with symbolic interactionism. Nelson Foote by developing a clear conception of motivation into self-orientation has tried to formalise exchange theory into interactionism. Social exchange has become a model of social life. Sociology, being structural and normative has found new avenues of analysing social and individual behaviour in terms of exchange theory – involving rewards, costs, outcome and standards of comparison. It is closely related to problem solving version of organisational theories. Exchange theory in sociology is currently very popular as a connecting bridge to other social disciplines like Economics, Political science, Anthropology and Psychology.

3.5 SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM

The term symbolic interactionism was coined by Herbert Blumer in 1937. Its roots lie in the work of the American pragmatist philosophers, William James and George Herbert Mead, and also in the early American humanist sociology of W.I. Thomas, Robert Park, Florian Znaniecki and Charles Horton Cooley. The perspective was developed largely at the University of Chicago. It was Blumer, his colleagues and students who evolved its main outline in a series of empirical, theoretical and methodological studies published between 1930 and 1950.

Symbolic interactionism is essentially a social-psychological perspective. It is particularly relevant to sociological enterprise. This approach has developed towards the end of the nineteenth century. Symbolic interactionism deals with the concrete forms of individual behaviour. It focusses on the nature of interaction, the dynamic pattern of social action and social relationship. Interaction itself is taken as the unit of analysis. The meanings we share with others, own definition of the social world and our perception of reality emerge in the process of interaction. The entire process of interaction is symbolic, with meanings constructed by human ingenuity.

Symbolic interactionists such as G.H. Mead (1863-1931) and C.H. Cooley (1846-1929) concentrate upon this interaction between individuals and groups. They note that people interact mainly through *symbols*, which include signs, gestures, and most importantly, through written and spoken words. A word has no inherent meaning. It is simply a noise, but it becomes a *word* when people reach an agreement that this noise carries a special meaning. Thus "yes", "no", "go", "come", and thousands of other sounds became symbols as a meaning is attached to each. Although some meanings can be exchanged without words, as all lovers know, most meanings are exchanged through spoken or written words.

People do not respond to the world directly; they respond to meanings they impute to the things and happenings around them: a traffic light, a lineup at a ticket window, a police officer's whistle and hand signal. An early sociologist, W.I. Thomas (1863-1947), coined the phrase, *definition of the situation*, noting that we can act sensibly only after we decide what kind of situation it is. If a man approaches with right hand extended, we define this as a friendly greeting; if he approaches with clenched fists, we define the situation differently. The person who misdefines situations and tries to run when he should make love, or vice versa, is a stock comic figure. But in real life, failure to define behaviour situations correctly and make appropriate responses can have unhappy consequences.

As Berger and Luckmann state in their *Social Construction of Reality* [1966], society is an *objective reality*, in that people, groups, and institutions are *real*, regardless of our perceptions of them. But society is also a *subjective reality*, in that for each person, the other persons, groups, and institutions are whatever that person perceives them as being. Whether most people are pretty nice or pretty nasty, whether the police are protectors or oppressors, whether corporations serve common interests or selfish interests – these are perceptions which persons form from their own experiences, and these perceptions become "the way it is" for persons holding them.

Modern interactionists such as Erving Goffman [1959] and Herbert Blumer [1962] emphasize that people do not respond to other people directly, instead, they respond to whatever they *imagine* other people to be. In human behaviour, "reality" is not something that is just "out there" like the curbs and sidewalks along the street. "reality" is constructed in peoples' minds as they size one another up and guess at the feelings and impulses of one another. Whether a person is a friend, an enemy, or a stranger is not a characteristic of the person; that person is, to me, whatever I perceive him as being, at least until I change my perception. Whether he is good or bad is measured by my perception of him. Thus, I create reality about him in my own mind, and then I react to this reality that I have constructed. This "social construction of reality" proceeds continuously as people define the feelings and intentions of others. Thus the "people" with whom we interact are, to some extent, creatures of our own imagination.

This does not mean that *all* reality is subjective – that it exists *only* in the mind. There are objective facts in the universe. The sun, moon, and stars are real, and still would be "out there" even if there were no humans to see them. Human beings are real; they get born and they die; they take actions which have consequences. But a fact has no meaning of itself. *Meanings* are given to facts and to human actions by human beings. The symbolic interactionist perspective concentrates upon what meanings

people find in other people's actions, how these meanings are derived, and how others respond to them. The interactionist perspective has brought a great deal of insight into personality development and human behaviour. It has been less helpful in the study of large groups and social institutions.

3.6 ETHNOMETHODOLOGY

Ethnomethodology is the most recent theoretical perspectives examined in this chapter. The term was coined by the American sociologist Harold Garfinkel who is generally regarded as its founder. Garfinkel's book *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, which provided the initial framework for the perspective, was published in 1967. Ethnomethodology means the study of the methods used by people. It is concerned with examining the methods and procedures employed by members of society to construct, account for and give meaning to their social world. Ethnomethodologists draw heavily on the European tradition of phenomenological philosopher-sociologist Alfred Schutz (1899-1959). Many ethnomethodologists begin with the assumption that society exists only in so far as members perceive its existence. With this emphasis on members' views of social reality, ethnomethodology is generally regarded as a phenomenological approach. Ethnomethodology is a developing perspective which contains a diversity of viewpoints.

As we have seen, Harold Garfinkel is the recognized founder of ethnomethodology. Born in 1917, Garfinkel completed his Ph.D. (Harvard) in 1952, and aside from a couple of brief teaching stints at Ohio State and the University of Chicago, he has taught since 1954 at the University of California at Los Angeles. To date, he has published no single major work, but has had many of his best articles published in a collected volume, entitled, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, by Prentice-Hall in 1967. Garfinkel's work differs considerably from Durkheim's over the issue of 'social facts', Garfinkel saying no and Durkheim saying yes to their *sui generis* objective reality. Ethnomethodology, rather, sees the objective reality of social facts, says Garfinkel, as an 'on-going accomplishment of the concerted activities of everyday life'. Much of the distinction in perspective between traditional

sociology and ethnomethodology can be established in the definition of the latter term. The term's meaning can be understood in terms of a form of folk technique by which actors in social interaction 'think up' a series of accounts or verbal description that enable them to construct social reality as they perceive it. Ethnomethodologists, on the other hand, are interested in the ways in which people create a sense of reality. By 'making sense' of events in terms of preconceived order for society, people create a world that is indeed ordered.

The term 'ethnomethodology' itself was coined while Garfinkel was working at Yale with their cross-cultural files. During this time he was working on an analysis of jury tape-recordings when he came upon the file card categories of 'ethnobotany', 'ethnophysiology', 'ethnophysics', etc. He became extremely interested in how the jurors knew what they were doing in the work of jurors. In such things as the jurors' use of some kind of knowledge of the way in which the organized affairs of the society operated, it occurred to him that on the jury deliberation project that he was faced with, jurors were actually doing methodology. 'He created "ethnomethodology"', explains Roy Turner, 'because "ethno" refers to the availability to a member of commonsense knowledge of the "whatever"'. Thus ethnomethodology is the study of 'folk' or commonsense methods employed by people to make sense of everyday activities by constructing and maintaining social reality.

Ethnomethodologists do not use a commonsense method, rather, they study commonsense methods of constructing reality. Mullins, defines Ethnomethodology 'to reflect his belief that the proper subject for social science is the way in which ordinary people establish rational behaviour patterns'. Ordinary people use various methods to determine what is happening in society; 'this methodology', continues Mullins, 'is "ethno" in that, like "ethnobotany", it is derived from folk knowledge rather than from professional scientific procedures'. Hence, ethnomethodology is the study of the methods used by members of a group for understanding community, making decisions, being rational, accounting for action, and so on.

Ethnomethodology has not as yet refined or even identified its most effective analytical techniques.

There are four, more or less regularly employed methods evident in the work of most ethnomethodologists. First, the tradition of participant-observation, second the 'ethnomethodological experiment' which essentially calls for a disruption of any interactive situation by acting incongruous with the situation's norms. 'Documentary interpretation', a third method, consists of taking behaviour, statements, etc., and other external appearances of the other (any other person or group) as a 'document' or reflection of an underlying pattern used to interpret appearances. And finally, a significant interest exists in linguistics as *communication of meaning*, with special attention placed upon the relationship between linguistic form and structure of social interaction, the overlapping in methodological presuppositions and processes between ethnomethodology and phenomenology is reflected.

3.7 PHENOMENOLOGY

The term 'phenomenology' as it is used by Edmund Husserl (1859 - 1938) in his most notable philosophical treatise, *Ideas: Introduction to Pure Phenomenology* (1913), designates first of all a principle of philosophical and scientific method. The usual method of natural science proceeds from a body of accepted truth and seeks to extend its conquest of the unknown by putting questions to nature and compelling it to answer. The phenomenological method adopts a softer approach. Setting aside all presuppositions and suppressing hypotheses, it seeks to devise techniques of observation, description, and classification which will permit it to disclose structures and connections in nature which do not yield to experimental techniques. *Ideas* was written with a view to clearing up the distinction between phenomenological psychology, and phenomenological philosophy, as the foundation of all science. When a sociologist or psychologist conducts a phenomenological investigation, he puts aside all the usual theories and assumptions which have governed research in that field; but he cannot rid himself of all presuppositions (such as, for example, the belief in the

existence of the external world, the constancy of nature, etc.). As Plato say, every science (except philosophy) must proceed upon some assumptions. To fulfill its promise, the phenomenological approach must bring us at last to an absolutely presuppositionless science. Pure phenomenology, or phenomenological philosophy, is, in Husserl's opinion, precisely that.

The phenomenological approach in sociology is based upon this particular philosophical foundation. Its beginnings can be detected in earlier periods of the discipline's development, but only in the third quarter of this century has it become a major theoretical and methodological school of thought gathering prominent and numerous followers and making grand efforts to contribute to the science. Husserl's phenomenology, as implied above, is as Timascheff suggested 'a critique of positivism or naturalistic empiricism which assumes that scientists through their five senses can investigate the world and build a body of knowledge that accurately reflects the objective reality of the world'.

Husserl believed that a real and objective world exists, but because it is known only through subjective human consciousness, it is a socially constructed reality when it is interpreted. Phenomenology is considered a radical philosophical position which questions the empirical foundations of sociology as well as 'challenges the possibility of objective scientific knowledge, uninfluenced by the subjective consciousness of the investigator'.

Phenomenological sociology must be regarded as the antithesis of neopositivism. The development of phenomenological sociology questions the empirical foundations of sociology, thereby challenging the adequacy and meaningfulness of traditional sociological knowledge.

Even though there is strong sentiment in certain philosophical as well as sociological circles that phenomenological sociology is simply not possible, there is a vocal, literate, and growing body of sociologists who are setting about the development of just this kind of approach, building primarily on the work of the German expatriate Alfred Schultz who is

considered more or less the founder of phenomenological sociology, or at least responsible for the introduction and development of the sub-discipline on American soil. Before we discuss Schutz's contributions, it should be pointed out that early philosophically-inclined sociologists in Europe had already begun to explore some of the issues addressed in phenomenology, particularly the German sociologist Alfred Vierkandt (1867-1952), and the Frenchman Jules Monnerot of the same period. Vierkandt, whose books include *Natural and Cultural People* (1895), and *Theory of Society* (1922), believed that society is the sum total of human interaction (not a novel idea to be sure) and his method, called 'ideational abstraction' consisted of a quest 'for basic unreducible concepts clarified through contemplation'. This emphasis on the 'irreducible' and 'contemplation' plays heavily in Schutz's work.

Alfred Schultz (1899-1959) was a social philosopher who fled Germany in 1939 to escape the Nazis. Gifted and talented in banking and ingenuity, Schultz took a daytime position in a New York City bank to support himself and taught social philosophy classes in the evening at the New School for Social Research in 1943. Nine years later, he became professor of sociology and philosophy and continued to teach at the New School until his death in 1959. Schultz is generally credited with introducing phenomenology to American sociology. He assigned central importance to the meaning individuals impart to situations in everyday life and adapted Husserl's philosophy to sociology as well as incorporated Weber's concept of *verstehen* or subjective understanding into his system.

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman extended the theory of Alfred Schultz to an inquiry into "The social construction of Reality". The dialectical aspects of subjective experience and objective structure are confronted and resolved finally by the super-structure of moral values. Morality is the golden rule; cultural elements are traditionally fixed to guide the community. This phenomenal approach is synonymous with Durkheim's theory of "Collective consciousness" and Talcott Parson's theory of the "Cultural system". Berger and Luckman have contributed an extensive

theory of phenomenology by the addition of cultural elements involved in subjective cognition and objective social structure.

Phenomenology is a modern theory with many abstract ideas and falls short of dynamic concerns of modern society. Some of the important concepts like, Richard M. Zaner's "Solitude", Husserl's "Subjective cognition", Alfred Schutz's "Biographic situation" are vague and redundant. In modern social research, phenomenology is not relevant to the present day issues, since it is just an elaboration of the obvious concepts. The social, psychological and historical themes are mysterious for empirical application. However, phenomenological sociology is found to operate on all levels of sociological concern, particularly in areas of social problems, upheavals and crisis.

UNIT - II**LESSON - 4**

SOCIETY AND COMMUNITY

CONTENTS

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Society and Community

4.3 Differences between Society and Community

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Aristotle believed that man was social by nature. In his view men always live in some form of society. Societies were first formed for the sake of survival through corporate living and they were subsequently maintained for the sake of good living. Not only the society but the state also is a creation of nature; and man is by nature a political animal. The state is by nature prior to the family and the individual, since the whole is necessarily prior to the part. Hence, an individual who is isolated from the state is not self-sufficient just as a limb of the body is not self-sufficient when it is severed from the whole body. The social instinct is implanted in human nature from the very beginning. This natural impulse prompts human beings to associate with one another with the common end of having good life. Good life is the chief aim of the community as well as the individuals. The end of individuals and the community are identical. Good life is essentially public because an individual can fulfil his ethical purpose by participating in the community life. The social nature of man is biologically determined. An individual follows his natural impulses, marries and institutes a family life. On the basis of his natural impulses individuals form a state in which some rise to the position of leaders by virtue of their talents and others are content to be led. The entire social structure is conditioned by the natural social endowments of individuals.

4.2

and

con

gro

me

the

gro

cor

infl

ind

to

sys

ind

out

int

me

one

cor

gro

Th

eth

the

con

ret

un

ma

life

pa

sp

th

4.2 SOCIETY AND COMMUNITY

A society, is an organization of teleological personalities. An individual and a society are not like the two poles of a social phenomena. In normal conditions individuals cannot exist apart from social groups and social groups cannot exist without individuals. Social relations presuppose membership of individuals of a social group. The idea of group exists in the members constituting a social group. There can be no society or social group unless there is real and objective relationship between its constituents members. The members of a social group must have effective influence on one another. A society is a group of effectively interacting individuals with a common social purpose. A society does not merely refer to a group of individuals living in proximity to one another, but to the system of norms and purposes which emerge out of the interaction between individuals of a social group. Individuals may come into existence or go out of existence in a social system, but the characteristic mode of interaction between them may persist in the form of system or norms. The members of social group influence one another and raise psychic tides in one another and thereby bring about effective social bonds. A society is a complex organization of relations between teleological individuals. It is a group of effectively interacting individuals with a common social purpose. The common social purpose of a social group is a synthesis of intellectual, ethical, aesthetic and religious purposes of the group members. In a society, therefore, there is conflex of individual teleologies producing thereby common social purpose which may be either conservative or liberal, retrogressive or progressive. A society or a social group always has some unifying purpose. A society cannot exist without the teleological manifestations of its members.

Community may be defined as a social organization which has common life. It refers to a group of individuals who share common joys, sorrows, pains, and the like, and who have also a sense of group solidarity. It is a spontaneous association of individuals who have close contact amongst themselves on account of psychical affinities. There is mutual co-operation

between the members of a community on account of common purpose. The members of a community usually reside within the same territory. W.F. Ogburn and M.F. Nimkoff have defined community as 'the total organization of social life within a limited area'. R.M. MacIver and C.H. Page have defined community as a large or small group of individuals who live together in such a way that they share the basic conditions of a common life. The most essential characteristic of a community, according to them, is that an individual must be capable of leading his life entirely within it. Talcott Parsons has defined community as 'that collectivity, the members of which share a common territorial area as their base of operations for daily activities'. P.V. Young and C.F. Schmid have defined community as a reciprocal exchange of interests between the members of a group. A community, according to them, is a physical configuration of individuals who have psychical relationship. In their opinion, a community may be an extension of home. It is the indispensable condition of group life. It is a constellation of social institutions. The integration of community is due to consciousness of its members of common objectives. Intense common life is the inciting cause for the formation of a community. There may be a smaller community within a bigger community. The dimensions of a community are increased with the corresponding increase of the common interests of the members of a society. A community is the sphere of social activity. Hence, social activities of the members of a society progressively become diverse with the enhancement of the sphere of community life.

Community has undergone a long process of evolution. Village community is the most primitive permanent community. The members of a primitive village are usually related to one another by blood on account of excessive in-breeding. There is strong social solidarity in a village community on account of close kinship and feeling of intimacy between individuals. Large joint families abound in such village communities. The community life in cities is more complex than in villages. In-breeding in urban communities is very low on account of constant mobility of

popul
the fa
trans

I
comm
mem
comm
howe
on th
the r

solid
harm
comm
be s
comm
of a
prev
cont

4.3

loca
sent
whic
all
cons
of li
the
uni

population. A small locality is converted into an extensive region due to the facilities of extensive network of communications and facilities for quick transportation.

R.M. MacIver has defined community as 'any area of common life'. A community, in his view, may be either small or extensive in its area. The members of community have certain common characteristics, such as common language, common modes of behaviour, and so on. Community, however, is not a self-contained group. Its size may increase or decrease on the basis of its number of members. A group is called a community if the members of such a group share the basic conditions of common life.

MacIver has pointed out that there are certain barriers which hinder solidarity in a community. One of the greatest barriers of communal harmony consists in domination of one group over the other within the community. This domination or pressure of one group over the other may be social, political, or economic. Secondly, lack of solidarity within a community may be due to lack of free contacts between different groups of a community. This physical aloofness of different groups of a community prevents cultural contacts between them which may sometimes produce contempt of one group for another.

4.3 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOCIETY AND COMMUNITY

A community is a group of people who live together in a particular locality and share the basic conditions of a common life. The presence of sentiment among the members is necessary. Society includes every relation which is established among the people. It is the name of the structure of all social relationships direct or indirect, organized or unorganized, conscious or unconscious, co-operative or antagonistic. There is an element of likeness in society but it is not necessary that likeness should include the people in oneness.

Secondly, society has no definite boundary or assignable limits. It is universal and pervasive. Society is the name of our social relationships.

Community, on the other hand, is group of people living together in a particular locality.

Community is the species of society. It exists within society and possesses its distinguishable structure which distinguishes it from other communities. Some communities are all inclusive and independent of others.

Society is a network of social relationships which cannot be seen or touched. It is an abstract concept. On the other hand, community is a concrete concept. It is a group of people living in a particular locality and having a feeling of oneness. We can see this group and locate its existence.

Zimmermann and Frampton describe the distinction between community and society as follows:

"In the community (Gemeinschaft) the group has a life of its own, superior to that of its temporary members. The group is an end in itself. In the society (Gesellschaft) the group is merely a means to an end. In the Gemeinschaft we have faith, customs, natural solidarity, common ownership of property, and a common will. In the Gesellschaft we have doctrine, public opinion, fashion, contractual solidarity, private property, and individual will".

CONT

5

5

5

5

5

5.1 I

S

refers

The h

is a d

of a

alway

meml

F

In his

relati

both

indivi

indivi

excha

differ

types

5.2 I

I

in-gr

but t

LESSON - 5

SOCIETY

CONTENTS

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Definition of Society
- 5.3 Features of Society
- 5.4 Types of Society
- 5.5 Individual and Society

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Society may be defined as a gathering or company of Individuals. [It refers to the togetherness of individuals who mutually exclude one another]. The human society came into existence in course of evolution. A society is a dynamic organisation of purposive individuals. Individuals are the units of a society. However, individuals do not precede society. Individuals have always lived in some form of society. The aim of a society is to protect its members from destruction by external forces.

R.M. MacIver maintains that a *Society is a web of social relationships*. In his view, individuals are held together through social relations. Social relations are possible amongst those individuals who resemble one another both in body and in mind in some respects. But complete likeness between individuals is not necessary. Social relations are possible amongst individuals who have certain degrees of differences. Reciprocity and exchange of views and the like are possible only when there are partial differences between individuals. Individuals live in society through different types of social relationships.

5.2 DEFINITION OF SOCIETY

In common the term 'Society' is used to mean the members of a specific in-group. In sociology, the term 'Society' refers not to a group of people but to the complex pattern of the norms of interaction that arise among

them. Society is a process rather than a thing, motion rather than structure. The important aspect of society is the system of relationships by which the members of the society maintain themselves. The following definitions will make us understand the term society.

R.M. MacIver defines Society as "a web of social relationships".

1. "Society is a system of usages and procedures, authority and mutual aid, of many groupings and divisions, of controls of human behaviour and of liberties". - MacIver and Page.
2. "A society is a collection of individuals united by certain relations or modes of behaviour which mark them off from others who do not enter into these relations or who differ from them in behaviour". - Ginsberg.
3. "Society is a complex of forms or processes each of which is living and growing by interaction with the others, the whole being so unified that what takes place in one part affects all the rest". - Cooley.
4. "A society may be defined as a group of people who have lived together long enough to become organized and to consider themselves and be considered as a unit more or less distinct from other human units". - John F. Cuber.
5. "Society may be defined as the total complex of human relationship in so far as they grow out of action in terms of mean-end relationship, intrinsic or symbolic". - Parsons.

5.3 FEATURES OF SOCIETY

E.C. Hayes points out that every society has certain common characteristic features. According to him, the members of a society must participate in "some important common activity". For instance, they must have a common language, common creed or common belief. They must follow certain common customs. They must share amongst themselves some common beliefs and opinions. They must have some kind of uniformity in their behaviour patterns. But however, in some of the modern advanced societies complete uniformity of behaviour is not always found

amongst all their members. In modern advanced societies a wide variety of norms and standards of social behaviour are sometimes found. Nevertheless, in each society there is some common harmonizing principle which binds all individuals together.

The second important characteristic of society is that "*the activities of its members casually condition each other*". The similarities of behaviour which are found amongst the members of a society are due to their mutual influence and interaction. In a society, every generation passes its own standard of behaviour to its successors even though the standard which is transmitted may be modified in course of evolution. The contiguity of a society is maintained through this causal relation.

The third characteristic of a society is "*inter-communication*". Individuals of a society get acquainted with one another directly or indirectly through a network of inter-communication.

In brief, the most important characteristic of a society is "*the inter-relationship between its members*". No society or social group can be found unless there is inter-relation between at least two individuals.

5.4 TYPES OF SOCIETY

Societies have been classified by anthropologists and sociologists in various ways. One important classification system is based on the way the problem of subsistence is solved. All societies must find ways to fulfill the need for food, and the evolution from pre-industrial society (including hunting and gathering, horticultural, and agricultural societies) to industrial society and post-industrial society has been based on the solution of this problem.

