

PAPER – I

**SOCIOLOGY: BASIC CONCEPTS AND
PERSPECTIVES**

Chapter 1

Introduction to Sociology

Sociology has a long past but only a short history. Sociology which is known as the science of society, is one of the youngest as well as one of the oldest of the social sciences. It is one of the youngest sciences because only recently it came to be established as a distinct branch of knowledge with its own distinct set of concepts and its own methods of inquiry.

Sociology is also one of the oldest of the sciences. Since the dawn of civilization, society has been a subject for speculation and inquiry along with other phenomena which have agitated the restless and inquisitive mind of man. Even centuries ago men were thinking about society and how it should be organized, and held views on man and his destiny, the rise, and fall of peoples and civilizations. Though they were thinking in sociological terms they were called philosophers, historians, thinkers, law-givers or seers. Thus, “Broadly it may be said that sociology has had a fourfold origin: in political philosophy, the philosophy of history, biological theories of evolution and the movements for social and political reforms...”

There was social thought during the ancient age. Though sociology came to be established as a separate discipline in the 19th century due to the efforts of the French philosopher Auguste Comte, it is wrong to suppose that there existed no social thought before him. For thousands of years men have reflected upon societies in which they lived. In the writings of philosophers, thinkers and law-givers of various countries of various epochs we find ideas that are sociological. For instance, in the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Manu, Kautilya, Confucius, Cicero and others we find major attempts to deal methodically with the nature of society, law, religion, philosophy etc. Plato’s Republic, Aristotle’s Politics, Kautilya’s Arthashastra, the Smriti of Manu, Confucius’ Analects, Cicero’s “On Justice” are some of the ancient sources of social thought.

During the middle ages and early modern times the teachings of the church dominated the human mind and hence most part of the human thinking remained as metaphysical speculation far away from the scientific inquiry. Intellectuals became more active since the 16th century onwards. Their quest for an understanding human society, its nature, socio-political system and its problems. Their quest for an understanding human society, its nature, socio-political system and its problems now received new impetus. Their literary works of some prominent intellectuals of this period clearly reveal this urge to understand and interpret man's socio-political system.

Machiavelli's "The Prince", Thomas Hobbes' "Leviathan", Rousseau's "Social Contract", Montesquieu's "The Spirit of Laws", Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations", Condorcet's "Historical sketch of the Progress of the Human mind" serve as examples of such literary works.

However, it was only in the 19th century that systematic attempts were made by Auguste Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, Weber and others to study society and to establish a science of society called "sociology".

Characteristics of Early Sociology

The Science of sociology was taking its shape to emerge as a distinct science in the second half of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century. According to T.B. Bottomore* early sociology assumed the following characteristics:

- (i) Early sociology was encyclopedic in character. It was "concerned with the whole social life of man and with the whole of human history".
- (ii) Early sociology, which was under the influence of philosophy of history and the biological theory of evolution, was largely evolutionary in nature.
- (iii) It was generally regarded as a positive science similar in character to the natural sciences. "Sociology in the 19th century was modeled upon biology". This fact could be ascertained from the widely used conceptions of society as an organization and from the attempts to formulate general laws of social evolution.

- (iv) Sociology was virtually recognized above all, “science of the new industrial society”. Even though sociology claimed itself to be a general science, it dealt particularly with social problems arising from the political and economic revolutions of the 18th century.
- (v) Sociology as “an ideological as well as scientific character”. Various conservative and radical ideas entered into its formation, gave rise to conflicting theories, and provoked controversies which continue to the present day.

Origin and Development of Sociology:

Sociology came to be established as an independent and a separate social science in the middle of the 19th century. Various factors paved the way for its emergence. Ian Robertson in his book “Sociology” has mentioned of three factors that hastened the process of the establishment of sociology as a separate science. They may be summarized as follows:

(i) Industrial Revolution and Industrialization

Industrial Revolution that took place first in England during the 18th century brought about sweeping changes throughout Europe. Never before in history did social changes take place on such a massive scale. Sociology emerged in the context of the sweeping changes.

Factory system of production and the consequent mechanization and industrialization brought turmoils in society. New industries and technologies change the face of the social and physical environment. The simple rural life and small-scale home industries were replaced by complex urban life and mass production of goods. Industrialization changed the direction of civilization. It destroyed, or radically altered, the medieval customs, beliefs and ideals.

Industrialization led to urbanization. Peasants left rural areas and flocked to the towns, where they worked as industrial labourers under dangerous conditions. Cities grew at an unprecedented rate providing an anonymous environment for people. Social problems became rampant in the fast developing cities.

Aristocracies and monarchies crumbled and fell. Religion began to lose its force as a source of moral authority. “For the first time in history, rapid social change became the normal rather than an abnormal state of affairs, and people could no longer expect that their children would live much the same lives as they had done. The direction of social change was unclear, and the stability of the social order seemed threatened. An understanding of what was happening was urgently needed”.

It is clear from the above that sociology was born out of the attempt to understand the transformations that seemed to threaten the stability of European society. Social thinkers like Comte, Spencer and others argued that there was an urgent need to establish a separate science of society. They believed that such a science would be of great help in understanding the nature and problems of society and to find out solutions for the same.

(ii) Inspiration from the Growth of Natural Sciences

Nineteenth century was a period in which natural sciences had made much progress. The success attained by the natural scientists inspired and even tempted good number of social thinkers to emulate their example. If their methods could be successful in the physical world to understand physical or natural phenomena, could they not be applied successfully to the social world to understand social phenomena? As an answer to this question Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, Weber and others successfully demonstrated that these methods could be used to study the social world.

(iii) Inspiration provided by the radically diverse societies and cultures of the colonial empires

The colonial powers of Europe were exposed to different types of societies and cultures in the colonial empires. Their exposure to such diversities in societies and cultures provided an intellectual challenge for the social scientist of the day. Information about the widely contrasting social practices of these distant peoples raised fresh questions about society: why some societies were more advanced than others? What lessons could the European countries learn from comparisons of various societies? Why the rate of social change was not the

same everywhere? The new science of society called “sociology” had emerged as an independent science in an attempt to find convincing answers to these questions.

Founding Fathers of Sociology and their contributions:

In this section, we will briefly examine the views and main contributions of founding fathers of sociology – Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, Marx and Weber, who had a major and lasting impact (especially the last three thinkers) on the discipline of sociology. An understanding of the Origins of Sociology helps us to grasp of what the discipline is today.