I. Pre-industrial Societies

(a) Hunting and gathering society: The hunting and gathering society survived by hunting animals and gathering edible foods such as wild fruits and vegetables. This is the oldest solution to the subsistence problem.

In fact, it was only about 9,000 years ago that other methods of solving the subsistence problem emerged.

Although not all hunting and gathering societies are exactly alike, they do share some basic features. Hunting and gathering societies are nomadic - they must move from place to place as the food supply and seasons change. Because they must carry all of their possessions with them on each move, these nomads accumulate few possessions. Hunting and gathering societies also tend to be very small - usually less than fifty people - with their members scattered over a relatively wide area. Since the family is the only real institution in hunting and gathering societies, it takes care of nearly all of the needs of its members. Association is typically limited to one's immediate family. Hunting and gathering societies are tied together by kinship. Most members are related by blood or marriage.

Economic relationships within these societies are based on cooperation. Since most members of this type of society are kin, sharing takes place without the implication that a return must be made. Generosity and hospitality are valued; Since the obligation to share goods is one of the most binding aspects of their culture, members of these societies have little or no conception of private property or ownership.

Without a sense of private ownership and with few possessions for anyone to own, these societies have no social classes. They have no rich and poor - only poor. These societies lack differences in status based on political authority because they have no political institution; there is nobody to organize and control activities. When the Eskimos, for example, wanted to settle disputes, they sang dueling songs. Those in disagreement prepared and sang songs to express their side of the issue. They were accompanied by their families as choruses, and the victor was decided by the applause of those listening to the duel (Hoebel, 1954).

The division of labour in these societies is limited to the sex and age distinctions found in most families. Men and women are assigned separate tasks, and certain tasks are given to the old, the young, and young adults.

This
the f

(b)
horti
domi
year
socie

more
horti
the l
socie

than
socie
prim
proc
all f
can

cons
does
and

(c) /
soci
plov
eno
allo
ther
root

This scant division of labour exists because there are no institutions beyond the family.

(b) Horticultural society: According to archaeological evidence, *horticultural societies* solved the subsistence problem primarily through the domestication of plants. This type of society came into being about 9,000 years ago. The transition from hunting and gathering to horticultural societies was not an abrupt one; it occurred over several centuries.

The gradual shift from hunting and gathering to horticulture led to more permanent settlements. This relative stability in even simple horticultural societies – and particularly in the permanent settlements in the Middle East and Southeastern Europe – permitted the growth of larger societies with somewhat greater population densities.

The family is even more basic to social life in horticultural societies than in those based on hunting and gathering. In hunting and gathering societies, the survival of the band has top priority. In horticultural societies, primary emphasis is on providing a livelihood for household members. But producing a living in horticultural societies does not require the labour of all family members. With more labour than is needed to survive, households can be more self-sufficient and independent.

Hunters and gatherers seldom engage in wars or raids, but there is considerable inter-village conflict in horticultural societies. Although conflict does sometimes lead to heated battle and many deaths, religious beliefs and rituals keep slaughter within bounds.

(c) Agricultural society: The transition from horticultural to *agricultural society* was made possible largely through the invention of the plough. The plough, which appeared about 5,000 or 6,000 years ago, was effective enough to permit the permanent cultivation of land. The plough not only allowed the control of weeds but also turned them into fertilizer by burying them under the soil. The plough brought nutrients that had sunk below root level back to the surface.

Moreover, the plough permitted a shift from human to animal energy. Only humans could use a hoe or spade, but oxen could pull a plough. This new technology increased productivity. As a result, more people were released from the land to engage in noneconomic activities. This led in turn to the establishment of cities, the development of more complex economic specialization, and the emergence of separate political, economic, and religious institutions.

Although family ties remained important, the state replaced the kinship group as the basic force holding agricultural societies together. Advanced agricultural societies were monarchical, headed by a king or emperor who desired as much control as possible. Distinct social classes appeared for the first time in advanced agricultural societies. Wealth and power were based on land ownership, which was controlled by the governing elites. The elites enjoyed the benefits of the economic surplus, but the peasants did most of the work. The economy, involving considerable trade and a monetary system, began to emerge as an identifiable institution during the agricultural era. The agricultural economy developed two basic sections - a rural agricultural sector and an urban commercial and handicraft sector. Institutional specialization was also reflected in the increasing separation of political and religious elites. Although rulers were believed to be divinely chosen, few of them doubled as religious leaders.

II. Industrial and Post-industrial Societies

The industrial revolution created *industrial society* - the type of society whose subsistence is based primarily on the application of science and technology to the production of goods and services.

There are definite differences among the three pre-industrial societies, but there are even greater differences between pre-industrial societies and industrial society. For this reason, scholars have attempted to outline the basic social characteristics that distinguish industrial from pre-industrial society. One of the most common approaches has been to divide pre-industrial and industrial societies into two basic types.

F
Geme
closel
and
societ
social
S
a sim
Frenc
and
tradit
unity
of a
I
an u
consc
on th
contr
consc
comp
(
same
from
were
partic
a new
The
prom
outlin

Ferdinand Tonnies, an early German sociologist, distinguished between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society). The former type – closely approximating preindustrial society – is based on tradition, kinship, and intimate social relationships. The latter – representing industrial society, is characterized by weak family ties, competition, and less personal social relationships.

Shortly after the appearance of this distinction, Emile Durkheim made a similar one. A society based on *mechanical solidarity*, according to this French sociologist, achieves social unity through a consensus of values and norms, strong social pressures for conformity, and dependence on tradition and family. A society based on *organic solidarity* achieves social unity through a complex of highly specialized roles that makes members of a society dependent on one another.

In this same vein, anthropologist Robert Redfield described a folk and an urban society. A *folk society* rests on tradition, cultural and social consensus, family, personal ties, little division of labour, and an emphasis on the sacred. In *urban society*, social relationships are impersonal and contractual, the importance of the family declines, cultural and social consensus is diminished, economic specialization becomes even more complex, and secular concerns outweigh sacred ones.

Clearly, each of these sociologists was attempting to accomplish the same thing – to isolate the central features differentiating pre-industrial from industrial society. Contemporary sociologists generally agree that they were successful.

Some social analysts believe that advanced industrial societies, particularly the United States, are passing beyond industrial society into a new form. They envision a post-industrial society.

The major features of post-industrial society: Daniel Bell, the most prominent advocate of the emergence of post-industrial society, has outlined the major tendencies of the nature of the new society. Bell is

careful to point out that he is attempting to forecast the future, a future that will be affected by events - wars, economic changes, political occurrences. Assuming that unforeseen forces do not radically alter current tendencies, Bell believes that five features will characterize post-industrial society:

(i) For the first time, the majority of the labour force will be employed in services rather than in agriculture or manufacturing. Today the United States is the only country in the world in which more than half of all employment is in services - trade, finance, transportation, health, recreation, research, and government.

(ii) In industrial society, most workers are unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled blue-collar workers. The shift to a service economy in post-industrial society - with its emphasis on office work - will lead to a preponderance of white-collar workers. White-collar workers outnumbered blue-collar workers. The gap between numbers of blue-collar and white-collar workers is still increasing. The most rapid growth among white-collar workers has been in professional and technical employment, particularly among scientists and engineers.

(iii) Theoretical knowledge will be the key organizing feature in post-industrial society. Knowledge will be used for creating innovations (computers lead to more sophisticated defense systems) as well as for formulating government policy (computers permit economic forecasting so that various theories can be tested to see their probable effects if actually applied to a real economic system).

(iv) Through new means of technological forecasting, post-industrial society will be able to plan and control technological change. In industrial society, technological change is uncontrolled. That is, the effects of a technological innovation are not assessed prior to its introduction into an economic system. Thus, the pesticide DDT was introduced as a benefit to agriculture before it had been determined that it is harmful to living things. The internal combustion engine contributes to our affluence and economic

growth
will p
before

(
post-i
indus
repla
probl
accou
capat
preva
organ
to se

5.5 1

for t
fulfil
and
behav
socie

do w
contr
typev
smok
the e
psych
intell
is n
recog
wher

growth, but it contaminates the environment. Technological assessment will permit us to consider the effects – good and bad – of an innovation before it is introduced.

(v) A new intellectual technology will dominate human affairs in post-industrial society, much as production technology has dominated industrial society for the past 150 years. Intellectual technology is the replacement of human judgement with mathematically based problem-solving rules. With modern computers, it is possible to take into account a large number of interacting variables at the same time. This capability will allow us to manage the large-scale organizations that will prevail in post-industrial society. Intellectual technology will enable complex organizations – including government at national, state, and local levels – to set rational goals and to identify the means for reaching them.

5.5 INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY

Society liberates and limits the activities of men. It sets up standards for them to follow and maintain. It is a necessary condition of every fulfilment of life. "Society is a system of usages and procedures, of authority and mutual aid, of many groupings and divisions, of controls of human behaviour and of liberties". This ever-changing complex system, we call society. It is the web of social relationships. And it is always changing.

Therefore society is the changing pattern of social relationships. What do we mean by social relationship? We may approach the answer by contrasting the *social* and *physical*. There is a relationship between a typewriter and desk, between the earth and the sun, between fire and smoke, between two chemical constituents. Each of these is affected by the existence of the other, but the relationship is not a *social* one. The psychological condition is lacking. The typewriter and the desk are in no intelligible sense aware of the presence of one another. Their relationship is not in any way determined by mutual awareness. Without this recognition there is no social relationship, no society. Society exists only where social beings "behave" toward one another in ways determined by

their recognition of one another. Any relation so determined we may broadly name "Social".

Social relationships are as varied as society is complex. The relations of voter to candidate, mother to child, employee to employer, friend to friend, are but a few of the varying types. Some of them we label, "Economic", some "Political", some "Personal", some "Impersonal", some "Friendly" and so on.

We have still to mention the fundamental attribute on which society depends. We cannot conclude our treatment of the structure of society in general without referring finally to the relationship between society and the individual. It is in fact a philosophical rather than a sociological problem, for, it involves the question of values.

We see ourselves on one side and our society on the other – the person and the group, the individual and the collectivity. What does each have to pay/owe to the other? In what sense is the single individual a part of a whole that is greater than he? In what sense does the whole exist for the individual? What is his role and responsibility to himself and to his society? Is the individual lost in society, or is it only in society that he can find himself?

Everywhere and all the time we are members of groups. The isolated individual does not exist, if by isolation we mean a total and permanent separation from society. The language we speak, the clothes we wear, the foods that sustain us, the games we play, the goals we seek, and the ideals we cherish are all derived from our culture. And the culture of our own society differs in many respects from the culture of every other.

Society surrounds us in our infancy and follows us to our resting place. We depend upon society and its processes not only for our livelihood but for our very lives. We need culture in order to become human and so also do we need society in order to become a person. Society is no great engine of which we are merely a mechanical part, nor is it a giant organism

in whi
of its
From
person
group
one], 1
of our
and in
A
is al
uncon
also b
intern

in which we are only a microscopic cell. Society on the contrary is a reality of its own kind, itself unique, and different from every other natural object. From it we receive the gift of individuality and in it we express our personality. It is in "the vast intrinsic traffic of society", [joining first this group and then that group, conforming first to this norm and then that one], that we reach full stature as human beings and realized the meaning of our selves. Society gives us choices, inviting us to accept or decline, and in our selections we become ever more completely what we are.

And finally, even in society we are always, in some sense, alone. There is always a part of us that we never share, a thought that is uncommunicated, a dream that stays in its private chamber. For, it has also been written that "the heart knoweth its own bitterness and a stranger intermeddleth not with its joy".

LESSON - 6**COMMUNITY****CONTENTS**

- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Definition of Community
- 6.3 Elements of a Community
- 6.4 Types of Community

6.1 INTRODUCTION

"The community may be described as the entire population occupying a certain territory (or, in the case of nomad, habitually moving in association,) held together by a common system of rules regulating the intercourse of life".

Community may also be defined as a social organization which has common life. It refers to a group of individuals who share common joys, sorrows, pains, and the like, and who have also a sense of group solidarity. There is mutual co-operation between the members of a community on account of common purpose. The members of a community usually reside within the same territory [but in the case of nomads they habitually move in association]. According to MacIver and Page, the most essential characteristic of a community is that an individual must be capable of leading his life entirely within it. There may be a smaller community within a bigger community. A community may be either small or extensive in its area. The members of community have certain common characteristics, such as common language, common modes of behaviour, and so on. Community is not a self-contained group. Its size may increase or decrease on the basis of its number of members. A group is called a community if the members of such a group share the basic conditions of common life.

The members of a community must have similar interests so that there may be harmony within the community. There is disruption in a community

if there
caste i
ability
memor
accoun
memb
memb
rooted
societ
N
solida
consi
This
politi
be d
(This
cultu
of or
6.2

if there is clash of interests between its sub-groups. There are divisions of caste in a community. There are also class distinctions, such as occupation, ability to have community sentiment because they share in common memories, customs, traditions and the like. They have "we sentiment" on account of which they identify themselves with the community. The members of a community take greater interest in one another than in the members of other communities. The sentiment of community is deeply rooted in human nature. The feeling of nationality in the members of a society may be regarded as a community sentiment.

MacIver has pointed out that there are certain barriers which hinder solidarity in a community. One of the greatest barriers of communal harmony consists in domination of one group over the other within the community. This domination or pressure of one group over the other may be social, political, or economic. Secondly, lack of solidarity within a community may be due to lack of free contacts between different groups of a community. (This physical aloofness of different groups of a community prevents cultural contacts between them which may sometimes produce contempt of one group for another).

6.2 DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY

- (1) Community is "a social group with some degree of "we feeling" and "living in a given area". – Bogardus.
- (2) Community is "the total organisation of social life with a limited area" – Ogburn and Nimkoff.
- (3) Community is "the smallest territorial group that can embrace all aspects of social life". – Kingsley Davis.
- (4) "A community is a cluster of people, living within a contiguous small area, who share a common way of life". – Green, Arnold.
- (5) Community is "a group of social beings living a common life including all the infinite variety and complexity of relations which result from that common life or constitute it". – Ginsberg.

6.3 ELEMENTS OF A COMMUNITY

A community is a continuous geographic area in which mutually dependent groups act together to satisfy their needs through a common set of organizations and institutions. This definition emphasizes four characteristics of this ecological form:

A continuous land area (1): A community is a continuous land area, that is, it is not made up of scattered land units. This physical unity is one basis for its solidarity.

Composed of people (2): It is composed of people as are all relationship structures in society. We are dependent on each other for services because we cannot obtain our necessities or achieve our objectives by our own efforts or through the groups in which we operate alone. It takes an interrelated set of groups working together to achieve many of our goals - such as places for worship, places to buy and sell goods, and protection for life and property. Our needs and desires and the development of the machinery to satisfy them, therefore, are an additional basis for community.

Co-operate to satisfy needs (3): The community is the place where we cooperate to satisfy our basic needs and desires. It is true that all our needs cannot usually be taken care of within a single community. Many consumer goods are brought into the community from other communities since practically no community, except the simplest societies, produces and manufactures all its requirements. It is necessary to satisfy some desires by going to other places. A small rural community, for example, could hardly provide classical opera for its residents.

Communities may so completely provide the essential goods and services of life that we may rarely need to go outside of them - even in urban areas.

It is not implied that all co-operation is conscious and voluntary when we say that individuals and groups act together to satisfy their needs and desires. Much of it is, unconscious. We accept stores, schools, and

professio
problem
commun

Common
include:
and des
and ins
commur
the chu
manufa
houses
and pro
whole s
of relati

6.4 TY
Th
classific

1. The
Th
is relat
most in
a villag
arouse
of the
import
elderly
memb
great c
the vi
panch

professional and other services automatically and impersonally. A major problem in communities is to maintain a conscious awareness that the community requires us to act together to satisfy our needs.

Common set of organizations and institutions (4): Because communities include a common set of organizations and institutions for satisfying needs and desires, they have a life of their own. The number of organizations and institutions in a community vary with its size and type, but most communities include the same basic ones. There are always the school, the church, and the economic agencies, such as stores, banks, and manufacturing establishments; some recreational facilities, such as movie houses and public parks; and lodges and other voluntary organizations and professional and personal service facilities. The community may be the whole society for some individuals, for here they are involved in a network of relationships that encompasses almost the whole of their lives.

6.4 TYPES OF COMMUNITY

There are various types of communities. Communities may be classified into the following types:

1. The Village Community

The village community is one of the earliest forms of communities. It is relatively simple in its structure. The common geographical area is the most important binding principle of a village community. The members of a village community have great loyalty for their village. They are emotionally aroused if the prestige of their village community is at stake. The heads of the most prominent families in a village form the village council. All important public decisions are taken in a village with their consent. The elderly members of a village community set up the social norms for all members of the village and maintain the customary laws of the village with great care. A village community is in many respects self-governing. In India the village communities are governed to a very great extent by the panchayats or the council of elders.

2. The City Community

A town or city community is larger in magnitude and more complex in its structure than a village community. The earliest city communities were found in ancient city states of Greece and Athens. [The citizens of ancient city states were deeply interested in outdoor life. They liked to spend a lot of time in market-places, theatres, clubs, and so on]. The modern city communities are more complex than the city communities of ancient Greece and Rome. The modern city community is a conglomeration of smaller communities. The smaller communities of a big city form the integral part of the entire city community. There is co-ordination between the smaller communities of a big city community. The city of Calcutta, for instance, consists of many smaller communities; in Calcutta there are the communities of refugees, Chinese, slum-dwellers, businessmen, beggars and so on. These smaller communities are the units of the entire city community.

3. The Feudal Community

Feudal communities developed out of the ownership of land by an individual or a group of individuals and their subordinates. In feudal societies the feudal lords ruled over the landless cultivators. In a feudal society there are usually persons with various social ranks. The rights and duties of each member of a feudal society are determined by his rank (in the latter). Maximum rights are enjoyed by a feudal lord, and a slave has very few rights in a feudal society. In India, for instance, the princes of the various states and Zamindars of villages formed the feudal societies during the British rule. In the contemporary period, however, feudal societies are fast breaking down.

4. The Nation Community

In the history of social evolution, the development of the nation community is of recent growth. The members of a nation community are united on the basis of their common nationality. National like-mindedness of the members of a society leads to the formation of a nation community. A nation community has unity of purpose if there is strong social solidarity

between its members. It unites its members on the basis of certain fundamental principles. India, for instance, attained the status of a nation community when the patriotic Indians thought of ousting the British imperialists from the Indian soil.

5. Rural Community

Dwight Sanderson - "Rural Community is that form of association maintained between the people and their institutions in a local area in which they live on dispersed farmsteads and in a village which usually forms the center of their common activities".

6. Urban Community

It is a community with a high population density, a predominance of non-agricultural occupations, a high degree of specialization resulting in a complex division of labour, and a formalized system of local government. Urban communities also tend to be characterized by a *heterogeneous population*, a prevalence of impersonal *secondary relations*, and dependence on *formal social controls*.

UNIT - III**LESSON - 7**

CULTURE

CONTENTS

- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Definition
- 7.3 Contents of Culture
- 7.4 Characteristics of Culture
- 7.5 Functions of Culture

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The term culture is defined in various ways. Generally in common usage, the term culture means good manners and polite behaviour. In Sociology and Social Psychology the term culture generally refers to the characteristic of an individual's personality. To begin with, the distinction between culture and civilization, should be clearly understood. In fact, when it comes to a clear-cut definition of the concepts, then it is difficult to distinguish between them. For example, MacIver states that culture is what we are and civilization is what we have. This distinction does not help us to understand characteristics of culture as different from the characteristics of civilization.

There are other definitions which imply that culture stands for the material aspect of human society and civilization stands for non-material aspects of society. However, the authority like Max Weber makes such a distinction between material and non-material of a society within the definition of the culture.

The term culture includes the customs, conventions, traditions, the mores, the social norms, the values, the various institutions, the means

of pro
is the

7.2 D

7.3

com
has
conc
cult
that
the

com
we

of production and distribution, the art, the science etc., In short, culture is the whole of social heritage of a generation in a society.

7.2 DEFINITION

- (1) "Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities acquired by man as a member of society". – Tylor.
- (2) Culture "is the handiwork of man and the medium through which he achieves his ends". – Malinowski.
- (3) "Culture is the expression of our nature in our modes of living and our thinking, intercourse in our literature, in religion, in recreation and enjoyment". – MacIver.
- (4) "Culture is the sum total of integrated learned behaviour patterns which are characteristics of the members of a society and which are therefore not the result of biological inheritance". - E.A. Hoebel.
- (5) "Culture is the complex whole that consists of everything we think and do and have as members of society". – Bierstedt.
- (6) "Culture is the total content of the physico-social, bio-social, and psycho-social universes man has produced and the socially created mechanisms through which these social products operate". – Anderson and Parker.

7.3 CONTENTS OF CULTURE

Many sociologists have classified the content of culture into two large components, *material culture* and *nonmaterial culture*. William F. Ogburn, has used this distinction as the basis for a theory of cultural change. The concept of material culture is clear enough. But the concept of nonmaterial culture is not quite so clear, except in the sense that it includes everything that is not material. We shall therefore adopt a threefold classification of the content of culture.

Our classification stems directly from the definition of culture as the complex whole that consists of all the ways we think and do and everything we have as members of society. Thinking and doing and having are three

of the most fundamental categories in the grammar of any language. They give us the three components of culture – *ideas*, *norms* and *things*. The last of these is the material culture mentioned above. Ideas and norms are both non-material culture, but we distinguish them because they perform different functions in society and operate in different ways.

1. Ideas

In literate societies ideas are recorded and written down and stored in books and libraries. Ideas thus make up the literature of the society. In nonliterate societies they constitute the *lore and legends* of the tribe. The Sociologist is not interested in the truth or falsity of the notions that prevail in various societies but only in the fact that some notions do prevail and help to determine the unique character of the lives that people live in these societies.

The Greeks believed in many Gods, Gods of both sexes. The Eskimos believe in several Gods, but the most important one is a beautiful female deity named Sedna. The Russians, officially at least, believe in no God. All of these are but the major variations in the religious ideas to be found in the world's societies.

We find a similarly vast and heterogeneous collection of political ideas. Some peoples believe that their chiefs or kings are divinely ordained to rule them. Some believe that the strongest should rule, or the wealthiest, or the most excellent, or the most wise.

In the examples, we have just used the fields of religion and political philosophy.

Some of the ideas of the members of a society are true and the others are false. Sociologically speaking, [it is important to recognize that] both kinds of ideas influence human conduct. To generalize, however, we may say that there are three classes of ideas – those which are true, those which are false, and those whose truth or falsity has not yet been determined. From another point of view we may classify ideas into such

categories
super-

Th
succe

2. Nor

Th

we use

Most

we ref

people

behav

inter

C

condu

expec

v

order

hand

him

I

of the

J

into

for n

and

and

and

sleep

one

categories as scientific propositions, (statement/proposal), legends, myths, superstitions, and proverbs.

The task of classifying ideas is a complex one, and no one has succeeded in constructing a list that will be satisfactory for all purposes.

2. Norms

The concept of Norms is the second large component of culture. When we use this concept we refer not to ways of thinking but to ways of doing. Most of the things we do as members of society and most of the things we refrain from doing are cultural in character. When we talk about what people do in society we are interested, as sociologists, in the type of behaviour that is considered socially acceptable or unacceptable. We are interested, in short, in conduct.

Conduct, implies the presence of norms, which are cultural. Our conduct conforms to certain standards. These standards and rules and expectations are what we call norms. The norms are of several kinds.

Without norms social life would be impossible and there would be no order in society. Without norms we should never know whether to shake hands with a new acquaintance, rub noses with him, kiss him, or give him an affectionate push. Norms are the essence of social organization.

In all societies, there are rules, and it is these rules that are the norms of these societies.

By and large, whatever we do, whenever and wherever we do it, falls into certain patterns that are set for us by our society. There are norms for meeting people and norms for taking leave of them, norms for writing and norms for speaking, norms for eating and drinking, norms for playing and working, norms in class-rooms and in cafeterias, norms in hospitals and hotels, and so on for every [conceivable] activity. Wearing clothes, sleeping at night, eating three times a day, drinking from a glass, marrying one wife at a time, paying bills on the first of the month, speaking a

language, writing from left to right, taking examinations at the end of a semester – all these and countless thousands more, are norms.

It is apparent too that the norms of one society are different from the norms of another.

3. Material

We have now discussed *ways of thinking* and *ways of doing* and the next major component of culture is *what we have* as members of society. This component consists of things; it is the material culture or material.

This category includes all of the material items that the members of a society have and use. It would be an enormous task to list all the material of even a very small and simple society, and this difficulty increases in dimension as we move to the large and complex societies.

The material culture includes Machines, Tools, Utensils, Buildings, Roads, Bridges, Clothing, Vehicles, Furniture, Medicines and so on.

4. Ideologies

We have now discussed the three major components of culture – ideas, norms and material. Some kinds of culture may not fit clearly into only one of these components but may belong (rather) to two or even three of them. Thus, it has a *material* component, (eg. music, painting) an *idea* that informs it, and *norms* to which it conforms. A work of art exhibits all three of the components of culture.

Similarly some kinds of culture rebate two of these components. We call the combination of *ideas* and *norms* as *ideologies*.

When we are presented with an idea we want to know not only whether certain ideas are true or false but also whether they are good or bad. Ideas that are evaluated in this way are called ideologies. More precisely, an ideology is an idea supported by a norm.

7.4 CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURE

1. Learned Behaviour

Nat all behaviour is learned, but most of it is learned; combing one's hair, standing in line, telling jokes, criticising the President, and going to the movie, all constitute behaviours which had to be learned.

Sometimes the terms *conscious learning* and *unconscious learning* are used to distinguish the learnings. For example, the ways in which a small child learns to handle a tyrannical father or a rejecting mother often affect the ways in which that child, ten or fifteen years later, handles his relationships with other people.

Some behaviour is obvious. People can be seen going to football games, eating with forks, or driving automobiles. Such behaviour is called "overt" behaviour. Other behaviour is less visible. Such activities as planning tomorrow's work, (or) feeling hatred for an enemy, are behaviours too. This sort of behaviour, which is not openly visible to other people – is called "Covert" behaviour. Both may be of course, learned.

2. Culture is a Pattern of Learned Behaviour

The difinition of culture indicated that the learned behaviour of people is patterned. Each person's behaviour often depends upon some particular behaviour of someone else. The point is that, as a general rule, behaviours are somewhat integrated or organized with related behaviours of other persons.

3. Culture is the Products of Behaviour

Culture learnings are the products of behaviour. As the person behaves, there occur changes in him. He acquires the ability to swim, to feel hatred toward someone, or to sympathize with someone. They have grown out of his previous behaviours.

In both ways, then, human behaviour is the result of behaviour. The experiences of *other people* are impressed on one as he grows up, and also many of his traits and abilities have grown out of *his own past behaviours*.

(a) Culture includes Attitudes, Values, Knowledges: There is a widespread error in the thinking of many people who tend to regard the ideas, attitudes, and notions which they have as "their own". It is easy to overestimate the uniqueness of one's own attitudes and ideas. When there is agreement with other people it is largely unnoticed, but when there is a disagreement or difference one is usually conscious of it. Your differences, however, may also be cultural. For example, suppose you are a Catholic and the other person a Protestant.

And so it is also with knowledge. How does one really *know*, for example, that the major ideas and truths which he accepts as correct are correct in fact? How can he determine that they are correct? How does one *know* that one hundred fifty divided by three is fifty? He learned a thinking method called "arithmetic".

(b) Culture also includes Material Objects: Man's behaviour results in creating objects. Men were behaving when they made these things. To make these objects required, numerous and various skills which human beings gradually built up through the ages. Man has invented something else and so on. Occasionally one encounters the view that man does not really "make" steel or a battleship. All these things, first existed in a "state of nature". Man merely modified their form, changed them from a state in which they were to the state in which he now uses them. The chair was first a tree which man surely did not make. But the chair is more than trees and the jet airplane is more than iron ore and so forth.

4. Culture is shared by the Members of Society

The patterns of learned behaviour and the results of behaviour are possessed not by one or a few persons, but usually by a large proportion. Thus, many millions of persons share such behaviour patterns as Christianity, the use of automobiles, or the English language.

Persons may share some part of a culture *unequally*. For example, as Americans do the Christian religion. To some persons Christianity is the

all important, predominating idea in life. To others it is less preoccupying/important, and to still others it is of marginal significance only.

Some times the people *share different aspects of culture*. For example, among the Christians, there are – Catholic and Protestant, liberal or conservative, as clergymen or as laymen. The point to our discussion is not that culture or any part of it is shared identically, but that it is shared by the members of society to a sufficient extent.

5. Culture is transmitted among members of Society

These cultural ways which we have been discussing are learned by persons from persons. Many of them are "*handed down*" by one's elders, by parents, teachers, and others [of a somewhat older generation]. Other cultural behaviours are "*handed up*" to elders. Some of the transmission of culture is among contemporaries. For example, the styles of dress, political views, and the use of recent labour saving devices. One does not acquire a behaviour pattern spontaneously. He learns it. That means that someone teaches him and he learns. Much of the learning process both for the teacher and the learner is quite unconscious, unintentional, or accidental.

6. Culture is Continually Changing

There is one fundamental and inescapable attribute (special quality) of culture: The fact of *unending change*. Some societies at some times change slowly, and hence in comparison to other societies seem not to be changing at all. But they are changing, even though not obviously so. People frequently have a deep-seated distrust and fear of change. It is usually easier not to change. Man does not meet each recurring situation in exactly the same way each time. He makes modifications, large and small. He tries new ways, or he accidentally tries the new ways. These new ways are transmitted to others, and already the culture is changed.

7.5 FUNCTIONS OF CULTURE

1. Culture defines Situations

Each culture has many subtle cues which define each situation, [it reveals] revealing whether one should prepare to fight, run, laugh, or make love. For example, suppose someone approaches you with right hand outstretched at waist level. What does this mean? That he wishes to shake hands in friendly greeting is perfectly obvious – obvious, that is, to anyone familiar with our culture. But in another place or time the outstretched hand might mean hostility or warning. One does not know what to do in a situation until he has defined the situation. Each society has its insults and fighting words. The cues (hints) which define situations appear in infinite variety. A person who moves from one society into another will spend many years misreading the cues. For example, laughing at the wrong places.

2. Culture defines Attitudes, Values, and Goals

Each person learns in his culture what is good, true, and beautiful. Attitudes, values and goals are defined by the culture, while the individual normally learns them as unconsciously as he learns the language. *Attitudes* are tendencies to feel and act in certain ways. *Values* are measures of goodness or desirability; (Eg.) We value private property, (representative) government, and many other things and experiences. *Goals* are those attainments which our values define as worthy, (eg.) winning the race, gaining the affections of a particular girl, or becoming president of the firm. By approving certain goals and ridiculing others, the culture channels individual ambitions. In these ways culture determines the goals of life.

3. Culture defines Myths, Legends, and the Supernatural

Myths and legends are (an) important part of every culture. They may inspire, reinforce effort and sacrifice, and bring comfort in bereavement. Whether they are true is sociologically unimportant. Ghosts are real to people who believe in them and who act upon this belief. We cannot understand the behaviour of any group without knowing something of the

myth
powe

univ
defin
in a
This
fortif

4. C

know
amon
him
path
secu

his c
and
his v
he is
patte

myths, legends, and supernatural beliefs they hold. Myths and legends are powerful forces in a group's behaviour.

Culture also provides the individual with a ready-made view of the universe. The nature of divine power, and the important moral issues are defined by the culture. The individual does not have to select, but is trained in a Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim or some other religious tradition. This tradition gives answers for the major (things imponderable) of life, and fortifies the individual to meet life's crises.

4. Culture provides Behaviour Patterns

The individual need not go through painful trial-and-error learning to know what foods can be eaten (without poisoning himself), or how to live among people without fear. He finds a ready-made set of patterns awaiting him which he needs only to learn and follow. The culture maps out the path to matrimony. The individual does not have to wonder how one secures a mate; he knows the procedure defined by his culture.

From before he is born until after he is dead, man is a prisoner of his culture. His culture directs and confines his behaviour, places his goals, and measures his rewards. His culture gets into his mind and shuts his vision so that he sees what he is supposed to see, and dreams what he is expected to dream. The individual who deviates from these expected patterns is abstained and punished by his fellows.

LESSON - 8

THEORIES OF CULTURE

CONTENTS

- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Theories of Culture
- 8.3 Sub-culture
- 8.4 Cultural lag
- 8.5 Acculturation

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Culture is the finest achievement of a society. It is the excellence of a society. It is possible for almost all types of societies. Cultural nuclei are formed through establishment of social bonds between creative-appreciative members of a society. In aboriginal and mediocre societies cultural nuclei are very sparsely distributed. In civilized societies, on the other hand, there are numerous cultural nuclei. These cultural nuclei are formed due to the formation of circuits between creation and appreciation of values by creative and appreciative persons.

Culture is the manifestation of conflux of creativity by creative-appreciative persons. Every society has at least some members who are creative in some sense. The term 'creative' is used here in a very broad sense. Creativity may range from most trivial form of creativity to the highest form of creativity.

Most of the anthropologists and sociologists are usually concerned with the study of culture of a society from the static point of view. But strictly speaking the static culture of a society can be hardly called 'culture', rather it should be called 'tradition'. Genuine culture is dynamic. Hence, the culture of a progressive society is perennially evolving, changing, and developing. In a sense, therefore, cultural flux is synonymous with social progress.

8.2 THEORIES OF CULTURE

According to E.B. Tylor, culture includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, customs, law, and other aptitudes and habits possessed by the members of a society. In his view, the complex network is bound together by various modes of connections, such as progress, degradation, survival, revival, and modification of social customs. Civilization consists in general improvement of mankind through satisfactory organization of society with the aim of promoting human goodness, power, and happiness. Civilization indicates that a society has progressed. Culture refers to the acquired experiences of individuals as well as social groups. Culture is acquired by the members of a society in course of time. There is also diffusion of culture in space and time. Cultural identities of different societies are due to diffusion of culture.

He seems to suggest that culture is a stable phenomenon. But culture is not static in its nature. It is basically dynamic. Culture refers to a system of norms. It is expressed through different forms of creativity. Moreover, culture does not merely refer to the material achievements of a society, it refers to many items which are non-material in their nature.

P.A. Sorokin has defined culture as the sum-total of everything that is created or modified through conscious or unconscious behaviour of two or more interacting individuals. In his view culture includes all forms of human expressions, such as science, philosophy, religion, art, technology, and so on. Even the pre-historic relics of human societies which are discovered through excavations are elements of culture.

Sorokin has mentioned about the two different types of cultural systems in some detail which can be conceived by human beings. One of the cultural systems is the Ideational Culture, and the other is the Sensate Culture. The pure forms of Ideational and Sensate Cultures very rarely exist in actuality.

In an *Ideational Culture* (i) reality is conceived as non-material or transempirical in its nature, (ii) the basic needs and ends of individuals

are regarded as spiritual, (iii) the extent of satisfaction of such needs is very wide, and the level of aspiration is very high, and (iv) the method of realization of spiritual ends is self-imposed and autonomous.

In a *Sensate Culture* the perceptual world is regarded as the only reality. Individuals in a sensate culture do not usually have faith in the trans-empirical reality. In a sensate culture reality is conceived as dynamic in its nature. The concepts of becoming, change and evolution are the most common terms in a sensate culture. The methods of achieving the ends of individuals are not through the transformation of their personalities, but through the exploitation of the external world or Nature. A Sensate Culture is the antithesis of an Ideational Culture both in its content and aim. Individuals of a Sensate Culture give priority to material, hedonistic, and utilitarian values.

Sorokin has maintained that apart from the Ideational and the Sensate types of cultures there may be mixed types of cultures in which there may be combination of Ideational and Sensate cultures in different proportions.

R.M. MacIver holds that culture is a dynamic social change. There is intimate relation between social change and cultural change. In his view, culture is the actual way of living and thinking which is expressed through human behaviour, such as art, literature, religion, and so on. It refers primarily to those things which have intrinsic value. Civilization, on the other hand, mainly refers to the various types of tools which human beings use in order to control the conditions of human life. A culture, therefore, represents the actual state of being of a social group; a civilization, on the other hand, mainly refers to the various types of machines that a social group uses. Culture is basically changing in its nature. In order to exactly find out the determinant of cultural lag it is necessary to take note of the methods of tracing the cultural trends. The external manifestations of culture can be easily studied and evaluated, but the internal changes of cultural change, such as opinions, attitudes, and the like cannot be easily

assess
measur

A
cultur
tools
ends.
are en
range
as we
huma
intell
signif
their
the w

and
also
of th
a n
MacI

can
to th
The
beha
thro
of ex
Cult
coul
the
If co

assessed. It is doubtful whether the attempts of the sociologists in 'measuring' the attitudes of people are valid.

According to MacIver, there is distinction between civilization and culture. Civilization mainly refers to the utilitarian commodities. The useful tools and equipments are used as means to the achievement of certain ends. They are not treated as ends in themselves. All those devices which are employed as tools for the achievement of certain goals fall within the range of civilization. Civilization refers to the system of social organizations as well as the material instruments and equipments which are useful for human welfare. Culture, on the other hand, refers to the system of values, intellectual adventures, emotional attachments and the like. Culture has significance with reference to the internal aspects of personalities, such as their attitudes, feelings, aspirations, and the like. It is the expression of the way of living and thinking.

There are certain elements of truth in MacIver's analysis of civilization and culture. It is also true that culture is a dynamic phenomenon. It is also true that civilization and culture are two distinct phenomena in spite of the fact that there is close correlation between the two. But there are a number of drawbacks in MacIver's view of civilization and culture. MacIver has not clearly mentioned why culture undergoes change.

W.F. Ogburn and M.F. Nimkoff maintain that the culture of a society can be understood if its origin and growth are properly studied. According to them, the meaning of culture cannot be understood through a definition. The significance of culture can be understood by observing the mode of behaviour of the members of a society. Culture keeps on accumulating through ages. The achievements of modern culture are the results of years of experience, and persistent efforts on the part of the members of a society. Culture is a growing phenomenon. There is growth of cultural elements in course of the progressive growth of society. There is growth of a culture if the addition of new cultural elements supersede the old cultural elements. If continuous addition of cultural elements does not take place, the culture

of a society remains either static or it declines. The additions of new cultural elements in a culture evoke new response patterns and help the formation of new habits. Cultural elements which are inherited by members of a society are their treasures and not their creations. New generations of a society are comparatively at an advantageous position than their preceding generations because the former enjoy the creations and inventions of the latter. New inventions are the products of social evolution. An inventor makes new improvements on the productions of the earlier inventors. All cultural elements have their historical background. The evolution of culture is also on account of the cross-fertilization of different cultural elements. They mean by 'cross-fertilization' of cultural elements, the convergence of the different branches of knowledge. There is intermixing of the various branches of knowledge. Cross-fertilization of cultures is the source of the new ideas in the members of culturally cross-fertilized societies.

According to Ogburn and Nimkoff, there is diffusion of culture into the different areas of a society. There is intermixing of different cultural areas in course of evolution. Inventions which are made in one cultural area are adopted by other cultures. The cultural traits of the members of one society may be borrowed or inherited by the members of some other society. This sort of transmission of cultural traits from one part of culture to another is called 'diffusion of culture'. Isolation of one society from another is detrimental to the diffusion of culture. Mountains, rivers, sea-waters, forests, and the like may hinder the diffusion of culture from one cultural area to another. Thus diffusion of culture is inhibited if different societies remain isolated from one another.

Ogburn and Nimkoff have aptly pointed out that culture is a growing and evolving phenomenon. Strictly speaking culture cannot be regarded as a static phenomenon. Culture refers to the vital aspect of a social structure. It is basically living and growing.

8.3 SU

Su

life-styl

domina

of such

in the

cohere

conten

particu

class,

sub-cu

8.4 C

TI

sociolo

invent

disturb

in whi

parts,

cultur

it esp

throug

much

man's

T

at the

and t

chang

chang

chang

in so

the cl

condi

8.3 SUB-CULTURE

Sub-culture is a system of values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and life-styles of a social group which is distinct from, but related to the dominant culture of a society. In modern society there are a great diversity of such sub-cultures, but the concept has been of most use in sociology in the study of ethnic groups, youth and deviancy. It is more or less coherent assembly of beliefs and perspectives which borrowed its form and content from the wider culture. Sub-cultures are the cultural traits of a particular group or category. The cultures of occupational groups, social class, caste, religion, age group, sex group and many others are sub-cultures.

8.4 CULTURAL LAG

The concept of cultural lag has become a favourite one with sociologists. It is a concept that has a particular appeal in an age in which inventions and discoveries and innovations of many kinds are constantly disturbing and threatening older ways of living. Cultural lag is a situation in which some parts of culture change at a faster rate than other related parts, with a resulting disruption of the integration and equilibrium of the culture. This concept was introduced by William F. Ogburn, who applied it especially to modern, industrial societies in which the material culture, through rapid advances in technology and science, has developed at a much faster rate than that part of the non-material culture which regulates man's adjustment to the material culture.

The thesis is that the various parts of modern culture are not changing at the same rate, some parts are changing much more rapidly than others; and that since there is a correlation and interdependence of parts, a rapid change in one part of our culture requires readjustments through other changes in the various correlated parts of culture. Where one part of culture changes first, through some discovery or invention, and occasions changes in some part of culture dependent upon it, there frequently is a delay in the changes occasioned in the dependent part of culture. When the material conditions change, changes are occasioned in the adaptive culture.

But these changes in the adaptive culture do not synchronize exactly with the change in the material culture. There is a lag which may last for varying lengths of time, sometimes indeed, for many years. The hypothesis of culture lag holds in particular that in modern societies there has been a tendency for changes in the political, educational, family, and religious institutions not to keep pace with technological changes.

The concept of cultural lag was first introduced by William F. Ogburn in his book 'Social Change'. He distinguishes between "Material" and "Non-material" culture. When changes occur in the material culture, these in turn stimulate changes in the non-material culture, particularly in what he terms the "Adaptive" culture, or the ways of utilizing, exploiting, or rendering more serviceable the material changes. But this adaptive culture may be slow to respond. The forests of the country may be destroyed because of the art of conservation does not keep pace with industrial or agricultural development. The factory system is well advanced before the need for the protection of workmen from accidents and industrial diseases and for workmen's compensation acts is realized. The system of political representation may remain unchanged though the character and distribution of the population changes.

The concept of cultural lag does not imply the stagnation or static condition of culture. Culture, is subjected to change as a mode of behaviour. But the change is not so rapid as material discoveries and inventions found in technology. Cultural lag, therefore, refers to slow rate of change disproportionate to technological change. Social equilibrium depends on proper adjustment between material and non-material culture. W.F. Ogburn analyses that non-material aspect does not keep pace with material advance particularly in modern technology and concludes that there is a problem of adjustment by the incidence of cultural lag. In modern society, the failure of non-material culture to make proportionate effective adaptation with material changes is due to rigidity of the ideological system. Cultural elements of beliefs, folkways, and mores resist changes in technology and gap is created between tradition and technological change.

Ogburn illustrates, cultural lag from the contents of culture between material objects and non-material ideologies. The material inventions which have created cultural lag, according to Ogburn, are the automobile, telephone, printing, photography, alloys, wireless, aeroplane, electrical goods, cinema, press, television and the like. They have terrific impact on society in terms of development in civilization. Changes in technology are rapid whereas social institutions, customs and ideologies have not adequately adapted or even failed to adapt. Ogburn points out a vast accumulation of cultural lag in the process of developments in science and technology. Social problems emerge from the lack of adequate adjustment between the different parts of culture.

The concept of cultural lag though accepted by some sociologists, is defective and subjected to criticism by some thinkers. Kingsley Davis points out that the distinction between material and non-material culture is artificial and impractical. He refuses the very idea of material in cultural reality. The material objects by themselves are not parts of culture. They are understood in terms of desire, thought and utility by human beings. It is their meaning but not the material aspect which provides cultural character. Culture is a socio-psychic reality. According to Davis, it cannot be divided into material and non-material. James W. Woodward criticises the distinction between the material and non-material culture as an unknowable or impracticable theory. We may cling to old-fashioned ways or new conditions and get our needs better served and such adaptation is not the lag between the material and non-material aspects. The material conditions may also be altered by non-material ideologies whereby the adoption is of the non-material to the material. According to R.M. MacIver, what lags behind is a curious question. There is no standard to measure the advanced and the laggard and as such, the term lag is dubious. In the absence of comparative efficiency, the concept of cultural lag leads to unintelligible implications. Moreover, it is superfluous applied to all kinds of disequilibrium of maladjustment in social change.

According to MacIver, there are certain failures of adjustment between the lower and higher techniques within a particular technological complex, and it is described as technological lag. Technological lag as a contrast to cultural lag may be illustrated from slow development and acceptance of techniques in primitive society. Stone implements, the bow and arrow technology remained without much change for hundreds of years even though there were more changes in the family, political and moral life of the people. Modern social organisation is highly complicated and it is very difficult to determine the peculiar ways in which the interdependent components of culture undergo changes. Maladjustment is found not only in material inventions but also in cultural pattern. There are restraints imposed on technological advance by cultural values. Certain technical devices become cultural patents, tend to be conservative and do not give scope for further developments. Technological lag by way of restraints develops into non-material culture by a system of faith, sentiment and values. It is therefore erroneous to make a distinction between material and non-material culture and such analysis would be superfluous and superficial. Human culture is a totality of human achievements not only in object, but also ideas and ideologies meaningful by their interdependence.

8.5 ACCULTURATION

A natural sequel to the culture area studies of Wissler and the study of the dynamics of contact initiated by Boas has been the considerable attention which a large number of American anthropologists have given to the study of changing of one way of life through impact with another. When culture-traits or complexes have been diffused we talk about diffusion, but when a whole way of life is in process of change under the influence of another culture, we call it *acculturation*. Linton, Redfield, Herskovits, Hallowell and Beals have made important contributions towards the development of a body of explanatory concepts relating to acculturation. Thus Herskovits says that when a growing child learns to conform to his own cultural traditions, the process may be designated as *enculturation*.