Auguste Comte (1798-1857):

Auguste Comte, the French Philosopher, is traditionally considered the “Father of Sociology”. Comte who invented the term “Sociology” was the first man to distinguish the subject-matter of sociology from all the other sciences. He worked out in a series of books, a general approach to the study of society. Comte is regarded as the “Father of sociology” not because of any significant contributions to the science as such, but because of the great influence he had upon it.

Comte introduced the word “sociology” for the first time in his famous work “Positive Philosophy” in 1839. The term “Sociology” is derived from the Latin word Socius, meaning companion or associate, and the Greek word logos, meaning study or science. Thus, the etymological meaning of sociology is the science of society. He defined sociology as the science of social phenomena “subject to natural and invariable laws, the discovery of which is the object of investigation.”

Comte devoted his main efforts to an inquiry into the nature of human knowledge and tried to classify all knowledge and to analyze the methods of achieving it. He concentrated his efforts to determine the nature of human society and the laws and principles underlying its growth and development. He also labored to establish the methods to be employed in studying social phenomena.

Comte believed that the sciences follow one another in a definite and logical order and that all inquiry goes through certain stages (namely, the theological, the

metaphysical and the ‘positive or scientific or empirical’). Finally, they arrive at the last or scientific stage or as he called the positive stage. In the positive stage, objective observation is substituted for speculation. Social phenomena like physical phenomena, he maintained, can be studied objectively by making use of the positive method. He thought that it was time for inquiries into social problems and social phenomena to enter into this last stage. So, he recommended that the study of society be called the science of society, i.e. ‘Sociology’.

He regarded sociology as the last science to develop in the chain of sciences – Mathematics, Astronomy, physics, Chemistry, Biology and Sociology – but as the most significant and complex of all the sciences.

For Comte, sociology is the study of the fundamental laws of social phenomena in accordance with the methods of the positive sciences. He believed that this new science could produce Knowledge of society based on scientific laws. Sociology, he argued, should contribute to the welfare of the community by using the canons of science to understand, predict and control of human behavior .He also propounded a new religion of humanity based on scientific knowledge. As stated earlier, although Comte did not specify in detail the sub-fields of sociology, he did propose to divide sociology into two main parts: social statics and social dynamics. The former is concerned with the anatomy of society and the latter is related with natural progress of mankind towards scientific rationality .Comte saw society in organismic terms, as an entity made up of interdependent parts, which are in balance with each other and create an integrated whole.

Against the trend of intellectual differentiation prevailing in his time, Comte wanted sociology to be a synthetic science, which attempts to integrate political, economic and social phenomena.

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903)

Another early great social theorist of society Hebert Spencer accepted the word ‘sociology’ without any hesitation in 1877 and titled one his books as principles of Sociology .He defined this new science as a science of societies .He was much more precise than Comte in specifying the topics or special fields of sociology

.The subject matter of sociology, according to Spencer includes family, politics , religion, social control and industry or work .In addition ,Spencer also included study of associations , communities ,the division of labour , social differentiation or social stratification and many other topics in the domain of sociology .He clearly mentioned that sociology should accept the whole society as its unit of analysis.

Spencer is also known for introducing Darwin's theory of scientific evolution in sociology .Another significant contribution that Spencer made is the so-called organic analogy in which society is compared with human organism, but did not describe society as an organism.

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917)

The first French academic sociologist Emile Durkheim, who is widely known as a 'founding father 'of modern sociology, has attempted to define its subject matter and establish sociology as a separate discipline studying society .He had a more lasting impact on modern sociology than those of Comte .Vine (1954) has made an interesting observation about him: "While Comte laid the foundation of sociology, it is Durkheim who commented it'. He is long acknowledged as the founding figure of functionalism, a perspective which permeates though almost all social sciences but more recently hailed by leading authorities on structuralism, socio-linguistics and post-modernism. He adopted collectivist perspective throughout his sociological analysis.

To Durkheim, sociology is the study of social facts (aspects of social life) that have distinctive social characteristics and determinants .They shape our actions as individuals .He defined social facts as "every way of acting , fixed or not, capable of exercising on the individual an external constraint". They include such things as folkways, customs, Laws, and the general rules of behavior that people accept without question .In this connection; he said that social facts should be studied as things .By this he meant that social life can be analyzed as rigorously as objects or events in nature. Social facts are exterior to individuals and cannot be reduced to psychological data. That are characterized by their potentiality for constraint or coercion relative to individual .They can tested empirically .The outstanding example of this approach in Durkheim's work is his study of suicide.

Durkheim was of the view that sociology should concern itself with a wide range of Institutions --- their development and functioning and social processes as its subject matter. Like Spencer, Durkheim also spoke of sociology as the “science of societies”, and repeatedly emphasized the importance of studying different types of society comparatively .This must be done by analyzing institutions in different types of society at comparable stages of evolution.

Durkheim’s main contributions are:

1. Durkheim attempted to establish sociology as an autonomous and distinctive science of social phenomena.
2. For Durkheim, the main domain of sociology is the study of social facts and not individuals .He believed both that societies had their own realities which could not simply be reduced to the actions and motives of individuals and that individuals were molded and constrained by their social environments. The reality of society for Durkheim lay in its values, ideas and beliefs.
3. The central theme of Durkheim’s sociology is the idea of moral comparison and normative constraint.
4. He saw social norms as regulating people’s behavior by means of institutionalized vales which the individual internalized rather than society simply acting as an external constraint.
5. Durkheim has explained the universal function of religious systems for the continuity of society as such.
6. He argued for guild socialism as a means of rebuilding cohesive and soldiery social communities.
7. He developed concepts of collective conscience, collective representation, organic and mechanical solidarity and many others in various contexts.
8. In spite of empirical orientation, Durkheim was very much concerned with the problem of making value judgments and believed that sociologists

should be able to say what ought to be or to make diagnosis of social ills. For Durkheim, the *raison d'être* of science was to help men live a more satisfying life. In this connection, he argued that criminality as a general characteristic is normal to all societies and as such its presence is not a sign of pathology. Durkheim wished to apply sociological knowledge to social intervention by the state in order to recreate social harmony.