When
trans
is ac
does
to de
is ca
India
Chot
oppc
auto

are
the
hist
scie

When there is exchange of culture traits and complexes it may be called *transculturation*, but when one way of life is being displaced by another, it is *acculturation*. Acculturation may lead to assimilation, but very often it does not. The dominated culture breaks down at first and then recovers to develop a reaction to the loss of its own individuality. Such a reaction is called *contra-acculturation*. An example is available from contemporary India: after centuries of exploitation and material impoverishment, the Chota Nagpur tribes have developed a new-found sense of strength and opposition which has resulted in the *Jharkhand* movement demanding autonomy in cultural, social, economic and political matters.

Acculturation studies have been motivated by the realization that there are no 'pure' or 'uncontaminated' cultures in the world today. Secondly, the conjectural studies of diffusionists about what happened in unrecorded history had also to be supplemented by more authentic studies of a scientific value in order to develop theoretical, explanatory postulates.

LESSON - 9

VARIABILITY OF CULTURE AND ETHNOCENTRISM**CONTENTS**

- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Variability of Culture
- 9.3 Ethnocentrism

9.1 INTRODUCTION

A society's culture is its way of life. As a society develops it becomes differentiated into sub-systems or sub-societies. Each of these will tend to develop its own norms, values, and other distinctive patterns. The norms of social behaviour create patterns for each group. Culture provides norms for regulating the human behaviour to satisfy their needs. Social relationships are intact only by culture; group life is the creation of culture. Culture provides for the co-operation of individuals and makes society stable. The functions of culture are of varied forms in terms of individual personality and social integration. Cultures vary from group to group in relation to behaviour patterns set by social norms. Changes in social norms according to new needs necessitate rearrangement of cultural values. There are differences in culture. Culture is not of a uniform pattern. Variety is endless in human life. There are hundreds of cultures in the world and thousands of patterns in each culture. Cultural variability is found in different forms of social behaviour among individuals as members of groups.

9.2 VARIABILITY OF CULTURE

It may be illustrated from several practices in institutional behaviour. Family as a fundamental social unit is universal, but differs in its make-up in terms of sex and marriage. Some societies are monogamous, some are polyandrous and some are polygamous. Others are polyandrous. Monogamy, the marital practice of having one husband and one wife, is prevalent in several cultural

group
of wo
woma
men

1

of ma
by el
indi
inst
marr
group
in al
tradi
siste

patri
auth
shar
of jo

form
Relig
of re
danc
love
The
core
cont

the
love

practice of having two or more
one boy and more and some
nd in terms of sex and
family as a unit
It may

groups. There are also group marriages—a group of men marrying a group of women. The mating arrangement is thus variable—one man to one woman, one man to several women, one woman to several men and several men to several women.

There are variations in the choice and selection of mates. The selection of mate is restricted by religion and caste. In some groups, it is restricted by elders or parents and in some others left to the voluntary choice of individuals in the restricted system of religion or caste. There are also instances of romantic love providing for inter-caste or inter-racial marriages. There are restrictions of endogamy—marrying within a designated group, and of exogamy—the obligation to choose outside the blood group in almost all cultural patterns. Apart from these practices there are traditions like pre-marital sex behaviour, eligibility to marry only after elder sisters or brothers are married, variations in age for marriage.

There are variations in the form of family. The major forms are patriarchal and matriarchal in terms of descent, inheritance of property, authority and residence. In modern society the marital status is equally shared by husband and wife. There are variable forms of family in terms of joint or nuclear patterns.

Variability in culture can be further analysed in terms of certain major forms of behaviour in religion, political administration, economic pursuits. Religion is an important cultural pursuit in human society. In the name of religion, he performs the most varied acts—meditation, fasting, feasting, dancing, silence, shouting, acts of kindness, hospitality, infanticide, cruelty, love and hate which are of endless forms in different cultural patterns. There are innumerable religious faiths, and practices which constitute the core of human culture and their variations are endless and exhibit contradictions of the human mind.

Culture variations are found in methods of public administration from the primitive to the modern forms of governments. Men have lived and loved, fought and died for governmental systems in varied forms. Hereditary

monarchies, cliques with power and tenure, autocratic powers of chieftains and wealthy group, dictatorship and democracy are varieties of public administration. There are also varieties in each form of government from country to country—democracy is of different varieties as found in America, England, India and other countries.

Societies vary in terms of economic pursuits. In some cultures wealth is the most important criterion of social stability and social welfare. In many cultures, pecuniary ideas are of no prominence and are subordinated to other pursuits. The values of life vary from group to group in terms of wealth—its accumulation, distribution and consumption. Possession of property is individualistic in some groups and collective in some others. People are motivated by different considerations in respect of the standards of living. Personal wealth may not bring prestige or power to its possessors and people may work effectively by co-operation for collective possession.

There are many other areas of social culture like education, recreation which indicate cultural variability. The character of education and recreation is subjected to cultural needs and varies from group to group. There is no uniformity or universal feature of cultural identity in all areas or pursuits as each culture has its own base of tradition and values. Cultural variability appears not only in the same group from time to time but in a larger range between different groups.

Factors for Cultural Variability

Several thinkers have speculated some reasons for a wide variety of cultural practice. The uncivilised, savage and barbarian people regarded certain acts as sinful and results of divine wrath. Modern outlook has advanced several explanations of cultural variability. Some thinkers have tried to explain the variability of culture in terms of variations in geography. Geographical conditions vary throughout the world and the differences determine different cultural practices. Natural environment determines the ways of living in terms of food, occupation and many other habits. It presents certain limitations and prohibitions to man as a culture maker.

But, man is capable of circumventing the geographical limitations by his knowledge. Man modifies the geographical conditions within certain limits but is subjected to natural order. There are similar cultures within variable geographical environment.

Some thinkers consider race as explanation of cultural variability. There are different races which are temperamentally different, possess different skills, needs and interest. Races indicate wide variations in culture. Racial traits are fixed and unchanging factors of inheritance. But culture undergoes changes by historical experience and cultural inheritance is variable from time to time. It is not exclusively owned by any racial group since it, depends on the process of social interaction. The process of culture-making depends on the historical accident of trial and error experience. The element of chance is found in the choice of practice. The accumulated experience in each group develops into traditional practices which constitute the values system in the nature of culture. Varied experiences in different groups account for variability. Human struggle to solve the problems of life leads to a form of behaviour based on certain coded rules of conduct. Neither geography nor race can explain cultural creation or variability. The empirical tests in historical situations characterise the formation of culture and its variability.

The concept of culture is not absolutely variable. There are uniformities among the cultures of the world. Variations in the specific content of cultures may be numerous; but cultural patterns possess significant uniformities. Uniformities depend on the inherent biological and psychological needs of man as a species. But they are not empirical. Cultural variations depend on empirical knowledge. There are no uniform cultural practices in the strict sense of the term. But there are universal cultural patterns recognised by all social groups. Family is a universal cultural pattern even though it differs in its specific content. Various social institutions are uniform patterns with definite objectives but differ in specific practices. Variability refers to content of culture whereas uniformity refers to cultural patterns.

9.3 ETHNOCENTRISM

The term Ethnocentrism was introduced by William G. Sumner in his "Folkways" (1906). It is an attitude of regarding one's own culture or group as superior. It considers the other cultures, since they are different, as inferior. According to John F. Cuber, "ethnocentrism is a tendency of persons to judge other cultures by the standards of judgement prevailing in their own". Harry Johnson observes, "ethnocentrism is partly conscious but largely unconscious tendency, when one comes in contact with foreigners to take the culture of one's own group as the basis of one's emotional reactions, cognitive assessments, and aesthetic and moral judgements". William Goode defines ethnocentrism as the belief that one's own community, group, tribe or nation is most worthy and excellent and that others should be viewed with some disapproval - greater their differences from us, the greater the appropriate disapproval". Robert Bierstedt in his book "Social Order", points out that ethnocentrism is a corollary of the principle of cultural relativity. It is the ethnic-centred tendency to evaluate other cultures in terms of one's own.

All these definitions indicate that the ways of thinking and of doing in a particular society are taken as standards to judge the behaviour patterns of other groups. Ethnocentrism is, of course, circular thinking. The person gets indoctrinated with a set of values, catholic or protestant, republican or democrat, christian or non-christian, capitalist or communist, and thereafter judges other cultural streams in terms of the already indoctrinated ideas. It is not surprising, then, that he usually concludes that his ways are the best ways. Ethnocentrism helps to keep a culture from changing, by reducing or eliminating some of the criticism. The more thoroughly ethnocentric a person is, he is likely to be more loyal when the society needs loyalty from him. The net result of these and other influences is to make for a more closely-knit and integrated society. Such conditions make for a permanent and strong group organisation. Ethnocentrism may be an advantage to the perpetuation of the group and of its culture. But there are also disadvantages of ethnocentrism to the group.

It
presen
in de
ethno
other
the n
did n
the c
ethno
confli
clear
certa

in th
Loya
beco
be s
peop
proc
grou
betw
were

one
right
cult
broa
app
prej
of t

It has its negative aspects from the point of view of cultural preservation. Ethnocentrism is virtually universal among humans. It varies in degree and form among different cultures and different groups. A more ethnocentric society, faces certain disadvantages, especially in relation to other societies. For example, Nazi Germany and Japan constituted two of the most ethnocentric modern nations. In either case their ethnocentrism did not save them. At best we may say that their ethnocentrism put off the day of their defeat. In other words it can be shown that their ethnocentrism have been largely responsible for getting them into the conflicts as a result of which they were defeated. Although it is not very clear that their ethnocentrism was the determining factor of their history, certainly it was a contributing factor.

The too-ethnocentric society often finds that its ethnocentrism stands in the way and prevent the understanding necessary to work in harmony. Loyalty may be so intense that essential co-operation between societies becomes difficult. Relations between two nations will probably continue to be strained due to the strong ethnocentric belief common among both peoples. Thirdly, ethnocentrism hinders assimilation. Assimilation is a process of absorption of persons or groups of one culture into a larger group of different culture. It is also thought that co-operative actions between religious groups in a nation could be facilitated greatly if there were less ethnocentrism in this phase of modern culture.

Adjustment with ethnocentrism depends on three conditions. Firstly, one must accept the fact that the culture of his own group is not necessarily right. Secondly, one must admit that he has very little knowledge of other cultures before underrating it. Thirdly, one should be sympathetic and broad-minded to see the worth of other cultures - an intellectual appreciation of other values and beliefs. Cultural conflicts and national prejudice can be reduced or eliminated by a proper sociological perspective of the contents of ethnocentrism.

UNIT - IV**LESSON - 10**

SOCIALIZATION

CONTENTS

10.1 Introduction

10.2 Definition

10.3 Process and stages of socialization

10.4 Agencies of Socialization

10.1 INTRODUCTION

Individuals usually possess, the inherited potentials that can make them persons under conditions of proper maturation and conditioning. This does not mean that the new human organism is a passive entity simply to be played upon. It is an active unit driven by the biological traits that react to the environment. Organisms become persons through the influence of environmental forces and through their own ability to respond and weave their responses into a unified body of habits, attitudes, and traits. These, in turn, control their thought and action and direct their reactions to the world about them as a consequence of interpersonal relationships. Becoming a person, therefore means absorbing the symbol systems of a society in order to communicate with fellow men and develop those traits that express the norms and values of the society. The process by which this is accomplished is called socialization.

10.2 DEFINITION

According to Ogburn, "Socialization is the process by which the individual learns to conform to the norms of the group". Ross defined socialization as "the development of the we feeling in associates and their growth in capacity and will to act together". Through the process of socialization the individual becomes a social person and attains personality.

According to *Lundberg*, socialization consists of the "complex processes of interaction through which the individual learns the habits, skills, beliefs, and standards of judgement that are necessary for his effective participation in social groups and communities". "Socialization is a learning that enables the learner to perform social roles." According to *Green*, "Socialization is the process by which the child acquires a cultural content, along with selfhood and personality." According to *Horton and Hunt*, "Socialization is the process whereby one internalizes the norms of his groups, so that a distinct "self" emerges, unique to this individual". *H.T. Mazumdar* defines socialization as "the process whereby original nature is transformed into human nature and the individual into person". Every man tries to adjust himself to the condition and environment predominantly determined by the society of which he is a member. If he fails to do so, he becomes a social deviant and is brought back into line by the efforts of the group of which he is a member. This process of adjustment may be termed socialization. It is the opposite of individualization. It is a process of the expansion of the self. It develops in him the community feeling.

Bogardus defines socialization as the "process of working together of developing group responsibility of being guided by the welfare needs of others".

According to *Machver*, Socialization is the process by which social beings establish wider and profounder relationships with one another, in which they become more bound up with, and more dependent on, one another, in which they develop the sense of their obligation to and responsibility for others, in which they grow more perceptive of the personality of themselves and of others and build up the complex structure of nearer and wider association." *Kimball Young* writes, "Socialization will mean the process of inducting the individual into the social and cultural world; of making him a participant member in society and its various groups and inducing him to accept the norms and values of that society ... Socialization is definitely a matter of learning and not of biological inheritance." It is through the process of socialization that the new born

individual is moulded into a social being and men find their fulfilment within society. Man becomes what he is by socialization.

10.3 PROCESS AND STAGES OF SOCIALIZATION

We have taken a general look at the forces involved in socialization; let's go on to examine this process on an individual level.

People develop their personalities in the course of interacting with others. These interactions are themselves influenced by a number of factors, such as age, intelligence, sex, and weight. For example, in our culture slimness is valued, fat people find it harder to develop self-esteem than thin people. Environment can also affect personality. Another important aspect of personality is culture. We become members of our culture through the influence of our parents, teachers, and peers.

In the past century psychologists and sociologists proposed a number of theories to explain how these various forces - Physical traits, environment, individual experiences, culture - interact to produce a unique personality. We will discuss some of those theories, which are summarized briefly in the Table given below:

Theories of Personality Development

Type of Theory	Theorist	Key Idea
Self theories	Charles Cooley (the looking-glass self)	Self-image reflects the ideas people have about how others view them.
	George Herbert Mead	The self develops in a series of stages that involve taking the role of others and building a 'me' and an 'I'.

Psychoanalytic Sigmund Freud
theories

Personality grows through a series of stages ending at puberty and marked by tension between the idea and the superego.

Erik Erikson

Personality grows through a lifelong series of stages marked by the resolution of major crises.

Cognitive Jean Piaget
theories

The ability to perform mental thought processes develops in a series of stages, each marked by the mastery of a new set of cognitive skills.

C.H. Cooley and G.H. Mead: Charles Horton Cooley believed personality arises out of people's interactions with the world. According to Cooley, people create "looking-glass selves" in these interactions. The looking-glass self is composed of three elements:

1. What we think others see in us (I believe people are reacting to my new hairstyle)
2. How we think they react to what they see (I believe they think it looks good).
3. How we respond to the perceived reaction of others (I guess I'll keep my hair in this style).

This theory places a lot of weight on our interpretations of other people's thoughts and feelings. The American psychologist George Herbert Mead (1934) went further in analysing how the self develops. Like Cooley, he believed the self is a social product arising from relations with other people. At first, however, as babies and young children, we are unable to interpret the meaning of people's behaviour. When children learn to attach meanings to their behaviour, they have stepped outside themselves. Once

children can think about themselves the same way they might think about someone else, they begin to gain a sense of self.

The process of forming the self, according to Mead, occurs in three distinct stages. The first is imitation. In this stage children copy the behaviour of adults without understanding it. A little boy might "help" his parents vacuum the floor by pushing a toy vacuum cleaner or even a stick around the room. During the play stage, children understand behaviours as actual roles – doctor, firefighter, race-car driver, and so on – and begin to take on those roles in their play. In doll play, little children frequently talk to the doll in both loving and scolding tones as if they were parents, then answer for the doll the way a child answers his or her parents. This shifting from one role to another builds children's ability to give the same meanings to their thoughts and actions that other members of society give them – another important step in the building of a self.

According to Mead, the self is composed of two parts, the "I" and the "me". The "I" is the person's response to other people and to society at large; the "me" is a self-concept that consists of how significant others – that is, relatives and friends – see the person. The "I" thinks about and reacts to the "me" as well as to other people. For instance, "I" react to criticism by considering it carefully, sometimes changing and sometimes not, depending on whether I think the criticism is valid. I know that people consider "me" a fair person who's always willing to listen. As they trade off roles in their play, children gradually develop a "me". Each time they see themselves from someone else's viewpoint, they practice responding to that impression.

During Mead's third stage, the game stage, the child must learn what is expected not just by one other person but by a whole group. On a baseball team, for example, each player follows a set of rules and ideas that are common to the team and to baseball. These attitudes of "other" a faceless person "out there", children judge their behaviour by standards thought to be held by the "other out there". Following the rules of a game

of b
expl
ider.

Sig
som
indi
driv
soci

The
the
Whe
proc
bodi

the
real
tens
atten
unti

func
stan

mus
in to
their
and
guilt
Stag
four

of baseball prepares children to follow the rules of the game of society as expressed in laws and norms. By this stage, children have gained a social identity.

Sigmund Freud: Sigmund Freud's theory of personality development is somewhat opposed to Mead's, since it is based on the belief that the individual is always in conflict with society. According to Freud, biological drives (especially sexual ones) are opposed to cultural norms, and socialization is the process of taming these drives.

The Three-Part Self: Freud's theory is based on a three-part self; the id, the ego, and the superego. The *id* is the source of pleasure-seeking energy. When energy is discharged, tension is reduced and feelings of pleasure are produced, the id motivates us to have sex, eat, and excrete, among other bodily functions.

The *ego* is the overseer of the personality, a sort of traffic light between the personality and the outside world. The ego is guided mainly by the *reality principle*. It will wait for the right object before discharging the id's tension. When the id registers hunger, for example, the ego will block attempts to eat spare tyres or poisonous berries, postponing gratification until food is available.

The *superego* is an idealized parent; It performs a moral, judgemental function. The superego demands perfect behaviour according to the parents' standards, and later according to the standards of society at large.

All three of these parts are active in children's personalities. Children must obey the reality principle, waiting for the right time and place to give in to the id. They must also obey the moral demands of parents and of their own developing superegos. The ego is held accountable for actions, and it is rewarded or punished by the superego with feelings of pride or guilt.

Stages of Sexual Development: According to Freud, personality is formed in four stages. Each of the stages is linked to a specific area of the body-an

erogenous zone. During each stage, the desire for gratification comes into conflict with the limits set by the parents and later by the superego.

The first erogenous zone is the mouth. All the infant's activities are focussed on getting satisfaction through the mouth – not merely food, but the pleasure of sucking itself. This is termed the oral phase.

In the second stage, the anal phase, the anus becomes the primary erogenous zone. This phase is marked by children's struggles for independence as parents try to toilet-train them. During this period, themes of keeping or letting go of one's stools become salient, as does the more important issue of who is in control of the world.

The third stage is known as the phallic phase. In this stage the child's main source of pleasure is the penis/clitoris. At this point, Freud believed, boys and girls begin to develop in different directions. Boys enter the Oedipal phase, in which they fantasize about having sex with their mothers; girls realize that they don't have a penis, and as a result they begin to feel inferior to boys.

After a period of latency, in which neither boys nor girls pay attention to sexual matters, adolescents enter the genital phase. In this stage some aspects of earlier stages are retained, but the primary source of pleasure is genital intercourse with a member of the opposite sex.

Jean Piaget: A view quite different from Freud's theory of personality has been proposed by Jean Piaget. Piaget's theory deals with *cognitive development*, or the process of learning how to think. According to Piaget, each stage of cognitive development involves new skills that define the limits of what can be learned. Children pass through these stages in a definite sequence, though not necessarily with the same stage or thoroughness.

The first stage, from birth to about age 2, is the *sensorimotor stage*. During this period children develop the ability to hold an image in their minds permanently. Before they reach this stage, they might assume that

an o
lister
pare:
testil

stag:
syml
be u
hom
syml

task
oper
six s
they
to o
oper
in tl

oper
logic
men
duri

10.4

the
long
side
the
tran
com

an object ceases to exist when they don't see it. Any babysitter who has listened to small children screaming themselves to sleep after seeing their parents leave, and six months later seen them happily wave good-bye, can testify to this developmental stage.

The second stage, from about age 2 to age 7 is called the *preoperational stage*. During this period children learn to tell the difference between symbols and their meanings. At the beginning of this stage, children might be upset if someone stepped on a sand castle that represents their own home. By the end of the stage, children understand the difference between symbols and the object they represent.

From about age 7 to age 11, children learn to mentally perform certain tasks that they formerly did by hand. Piaget calls this the *concrete operations stage*. For example, if children in this stage are shown a row of six sticks and are asked to get the same number from the nearby stack, they can choose six sticks without having to match each stick in the row to one in the pile. Younger children, who haven't learned the concrete operation of counting, actually line up sticks from the pile next to the ones in the row in order to choose the correct number.

The last stage, from about age 12 to age 15, is the stage of *formal operations*. Adolescents in this stage can consider abstract mathematical, logical and moral problems, and reason about the future. Subsequent mental development builds on and elaborates the abilities and skills gained during this stage (Elkind, 1968).

10.4 AGENCIES OF SOCIALIZATION

Personalities do not come ready-made. The process that transforms the primitive organism – into a reasonably respectable human being is a long process. As sociologists we are inclined to see the culture on the one side and the individual on the other and wonder what effect each has upon the other. Culture is always transmitted by people in interaction. It is transmitted through the communication they have with one another, and communication thus comes to be the essence of the process of culture.

transmission. It is the basic-though not the only - instrument of socialization. Let us consider this instrument in a little more detail so that we may disclose the specific kinds of communication through which the child acquires his culture.

The process of culture transmission begins for every one of us in the family, and that the parental-influence upon the infant is the most important of all. Most intimate of all human relationships, that between mother and child, must be accorded the largest significance in the socialization process. The father, of course, is important too, but his role is defined in somewhat different ways in different cultures. Nevertheless, it is the father in most societies who transmits to his sons the knowledge and the skill in particular activities that males in these societies are expected to acquire. In any event, these are the communications - with mother and father - through which the child receives an introduction to his culture. He receives additional communications from his older siblings, who have gone through the same process - with certain differences due to birth order.

The role of siblings in the socialization process leads us by an easy transition to the role of peer groups. Peer groups, as the word implies, means those groups made up of the contemporaries of the child, his associates in school, in playground and in street. He learns from these children. The members of peer groups have other sources of information about the culture and thus the acquisition of culture goes on. with much of the socialization process. a function of precisely these kinds of groups.

As time goes on, of course, the peer group surpasses the parental and family group in importance, and by the time the children are in high school, in our culture, they have begun openly and candidly to reject the parental influence in favour of the obvious superiority of the information and guidance they receive from their contemporaries. This seems to be an inevitable occurrence in rapidly changing societies.

adol
proc
peer
are
It is
in v
next
ther
attit
unc
may
they
teac
of tl
:
only
mos
case
and
of n
like
too
ideo
- at
the

The peer culture takes precedence over the parental culture in the adolescent years. We should not assume therefore that the socialization process is completed by the time the teen ages are reached. Parents and peers, however, are not the only agencies of the socialization process. There are teachers too and thus the school comes to play its own important role. It is in the school that the culture is formally transmitted and acquired, in which the science and the art of one generation is passed on to the next. It is only the formal knowledge of the culture that is transmitted there but most of its premises as well as its ethical sentiments, its political attitudes, its customs and taboos. The children in the earlier school may uncritically absorb the culture to which their teachers give expression; they may in the high school respond with increasing scepticism. But wherever they are, and at whatever age, the communications they receive from their teachers help to socialize them and to make them finally mature members of their societies.