Max Weber (1864-1920)

After Durkheim, in the galaxy of sociologists, the German social scientist Max Weber is the second prominent and most dominant figure who influenced the course of sociology. His influence still persists in various special fields of sociology. Ritzer wrote, "Weber was a prolific writer and a complicated thinker... His work is provocative and rich in insight". Sociology, according to Weber, "is a science which attempts the interpretive understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at a causal explanation of its course and effects" (1947). In other words, it is the search for the causes of social action. Action is behavior to which the individual attaches meaning and social action is meaningful in that it takes into account the behavior of others. Weber believed that sociologists must study not just social facts and social structures, but also social actions, the external objective behaviors as well as the internalized values, motives and subjective meanings that individuals attach to their behaviors and to the behavior of others. This view clearly suggests that Weber regarded the 'social act' or the 'social relationship' as the particular subject matter of sociology. He distinguished four types of social action: (1) Rational Action, (2) Value-rationality Action, (3) Affectual Action (4) Traditional Action.

Weber contended that social actions should be studied through qualitative (subjective methods) as well as objective and quantitative techniques. In this respect, he developed a sociological perspective that balanced two views. On the one hand, he advocated that social scientists should study the subjective values and meanings that individuals attach to their own behavior and that of others. At the same time, he believed that social scientists should study these values and

meaning of actions objectively, remaining morally neutral or value- free .The goal, Weber believed ,was to achieve a “ sympathetic understanding “ of the minds of others .He called this approach verstehen, i.e., understanding human action by examining the subjective meaning that people attach to their behavior and to the behaviors of others.

His approach to sociology, however, has probably been as influential as his ideas. His predecessors considered societies in terms of their large structures, social divisions and social movements’ .Spencer based his studies on the belief that societies evolved like organisms, Marx considered society in terms of class conflicts, and Durkheim was concerned with the institutional arrangements that maintain the cohesion of social structures. These theorists assumed that society, although composed of individuals, existed apart from them.

The main contributions of Max Weber may be summarized as under:

1. For Weber, Sociology should concern itself with the meaning of social action and the uniqueness of historical events. He developed a coherent philosophy of social science (sociology), which aimed at the understanding of the meaning of action.
2. Weber denied that sociology could (a) discover universal laws of human behavior comparable with those of natural science; (b) Confirm any evolutionary progress in human societies; and (c) provide any evaluation of, a moral justification for, any existing or future state of affairs.
3. Weber attempted to explain the basic characteristics of a modern, industrial civilization (bureaucracy).
4. He emphasized on value neutrality in the subjective interpretation of action. The findings of sociologists should be open to academic scrutiny and criticism.

5. Weber rejected as unwarranted the claims of positivism .He did not believe that sociology could be a natural science, as positivists claim .Instead his efforts to historical analysis.
6. Weber implicitly presented rationalization as the master trend of western capitalist society .He regarded capitalist society as having a logic which operated independently of the subjective attitudes of social actors.
7. Weber also contributed to the sociology of comparative religion and through his study of “The Protestant Ethic and the Sprit of Capitalism “tried to establish that economic phenomena themselves are governed by cultural ethos, particularly religion.
8. Weber constructed a typology of social action –rational, traditional, affective and evaluative.
9. Weber analyzed authority, which has stimulated a great deal of empirical research, particularly in the field of bureaucracy. His typology of authority is (1) Legal- Rational (2) Traditional (3) charismatic.

Karl Marx (1818-1883)

A long with Emile Durkheim and Max Weber, Karl Marx is generally regarded as one of the key figures in the development of sociological thinking .Like Comte and Durkheim, he sought to explain the changes in society that took place at time of the industrial revolution .It is said that Marx was not a sociologist (he never claimed himself to be a sociologist), but there is sociology in his all writings .His writings covered a diversity of areas. Much of his writings revolve round economic issues .His views about the relationship between economic life and social institutions attracted sociologists to study him deeply. He regarded all sciences, including sociology, as emancipator .Marx has been a major influence on the development of sociology as often a subject of criticism as of inspiration.

Marx's main contributions are:

1. The whole ideas of Marx are founded on what he called the materialistic conception of history. According to view, it is not the ideas or values human beings hold that are the main sources of social change. Rather, social change is prompted primarily by economic influences .Marx sees the structure of economic relations as the most basic and important element in society as a whole.
2. Marx is best known for his views on the relation between economic life and other social institutions .On the basis of his ideas, it is often said that he was an economic determinist, believing that the nature of a society is determined by the manner in which economy is owned and organized.
3. In his early work Marx was interested in the concept of alienation- a theme was to run through all his subsequent contributions. He used this concept sense of alienated labour – the work which is imposed on the labour. Marx's basic analytic concern was with the structures of capitalism that cause this alienation.
4. Marx analyzed societies on the basis of social classes, which are organized in relation of production in the economic system .For him, those who own and control the means of production from one class-capitalist (bourgeoisie) and those depend on their own labour constitute class-industrial labour (proletariat).
5. Marx believed that there has always been a conflict or contradictions between the classes .This conflict is inevitable because of their different relationship to the means of production. There has always a dominant and a subordinate class. For example, capitalists within a capitalists society effectively exploit workers by appropriating the product of their labour

- .HE argued that history could be understood in dialectical terms as record of the inevitable conflicts between economic classes. In Marx's words, all human history thus far is the history of class struggles.
6. Marx argued that this class conflict or class struggle is the 'motor of history '. It provides the motivation for historical development which suggests a theory of social change .He believed that change does not follow automatically from changes in the economic structure; class struggle as the active intervention of human beings is necessary.
 7. Marx was pre-eminently a theorist of capitalist society .He developed the economic mechanism of capitalist society, labour theory of value, the theory of capital accumulation, the concepts of historical materialism, commodity fetishism and predicted the possibility of the collapse of capitalist society – ushered by a classless socialistic society.
 8. For Marx, The key to understanding a particular society is its predominant mode of production which consists of the tools and techniques (forces of production) and the compatible relations of production (class relations).

DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE 20TH CENTURY

In the Second half of the 19th and in the beginning of the 20th centuries a large number of sociologists and social thinkers contributed a great deal to the development of sociology. Karl Marx 1818-1883, Lester F. Ward 1841-1913, George Simmel 1858-1918, Alfred Verkandt 1867-1953, Gabriel Tarde 1843-1904, Small 1854-1926, Giddings 1855-1931, C.H. Cooley 1864-1929, James Ward 1843-1925, Lloyd Morgan 1852-1932, L.T. Hobhouse 1864-1929, E.A. Westermarck 1862-1939. Pareto 1848-1923, Charles A. Elwood 1873-1946, Benjamin Kidd 1858-1916, E.B. Tylor 1832-1917, J.G. Frazer 1854-1941, B. Malinowski 1884-1942 and others are some of them.