There is another source of socialization, one that appears of course only in literate societies, and that is the printed word. The civilization that most of us share is constructed of words. Words rush at us in torrent and cascade; they leap into our vision, as in billboard and newspaper, magazine and textbook, and assault our ears, as in radio and television. "The media of mass communication," as our commentators, sociological and otherwise, like to call them, importance us with their messages and these messages too contain in capsule form the premises of our culture, its attitudes and ideologies. The words are always written by some one and these people too - authors and editors and advertisers - join the teachers, the peers, and the parents in the socialization process.

LESSON - 11

SOCIAL INTERACTION

CONTENTS

11.1 Introduction

11.2 Definition

11.3 Nature of Social Interaction

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Actions that have significance to the functioning of a society are those that take place between people and among various groupings of people. These "inter" actions constitute the basic relationships through which a society operates. They provide the possibilities for orderly and constructive association or for disorderly and destructive consequences. The types of interactions that take place within families, schools, the community, or the whole society have profound consequences on their operation, for it is through these interactions that the direction of human behaviour is determined. It is clear that the types of interactions within a society vary in form and in their consequences. They interpenetrate in complex and numberless ways. Some are consciously directed toward specific goals, while other may have no predetermined objectives.

11.2 DEFINITION

According to Eldredge and Merrill "Social interaction is the general process whereby two or more persons are in meaningful contact as a result of which their behaviour is modified, however slightly".

Thus social interaction refers to the entire range of social relationships, wherein there is reciprocal stimulation and response between individuals. An aggregate of individuals becomes a society not because each individual possesses 'its content' which actuates him, but because there is a reciprocal influence direct or indirect. Social interaction produces some definite influence upon social relations that exist among human beings.

It establishes mental relations among persons. It is the reciprocal influence mutually exerted by human beings through their stimulation and mutual response. According to Park and Burgess, social interaction is of a dual nature, of persons with persons and of groups with groups. The two essential conditions of social interaction are 1. Social Contract and 2. Communication. Social contact differs from physical or bodily contact. Social contact can be established through the medium of radio, letters, telephones and other media of communication even between people who are separated by thousands of miles. Of course, social contact is strengthened by physical contact. According to Gillin and Gillin "Social contact is the first phase of interaction."

According to Dawson and Gettys, "Social interaction is a process whereby men interpenetrate the minds of each other. In the words of Gish, "Social interaction is the reciprocal influence human beings exert on each other through interstimulation and response. Green defines social interaction as "the mutual influences that individuals and groups have on one another in their attempts to solve problems and in their striving towards goals."

11.3 NATURE OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

Interaction is the essence of social life. A group of any kind is inconceivable without reciprocal relationship and reciprocal influence. People are influenced not only by their contemporaries but also by past generations, whose transmitted traditions act as a unifying force and contribute to the persistence of the group as a unit.

According to Park and Burgess, social interaction is of a dual nature: of persons with persons and of groups with groups. Contact, the simplest as well as the phase of interaction, is the first stage of interaction and the preparatory one for the subsequent stages. The two kinds of contact are contact-in-time and contact-in-space.

The contact-in-time refers to contact of a group with proceedings of generations all the way back to the remote past, which expresses itself in

LESSON - 11

SOCIAL INTERACTION

CONTENTS

11.1 Introduction

11.2 Definition

11.3 Nature of Social Interaction

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Actions that have significance to the functioning of a society are those that take place between people and among various groupings of people. These "inter" actions constitute the basic relationships through which a society operates. They provide the possibilities for orderly and constructive association or for disorderly and destructive consequences. The types of interactions that take place within families, schools, the community, or the whole society have profound consequences on their operation, for it is through these interactions that the direction of human behaviour is determined. It is clear that the types of interactions within a society vary in form and in their consequences. They interpenetrate in complex and numberless ways. Some are consciously directed toward specific goals, while other may have no predetermined objectives.

11.2 DEFINITION

According to Eldredge and Merrill "Social interaction is the general process whereby two or more persons are in meaningful contact as a result of which their behaviour is modified, however slightly".

Thus social interaction refers to the entire range of social relationships, wherein there is reciprocal stimulation and response between individuals. An aggregate of individuals becomes a society not because each individual possesses 'its content' which actuates him, but because there is a reciprocal influence direct or indirect. Social interaction produces some definite influence upon social relations that exist among human beings.

It establishes mental relations among persons. It is the reciprocal influence mutually exerted by human beings through their stimulation and mutual response. According to Park and Burgess, social interaction is of a dual nature, of persons with persons and of groups with groups. The two essential conditions of social interaction are 1. Social Contract and 2. Communication. Social contact differs from physical or bodily contact. Social contact can be established through the medium of radio, letters, telephones and other media of communication even between people who are separated by thousands of miles. Of course, social contact is strengthened by physical contact. According to Gillin and Gillin "Social contact is the first phase of interaction."

According to Dawson and Gettys, "Social interaction is a process whereby men interpenetrate the minds of each other. In the words of Gish, "Social interaction is the reciprocal influence human beings exert on each other through interstimulation and response. Green defines social interaction as "the mutual influences that individuals and groups have on one another in their attempts to solve problems and in their striving towards goals."

11.3 NATURE OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

Interaction is the essence of social life. A group of any kind is inconceivable without reciprocal relationship and reciprocal influence. People are influenced not only by their contemporaries but also by past generations, whose transmitted traditions act as a unifying force and contribute to the persistence of the group as a unit.

According to Park and Burgess, social interaction is of a dual nature: of persons with persons and of groups with groups. Contact, the simplest as well as the phase of interaction, is the first stage of interaction and the preparatory one for the subsequent stages. The two kinds of contact are contact-in-time and contact-in-space.

The contact-in-time refers to contact of a group with proceedings of generations all the way back to the remote past, which expresses itself in

the followings and mores and in the survival of memories and sentiments. This kind of contact exerts a powerful influence upon the thoughts and behaviour of the group.

In contact-in-space refers to association between contemporary individuals and groups within a certain area. In both types of contact the important factors are the rate, number, and intensity of the relationships.

Contacts may also be Primary and Secondary. Primary contact involves the intimate, face-to-face relationships of such groups as the family, the play group and the small fellowship.

Secondary contact involves the indirect relationship of larger groups, such as the nation, city, church and labour organization.

Park and Burgess stated further that the medium of social interaction is communication, which takes place in three distinctive ways or on three levels: 1. Communication through the senses; 2. Communication through the emotions; and 3. Communication through sentiments and ideas. The first two, the sensory and emotional media may be called "the Natural forms of communications", because they are the more elementary and are common to man and to lower animals. Communication via the senses and emotions is capable of bringing forth only attitudes and feelings.

On the sensory level, vision, hearing, smell and touch all, in varying degrees, play a role in evoking responses. On the emotional level, such things as facial expression, blushing, and laughing arouse reactions. Communication on the third level, taking place through the intellect is strictly speaking, limited to man. Its tools are speech and language. Language enables man to transmit abstract ideas to his fellows and makes it possible for one generation to transmit its social heritage to another.

LESSON - 12

FORMS OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

CONTENTS

- 12.1 Co-operation
- 12.2 Competition
- 12.3 Conflict
- 12.4 Accommodation
- 12.5 Assimilation

12.1 CO-OPERATION

Interaction has been classified by sociologists into four major types:

Co-operation is the form of social action in which two or more individuals or groups work together jointly to achieve common goals".

It is the type of activity upon which societies depend to maintain their stability. It is the form of interaction which makes unified social achievement possible because, in contrast to competition and conflict, it is the form of social action in which all participants benefit by attaining their goals. Co-operation permeates all aspects of a social organization from the maintenance of personal friendships to the successful operation of international programs. It appears wherever social and personal ends may be advanced. Boys co-operate in games, men in business, workers in production, public officials in community controls, and so on, in an endless variety of beneficial activities that make possible an integrated social life.

Co-operation is brought about by several circumstances:

1. Individual gain: working together to achieve common values results first, perhaps, from the desire for individual benefits. The impossibility of solving many of our personal problems alone cause us to work with others. Our own security depends upon co-operating with others.

2. Altruistic motives: Striving together also results from the desire to give aid. We join together voluntarily to put out a fire, to rescue persons in danger, or to take part in pleasurable associations. Many of society's organizations are founded on principles of mutual aid. We develop a spirit of altruism that leads us to co-operate to benefit our fellows as well as ourselves.

3. Common purposes: Co-operation also reveals itself in the devotion to common purposes. A group of people, believing strongly that atomic bomb testing should be stopped, work together to create a public opinion that will demand its elimination.

4. Situational necessity: Co-operation also results from necessity. It would be impossible to operate a modern factory, a large department store, or an educational system if the divisions and branches in each did not work together.

5. Achieve larger goals: Co-operation is often required for the achievement of larger values. (Sumner has called this "antagonistic co-operation").

The sense of co-operative striving may be dimmed as societies grow and communities take over more activities that are performed more efficiently by specialized personnel and departments.

12.2 COMPETITION

"Competition is that form of social action in which we strive against each other for the possession or use of some limited material or non-material good".

Societies vary in the extent and manner in which competition is allowed to operate. In open-class societies, where status is commonly achieved, competition is given a vital role. Here prestige is accorded to persons who compete successfully. In those societies where status is ascribed, competition is allowed only between persons and groups in the same class or caste. Even within a caste there are often restrictions on

com
pro
of li
or t

for
acti
stri
pres

1. .
env
whi
maj
hav
bec

with
imp

2. .
effo
indi
thei
leve

3.
une
may
Con
cap

Res
cons

competition for work. In some societies, competition is not a significant process, especially where there is general availability of the basic necessities of life and the social organization does not depend upon personal initiative or the exercise of power over others.

Competition results from several motives. We compete with each other for the same basic reasons, that we cooperate with each other; both are actions to attain given goals. The goals in competition are generalized as striving against others: 1) For material objects and, 2) For non-material prestige.

1. Material objects are usually scarce and competed for because the environment is limited or because the society has given them status value, which makes them symbols of achievement. Money, wives and animals are major goals of competition in various societies. Non-material goods that have prestige value, (and thus give status and power), are scarce, too, because the society makes them so. Their successful attainment carries with them recognition of superiority. Champion, captain, or president, imparts a high prestige position in our groups and communities.

2. Values of Competition: Societies encourage competition to promote effort and efficiency. People seem to work hardest when they are individually rewarded for producing better quality or larger quantities than their fellows. Competition increases the level of achievement by raising the level of aspiration.

3. Harmful Possibilities: On the other hand, competition between unequals can be harmful because it creates discouragement. Competition may also be harmful if goals are trivial, is unimportant/insignificant. Competition is harmful also where it is allowed to destroy the energy and capacity of those competing. Competition may also have false promotion.

Competition is not allowed to operate in an unrestricted manner. Restrictions are imposed by rules of custom and tradition, or norms are consciously made by societies to control cheating, fraud and farce.

Competition does not always operate, even when it is supposed to proceed under the "rules of the game". In many situations, there are attempts to avoid competition in order to protect gains. (ex. Businessman).

12.3 CONFLICT

"Conflict is interaction in which individuals and groups endeavour to achieve their goals by eliminating other contenders".

Conflict is also goal oriented. But unlike co-operation and competition, it seeks to capture its goals by making ineffective the others who also seek them. It is a form of struggle like competition, but in conflict the struggle is directly between individuals and groups. Conflicts between individuals and groups range from fights between two persons with fists or weapons to wars involving millions of people and unlimited quantities of armaments. The use or threat to use such materials for destruction is aimed at eliminating or neutralizing the opposition in order to achieve the goal. Each party to a conflict tries to avoid being neutralized. If the opposition is made powerless, the goal is automatically won.

Conflicts are the results of the clash of opposing interests that are socially created.

1. Differences in Interests: Individuals and groups operate in relation to their interests. They live in societies where these do not remain fixed. The aspirations of men and societies often change as conditions change. The desire to retain a situation or to change it sets up circumstances that creates opposing interests that incite conflicts.

2. Value of Goals: The seriousness extent of conflicts will depend chiefly upon the value of contending parties place upon their goal. Some conflicts have lasted many years because of the importance placed on the goal or because the struggle has inflicted damage or injured feelings that cannot be overlooked. Feuds are of this nature.

Types of Conflict

George Simmel, distinguished four types of conflict.

1. W
tribes
cond
alien
other

2. T
base
whic
carri

3. L
wage

4. T
the
indiv
Soci
minc

12.4

pern

indiv
a sta
diffe
each
arriv
adju
proc

Indi

1. War: It is practically universal in primitive life. Relationships between tribes are almost always marked by hostility. Indeed under primitive conditions of life war provides almost the only means of contact between alien groups; so long as peace exists, the groups remain indifferent to each other.

2. The Feud or Factional Strife: It is an intragroup form of war. It is based on an alleged injustice done to one member or family, by another which is regarded by the group as a threat to its unity. The feud may be carried on for a considerable time and may become extremely bitter.

3. Litigation: It is conflict which assumes a judicial form. It is a struggle waged by an individual or group to protect rights to possessions.

4. The conflict of impersonal Ideals: This struggle is differentiated from the personalities waging it, because this type of conflict is carried on by individuals not for themselves but for an ideal. For example, campaigns of Socialists or Communists for a better world order, and the efforts of a minority group to gain or regain freedom.

12.4 ACCOMMODATION

"Accommodation is the achievement of adjustment between people that permits harmonious acting together in social situation".

It is the termination of competing or conflicting relations between individuals, groups and other human relationship structures. It establishes a state of agreement so that people may work together, even though certain differences may separate them. As groups and individuals interact with each other by co-operating, by competing, or being in conflict they may arrive at adjustments so that further interaction is in concord. This adjustment is an end product, a result where further action together can proceed in an orderly manner.

The prevailing condition in modern societies is one of accommodation. Individuals and groups adjust to each other and to the requirements of

their society so effectively that they can continue to operate in relation to each other without serious rivalries.

Accommodation is achieved in a number of ways:

1. *Compromise*: Compromise is one of the most useful accommodation. In a compromise, each contending party agrees to make concessions that allow them to reach agreement. The exchange of goods practically always involves compromise. Persons buy and sell to each other when they agree on a price. An interesting example of this is the "bargaining" between buyers and sellers. Compromise in labour-management disputes prevent the more serious struggles of strikes and lockouts.

2. *Conversion*: Accommodation is also achieved by conversion. Here one of the interacting parties accepts the views or actions of the others as its own. This is the form of accommodation usually related to religious beliefs.

3. *Tolerance*: Tolerance may effect accommodation where compromise and conversion do not. In this circumstance, the contending parties decide to bear each other, but the basic issue is not eliminated. Each party holds to its position and agrees to live and let live.

4. *Arbitration*: Here the contending parties submit their problem to third parties who act as (supposedly) neutral mediators. They judge their problem on the merits of the case, bringing the contending parties to a point where they come over differences. For example, United Nations performance is that of mediation. It often prevents serious consequences by getting contending nations to arbitrate before conflict takes place.

5. *Truce*: A truce is usually made to allow time for (the consideration of proposals for) settling issues. It does not indicate that the issues are settled: only (it) allows a period of time to probe the possibilities of settlement. Such a period is known in warfare as an armistice. Both sides agree to cease their fighting to discuss terms of peace. Therefore it is only a temporary accommodation for paving the way to a permanent one.

6. *Su*
means
Accom
occurs
is for
relatio
exampl
develo
System

12.5
Assim
within
consequ
compl
body,
"assim

A
between
think,
and lo
process
own s
favour
of the
the ci

T
until
elimin
functi
of soc

6. Subordination: An inequal status between contending groups usually means submission to a subordinate position for the conquered party. Accommodation by subordination is effective under two conditions. One occurs when the dominant party is so strong that the subordinate party is forced to accept. Subordination is also successful where these relationships are a part of the sanctioned social heritage of a society. For example, the military relationship. Rigid subordinate systems have developed in some societies. The most extreme example is "The Hindu Caste System".

12.5 ASSIMILATION

Assimilation implies the complete merging of divergent cultural groupings within a society: Successful accommodation sets the stage for an additional consequence of human interactions, namely *assimilation*. This implies the complete merging and fusion of two or more bodies into a single common body, a process analogous to digestion, in which we say that food is "assimilated".

Assimilation in social relationships means that the cultural differences between divergent groupings of people disappear. Thus, they come to feel, think, and act similarly as they absorb new common traditions, attitudes, and loyalties and consequently take on a new cultural identity. We see the process operating among ethnic groups which enter a society with their own society's culture. The processes that lead to accommodation develop favourable attitudes toward the host group. The results are an acceptance of the common goals, common attitudes, and common loyalties that make the culture of the host society their own.

The complete union of divergent cultural groups does not take place until such distinguishing characteristics as race and nationality are eliminated. Divergent groups can accommodate each other so that they function in the main through the common cultural life. But the elimination of social distance takes place exceedingly slowly.

A striking example of the process is the way in which the many nationalities have been assimilated into society.

Amalgamation: The biological process of mixing different peoples, usually ethnic and national groupings.

Public Education: Public schools have played a powerful role in this assimilative process. The children of immigrants always want to become Americanized. This desire has often been difficult to fulfill because of the unwillingness of many Americans to accept them and to share their way of life on a basis of equality.

The has not been a forced process. The culture was absorbed quietly by those exposed, both consciously and unconsciously, and appropriated as the heritage of all. Assimilation takes time because it involves the slow process of replacing once vital values by other values that must become just as vital.

The common opinion is that when migrating people move into a society and are assimilated they take on the culture of the new situation and give up their own. This is only part of the interplay. Those who move into the society also contribute, as well as receive, cultural materials. The outcome of assimilation may actually be a fusion of two or more cultures into a new one that has a distinctiveness of its own.

We have indicated that cross-breeding and public education are important factors in promoting the assimilation of different cultural groups within a society. Wherever toleration makes opportunities available for economic, educational, and social advance, conditions are good for the rapid assimilation of newcomers. This acceptance makes possible intimate contact with the receiving culture. It also overcomes forced social isolation and eliminates the superior attitudes of contempt for the newcomers which, in turn, could create social barriers that make accommodation difficult.

CONT

13.1

S

is par

T

way o

of int

functi

five i

religio

impor

13.2

1

or cor

Sumn

intere

institi

enter

UNIT - V**LESSON - 13**

SOCIAL INSTITUTION

CONTENTS

- 13.1 Introduction
- 13.2 Definition
- 13.3 Characteristics of Social Institution
- 13.4 Types of Social Institution
- 13.5 Association - Definition
- 13.6 Differences between Association and Social Institution

13.1 INTRODUCTION

Sociologically speaking, an institution is not a person or a group. It is part of the culture, [a patterned segment of the way of life of a people].

The more common practice is to define an institution as "an organized way of doing something". [Kingsley Davis defines the institution as "a set of interwoven folkways, mores, and laws built around one or more functions".] An institution is an organized system of behaviour. There are five important basic institutions in complex societies – the familial, religious, governmental, economic and educational institutions; less important institutions are also there.

13.2 DEFINITION

1. Institutions have been defined by MacIver as the "established forms or conditions of procedure characteristic of group activity". According to Sumner, "An institution consists of a concept (idea, notion, doctrine or interest) and a structure". According to Woodward and Maxwell, "An institution is a "set or web of interrelated folkways, mores and laws which enter in some function or functions".

2. According to Green, "An institution is the organisation of several folkways and mores into a unit which serves a number of social functions". According to Gillin and Gillin, "A social institution is a functional configuration of culture pattern (including actions, ideas, attitudes and cultural equipment) which possesses a certain permanence and which is intended to satisfy felt social needs".

3. According to Ginsberg "Institutions are definite and sanctioned forms or modes of relationship between social beings in respect to one another or to some external object".

4. According to Horton and Hunt, "An institution is an organised system of relationships which embodies certain common rules and procedures and meets certain basic needs of the society". M.T. Majumdar defines institution "as that collective mode of response or behaviour which has outlasted a generation, which prescribes a well defined way of doing things and which binds the members of the group together into an association by means of rituals, symbols, procedures and officers possessed of regulatory power or Danda". According to Bogardus, "A social institution is a structure of society that is organised to meet the needs of people chiefly through well established procedures". According to Young, "an institution is a set of folkways and mores integrated round a principal function of the society".

13.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

1. *Institutions are purposive* in the sense that each has as its objective or goal the satisfaction of social needs. They are the major ways of behaviour through which people in association with one another get things done.

2. They are *relatively permanent in their content*. The patterns, roles, and relations that people enact in a particular culture become traditional (and enduring). Like any man-made object, they are subject to change, but institutional change is relatively slow.

3. The institution is *structured, or organised, or coordinated*. The components tend to hang together and reinforce one another. [This follows from the fact that social roles and social relations are in themselves structured combinations of behaviour patterns.]

4. Each institution is a unified structure in the sense that it *operates as a unit* even though it is *interdependent with other institutions*. No institution can be completely separated from other institutions in the culture.

5. The institution is *necessarily value-laden* because its repeated uniformities of behaviour became [normative] code of conduct, some of them written into rules and laws but most of them subconsciously exerting social pressure on the people.

13.4 TYPES OF SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Some institutions are strongly compulsive, others place little obligation on people; some are as wide as the society in their application, others are relatively local; some involve high social values, others deal in a lower order of values.

The most fruitful general classification of institutions is the twofold division into *major* and *subsidiary* institutions. This distinction is made on the basis of three characteristics: *Universality, necessity, and importance*.

The *major basic institutions* are those that have the largest number of people participating, that are *essential* to the society, and that are considered most important for the individual and the common welfare. These are the familial, educational, economic, political, religious, and recreational institutions.

The *subsidiary institutions* do not have these characteristics. They are the numerous, minor, and variable institutions that are contained within the major institutions. Every subsidiary institution can be classified under one of the major institutions.

The following is a brief description of the major institutions, with some indications of the subsidiary ones that are found within them:

(a) The familial institution is the system that regulates, stabilizes, and standardizes sexual relations and the reproduction of children. Its most widespread form is the monogamous union of male and female living together with their children in a household. The sub-institutions like marriage, child care, in-law relations, and many others are contained under this main institution.

(b) The educational institution is basically the systematized process of socialization occurring *informally* in the home and in the general cultural environment, and *formally* in the complex, educational arrangements of the society. The sub-institutions within this institution are grading and testing, graduation and degrees, homework and the honours system.

(c) The economic institution is the patterned social behaviour through which material goods and services are provided for the society. It involves fundamentally the production, distribution, exchange, and consumption of commodities. There are many subsidiary institutions like credit and banking, book-keeping, advertising, collective bargaining and seniority systems.

(d) The Political institution functions primarily to satisfy the need for general administration and public order in society. There are many subinstitutions within it such as the legal, police, and military systems, the forms of appointment and election to public offices, and diplomatic relations with foreign countries.