Sociology experienced a rapid development in the 20th century, most notably in France, Germany, the United States and England. Recently famous sociologists like P.A. Sorokin, Talcott Parsons, R.R. Merton, R.M. MacIver, M. Ginsberg, Kingsley Davis, W.F. Ogburn, A.W. Green, Kimball Young, P.G. Murdock, W.I.H. Sprott, E.A. Ross, Wilbert Moore, Karl Manheim M.N. Srinivas, G.S.Ghurye and a host of others have further enriched the subject by their social investigations and writings. Today, sociology is firmly established as a discipline. The developments of the 20th century provided a great stimulus for the study of social sciences in general, and sociology in particular. All major universities in the world now offer instruction in the subject. Even in the U.S.S.R. sociology is a legitimate discipline now. “It is not yet in many respects, a mature science and the student will find in it therefore, more divergent points of view and rather less systematic agreement than in such other science as physics, astronomy and biology”.

Sociology in India

Sociology was introduced to India as an academic discipline only after World War I. Since then, being closely allied with anthropology, it is forging ahead in India. The sociological movement has gained some momentum in Bombay with its mouthpiece “Sociological Bulletin” and in Agra with its organ “Journal of Social Sciences”. Some prominent sociologists of our country like G.S. Ghurye, R.K. Mukherjee, D.P. Mukherjee, Humayun Kabir, K.M. Kapadia, R.N. Saxena, Mrs. Iravati Karve, Benoy K.Sarkar, A. Aiyappan, D.N. Majumdar, M.N. Srinivas, M.S. Gore, S.C. Dube, P.N. Prabhu, A.R. Desai and others have contributed their mite to the enrichment of the discipline. India with its diverse cultural peculiarities provides wonderful opportunities for sociological researches and studies. Sociology is now taught in mainly universities as one of the major disciplines. It is becoming more and more popular at the level of students also. Compared with the English-speaking countries, the sociological movement has not much flourished in India to the extent which it should have been.

The 1950s and 1960s witnessed the gradual acceptance of sociology and anthropology as subjects of specialized study at institutions of higher

learning on the one hand, and academic politics to delineate the areas of the two disciplines on the other. Questions were also raised with regard to what constitutes Indian Sociology.

The first few issues of the journal Contributions to Indian Sociology contained articles on the debate around Indian sociology. The debate was inaugurated by the Presidential address to the first All-India Sociological Conference delivered by D.P. Mukerji. He emphasized the need to study 'tradition' to understand Indian society. He attributed the failure of social sciences to contribute to Indian development 'chiefly on account of their ignorance of, and un-rootedness in, India's social reality'. His argument was that 'greater ease of insight and understanding' can be secured by the sociologist when he is saturated in his own traditions'. Although Mukerji took care to qualify his statement by saying that he did not want to 'bar foreign scholars out of Indian problems', he was understood as an advocate of 'insiderism'. A. K. Saran-a student of Mukerji-took this seriously and even questioned the possibility of sociology as was understood then. It must, however, be said that Saran denied belonging to the 'Marxologist school' of his teacher. Clearly, there were those who thought of Indian sociology as 'sociology by the insiders', and who went so far as to indicate that it should be built from an Indological perspective.

A contrary view was propounded by M.N. Srinivas, S.C. Dube, and others of an anthropological orientation. They felt that a proper understanding of Indian society needs both insider and outsider perspectives, and a solid grounding in fieldwork. Srinivas said that the insider is so 'fundamentally and even hopelessly enslaved in one's society that detachment is well-nigh impossible. Such detachment is necessary if one wants to present an account of one's society which is intelligible to others...'

Apart from this debate surroundings what constitutes Indian sociology, the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s saw debates surroundings who qualifies as a sociologist. Since courses were introduced in these disciplines and degrees awarded in sociology and anthropology, regimentations began to occur, and academic politics began revolving around the basic degree. The futility of these distinctions were apparent as both sociologists and anthropologists

were researching various aspects of Indian society and following the same methodology, with the exception that those trained in sociology began using survey research that required sampling, administration of questionnaires, and statistical analysis, and those trained in anthropology laid emphasis on participant observation and microcosmic studies of villages. But when they engaged in the study of processes of modernization-industrialization and urbanization, analyses of directed culture change, and policy-relevant research-research techniques depended on the subject matter and the type of population group being studied.

While such debates continued, leading scholars hailing from different backgrounds-economics, political science, psychology, sociology or anthropology-received due attention and their writings influenced the younger generation of sociologists. Now, with the increasing emphasis on interdisciplinary, this debate has died down, and sociologists are becoming more open to outside influences. The growth of specializations such as political sociology, social ecology, economic sociology, criminology, etc., has exposed sociologists to contributions from related social science disciplines.

Chapter 2

Definition, Nature, Scope, and Importance of Sociology

DEFINITION OF SOCIOLOGY:

‘Sociology’ which had once been treated as social philosophy or the philosophy of history emerged as an independent social science in the 19th century. Auguste Comte, a French Social Scientist is traditionally considered to be the father of sociology. Comte is accredited with the coining of the term sociology in 1839. “Sociology” is composed of two words: socius, meaning companion or associate; and ‘logos’, meaning science or study. The etymological meaning of “sociology” is thus the science of society. John Stuart Mill, another social thinker and philosopher of the 19th century, proposed the word ethology for this new science. Herbert Spencer developed his systematic study of society and adopted the word “sociology” in his works. With the contributions of Spencer and others it (Sociology) became the permanent name of the new science.

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. For some of the importances are as follows:

Sociology is currently taught in 89 universities in 25 states and Union Territories. From 49 universities in the 1970s, the number of sociology departments in the universities has grown to at least 89. The number of colleges affiliated to these universities and those teaching sociology is indeed quite large. Add to this the institutes set up to teach Management and Business Administration, where some aspects of sociology form part of the essential core syllabus. In this sense, sociology has gained immense popularity and importance in recent’ years.

Sociology is now a well-established discipline in the Indian academia, and both sociologists and social anthropologists are contributing to its development. Most of the research in sociology carried out in India relate to

issues of development, industrialization and urbanization, the Indian diaspora, peasant movements, gender studies, and agrarian studies

Auguste Comte, the founding father of sociology, defines sociology as the science of social phenomena “subject to natural and invariable laws, the discovery of which is the object of investigation”.

1. Kingsley Davis says that “Sociology is a general science of society”.
2. Harry M. Johnson opines that “sociology is the science that deals with social groups”.
3. Emile Durkheim defines sociology as the “science of social institutions”.
4. Franklin Henry Giddings defines sociology as “the science of social phenomena”.
5. Max Weber defines sociology as “the science which attempts the interpretative understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at a casual explanation of its course and effects”.
6. Kimball Young and Raymond W. Mack define sociology as “the scientific study of the social aspects of human life”.

A careful examination of various definitions cited above, makes it evident that sociologists differ in their opinion about the definition of sociology. Their divergent views about the definition of sociology only reveal their distinct approaches to its study. However, the common idea underlying all the definitions mentioned above is that sociology is concerned with man, his social relations and his society.

NATURE OF SOCIOLOGY

Sociology, as a branch of knowledge, has its own unique characteristics. It is different from other sciences in certain respects. An analysis of its internal logical characteristics helps one to understand what kind of science it is. The following are the main characteristics of sociology as estimated by Robert Bierstedt in his book “The Social Order”:

1. Sociology is an Independent Science:

Sociology has now emerged into an independent science. It is not treated and studied as a branch of any other science like philosophy or political philosophy or history. As an independent science it has its own field of study, boundary and method.

2. Sociology is a Social Science and not a Physical Science

Sociology belongs to the family of Social Sciences and not to the family of Physical sciences. As a social science it concentrates its attention on man, his social behavior, social activities and social life. As a member of the family of social sciences it is intimately related to other social sciences like history, political science, economics, psychology, anthropology etc. The fact that sociology deals with the Social universe distinguishes it from astronomy, physics, chemistry, geology, mathematics and other physical sciences.

3. Sociology is a Categorical and not a Normative Discipline

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 does not make any kind of value-judgements. Its approach is neither moral nor immoral but amoral. It is ethically neutral. It cannot decide the directions in which sociology ought to go. It makes no recommendations on matters of social policy or legislation or programme. But it does not mean that sociological knowledge is useless and serves no purpose. It only means that sociology as a discipline cannot deal with problems of good and evil, right and wrong, and moral or immoral.

4. Sociology is a Pure Science and not an Applied Science

A distinction is often made between pure sciences and applied sciences. The main aim of pure sciences is the acquisition of knowledge and it is not bothered whether the acquired knowledge is useful or can be put to use. On the other hand, the aim of applied science is to apply the acquired knowledge into life and to put it to use. Each pure science may have its own applied field. For example, physics is a pure science and engineering is its applied field. Similarly the pure sciences such as economics, political science, history, etc., have their applied fields like business, politics, journalism respectively. Sociology as a pure science has its applied field such as administration, diplomacy, social work etc. Each pure science may have more than one application.

Sociology is a pure science, because the immediate aim of sociology is the acquisition of knowledge about human society, not the utilization of that knowledge. Sociologists never determine questions of public policy and do not recommend legislators what laws should be passed or replaced. But the knowledge acquired by a sociologist is of great help to the administrator, the legislator, the diplomat, the teacher, the foreman, the supervisor, the social worker and the citizen. But sociologists themselves do not apply the knowledge to life and use, as a matter of their duty and profession.

5. Sociology is Relatively an Abstract Science and not a Concrete Science

This does not mean that sociology is an art and not a science. Nor does it mean, it is unnecessarily complicated and unduly difficult. It only means that sociology is not interested in concrete manifestations of human events. It is more concerned with the form of human events and their patterns. For example, sociology is not concerned with particular wars and revolutions but with war and revolution in general, as social phenomena, as types of social conflict. Similarly, sociology does not confine itself to the study of this society or that particular society or

social organization, or marriage, or religion, or group and so on. It is in this simple sense that sociology is an abstract not a concrete science.

6. Sociology is a Generalizing and not a particularizing or Individualizing Science.

Sociology tries to find out the general laws or principles about human interaction and association, about the nature, form, content and structure of human groups and societies. It does not study each and every event that takes place in society. It is not possible also. It tries to make generalization on the basis of the study of some selected events.

7. Sociology is a Social Science and not a Physical Science

Sociology belongs to the family of Social Sciences and not to the family of Physical sciences. As a social science it concentrates its attention on man, his social behavior, social activities and social life. As a member of the family of social sciences it is intimately related to other social sciences like history, political science, economics, psychology, anthropology etc. The fact that sociology deals with the Social universe distinguishes it from astronomy, physics, chemistry, geology, mathematics and other physical sciences.

8. Sociology is a Categorical and not a Normative Discipline

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 does not make any kind of value-judgements. Its approach is neither moral nor immoral but amoral. It is ethically neutral. It cannot decide the directions in which sociology ought to go.

9. Sociology is a Pure Science and not an Applied Science

A distinction is often made between pure sciences and applied sciences. The main aim of pure sciences is the acquisition of knowledge and it is not bothered whether the acquired knowledge is useful or can be put to use. On the other hand, the aim of applied science is to apply the acquired knowledge into life and to put it to use. Each pure science may have its

own applied field. For example, physics is a pure science and engineering is its applied field. Similarly the pure sciences such as economics, political science, history, etc., have their applied fields like business, politics, journalism respectively. Sociology as a pure science has its applied field such as administration, diplomacy, social work etc. Each pure science may have more than one application.

10. Sociology is a General Science and Not a Special Social Science

The area of inquiry of sociology is general and not specialized. It is concerned with human interaction and human life in general. Other social sciences like political science, history, economics etc., also study man and human interaction, but not all about human interaction. They concentrate their attention on certain aspects of human interaction and activities and specialize themselves in those fields. Accordingly, economics specializes itself in the study of economic activities, political science concentrates on political activities and so on. Sociology, of course, does not investigate economic, religious, political, legal, moral or any other special kind of phenomena in relation to human life and activities as such. It only studies human activities in a general way. This does not, however, mean that sociology is the basic social science nor does it imply sociology is the general social science.

11. Sociology is Both a Rational and an Empirical Science.

There are two broad ways of approach to scientific knowledge. One, known as empiricism, is the approach that emphasizes experience and the facts that result from observation and experimentation. The other, known as rationalism, stresses reason and the theories that result from logical inference.

The empiricist collects facts; the rationalist co-ordinates and arranges them. Theories and facts are required in the construction of knowledge. In sociological inquiry both are significant. A theory unsubstantiated by hard, solid facts is nothing more than an opinion. Facts, by themselves, in their isolated character, are meaningless and useless. As Immanuel Kant

said, “theories without facts are empty and facts without theories are blind.” All modern sciences, therefore, avail themselves of both empirical and rational resources.

It is clear from the above that sociology is an independent, a social, a categorical, a pure, an abstract, a generalizing, both a rational and an empirical and a general social science.