(e) The religious institution satisfies man's basic social need for a relationship with God. Subsidiary institutions are systems of prayer, and arrangements for divine services. Practices of magic and superstition are in some places institutionalized by religious groups.

(f) The recreational institution fulfils the social need for physical and mental relaxation. It includes numerous subsidiary institutions such as

games, sports, and dancing as well as the aesthetic systems of art, music, painting, and drama.

13.5 ASSOCIATION - DEFINITION

1. According to Bogardus, "Association is usually a working together of people to achieve some purposes".

2. According to Ginsberg, an association is "a group of social beings related to one another by the fact that they possess or have instituted in common an organisation with a view to securing a specific end or specific ends". G.D.H. Cole writes. "By an association I mean any group of persons pursuing a common purpose by a course of co-operative action extending beyond a single act and for this purpose agreeing together upon certain methods of procedure, and laying down in however rudimentary a form, rule for common action".

3. According to MacIver, an association is "an organisation deliberately formed for the collective pursuit of some interest or set of interests, which its members share".

13.6 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ASSOCIATION AND SOCIAL INSTITUTION

The concept of institution is one of the most important in the entire field of sociology. Some writers will call any large-scale organized group an institution and reserve the word "association" for the smaller organized groups in society. The distinction between institutions and associations then becomes a simple distinction of size.

Simplicity, however, does not always induce clarity, and no one knows how large a group must become, [in these terms,] in order to merit the name of institution. As a matter of fact, it would not be wise to encourage this usage. There is a much more important distinction to be made between institutions and associations, a distinction introduced into the literature by Robert M. MacIver.

An *association* is any organised group, whether large or small. Because of its organization, it has some structure and some continuity. It has, in addition, an identity and a name. An *Institution*, on the other hand, is not a group at all, organized or unorganized. An Institution is an organized procedure. An institution is a formal, recognized, established, and stabilized way of pursuing some activity in society. [In short terms], An *association* is an organized group; an *institution* is an organized procedure.

An *institution* in short is a definite, formal, and regular way of doing something. It is an established procedure. In any society certain actions are repeated again and again, and it is this repetition that confers a pattern upon the action and that makes of it a recognized procedure. The procedure in turn, when established, becomes the institution. Society is always at work transforming event into precedent, and precedent into institution.

Institutions are impossible without associations, and most associations operate in an institutionalized way. Two simple tests can help us to understand the difference between Institutions and Associations. The first of these is that an association has a location. An institution, [on the contrary], does not have a location. For example, a University can be located (in space); education cannot. The second test is that it is *possible to belong to an association*. Thus, one can become a member of a committee, a club, or a corporation; one cannot become a member of journalism, education, or religion. One can join a church and one is a member of a family.

A church and a family are thus associations. Religion and marriage, [on the contrary,] are institutions. This distinction and these tests can best be illustrated by studying the following list:

Associations

A Corporation

An Army

A College

A Newspaper Company

A Church

A Family

A Night Club

Institutions

- Business

- War

- Education

- Journalism

- Religion

- The Family

- Entertainment

LESSON - 14

MAJOR SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTENTS

14.1 Marriage-Introduction

14.2 Definition of Marriage

14.3 Features of Marriage

14.4 Types of Marriage

14.5 Functions of Marriage

14.6 Family-Introduction

14.7 Definition of Family

14.8 Types of Family

14.9 Functions of Family

14.1 MARRIAGE-INTRODUCTION

Marriage is the most important institution of human society. It is a universal phenomenon. It has remained the backbone of human civilization. Marriage creates new social relationships and reciprocal rights between the spouses. It establishes the rights and the status of the children when they are born. Each society recognises certain procedure for creating such relationship and rights. Marriage can be of several types. The society prescribes rules for prohibitions, preferences and prescriptions in deciding marriage. It is in this institution through which a man sustains the continuity of his race and attains sexual satisfaction in a socially recognized manner.

14.2 DEFINITION OF MARRIAGE

According to *Westermarck*, "Marriage is nothing more than a more or less durable connection between a male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of the offspring". According to *Hoebel*, "Marriage is a social institution that regulates the special relations

of a mated pair to each other, their offsprings, their kinsmen, and society at large". *Lucy Mair*, defines marriage as a union between a man and a woman such that children born to the woman are recognized legitimate offspring of both parents.

14.3 FEATURES OF MARRIAGE

Sex-gratification is a basic reason for the formation of family and marriage. However, it is not the only cause. And also it is not the only purpose of man's existence and therefore, it is not the only cultural. Marriage ensures both biological and psychological satisfactions. This principle may be applicable to all human groups in the world. Marriage couples, among all peoples, live together in a union recognised and publicly approved by other members of the society. Moreover, they are expected to co-operate with each other and sometimes with other relatives in the maintenance of a household. They are similarly expected to produce children; in some primitive societies a marriage is not valid until the first child is born. When children do come, the married couple must acknowledge them as their own and provide for their care and rearing. In sum, marriage is everywhere a set of cultural patterns to sanction parenthood and to provide a stable background for the care and rearing of children. It is the major cultural mechanism to ensure the continuation of the family and other groupings based on kinship.

14.4 TYPES OF MARRIAGE

Rules prohibit certain persons as spouses. They designate others as particularly appropriate, or even as the only appropriate partners. If the rule prescribes that a man must marry a woman in a particular category, this type of marriage is called a "Prescribed Marriage". If it is just thought desirable that a man should find his wife in a particular category of persons, this is called a "Preferential or preferred Marriage".

The practice of marrying outside one's clan/subcaste is called Exogamy. The practice of marrying within one's own group is called Endogamy. If a man marries one woman, it is called Monogamy type of

marriage. Polygamy marriage refers to a marriage of one individual to two or more spouses. The polygamy may be divided into two types, Polygyny and Polyandry. Polygyny is the marriage of one man to several women. Polygyny is divided into two - Sororal Polygyny and Non-sororal Polygyny. Sororal Polygyny is the marriage of one man to several women who are related as sisters. Non-sororal polygyny is the marriage of a man to several women who are not related as sisters. Polyandry is the marriage of one woman to several men. The Polyandry has two forms namely, Fraternal Polyandry and Non-fraternal Polyandry. Prateral Polyandry is the marriage of one woman to several men who are related as brothers. Non-fraternal Polyandry is the marriage of one woman to several men who are not related as brothers.

Even now, in some primitive societies, Group marriage is in practice. Group marriage means sets of males and females share more or less equal conjugal rights over each other. In other words, a group of men are husbands to a group of women. The other form of marriage is Kin marriage. Most of the marriages are of this type. It means the marriage between man and woman who are related as cross-cousins.

The Widow marriages are known as Secondary union or marriages in primitive societies. There are two types in this marriage namely Levirate and Sororate. Levirate is a marriage of a widow to her husband's brother after the death of her husband. This may be divided into two types namely, Senior Levirate and Junior Levirate. Senior Levirate is the marriage of a woman to her husband's elder brother after the death of her husband. Junior Levirate is the marriage of a woman to her husband's younger brother after the death of her husband. Sororate is the marriage of a man to his wife's sister after the death of his wife. There are two types of sororate - Senior sororate and Junior sororate. Senior sororate means the marriage of a man to his wife's elder sister after the death of his wife. Junior sororate means the marriage of a man to his wife's younger sister after the death of his wife.

14.1
inst
mar
cou
labo
Mai
par
bet
opp
kin
stre
14.
con
the
an
ill-
in
14.
rel
anc
fan
hus
thr
the
def
ins
soc

14.5 FUNCTIONS OF MARRIAGE

The main function of marriage is sex-gratification. It is the powerful instrument of regulating the sex life of man. Sexual satisfaction offered by marriage results in self-perpetuation. It means marriage insists on the couple to establish a family by procreation. Marriage makes division of labour possible on the basis of sex. It provides for economic co-operation. Marriage contributes to emotional and intellectual interstimulation of the partners. It deepens the emotions and strengthens the companionship between the life-partners. Marriage not only brings two individuals of the opposite sex together but also their respective families, groups and kindreds. It facilitates to minimise the social distance between groups and strengthen their solidarity.

14.6 FAMILY-INTRODUCTION

Family is the most important primary group. It is a small social group consisting ordinarily of a father, mother, and one or more children. It is the family that gives us our principal identity. The study of family is not an easy study. In spite of our personal experience with it, most of us are ill-equipped to view the family as a social phenomenon. We are interested in the family both as an association and as an institution.

14.7 DEFINITION OF FAMILY

MacIver and Page defined, "Family is a group defined by a sex relationship sufficiently precise and enduring to provide for the procreation and upbringing of children". We understand, from this definition, that the family is a biological unit implying institutionalized sex relationship between husband and wife. Its members are more closely related to one another through the process of reproduction. It is based on the fact of sex having the production and nurture of children as its important function. Strictly defined, it consists of parents and children. It is both an association and institution. It is a universal institution found in every age and in every society. It is the primary cell out of which the community develops.

14.8 TYPES OF FAMILY

The words which provide the prefixes for the labels of a number of different family forms and types, are "*Mater*" and "*Pater*". *Mater* is the Latin word for *Mother* and *Pater* for *Father*.

Some societies are *matrilocal* in their marriage customs, others *Patrilocal*. In the former case the young married couple takes up residence at the home (tribe, village) of the bride's parents, in the latter at the bridegroom's. Our own culture is *patrilocal* in that it gives to the husband and not the wife the right to choose the place of residence after marriage.

Similarly, in a *Matrilineal* society descent is traced through the female line, and in a *Patrilineal* society through the male line. Again *Matronymic* and *Patronymic* mean, respectively, taking the name of the Mother or Father. Our own society, of course, is *patronymic*, but it is a custom that is far from universal. There are even exceptions in our own society.

We have, finally, terms which pertain to authority. *Matriarchy* means the authority is in the hands of women and *Patriarchy* means authority is in the hands of men.

14.9 FUNCTIONS OF FAMILY

The family performs a number of functions both for society and for the individual. There is no standard list of these functions in the literature. The first of these functions is replacement of the species. The survival of society requires a continuous replenishment of its members. For the sake of order the process of reproduction is institutionalized in the family. From the point of view of the individual, the family orientation satisfies a correlative need. It is the family that gives him life and chance to survive. A second function of the family is to regulate and control the sexual impulse. Family performs this function in all societies. Marriage is society's way of regularising a sexual relationship. If the family serves society as a means of sexual control, it serves the individual, as a locus of sexual opportunity. It is in the family that an appropriate recognition is given to the importance of sex in the life of the individual.

is M
he i
of c
educ
and
only
insti
insti
in a

for s
ascri
sex
almc
reco
direc
ident
the
ethn
upon
In s
ascri
royal
mech

sumr

1:

2:

The third function of the family both for the society and the individual is Maintenance. The family maintains the child for the society into which he is born. A fourth function of the family is its service as an instrument of culture transmission. Here culture is transmitted by the institution of education through the operation of such associations as schools, libraries and museums. But during the earliest years of an individual's life it is the only agency engaged in this activity. If the family serves society as an instrument of culture transmission, it serves the individual, as an instrument of socialization. A family prepares its children for participation in a larger world.

The final pair of functions that the family performs is Status ascription for society and Societal identification for the individual. Some statuses are ascribed and others achieved. Two of these ascribed statuses, i.e., age and sex are biological. Others are social ascriptions. It is the family that serves almost exclusively as the conferring agency or institution. Society recognizes us first of all by our names, and our names, of course, come directly from our family which serves as the source of our societal identification. When society asks who we are, it is the family that provides the answer. Numerous statuses are initially ascribed by our families. Our ethnic status, our nationality status, our religious status are all conferred upon us by our families and, although most of these may later be changed. In some occupational statuses are similarly the results of familial ascription. And again, wherever statuses are inherited, as in the case of royalty and nobility, it is the family that serves as the controlling mechanism.

The functions of the family that we have just discussed may be briefly summarized as follows:

<i>Functions of the family for the society</i>	<i>Functions of the family for the individual</i>
1. Continuation of the species	- Life and survival
2. Sexual control	- Sexual opportunity

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 3. Maintenance | - Protection and support |
| 4. Culture Transmission | - Socialization |
| 5. Status ascription | - Societal identification |
-

Changing Functions of The Family: Many of the traditional functions of the family have been taken away by special agencies in modern times. Even though the socialization of the child is still the basic function of the family, specialized trainings are given to children by educational institutions so that children may take up jobs when they go out of educational institutions. Recreational function was done by traditional family and this has been taken away by commercial agencies like cinema houses and mass media. Religious functions of the family are also diminished due to the secularization principles accepted by many societies. Protection of family members considered as one of the most important functions of the family has been again transferred to both private and public agencies like police. But the basic functions such as reproduction, affection and socialization have not been taken away from the family by any special agency and these functions are still carried out by the family with some minor adjustments.

Industrialisation and urbanisation have disturbed the traditional family life considerably. Due to industrialisation, many people left rural areas to take advantage of jobs created by industrial cities. People no longer needed large families of several generations in cities. It is generally felt that the non-wage earners are liabilities in cities and hence the size of the family has been reduced. Education is also a costly affair in cities and so urban people are unable to provide education to the members of the larger family. Industrialisation has also created a new trend of freedom i.e., freedom to be alone. This has reduced the size of the family and as a result the relationships of the family members have been changed.

LESSON - 15

EDUCATION - RELIGION - GOVERNMENT

CONTENTS

- 15.1 Education-Introduction
- 15.2 Definition of Education
- 15.3 Forms of Education
- 15.4 Functions and Changes of Functions of Education
- 15.5 Religion-Introduction
- 15.6 Definition of Religion
- 15.7 Forms of Religion
- 15.8 Functions and Changes of Functions of Religion
- 15.9 Government-Introduction
- 15.10 Definition of Government
- 15.11 Forms of Government
- 15.12 Functions of Government

15.1 INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the basic activities in all human societies, for the continued existence of a society depends upon the transmission of its heritage to the young. It is essential that the young be instructed in the ways of the group so that they will behave according to them. Every society, therefore, possesses means whereby these needs are met.

The means which are employed for the purpose of perpetuating the cultural heritage and of training the young in the ways of the group become more or less standardized, that is, institutionalized. The Sociologist seeks to analyze the nature and functions of educational institutions and to note their relationship to all other activities of society. In its broadest sense,

education is the process whereby a society seeks to transmit its traditions, customs, and skills, i.e., its culture, to its young members.

15.2 DEFINITION OF EDUCATION

1. Samuel Koenig: "Education may also be defined as the process whereby the social heritage of a group is passed on from one generation to another as well as the process whereby the child becomes socialised, i.e., learns the rules of behaviour of the group into which he is born".

2. F.J. Brown and J.S. Roucek say that education is "the sum total of the experience which moulds the attitudes and determines the conduct of both the child and the adult".

3. Sumner defined education as the attempt to transmit to the child the mores of the group, so that he can learn "what conduct is approved and what disapproved... how he ought to behave in all kinds of cases: what he ought to believe and reject".

4. Durkheim conceives of education as "the socialisation of the younger generation". He further states that it is "a continuous effort to impose on the child ways of seeing, feeling and acting which he could not have arrived at spontaneously".

15.3 FORMS OF EDUCATION

Formal Education: Education is divided into the formal and the informal. The former comprehends education as it is provided in educational institutions according to a particular pattern. In the school, the educator educates the educands according to a specific programme aiming at particular goal. He follows a pre-determined syllabus. In this formal kind of education, the time and place of teaching are fixed, and the educand has to arrive at that place and at that specific time to receive education. The length of such education is also fixed in terms of years. Both the kinds of education mentioned earlier can be included under the formal classification because both are often provided in schools. The advantages of the formal kind of education lie in that it can be scientifically and

cons
obje

Info
outl
Edu
Ever
from
in t
som
end,
his f
with
place
educ
techn
educ
there
recip

15.4

inform
surro
his s
and h
is it
not h
arran
even
of ad
girls :

consistently provided to a large number of children simultaneously. The objectives of this education are also determined beforehand.

Informal Education: Informal education complements the formal education outlined above, without which formal education remains incomplete. Education of this kind has no specific time or place at which it is provided. Even the educator is not fixed. All fixed syllabi, rules formalities are absent from it. Education of this kind is the education one receives while playing in the field, talking to family members in the house, roaming around somewhere, in fact, everywhere. This kind of education never comes to an end, and it teaches the individual more than he can ever learn through his formal education. A child learns many things when he comes in contact with new people. He discovers many new worlds when he goes to new places. This education that he receives cannot be evaluated as formal education can. Formal education can be evaluated by some specific techniques, and the quality and quantity of education imbibed by the educand can be known. But this is not true of informal education, for there is no standard of measure in its case. It also does not provide the recipient with a certificate or a degree.

15.4 FUNCTIONS AND CHANGES OF FUNCTIONS OF EDUCATION

The acquired knowledge in human life is the result of formal or informal education. When the child is born, he has no knowledge of his surroundings. Gradually he comes to recognize his environment by using his sense organs and by coming in contact with other people. Many ideas and habits he learns merely by observing others. But in no civilized society is it believed possible for an individual to be fit for adult life if he does not have some degree of formal education. For this reason, one finds arrangements for education everywhere. Not only in civilized societies, but even in primitive societies the adults try to educate adolescents in the ways of adult life. Among the tribals of India, this social education of the young girls and boys takes place at the dormitories.

When the child is born, he is already possessed of many kinds of natural abilities. As the body grows the mind also grows, but the innate abilities and qualities do not develop quite so naturally and without aid. It is often said that if the mind is not exercised, its abilities cannot be developed. Hence, the first aim of education is to try to develop such abilities as power of imagination, of thinking, etc., by providing appropriate opportunities and stimuli.

Psychologists contend that the foundation of the child's character is laid in the first few years of his life. The impressions about behaviour and conduct that fall upon the infant's mind are later exhibited in the form of his character. The importance of character is hardly a subject to be discussed. It is developed by education, mainly informal education.

The patterns of behaviour that a child chooses in his adjustment with the individuals and objects in his environment depend upon his personality. It is the development of personality which leads to a development of individuality, which is an inevitable characteristic of an educated individual. The formal development of the personality takes place through his family, neighbourhood, the conditions of work, etc., but educationists believe that one important objective of education is to develop personality.

Livelihood is believed to be the aim of education. Economic factors controlling life in the present day world have become so complex that no one who is not properly educated can hope to successfully earn his living. In the past, most people pursued agriculture, which does not demand such a high degree of specialization. For them education was not so essential. But the recent developments in science and the increasing specialization of all professions has made it impossible for one individual to perform any job without previous training and education. As a general rule, highly paid jobs require specialized training of a very high calibre. The ability to earn enough is not the only factor to be considered in the preparation for adult life. Earning money is one of the aspects of adult life, another is marriage and children. Once this stage is reached, the individual has to face all the

atte
his
othe

15.

even

ass

see

the

set

fun

mu

mu

exp

15.

sup

feel

"Th

sys

thi

reo

rell

pre

15.

Th

For

are

soc

attendant responsibilities. Education aims at training the individual to earn his livelihood, to marry, to bring forth children, to fulfil his duties towards other individuals and society in general.

15.5 RELIGION-INTRODUCTION

All societies have had some form of religion. Religion is not only found everywhere but also goes back to the earliest times. Sumner and Keller assumed that religion, like other institutions, is a means whereby man seeks to adjust himself to his environment. There is no consensus about the nature of religion. Since religion constitutes an adjustment to a special set of conditions and circumstances under which a society lives and functions, and those conditions and circumstances vary, it appears in a multitude of forms. Sumner and Keller stated that the religion of a people must fit in with the rest of its institutions. The forms in which religion expresses itself vary so much.

15.6 DEFINITION OF RELIGION

Most authorities maintain that religion includes a belief in supernatural or mysterious powers and this belief is associated with feelings of fear, and reverence, and so on. Emile Durkheim in his book "The Elementary Forms of Religious Life" defined religion as a "unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is, to say things set apart and forbidden". The supernatural beliefs are present in all recognised religions. Some scholars also accepted Confucianism as a religion, even though it does not possess supernatural belief.

E.B. Tylor defines religion as a belief in spiritual beings. This definition presupposes the supernatural elements as the basis for religion.

15.7 FORMS OF RELIGION

In simple societies, religion is both simple as well as complex in nature. The complexity of religion has nothing to do with the level of civilization. For example, a higher level of ceremonies and elaborate ritual practices are found in Australian aborigines. It is not always the most primitive society that has the simplest religious institution. Similarly the concept of

Monotheism is in no way attached with advanced societies. A number of primitive societies believed in single supreme deity. At the same time the most advanced societies like Hindus practice Polytheism, i.e., belief in many Gods.

15.8 FUNCTIONS AND CHANGES OF FUNCTIONS OF RELIGION

Religion is an universal institution and it exists in all societies. Hence, it must have functions for human beings. Like all institutions, religion tries to solve problems of human beings. Religion provides the guidelines for what is right and what is wrong. It also helps people to adjust with one another. Whether religion does this in the modern context or not is a debatable question.

According to Turner, religion performs two important functions. One is reinforcing norms, and another is softening anxiety and tension. Religious beliefs, values and rituals are called the elements of religion. Through these elements religion reinforces norms in social system. Since norms are standards of behaviour, they are used to control people. By making norms appear as extension of the supernatural order, norms are given more weight. People seldom violate these norms because they have been ordained by their Gods. Durkheim observed that rituals and religious activities reinforce society. They were directed not just at the sacred beliefs and Gods but at the society itself. By attributing sacred powers to objects and by instilling a belief about the supernatural being, religion reinforces the social order.

Raymond Firth's study on Tikopian Islanders provides a good example of how religion reinforces other norms. The Tikopia had a patrilineal descent system, that is, authority, wealth, influence etc., passed through the father's side of the family. According to their religious beliefs, the man has to maintain the temples where religious rituals to Gods and ancestors were performed. Since it was male dominated society women were excluded from religious rituals. This clearly showed that the eldest member of the family

was important as well as responsible to perform religious ceremonies and participate in them.

Max Weber also advocated that industrialisation first emerged in Europe rather than in Asia because of the religious beliefs of Protestant cults particularly of Calvinism. Hence it is viewed that the Protestantism was responsible for the development of modern capitalism in the west. Protestantism advocated this worldly activity, hard work, thrift and the accumulation of capital which consequently led to greater economic development.

The role of religion as a form of social control shows itself in the interests that it satisfies and in its regulating influence on collective behaviour principally through ritual and ceremony. Religion unites men to God. This bonds of unity strengthen the unity between man and man. This is the basis of the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. Religion, through the church and activities, establishes a centre of human fellowship in which persons of the most diverse categories unite to pray and worship; to collect funds and work for the poor and needy; to organize various functions for educational and recreational activities. These pursuits are not always of a religious nature but directly or indirectly they are inspired by religious ideals.

15.9 GOVERNMENT-INTRODUCTION

Political institution is the social institution, or complex of social norms and roles. It serves to maintain social order, to exercise power to compel conformity to the existing system of authority, and to provide the means for changes in the legal or administrative systems. The political institution includes the traditions and laws by which a society is coordinated and administered and is the major repository of force. The modern STATE is one type of social structure in which the political institution finds much of its formal expression and codification.