Major Concerns of Sociology (Subject-Matter of Sociology):

Ever since the beginning of sociology, sociologists have shown a great concern in man and in the dynamics of society. The emphasis has been oscillating between man and society. “Sometimes the emphasis was on man in society, at other times, it was on man in society. Sociology concentrated heavily on society and its major units and their dynamics. It has been striving to analyse the dynamics of society in terms of organized patterns of social relations. It may be said that sociology seeks to find explanations for three basic questions: How and why societies emerge? How and why societies persist? How and why societies Change?

The Major Concerns of Sociology can be explained as follows:

1. The major concern of sociology is sociological analysis. It means the sociologist seeks to provide an analysis of human society and culture with a sociological perspective. He evinces his interest in the evolution of society and tries to reconstruct the major stages in the evolutionary process. An attempt is also made “to analyse the factors and forces underlying historical transformations of society”. Due importance is given to the scientific method that is adopted in the sociological analysis.
2. Sociology has given sufficient attention to the study of primary units of social life. In this area, it is concerned with social acts and social relationships, individual personality, groups of all varieties,

communities (Urban, rural and tribal) , associations, organizations and populations.

3. Sociology has been concerned with the development, structure and function of wide variety of basic social institutions such as the family and kinship, religion and property, economic, political, legal, educational and scientific, recreational and welfare, aesthetic and expressive institutions.
4. Sociology studies the fundamental social processes that play a vital role. The social processes such as co-operation and competition, accommodation and assimilation, social conflict including war and revolution; communication including opinion formation, expression and change; social differentiation and stratification, socialization and indoctrination, social control and deviance including crime, suicide, social integration and social change assume prominence in sociological studies.
5. Sociology has placed high premium on the method of research also. Contemporary sociology has tended to become more and more rational and empirical rather than philosophical and idealistic. Sociologists have sought the application of scientific method in social researches. Like a natural scientist, a sociologist senses a problem for investigation. He then tries to formulate it into a researchable proposition. After collecting the data he tries to establish connections between them. He finally arrives at meaningful concepts, propositions and generalizations.
6. Sociologists are concerned with the task of “formulating concepts, propositions and theories”. “Concepts are abstracted from concrete experience to represent a class of phenomena”. For example, terms such as social stratification, differentiation, conformity, deviance etc., represent concepts. A proposition “seeks to reflect a relationship between different categories of data or concepts”. For

example “lower-class youths are more likely to commit crimes than middle-class youths”. This proposition is debatable. It may be proved to be false. To take another example, it could be said that “taking advantage of opportunities of higher education and occupational mobility leads to the weakening of the ties of kinship and territorial loyalties”. Though this proposition sounds debatable, it has been established after careful observations, inquiry and collection of relevant data. Theories go beyond concepts and propositions. “Theories represent systematically related propositions that explain social phenomena”. Sociological theories are mostly rooted in factual than philosophical. The sociological perspective becomes more meaningful and fruitful when one tries to derive insight from concepts, propositions and theories.

7. Finally, in the present era of explosion of knowledge sociologists have ventured to make specializations also. Thus, today good numbers of specialized fields of inquiry are emerging out. Sociology of knowledge, sociology of history, sociology of literature, sociology of culture, sociology of religion, sociology of family etc., represent such specialized fields. The field of sociological inquiry is so vast that any student of sociology equipped with genius and rich sociological imagination can add new dimensions to the discipline of sociology as a whole.

SCOPE OF SOCIOLOGY

Every science has its own areas of study or fields of inquiry. It becomes difficult for anyone to study a science systematically unless its boundaries are demarcated and scope determined precisely.

However, there are two main schools of thought regarding the scope of sociology: (1) The specialistic or formalistic school and (2) the synthetic school.

(1) The Specialistic or Formalistic School

This school of thought is led by the German sociologist George Simmel. The other main advocates of this school are Vierkandt, Max Weber, Small, Von Wiese and Tonnies.

Simmel and others are of opinion that sociology is a pure and an independent science. As a pure science it has a limited scope. Sociology should confine itself to the study of certain aspects of human relationship only. Further, it should study only the 'forms' of social relationships but not their contents. Social relationship such as competition, subordination, division of labour etc., are expressed in different fields of social life such as economic, political, religious, moral, artistic etc. Sociology should disentangle the forms of social relationships and study them in abstraction. Sociology as a specific social science describes, classifies and analyses the forms of social relationships.

Vierkandt says that sociology concerns itself with the ultimate form of mental or psychic relationship which links men to one another in society. He maintains that in dealing with culture, sociology should not concern itself with the actual contents of cultural evolution but it should confine itself to only the discovery of the fundamental forces of change and persistence. It should refrain itself from making a historical study of concrete societies.

Max Weber opines that the aim of sociology is to interpret or understand social behavior. But social behavior does not cover the whole field of human relations. He further says that sociology should make an analysis and classification of types of social relationships. Small insisted that sociology has only a limited field. Von wiese and Tonnies expressed more or less the same opinion.

CRITICISM: The views of the Formalistic school are widely criticized. Some critical remarks may be cited here:

Firstly, the formalistic school has unreasonably narrowed the field of sociology. Sociology should study not only the general forms of social relationships but also their concrete contents.

Secondly, the distinction between the forms of social relations and their contents is not workable. Social forms can not be abstracted from the content at all, since social forms keep on changing when the contents change. Sorokin writes, “we may fill a glass with wine, water or sugar without changing its form, but I cannot conceive of a social institution whose form would not change when its members change”.

Thirdly, sociology is not the only science that studies the forms of social relationships. Other sciences also do that. The study of international law, for example, includes social relations like conflict, war, opposition, agreement, contract etc. Political Science, Economics also study social relationships.

Finally, the establishment of pure sociology is impractical. No Sociologist has been able to develop a pure sociology so far. No science can be studied in complete isolation from the other sciences. In fact, today more emphasis is laid on inter-disciplinary approach.

2. The Synthetic School

The synthetic school of thought conceives of sociology as a synthesis of the social sciences. It wants to make sociology a general social science and not a pure or special social science. In fact, this school has made sociology synoptic or encyclopaedic in character. Durkheim, Hob House, Ginsberg and Sorokin have been the chief exponents of this school.

The main argument of this school is that all parts of social life are intimately inter-related. Hence the study of one aspect is not sufficient

to understand the entire phenomenon. Hence sociology should study social life as a whole. This opinion has contributed to the creation of a general and systematic sociology.

The Views of Emile Durkheim

Durkheim, one of the stalwarts of this school of thought, says that sociology has three main divisions or fields of inquiry. They are as follows: Social Morphology, Social Physiology and General Sociology.

- (i) Social Morphology: Social morphology studies the territorial basis of the life of people and also the problems of population such as volume and density, local distribution etc.
- (ii) Social Physiology: Social Physiology has different branches such as sociology of religion, of morals, of law, of economic life and of language etc.
- (iii) General Sociology: General Sociology can be regarded as the philosophical part of sociology. It deals with the general character of the social facts. Its function is the formulation of general social laws.

The View of Morris Ginsberg

Ginsberg, another advocate of the synthetic school, says that the main task of sociology can be categorized into four branches: Social Morphology, Social Control, Social Processes and Social Pathology.

- (i) Social Morphology: 'Social Morphology' deals with the quantity and quality of population. It studies the social structure, social groups and institutions.

- (ii) Social Control: 'Social Control' studies-formal as well as informal-means of social control such as custom, tradition, morals, religion, convention, and also law, court, legislation etc. It deals with the regulating agencies of society.
- (iii) Social Processes: 'Social processes' tries to make a study of different modes of interaction such as cooperation, competition, conflict, accommodation, assimilation, isolation, integration, differentiation, development, arrest and decay.
- (iv) Social Pathology: 'Social Pathology' studies social mal-adjustment and disturbances. It also includes studies on various social problems like poverty, beggary, unemployment, over-population, prostitution, crime etc.
- (v) Ginsberg has summed up the chief functions of sociology as follows:
 - (i) Sociology seeks to provide a classification of types and forms of social relationship.
 - (ii) It tries to determine the relation between different 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.
 - (iii) It tries to disentangle the fundamental conditions of social change and persistence and to discover sociological principles governing social life.

The scope of sociology is, indeed, very vast. It studies all the social aspects of society such as social processes, social control, social change, social stratification, social system, social groups, social pathology etc. Actually, it is neither possible nor essential to delimit the scope of sociology.

Importance and Uses of Sociology

Of the various social sciences, sociology seems to be the youngest. It is gradually developing. Still it has made remarkable progress. Its uses are recognized widely today. In modern times, there is a growing realization of the importance of the scientific study of social phenomena and the means of promoting human welfare.

The study of sociology has a great value especially in modern complex society. Some of the uses of sociology are as follows:

- (i) Sociology studies society in a scientific way. Before the emergence of sociology, there was no systematic and scientific attempt to study human society with all its complexities. Sociology has made it possible to study society in a scientific manner. This scientific knowledge about human society is needed in order to achieve progress in various fields.
- (ii) Sociology throws more light on the social nature of man. Sociology delves deep into the social nature of man. It tells us why man is a social animal, why he lives in groups, communities and societies. It examines the relationship between individual and society, the impact of society on man and other matters.
- (iii) Sociology improves our understanding of society and increases the power of social action. The science of society assists an individual to understand himself, his capacities, talents and limitations. It enables him to adjust himself to the environment. Knowledge of society, social groups, social institutions, associations, their functions etc., helps us to lead an effective social life.
- (iv) The study of sociology helps us to know not only our society and men but also their motives, aspirations, status, occupations, traditions, customs, institutions, culture etc. In a huge industrialized society our

experience is comparatively limited. We can hardly have a comprehensive knowledge of our society and rarely have an idea regarding other societies. But we must have some insight into an appreciation of the motives by which others live and the conditions under which they exist. Such an insight we derive from the study of sociology.

- (v) The Contribution of sociology is not less significant in enriching culture. Sociology has given training to us to have rational approach to questions concerning ourselves, our religion, customs, mores, institutions, values, ideologies, etc. It has made us to become more objective, rational, critical and dispassionate. The study of societies has made people to become more objective, rational, critical and dispassionate. The study of societies has made people to become more broad minded. It has impressed upon its students to overcome their prejudices, misconceptions, egoistic ambitions, and class and religious hatreds. It has made our life richer, fuller and meaningful.
- (vi) Another aspect of the practical side of sociology is the study of great social institutions and the relations of individuals of each one of them. The home and family, the school and education, the state and government, industry and work, religion and morality, marriage and family, law and legislation, property and government, etc. are some of the main institutions, through which our society functions. More than that, they condition our life in countless ways. Knowledge of sociology may help to strengthen them to serve man better.
- (vii) Sociology is useful as a teaching subject too. 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, social work, social welfare, supervision, advertising, communications, administration, and many other areas of community life. A few years

ago, sociologists could only teach sociology in schools and colleges. But sociology has now become practical enough to be practiced outside of academic halls. Careers apart from teaching are now possible in sociology. The various areas of applied sociology are coming more and more into prominence in local, state, national and international levels.

- (viii) The need for the study of sociology is greater especially in underdeveloped countries. Sociologists have now drawn the attention of economists regarding the social factors that have contributed to the economic backwardness of a few countries. Economists have now realized the importance of sociological knowledge in analyzing the economic affairs of a country.
- (ix) The study of society is of paramount importance in solving social problems. The present world is beset with several social problems of great magnitude like poverty, beggary, unemployment, prostitution, over-population, family disorganization, community disorganization, racial problems, crime, juvenile delinquency, gambling, alcoholism, youth unrest, untouchability etc. A careful analysis of these problems is necessary in order to solve them. Sociology provides such an analysis.
- (x) Sociological knowledge is necessary for understanding and planning of society. Social planning has been made easier by sociology. Sociology is often considered a vehicle of social \reform and social reorganization. It plays an important role in the reconstruction of society.
- (xi) The practical utility of sociological techniques. The techniques developed by the sociologists and other social scientists are adopted by others. Let us think the example of social survey. Developed and used mainly by sociologists and statisticians, it has become an essential tool of market research and political polling. In the same

way, sociologists provide a great deal of information that is helpful in making decisions on social policy.

- (xii) Study of society has helped several governments to promote the welfare of the tribal people. Not only the civilized societies, but even the tribal societies are faced with several socio-economic and cultural problems. Studies conducted by sociologists and anthropologists regarding tribal societies and problems have helped many governments in undertaking various social welfare measures to promote the welfare of the tribal people. Efforts are now being made to treat the tribals on par with the rest of the civilized people.
- (xiii) Sociology has drawn our attention to the intrinsic worth and dignity of man. Sociology has been greatly responsible in changing our attitudes towards fellow human beings. It has helped people to become catholic in outlook and broadminded in spirit. It has made people to become tolerant and patient towards others. It has minimized the mental distance and reduced the gap between different peoples and communities.
- (xiv) Sociology is of great practical help in the sense, it keeps us up-to-date on modern social situations and developments. Sociology makes us to become more alert towards the changes and developments that take place around us. As a result, we come to know about our changed roles and expectations and responsibilities.
- (xv) Finally, as Prof. Giddings has pointed out “Sociology tells us how to become what we want to be”.