The state is a political form of human association by which a society is organized under the agency of a government that claims legitimate

sovereignty over a territorial area, authority over all of the members of the society. The state must obviously be distinguished from Government. Government is that body of men entrusted with the responsibility and the authority for carrying on the tasks of the state. The well known phrase that Government changes, but the State remains means that the State is more permanent than the Government.

A state and Government are necessary for an orderly society. All human societies therefore possess some system of Government and by means of which individuals are controlled and by which the interests of the people are protected. Government is the super-institution of the modern society. Modern government is multifunctional. On the operational level, governments work through bureaucracies.

15.10 DEFINITION OF GOVERNMENT

J.W. Garner gives a comprehensive definition of the state as "a community of persons, more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite portion of territory, independent or nearly so of external control and possessing an organized government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience".

In this definition, two elements are conspicuous: the social and the political. In other words, society and the state. The state is, therefore, society and "something else". But, as we shall presently see, society is not to be taken in all its comprehension - it is the 'Something else' which determines the existence of the state.

The State must obviously be distinguished from Government. Government is "that body of men entrusted with the responsibility and the authority for carrying on the tasks of the state". The well known phrase that "government changes, but the state remains" cannot mean more than that the state, (though also subject to change), is more permanent than the government.

15.11

A

Mona

is cal

mona

govern

When

is rur

many

it is p

demo

and p

of g

repre

of der

is ver

and h

indus

the ir

15.12

A

relati

encro

the s

system

perfor

provid

Giddi

agenc

as to

s

almos

15.11 FORMS OF GOVERNMENT

According to Aristotle, the governments are of three types namely, Monarchy, Aristocracy and Polity. A government run by a single individual is called Monarchy. Here the King or Queen is the source of law. But monarchy in its perverted form is called tyranny or autocracy. A government run by a few people in its good form is called Aristocracy. When the same is perverted, it is called Oligarchy. This form of government is run by a few people usually with vested interest. A government run by many in its good form is called Polity. The same becomes democracy when it is perverted. Though the above classification of Aristotle does not place democracy as an ideal type, nevertheless democracy is the only acceptable and practical government in the modern context. Democracy is that form of government in which representatives are freely elected. These representatives make decisions on behalf of the people. In the present form of democracy, the role of the ordinary citizen in influencing the decision is very limited. As such we have not reached the perfect form of democracy and have only a small degree of democracy. It is generally agreed that the industrially advanced countries have considerably more democracy than the industrially less advanced countries.

15.12 FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT

Although the State is an agency designed primarily to regulate the relationships of its members and to protect its interests from outside encroachments, it performs many other services. The nature and extent of the services vary with the system of government and, under the same system, with the times and conditions. Even in democracies the services performed by the state in the past have been quite different from those provided at present. Some sociologists, among them Comte, Pareto, Giddings and others, held that the state is indispensable, that it is the agency best adapted to regulate relationships in a complex society as well as to safeguard the interests of its members.

Some German philosophers asserted that the state is endowed with almost divine powers. Other sociologists, such as MacIver asserted that

the state is only one of a number of such agencies in a society and has definite limits. Finally, some sociologists such as Spencer, Sumner, Durkheim and others, have regarded the state as a necessary evil required for the maintenance of law and order.

Accepting the doctrine of *Laissez faire*, Spencer and Sumner maintained that the interests of society, of individuals, are best served when their activities are least interfered with by government. According to Sumner, the state should not be concerned at all with promotion of the welfare of its members.

Among writers who went to the extreme of denying any need for the state and even considering it as harmful to human progress were Karl Marx and Engels and their followers. Holding that the state arose as a result of class cleavage in society, these chief exponents of modern socialism claimed that it will disappear with the disappearance of classes. Sociologists such as Schaffle and Ward went to the other extreme. They believed that the state should carry on economic and social activities to increase human welfare and happiness.

CON

16.

 earl
thir
ani
the
ach

 wit
pri
fun
of t
soc
in
oth

16.

UNIT - VI**LESSON - 16**

SOCIAL GROUPS

CONTENTS

- 16.1 Introduction
- 16.2 Definition
- 16.3 Characteristics of Social Groups
- 16.4 Functions of Social Groups

16.1 INTRODUCTION

Chemists and physicists have arranged all substances that appear on earth into a small number of classes called elements and of these all other things are compounded. Biologists, similarly have arranged plants and animals and insects into a small number of classes called species and of these, all living things are varieties. Sociologists, however, have not yet achieved a satisfactory classification of social groups.

A social group is a collection of individuals who are united together with the aim of realizing some end. Common interest is the motivating principle for the formation of social group. Each social group has its specific function. Members of a social group have to sacrifice or relinquish some of their private selfish interest in favour of the interest of the group. Every social group possesses a collective mind. The behaviour of an individual in a social group is quite different from his behaviour in isolation from others.

16.2 DEFINITION

1. "Groups are aggregates of categories of people who have a consciousness of membership and of interaction". – Horton and Hunt.

2. "A social group is a given aggregate of people, playing inter-related roles and recognised by themselves or others as a unit of inter-action". – Williams.
3. "A group is an aggregate of individuals which persists in time, which has one or more interests and activities in common, and which is organised". – Green, Arnold.
4. "A social group may be thought of as a number of persons two or more, who have some common objects of attention, who are stimulating to each other, who have common loyalty and participate in similar activities". – Bogardus.

16.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL GROUPS

A more descriptive explanation of the group must include the following:

1. A group must be *identifiable* both by its members and by outside observers. This does not mean that every member must be known personally to every other member or to non-members. Secret societies and fraternities have a recognizable existence, although their membership may be exclusive and hidden. The groups in any large city are so numerous that no individual could have personal knowledge of all of them but they are known.
2. The group has a social structure in the sense that each member has a position related to other positions. Social stratification or the ranking of social status is present even in the smallest informal groupings.
3. The various members enact their social roles in the group. This is group participation. When the members cease to enact their roles, the group ceases to exist.
4. Reciprocal relations are essential to the maintenance of the group. In other words, there must be contact and communication among the members.

16

ne
its
grth
tin
fal
acso
coso
fol
m
gr
Th
th

5. Every group has norms of behaviour that influence the ways in which the rules are enacted. These need not always be written rules or regulations or constitution.
6. The members of the group have certain common interests and values.
7. Group activity must be directed towards some social goal. In other words, all groups are to some degree purposeful.
8. A group must have relative permanence that is, a measurable duration over a period of time.

16.4 FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL GROUPS

A simple statement is that groups are formed in order to satisfy human needs. We derive so many satisfactions from groups that group affiliation itself becomes precious to us. We want to feel that we belong to certain groups. In this way groups provide us with security and fellowship.

If the society is to continue, human beings in group life must perform the major universal social functions. Human beings everywhere and at all times must co-operate in some way to satisfy the social needs implied in familial, educational, political, economic, religious and recreational activities. These essential needs and functions are sometimes called the social and cultural *prerequisites* in the sense that without them no society could continue to exist.

Though these social needs, functions and groups are present in every society it does not mean that they are present in the same way. Different forms are emphasised in different societies. Marriage is almost everywhere monogamous, but polygyny is practised in some places. The economic groups in an industrial society differs from those in an agricultural society. The variety of recreational and religious groups is tremendous throughout the world.

The family group is made up of those persons engaged in satisfying the basic needs of family life; the arrangements for sex relations, the birth and care of the children and mutual affection of the members.

The educational groups are those in which the essential social function of transmitting the culture to succeeding generations is performed in formal and informal ways. In simple societies this is often done within the family itself.

CO

17.

Coc
gro

17.

Pri
atte

ass

Sec
opp

sec

mei

17.

Pri
inti

LESSON - 17

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS

CONTENTS

- 17.1 Introduction
- 17.2 Definitions of Primary and Secondary Groups
- 17.3 Characteristics of Primary and Secondary Groups
- 17.4 Importance of Primary and Secondary Groups
- 17.5 Differences between Primary and Secondary Groups

17.1 INTRODUCTION

Cooley has classified groups into primary and secondary, though Cooley has never used the term 'secondary group'. His concept of primary group is similar to Sumner's concept of the in-group.

17.2 DEFINITIONS OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS

Primary group: Charles H. Cooley, the first sociologist to draw the attention to primary groups, describes them in the following words:

"By primary groups I mean those characterised by intimate face-to-face association and co-operation".

Secondary group: "Secondary groups can be roughly defined as the opposite of every thing already said about primary groups". – Davis.

"The groups which provide experience lacking in intimacy are called secondary groups". – Ogburn.

"When face-to-face contacts are not present in the relations of members, we have secondary group". – Muzumdar, H.T.

17.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS

Primary group: The essential characteristics of a primary group are intimate feelings and close identification.

In order that relations of the people may be close, it is necessary that their contacts also should be close. Seeing and talking with each other makes exchange of ideas and opinions easy. It makes possible the "conversation of gestures".

Relationship can be intimate and personal only in a small group.

To promote intimacy of relationship, the primary group should be stable to some extent.

The members of a primary group must be not only close and near to each other but also approximately equally experienced and intelligent. "There is", says MacIver, "a level on which every group must dwell, and the person's participation". Each member must have something to give as well as to take.

Though members join the group with the motive of satisfying their own interests, yet they should subordinate their interests to the central interests of the group. They must come together in a spirit to participate co-operatively. The common interest must predominate in their minds.

Secondary group: The main characteristics of secondary group are the following:

The relations of members in a secondary group are of a formal and impersonal type. It does not exercise primary influence over its members. The members need not meet face to face. They perform their jobs, carry out the orders, pay their dues and still may never see each other.

Secondary groups are large in size. They might be spread all over the world, for example, the Red Cross Society consists of thousands of members scattered all over the world.

The membership of most of the secondary groups is not compulsory.

A secondary group is large in size. There is absence of intimacy among its members. Due to the absence of intimate relations some members of the group become inactive while some others are quite active.

The members of a secondary group hardly meet face to face. They are scattered throughout the length and breadth of the country.

A secondary group is regulated by formal rules.

In a secondary group the status of every member depends upon his role. The status of the President in a trade union depends upon the role he plays in the union and not upon his personal qualities of birth.

The main purpose of a secondary group is to fulfil a specific function.

17.4 IMPORTANCE OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS

Primary group: The group is an important factor in shaping the personality of individuals. They are realization of the human need for spontaneous living and the provision of stimulus to each member in the pursuit of interest.

In primary group, members come freely together. A family, a play-group, a group of friends, a study group, tribal council comes into of its own initiative. Primary groups are not judged so much by their efficiency in performing some task as by the emotional satisfactions they bring to their members.

The primary groups not only satisfy the human need for spontaneous living but also provide a stimulus to each of its members in the pursuit of interest. The presence of others in a group acts as a stimulus to each. The man feels that he is not alone pursuing the interest but there are many others who along with him are devoted to the same pursuit. This feeling stimulates him to keener efforts.

The primary group not only affects the quality of our interests by enlarging and enriching them but as told above, also the method of their pursuit. The members directly co-operate and do the same together.

Secondary group: The changing trends of modern society have swept away primary groups. Man now depends for his needs more on secondary groups than primary groups. One activity after the other is being withdrawn from the primary group.

The growth of secondary groups have brought some benefits. These benefits are the following:

A secondary group is marked by clear-cut division of labour. There are set rules to regulate it. A formal authority is set up with the responsibility of managing the organisation efficiently. The organization of a secondary group is carefully worked out.

Secondly, the secondary groups have opened channels of opportunity. They provide a greater chance to develop individual talents.

A secondary group broadens the outlook of its members. The members of a secondary group are widespread. Its boundaries extend beyond the primary group. A secondary group has to accommodate a large number of individuals and localities which widens the outlook of its members.

Moreover, the nature of the large-scale group is such that it cannot satisfy man's intimate cravings for fellowship and sociality. To satisfy the desire of sociality men in large scale organizations form their clubs wherein they establish personal contacts and express their personality. Charles H. Cooley has greatly emphasized the need of creating opportunities for spontaneous and unrestricted expression of individual's personality within the large groups.

17.5 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS

The following are the chief points of difference between the primary group and secondary group:

A primary group is small in size as well as area. The membership is limited to a small number and usually confined to defined area. At the

other end, in a secondary group the membership is widespread. It may contain thousands of members scattered in different parts of the world.

In a secondary group the co-operation with the fellow-members is indirect. In a primary group, on the other hand, the members directly co-operate with each other participating in the same process. They sit together, discuss together, play together, decide together.

Every secondary group is regulated by a set of formal rules. A formal authority is set up with designated powers and a clear-cut division of labour. The members, as told above, participate in the same process.

The relationship of members with each other in a primary group is direct, intimate and personal. There is congeniality among the members. They meet face to face and develop direct contacts. The primary group is concerned with the total personality of a person. The relations are inclusive. A secondary group is regulated by formal rules which mean a substitution of impersonal for personal relationships. The relations now become secondary and formal.

LESSON - 18

TYPES OF GROUPS

CONTENT

18.1 Major Types of Groups

18.1 MAJOR TYPES OF GROUPS

We are members of some groups through the circumstance of statistical arrangement. We are members of other groups because we are conscious of having something in common, some shared attribute or characteristic, with other people. We are members of still other groups because we enter into social relationships with other people. And, finally, we are members of groups because we join them and have our names inscribed on the membership rolls. These observations provide clues to distinctions between four different kinds of groups that we shall call, respectively.

1. The Statistical Groups.
2. The Societal Groups.
3. The Social Groups.
4. The Associational Groups.

1. Statistical Groups: Statistical groups are "formed", not by the members themselves, but by Sociologists and Statisticians. The members of such groups are not usually conscious of belonging to them. Some sociologists do not include these groups at all when discussing this subject on the very reasonable ground that, since no social interaction is involved, no social relations exist and social relations constitute the specific business of Sociology. Some absurd examples would be the people who were born on a Tuesday, those who have seen Pondicherry.

2. Societal groups: Societal groups differ from statistical groups in one very important characteristic - "Consciousness of kind". The concept "Consciousness of kind" was introduced into Sociology by Franklin Henry

Giddings, who taught Sociology and the history of civilization for many years at Columbia University: Societal groups are composed of people who have a consciousness of kind, who are aware of the similarity or identity of the traits or characteristics that they all possess.

3. Social groups: Social groups are those in which people actually associate with one another and have social relations with one another. They can be of many kinds – friendship or acquaintance groups, class-room groups, crowds, audiences, kinship groups, passengers on the same ship, neighbourhood groups, play groups, and numerous others.

4. Associational groups: We come finally to a most important kind of group in modern complex societies, the Associational group. An associational group, or, more simply, an association, is an organized group. It satisfies the criteria of the other kinds of groups and has in addition a formal structure, that is, an organisation.

The Form and Content of Groups

Though keeping in mind the basic classification of groups presented in the preceding section, we now alter our viewpoint and consider a distinction between *the Sociological form of a group* on the one hand and *the Sociological content* on the other. It should be apparent that form and content are two distinct characteristics.

1. Primary groups and secondary groups: The concept of primary group was introduced into American Sociology by Charles Horton Cooley. By primary groups Cooley meant the intimate, personal, "face-to-face" groups in which we find our companions and comrades, the members of our family, and our daily associates. These are the people with whom we enjoy the more intimate kinds of social relations.

Secondary groups, are all those that are not primary. (They constitute a residual category that has no significance in and by itself). A very large number of social relationships in a complex society are relationships of this secondary group kind.

2. In-groups and out-groups: In-groups and Out-groups are of no specific size and may indeed be highly variable, An In-group may be as small as a family or as large as the world. And the out-group, then, is simply everybody who is not in the family or not in the world, as the case may be. An In-group is simply the "We-group", an Out-group the "they-group". The in-group includes ourselves and anybody we happen to mean when we use the pronoun "we".

3. Large groups and small groups: The size of a group, however, is one of its most important characteristics and one that has consequences of considerable sociological significance. Increase in size and decrease in size alike can alter initial arrangements and introduce changes into structure and function.

A large army is superior to a small one, a large country is more powerful than a small one. But most committees become ineffective when they have more than a small number of members. Finally, social relations in large groups are more formal and less personal than they are in small groups.

4. Majority groups and minority groups: Related to the gross factor of size, (but not identical with it,) is the characteristic that determines whether the group is a majority or a minority. Majorities and minorities, of course, are always components of other groups and the terms have no meaning in themselves. It is obvious that majorities may be very small (For example, two out of a group of three friends) and minorities may be large (For example, those who supported the defeated candidate in a presidential election).

5. Long-lived groups and short-lived groups: The duration of a group, its span of existence, is also one of the most important of its properties. Some groups have only a brief and momentary existence; others last for centuries. A committee formed for the sole purpose of collecting a fund or arranging a dinner disbands as soon as it has fulfilled its function. The crowd that gathers to watch a fire, to witness the aftermath of an accident,

or to see a ship come into port melts away when the excitement subsides. Universities and long-established business firm are the long-lived groups. And, finally, some groups manage to attain a great age.

6. Voluntary groups and involuntary groups: Some groups we join. Of others we are members, willy-nily, without choice. Our age group and sex group (and ethnic group,) based as they are upon biological properties, are involuntary groups. Our language group, similarly, is involuntary, since as children we learn the language of our parents or guardians. Our social-class group and our religious group, our regional group and our nationality group are all initially involuntary, although all of these, in our society, can be changed and this, to some extent at least, can become voluntary groups. Our occupational group, our recreational group, our educational group, and indeed all of our interest groups are voluntary. It is in voluntary group that status is *achieved*, in involuntary groups that status is *ascribed*. And at the same time the groups which are voluntary in some societies may be involuntary in others.

7. Open groups and closed groups: All groups, of course, are closed to those who do not possess certain qualifications corresponding to the certain criteria by which the groups were formed. Nevertheless, some groups are relatively open and some are relatively closed. Thus, almost anyone of voting age can easily become a member of a political party, anyone can become a contributor to the community chest, anyone with the price of admission may attend a football game, and anyone can join a street crowd.

8. Horizontal groups and vertical groups: Some groups include members from all social classes and others receive their membership only from certain strata in society. The former we call vertical groups, the latter Horizontal groups. A religious association, in theory at least, is usually a vertical group. Occupational groups tend to be horizontal because occupations themselves are stratified in complex societies. Ethnic groups, on the other hand, are vertical since they are, of course, made up of individuals in various social classes.

9. Independent groups and dependent groups: Some groups exist in their own right and others only as subgroups of larger groups. The former are independent, the latter dependent. A branch office of a corporation, the local office of a government agency and so on are dependent groups. A committee is almost always a dependent group. A Private College or University is an independent association whereas a State University or Government College, since it is a branch or bureau of a state or (city) government, is a dependent association.

10. Organized groups and unorganized groups: We come, finally, to one of the most important of all the formal properties of groups. The associational groups come to be through a formally articulated process known as organization. Here we are speaking not of the organization of society itself but rather of the organization of associations, that is, of groups within a Society. This is an important phenomenon.

In the modern complex societies, a very large number of the social relations and social interactions between people are conducted in organized groups.

CO

19.

a s

Cla

per

is

soc

"ur

nev

19.

we

soc

pro

div

Gis

gro

sup

UNIT - VII**LESSON - 19**

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

CONTENTS

19.1 Introduction

19.2 Definition

19.3 Features

19.4 Functions

19.1 INTRODUCTION

Social stratification is the hierarchical arrangement of social strata in a society. In this sense social stratification refers specifically to the Social Class or Caste system of a society. It involves inequality. It is a relatively permanent ranking of statuses and roles in a social system. Every society is divided into more or less distinct groups. Even the most primitive societies had some form of social stratification. As Sorokin pointed out, "unstratified society with real equality of its members, is a myth which has never been realized in the history of mankind".

19.2 DEFINITION

Social stratification has been defined in a variety of ways. Essentially we mean by social stratification, "the arrangement of any social group or society into a hierarchy of positions that are unequal with regard to power, property, social evaluation, and/or psychic gratification".

According to *Raymond W. Murray*, "Social stratification is a horizontal division of society into 'higher' and 'lower' social units". According to *Gisbert*, "Social stratification is the division of society into permanent groups or categories linked with each other by the relationship of superiority and subordination". *John F. Cuber* defines social stratification

as "a pattern of superimposed categories of differential privilege". These privileges determine the status of a person or a group in the society.

19.3 FEATURES OF STRATIFICATION

A society consists of various strata arranged in a hierarchial order based on the amount of power, property, evaluation, and psychic gratification. This is the general picture of a stratified society. Almost all societies are stratified in this way to some degree. The basic characteristics of stratification are:

1. It is social;
2. It is ancient;
3. It is ubiquitous;
4. It is diverse in its forms;
5. It is consequential.

When we say that stratification is social, it is to imply that it is not about biologically caused inequalities. Although the differences in such biological factors can serve as bases on which statuses are distinguished such differences are never by themselves sufficient to explain, stratification. Biological traits may become relevant only when they are socially recognized and given importance. The social aspect of stratification also suggests that the distribution of rewards in any community is governed by 'Norms'. The third implication of the social aspect of stratification concerns the way in which the norms of the community are carried down from generation to generation. There is no evidence that any kind of mentality - Slave, Ruling or otherwise - is biologically inherited. To the contrary, all the evidence indicated that every child has to be taught the rules of his group.

The norms and sanctions are unstable and discontinuous partly because that process and those sanctions never work perfectly. It is always uneven in their effectiveness from one family to the next and from one generation to the next. For this reason, every system of stratification is continuously changing. To say that stratification is 'social' also implies that the system of stratification is always connected with other aspects of a

soci
or "

pres
botl
imp

of s
incl
fou
in
ma

eva
hea
thi
me
as
pu

19

laz
ine
no
gre
in

eff
seq
qu
lor
for

society. We speak of such connections as "institutional interdependence" or "institutional interrelationships".

According to historical and archaeological records, stratification was present even in the small wandering bands. In such primitive conditions both age and sex in combination with physical strength must have been important criteria of stratification.

On one level the nations of the world constitute a worldwide system of stratification - the haves vs the have-nots. And within every nation, including all the so called socialist countries, stratification is also to be found. Stratification is also present in non-literate societies. The diversity in amount of stratification found in societies of the past and present is matched by diversity in form.

The consequences that flow from inequalities in power, property, evaluation and psychic gratification can be classified under two general headings - (1) Life-changes and (2) Life-styles. Life-changes refer to such things as rates and incidents of infant mortality, longevity, physical and mental illness, marital conflict and divorce. Life-style includes such matters as the kind of house and neighbourhood one lives in; the recreational pursuits one follows; and so on.

19.4 FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

Social stratification sometimes serves as the motivating force. Human laziness is widespread both under conditions of relative equality and great inequality of rewards. Variations in the quality of human efforts are found not only between societies but within any society. Stratification produces greatest benefit and gain for those who rank high. Stratification is useful in direct proportion to one's height on the ladders of rank.

Stratification produces mixed consequences wherever it is found. Its effect upon one segment of a population differs from the effect upon other segments. Its implications for social and economic development are also quite varied and involve very different strategies of short-range vs long-range benefits and harms, depending on which segments are chosen for the momentary advantage and whose interests are held in abeyance.

LESSON - 20

PROCESSES OF STRATIFICATION

CONTENT**20.1 Processes of Stratification****20.1 PROCESSES OF STRATIFICATION**

If systems of stratification are ancient, universal, and basically alike in their main features, there must be some common social processes that bring such systems into being, shape them, and maintain them. Four such processes can be identified:

1. Differentiation.
2. Ranking.
3. Evaluation, and
4. Rewarding.

1. Differentiation

Status differentiation is the process by which social position, such as father, mother, teacher, and employer, are defined and distinguished from one another by assigning to each a distinctive role – a set of rights and responsibilities. This process is indispensable (absolutely necessary) to any society.

Status differentiation operates most effectively when (1) tasks are clearly defined; (2) lines of authority and responsibility for roles are clearly distinguished; (3) effective mechanisms exist for recruiting and training a sufficient number of persons to assume the statuses; and (4) adequate sanctions, including rewards and punishments, exist to motivate individuals to conscientious performance and to restrain them from indifference from minimum standards of performance.

2. Ranking

Once statuses have been *differentiated* on the basis of their roles, it becomes possible to compare them. One special kind of comparison involves *Ranking*. Statuses can be ranked on three criteria:

1. *Personal characteristics* such as intelligence, beauty, or strength that are believed to be required of anyone who is to play the role effectively.

2. *Trained skills and abilities* that are believed to be required to discharge a role efficiently, for example, manual dexterity, knowledge etc., (of the law, command over scholarly literature, or the ability to saw wood and hammer nails).

3. *Consequences or effects upon others and upon society* at large of the role; example; Actors provide entertainment, Judges ensure justice, Policemen preserve order. These consequences are sometimes called the "Social functions" of the role.

One major purpose of such ranking is to facilitate the search for the right people for the right positions. By specifying tasks in terms of levels of skills and talent required, amount of education necessary, or personal qualities desired, it becomes more possible to find and allocate manpower rationally and to train this manpower efficiently.

3. Evaluation

Evaluation involves assigning to various statuses different places on a scale of value or worthiness. The gradations of this scale may also be described in terms such as superior to inferior, better to worse, more to less distinguished, or as evoking more to less favourable public opinion.

There are two dimensions of evaluation namely "Prestige" and "Preferability".

Prestige: Prestige refers primarily to honour, and involves deferential and respectful behaviour. The effect of prestige can be seen most clearly in situations where there are well established hierarchies of status. For

example, a junior executive will ascribe more honour and respect to the president than to a vice-president.

Preferability: The second type of evaluational judgement is Preferability. Here the judgements of worthiness are blended with considerations of realistic possibilities and social comfort. Here the attitudes are suggested by terms such as "I would like to be like him", "I would like my children to be like this". The Preferability evaluation of a status may differ significantly from its prestige evaluation.

4. Rewarding

The fourth process involved in Stratification is that of *Rewarding*, whereby statuses which have been differentiated, ranked, and evaluated are allocated various amounts of the good things in life. In every society there are rules or norms that determine how rewards will be distributed. These rules can be very variable and operate so that large portions of a population experience extreme deprivation while others live in relative comfort or luxury. Some inequality in rewards is, of course, characteristic of every known society. Equality is approached most closely in those societies where the share of rewards that any individual receives is determined largely by his demonstrated need, rather than by other criteria. The greatest inequality is reached in societies where the elite in power and their ideology favour the notion of unrestricted competition, with minimal official control of the supply of goods and services; an individual's power determines the rewards he will receive, and the result is normally one of extreme inequality. The modern welfare state represents a middle point between the extremes of inequality and equality.

LESSON - 21

FORMS OF STRATIFICATION

CONTENTS

21.1 Forms of Stratification

21.2 Differences between Caste and Class

21.1 FORMS OF STRATIFICATION

Although the social stratification systems of specific societies vary from one another in important details, they can be distinguished on the basis of certain recurrent forms or types of social stratification. The important forms of social stratification are - CASTE AND CLASS.

Caste

The most rigid form of social stratification is the Caste. Membership in a caste is determined by birth. One inherits a caste position from which, with few exceptions, he cannot rise or cannot fall. In some instances membership may be acquired in a caste through marriage or adoption, but such instances are clearly exceptional. Caste is, therefore, a permanent basis of stratification for the person. Caste stratification consists of rigid hereditary placement of the person irrespective of personal attributes or desires. Caste is often characterised by Endogamy, occupational prohibitions and requirements, segregation, distinguishing caste attire and possessions, or some combinations of these. There are certain caste-like attributes which are found in other countries too. The position of Negroes, for example, in the United States, has certain attributes of caste.

Class

A social class is a category or group of persons having a definite status in society which permanently determines their relation to other groups. The relative position of the class in the social scale arises from the degree of prestige attached to the status. The class system does not place categorical limitations on the person with respect to his class position. This

means that admission to another class is determined chiefly, by whether he possesses the necessary skills pertinent to the role of the class to which he aspires. Caste and Class represent the extremes. They could be distinguished:

21.2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CASTE AND CLASS

CASTE	CLASS
1. Membership is ascribed and is mainly based on birth.	Membership is acquired on the basis of objective criteria like wealth, occupation and education.
2. Caste system is endogamous, i.e., closed.	Class is more open and as such social mobility becomes easier in it.
3. Much restricted.	Individual freedom is generally recognised and encouraged.
4. Restricted.	Social relations are not restricted.

UNIT - VIII**LESSON - 22**

SOCIAL CONTROL

CONTENTS

22.1 Introduction

22.2 Definition of Social Control

22.3 Formal and Informal Social Control

22.4 Agencies of Social Control

22.1 INTRODUCTION

Social control occurs when one group determines the behaviour of another group, when the group controls the conduct of its own members, or when individuals influence the responses of others. Consequently, social control operates on three levels - Group over Group, the Group over its members, and Individuals over their fellows. The aims of social control, according to Kimball Young, are "to bring about conformity, solidarity, and continuity of a particular group or society".

22.2 DEFINITION OF SOCIAL CONTROL

According to *MacIver*, "Social control is the way in which entire social order coheres and maintains itself - how it operates as a whole, as a changing equilibrium". *Ogburn* and *Nimkoff* defined social control, "as the patterns of pressure which a society exerts to maintain order and established rules". *Roucek* defined Social Control as, "those processes and agencies, planned, or unplanned, by which individuals are taught, persuaded, or compelled to conform to the usages and life values of groups".

22.3 FORMAL AND INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROL

Means of social control are numerous and varied. There are a number of means by which individuals are induced or compelled to conform to the norms of the society. For example, law, public opinion, custom, religion,

morality, personality, folkways, mores and so on. Some sociologists have classified the social control into INFORMAL AND FORMAL MEANS.

Informal Means of Social Control

The informal means of social control are very powerful in primary social groups. The effectiveness of the informal means may still be observed in small villages. In modern times the informal means have given place to formal means such as Laws, Education, Coercion and Codes. The informal means of social control grow themselves in society. The important means of social control are Belief, Folkways, Mores, Customs, Religion, Ideologies and Public Opinion.

Belief is a statement about reality based on faith. It is a statement about reality that is accepted by an individual as true. Beliefs form the basic structure of the individual's conception of the world. Beliefs influence man's behaviour in society. The belief in God makes an individual to believe that his actions are being watched by God. So in this way his actions are controlled in the society.

Folkways is a term introduced by William Graham Sumner, an American Sociologist. The word literally means the ways of the folk, the ways people have devised for satisfying their needs, for interacting with one other, and for conducting their lives. Each society has different folkways. Folkways, in short, are norms to which we conform because it is customary to do so in our society. Conformity to the folkways is neither required by law nor enforced by any special agency of society. There is no law that requires us to wear shoes, to eat breakfast in the morning, to drink water from a glass and tea and coffee from a cup. And yet we do all of these things, and thousands of them, without thinking. It is a matter of custom, a matter of usage. They are our folkways. We cannot construct a comprehensive list of the folkways. Folkways are a universal characteristic of human societies and no society could exist without them. They are important part of social structure and contribute to the order and stability of social relations.

Mores differ from the folkways in the sense that moral conduct differs from merely customary conduct. Our society requires us to conform to the mores, without having established a special agency to enforce conformity. The word MORES is the Latin word for customs. But we use it rather as synonymous with morals; it is, of course, the Latin source of the word "morals". Sumner introduced this word into the sociological vocabulary and said that the mores are those practices that are believed to conduce to societal welfare. Folkways, on the contrary, do not have the connotation of welfare.

Customs are the Folkways and Mores which have persisted for a long period of time and are well established in a society. They have become traditional and have received some degree of formal recognition. They arise spontaneously and gradually. There is no constituted authority to declare them, to apply them and to safeguard them. They regulate social relationships to a great extent. They compel the individuals to conform to the accepted standards.

Religion includes those customs, rituals, prohibitions, standard of conduct, and roles primarily concerned with or justified in terms of the supernatural and the sacred. Religion is a powerful agency of social control. It controls man's relations to the forces of his physical and social environment. The extent to which religion controls the behaviour of men depends upon the degree to which its adherents accept its teachings.

Ideologies serve as logical and philosophical justifications for a group's patterns of behaviour, as well as its attitudes, goals, and general life situation. It is the projection of a certain ideal. Leninism, Gandhism and Fascism are ideologies which have analysed social realities and laid down an ideal before the people. They provide a set of values.

Public opinion is a composite opinion formed by the public. Since every individual wants to win public praise and avoid public ridicule or criticism, they conform to the accepted ways of behaviour. Thus, public opinion is one of the strongest forces influencing the behaviour of people.

Formal Means of Social Control

The important formal means of social control are - LAWS, EDUCATION AND COERCION. Law is a system of standardised norms regulating human conduct, deliberately established for the purpose of social control. Laws are interpreted and enforced by formal public authority, rather than by custom. Informal means of social control are no longer sufficient to maintain social order and harmony. Modern societies had to resort to formal means of social control.

Education is the sum total of the experience which moulds the attitudes and determines the conduct of both the child and the adult. We may interpret this to include every influence which durably modified thought, feeling or action. The schools are primarily committed to the moulding of citizens. Certain factors have prevented education from becoming a unified system that might be employed in a concerted fashion for purposes of social control.

Coercion is an overt expression of power to compel an individual or group to follow a course or courses of action desired by the society. It may take the form of physical manipulation or social pressure. It may have immediate effect upon the offender. If a society has to depend on coercion, it shows its weakness rather than strength in social control.

22.4 AGENCIES OF SOCIAL CONTROL

There are various agencies through which social control is exercised. Among them the chief agencies are institutions like Family, Religion, Education, Government, Public opinion and Propaganda.

1. Family: Family constitutes a concrete reality of experience which develops in the child as a complex pattern of overt and covert habits. Family conditions the child to the family itself. From time to time, the child learns to receive many different types of basic attitudes from the family. Family is the most important agency of social control. It teaches the child to conform to the norms of the society.

2. Religion: The effectiveness of social control in other than religious activities is partially determined by the concept of God which the followers of religion have. The universal function of religion is the interpretation and control of man's relations to the forces of his physical and social environment. These in turn are thought to be under the control of some supernatural power. For effective functioning, Religion becomes institutionalized. Ritual, ceremony, prayer, sacrifices and authority of priests and officers develop to control thought and behaviour. The types of institutions, religious or otherwise, vary from time to time and from culture to culture. Similarly the methods of exerting social control which become a part of the institutions differ. The extent to which religion controls the behaviour of men depends upon the degree to which its adherents accept its teachings and authoritative and valid explanations of desirable behaviour. In many situations during the development of civilization religious institutions together shared with the state the control of social behaviour. Among many primitive peoples there is no sharp distinction between religious and political institutions. As civilization develops, control through religious institutions tends to be weakened. In order to prevent this, religious institutions develop rituals, ceremony, and various types of beliefs, propagands and training.

3. Government: In recent generations, government have become more and more important as a means of control. But the political institutions have not always been the main reliance of society for the exercise of social control. In the past custom, the family, the tribe and religion have played a weightier part. Many sociologists took the view that government is merely one of the many institutions of control in society.

4. Education: Education is an expansive term. It signifies a process as long as human history and as wide as experience. Education is the sum total of the experience which moulds the attitudes and determines the conduct of both the child and the adult. We may interpret this to include every influence which durably modifies thought, feeling or action. The educational institutions, such as, schools, colleges, and universities, are

committed to the moulding of citizens. Certain factors have prevented education from becoming a unified system that might be employed in a concerted fashion for purpose of social control. Education teaches to conform to the norms of the society. There are many educational organizations and institutions that influence the young. These include adult education programmes, religious education, youth organization etc.

5. Public Opinion: Public opinion is a composite opinion formed by the public. It can be mobilized on some particular issue and directed towards some kind of decision. The formation of opinion tends in large measure to be the result of activation of previous experiences and attitudes. Public opinion plays major role as a means of social control. Since every individual wants to win public praise and avoid public criticism, they conform to the accepted ways of behaviour.

6. Propaganda: Propaganda is the deliberate effort to control the behaviour and relationships of social groups through the use of methods which affect the feelings and attitudes of the individuals who make up the group. The motive of the propagandist is ultimately to influence the behaviour of individuals and groups whose actions affect his own safety and welfare. Propaganda is always aggressive. There are two diverse general aims of propaganda. One is that of "Negative" propaganda, which looks toward the weakening or dissolution of social groups. The other is "Positive" propaganda, which looks toward the building of morale, the strengthening of the unity of the target group. There is no essential distinction of method between negative and positive propaganda. The weapons of propaganda are two. One is the force of the "Folkways" and "Mores", the other is the force of the psychological tendencies of individuals.

LESSON - 23

SOCIAL CHANGE

CONTENTS

- 23.1 Introduction
- 23.2 Definition of Social Change
- 23.3 Forms of Social Change
 - (a) Evolution
 - (b) Progress

23.1 INTRODUCTION

Change is the law of nature and hence no society can be static. All societies undergo changes in one way or the other, depending upon the values and nature of society. The history of societies show that man considered change as an important factor for maintaining stability. Social change does not occur as a matter of a chance. There are definite causal factors which bring social and cultural change. At the same time it is to be remembered that no one particular cause is responsible for the whole series of the changes. There could be multiple causes.

The word change denotes a difference in anything observed over a period of time. Social change, therefore, would mean observable differences in any social phenomena over a period of time. According to Kingsly Davis, by "Social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organization, that is, structure and functions of society". MacIver and Page restrict the scope of social change only to the change in social relationships.

23.2 DEFINITION OF SOCIAL CHANGE

1. Anderson and Parker: "Social change involves alteration in the structure or functioning of societal forms or processes themselves".

2. Ginsberg, M: "By social change, I understand a change in social structure e.g., the size of a society, the composition or balance of its parts or the type of its organization".
3. Koenig, S: "Social change refers to the modifications which occur in the life patterns of a people".
4. Davis: By "Social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organisation, that is, structure and functions of society".

23.3 FORMS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Many attempts have been made to trace the general way or patterns of social change of which the most well known are the unilinear, the pendular, and the evolutionary.

The unilinear type of change is upheld by those who believe that society is always following its onward march in a constant way towards an end or point appointed by the blind forces of nature, fate, or Divine Providence.

The second type of change, the pendular or rhythmical, implies a sequence of periodically recurring stages of change similar to the movement of the pendulum. This type of change has found favour in the great literary and mythological traditions of mankind, and is manifest in Hindu thought according to which the world is in a periodic movement of dissolution and reformation. The period between formation and dissolution is called kalpa, and the period of repose, pralaya; self-repetition, therefore, is the characteristic of this process of cosmic change. Many of these conceptions are undoubtedly based on the cyclic movements of everyday observation such as the recurring of the four seasons of the year. In modern times, Oswald Spengler renewed this theory by holding that all cultures go through various stages of development similar to the four seasons of the year: spring, summer, autumn and winter.

The third type of change, the evolutionary, is widely held in our own days and is immediately related to the theory of social evolution with which we shall now deal in more detail.

to 'de
which
intern
and c
passi
Latin
'pra-g
advan
progr
acqui
histor
advan
strivi

Theo
progr
in th
Hobb
such

progr
most
all s
hunti
evolu
activi
matri
anim
stage
prop

The term evolution comes from the Latin word 'evolvere' which means to 'develop' or 'to unfold'; it closely corresponds to the Sanskrit 'vikas', which has the same meaning. This concept applies more precisely to the internal growth of an organism. Thus we say that a plant, or animal, grows and develops its organs, or that the mind of the child develops with the passing of years. This concept is different from that of progress, from the Latin 'progredior', 'to step forward', and coincides with the Sanskrit 'pra-gat'. The fundamental meaning of progress therefore is the march or advance towards a desirable end; so that there may be as many types of progress as there are desirable ends, for instance, progress in the acquisition of learning, in health, in our march towards a place, etc. But historically, progress has an ethical connotation and is taken to mean the advance towards the ultimate moral values which mankind has been striving all down the ages to attain.

Theories of Social Evolution: Though the concepts of evolution and progress do not coincide, yet both could be taken together and be realized in the same process. Such was the theory of evolution proposed by L.T. Hobhouse, according to which society is progressively advancing towards such desirable ends.

Another version of social evolutionism associated also with the idea of progress was the so-called unilinear evolutionist theory which flourished mostly during the second half of the last century. According to this theory all societies pass through three fundamental stages of economy viz., hunting, pastoralism, and agriculture. Based on this presupposition other evolutionary sequence of stages were framed for every branch of social activity. The stages for the family were: promiscuity, group-marriage, matriarchy, patriarchy, and the individual monogamous family. In religion, animism (or totemism), polytheism and monotheism were the approved stages; and in the institution of property, primitive communism, family property, private property, and state property.

LESSON - 24

FACTORS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

CONTENTS

24.1 Factors of Social Change

24.2 Theories of Social Change

24.1 FACTORS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

There are various factors responsible for the social change. They are:

1. Biological Factors

Biology especially its qualitative aspect is related to heredity. Heredity in turn decides very often the quality of man a society can produce. Depending on intelligence and physical standard of men in a given society, the social activities of the people are directed. Therefore social change is dependent on the physical quality of the population for new invention, adoption and adaptation. Further human ecology and the principle of natural selection and the struggle for survival are constantly producing changes in human society.

2. The Technological Factors

There are many advocates of the technological theory of social change. Very important among them is Professor William F. Ogburn. He divided culture into two broad categories namely Material and Non-material culture. He suggested that usually changes occur first in the material culture and the non-material culture has to adjust to this change. At the same time he recognized that changes can occur first in both. He argued that changes in the material culture are causes of changes in the non-material culture. Though the non-material culture may lag behind, it is always in process of adjustment. In this way technological invention becomes an important factor in explaining cultural change.

3. The Cultural Factors

Here we shall consider ideas and ideologies together and show how they are powerful motivating factors in social change. When people think, in short, determining in a very large measure – What they do and what they want. These thinking pattern is again determined by the cultural level of society. Therefore the cultural values are important for initiating impulses in social change. The chief advocate of the influence of culture on social change was Max Weber. Max Weber thought that among many factors, religion was more important especially what people believed had a profound effect on economic and social change. He held the view that the economic phenomenon themselves rest upon a broad ideological base and particularly upon religion.

4. The Economic Factor

The chief proponent of the theory of economic determinism is Karl Marx. He gave importance to the economic factor having great influence in all matter of life. He emphasised that the productive relation as important factors of economic life decide the social relations in society. He traced the productive relation at different levels of the evolution of the society and said that the history of the hitherto societies is the history of class struggle. Historically he traced the productive relations in terms of a owning class and working class. These two classes, according to him have conflicting interests and hence there is a continuous conflict between the two. Whatever may be the stage of evolution of society, he said, the conflict between the master and the slave, the land-lord and the tenant, the land-owner and the tiller, the capitalist and the worker are all historical examples. Similarly he correlated the various changes that occur in the social life including political life as corresponding to the above changes in productive relations. Therefore his final analysis is that the contradiction between the Bourgeoise and the proletariat will end in major and sudden social change, namely Proletarian Social Revolution.

24.2 THEORIES OF SOCIAL CHANGE

There are two main theories of social change – one is the "LINEAR THEORY" and the other is the "CYCLICAL THEORY". The advocates of the Linear theory are Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Hobhouse and Karl Marx.

According to Auguste Comte social change comes up as a result of man's intellectual development. He believed society progressed from the Theological way of thinking through the Metaphysical mode and finally to the Positive mode of thought represented by modern science. These changes have impact on the institutions and associations of society.

Herbert Spencer believed in a theory of evolution and said the different aspects of society have slowly evolved from Simpler form to that of a Complex one. He depended more on empirical than on conjecture. He recognised that a variety of factors are involved in social change. In dealing with the actual course of evolution, he gave importance to the increasing differentiation of function within society. He also recognized the increasing size of the society. His theory is based on the theory of cosmic evolution, according to which there is a universal from indefinite, unstable, homogeneity to a definite, stable, heterogeneity.

Hobhouse wrote his theory based on historical and anthropological data. He accepted the idea of Comte that the development of human mind was an important factor in social change. But he did not accept the positivism of Auguste Comte. He adopted the notion of social evolution as a process of increase in scale complexity and internal differentiation. His conception of social change is that the development of mind brings about social development, since this mental development includes a development of modern ideas towards the ideal or rational ethics which transfers the major social institutions.

Karl Marx theory of social change gives importance to two elements in social life, namely, the development of technology and the relations between social classes. The theory states that there is correspondance

between a particular stage in the development of productive forces and the system of social class relationships. But the continuing development of productive forces changes the relation between classes, and conditions of their conflict and in due course the dominated class is able to overthrow the existing mode of production and system of social relationships in order to establish a new social order.

The linear theory discussed above have brought-out in one form or another a number of significant changes in human social theory. They have shown how the growth of knowledge and complexity of societies can be explained in one way or the other. They have recognized the importance of the changes which occurred in Europe from the seventeenth century which subsequently influenced the social life of mankind throughout the world.

Cyclical Theory

The Cyclical theory of social change shows other aspects of human history in contrast to the Linear theory. Vilfredo Pareto presented his theory of circulation of elites as an interpretation of history. According to him social change is brought about by the struggle between groups for political power. There are alternating periods of harsh rule by a vigorous and newly victorious elite, and of mild humanitarian rule by declain elite. Thus social change will depend upon the kind of dominating elites.

Pitrim A. Sorokin, while recognizing the occurrence of Linear processes, draws attention to other cyclical processes which occur within human societies. He makes a distinction between Ideational, Idealist, and sensate-culture and conceives as succeeding each other in cycles in the history of societies. Sensate-culture is one which gives importance to worldly pleasures. The Ideational gives importance to the spiritual aspects of life. When society gives importance only to spiritual aspects of life, as the alternate to achieve, then it becomes an Idealist culture.

Toynbee in his famous book "A Study of History" has expressed the cyclical character of the growth, arrest and decay of civilization. He puts

forward his idea that civilization grows in response to certain challenges that are faced by societies. A few intelligent leaders of men take the challenge that the society faces as their own and try to lead the society for material and moral progress. This is called "Civilization". This civilization lasts till there are sufficient leaders to face the challenge continuously. The challenge may be physical or social. When a society is no longer capable of facing the challenge to push forward, it is in a state of arrest. Then after sometimes there are no leaders of men to continue this trend and civilization decays. This decadence remains for sometime till new leaders emerge to face the challenge. If new leaders come and take up the challenge, the society progresses once again and reaches the peak. And decaying civilization form a cycle at periodical intervals in history.