In conclusion, it can be said that the question of ‘value of sociology’ is not a question whether or not we should study a subject. But it is a simple question of how it is actually to be used. Sociology, in short, has both individual and social advantages.

Chapter 3

METHODS OF SOCIOLOGY

Sociology as a social science has been trying to develop its own method of study. In comparison with other social sciences sociology has to face greater problems in evolving a satisfactory method. Man's social life is complex and multi-faceted. It is highly a challenging task for sociologists to collect, analyze, synthesize and finally generalize social data which are too numerous, complex and illusive. They are seeking out all the avenues of collecting and interpreting social data. Hence it has become quite natural for them to employ various methods in their study. A brief survey of some of these methods is given below:

1. THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

In order to tackle the problems of society effectively and to make fruitful discoveries, sociology has to employ precise and well-tested methods of investigation. The comparative method is one such method. This method is as old as Aristotle for it is known that he had made use of this method in his study of political systems. But it became “the method par excellence of sociology” only in the 19th century. Sociologists like Comte, Durkheim, Tylor, J.G. Frazer, Weber, Hobhouse, Wheeler, Ginsberg, Gouldner, G.P. Murdock, S.F. Nadel, S.M. Lipset and R. Bendix, E.R. Leach, and others have not only used this method in their studies but also made it sufficiently popular.

The Comparative method refers to “the method of comparing different societies or groups within the same society to show whether and why they are similar or different in certain respects”.

The Comparative method is not specifically a sociological method but is a method quite known in logic, and as such it is applicable to all the sciences. In the 19th century, this method was used by the social investigators to find out similarities in social institutions so as to trace their common origins. Both Montesquieu and Comte used and recommended this method in the 19th century to establish and explain both differences and similarities between societies.

Throughout the 19th century there was a strong link between the use of the comparative method and the evolutionist approach. Durkheim set out clearly the significance of this method in his “The Rules of Sociological Method”. According to him, the sociological explanation consists entirely in the establishment of causal connections’. In the case of natural sciences, the causal connections could be more easily established because of facility of experiment. Since such direct experiments are out of question in sociology, we are compelled to use the method of indirect experiment, i.e., comparative method-says Durkheim

Durkheim in his work “Division of Labour in society” compared the legal systems of different societies at the same time and at different levels of development. In that he used law as an index of the moral character of society. By comparison “he tested his hypothesis that an increase in the division of labour is accompanied by a change in the nature of social integration or solidarity”.

Further, Durkheim in his study of “Suicide” aimed to discover the social causes of suicide by relating the rates of suicide in different social groups to characteristics of the groups. He showed that “the suicide rates varied inversely with the degree of social cohesion and with the degree of stability of moral norms”.

Tylor used this method in the study of institutions connected with the family among primitive people and was able to show that the practice of mother-in-law avoidance was correlated with the system of matrilineal residence.

Recently, S.M. Lipset and R. Bendix have compared “rates of social mobility in different industrial societies to show that these rates are governed largely by the stage or degree of industrialization.”

Thus, by employing this method it may be possible to explain the significance of a custom or practice, though it varies from one society to another, by studying the motives behind it.

By adopting this method it is quite possible to establish correlations between crime and urbanization, between family size and social mobility, between social class and educational attainment, between urban living and divorce or delinquency rates, etc. studies of this kind have resulted in a number of generalizations also.

THE HISTORICAL METHOD

The historical method refers to, “a study of events, processes, and institutions of past civilizations, for the purpose of finding the origins or antecedents of contemporary social life and thus understanding its nature and working.” This method is based on the idea that our present forms of social life, our customs and traditions, beliefs and values, and our ways of living as such have their roots in the past and that one can best explain them by tracing them back to their origins.

The Utility and wide acceptance of the historical method have resulted in one of the fields of sociology known as “historical sociology”. “Historical sociology studies societies of the remote as well as of recent past to discover origins of, and find explanations for, our present ways of life”.

In a way, all types of sociological researches are historical for the sociologists make use of the records relating to the things that have happened or have been observed. But generally, the term “historical sociology” is applied to the study of social facts which are more than fifty or so years old. It means all the social facts relating to the 19th and early phase of 20th centuries are referred to as “historical”.

In practice, “historical sociology is a particular kind of comparative study of social groups; their compositions, their interrelationships and the social conditions which support or undermine them”. The social anthropologist examines these things in contemporary simple societies. But the historical sociologist examines them in the records of societies and cultures prior to his own.

The historical approach has taken two main forms. (i) The first one is highly influenced by the biological theory of evolution, and (ii) the second one by the economic interpretation.

- (i) In the first approach concentration is made on the issues such as the origins, development and transformation of societies and social institutions. This is actually concerned with the entire span of human history. Comte, Spencer and Hobhouse used this approach to study the development of the whole society. But E. Westermarck and F. Oppenheimer followed this method to study the development of institutions such as marriage and state in their

famous studies of “History of Human Marriage” and “The State” respectively.

- (ii) The second approach was characteristic of the works of Max Weber and his followers. Weber strongly criticized Marx’s materialist conception of history and his “formula for the causal explanation of historical reality”. He advocated the idea of economic ‘interpretation’ of history. Weber applied this approach in his studies of the origins of Capitalism, the development of modern bureaucracy, and the economic influence of the world religions. In these studies particular historical changes of social structures are investigated and interpreted. Very recently C. Wright Mills and Raymond Aron also came under the influence of Weber’s methodology in their studies.

THE STATISTICAL METHOD

The term ‘social statistics’ or ‘statistical method’ refers to the method that is used to measure social phenomena mathematically. It may be regarded as “the method of collecting, analyzing and interpreting numerical information about social aggregates”. As Bogardus has pointed out “Social statistics is mathematics applied to human facts”.

The statistical method is of great help in some cases in order to disclose the relationship between different aspects of social phenomena. It also helps to arrive at generalizations regarding their nature, occurrence, and meaning. It is an important tool in research in the sense it can be effectively used in issues or problems which involve measurement or numerals. For example, this method can be very effectively used in studies relating to rates of birth and death, divorce and marriage, crime and suicide. Useful information can be obtained by the application of this method in studies pertaining to migration, economic conditions, standard of living, human ecology, public opinion, and so on.

The statistical method reveals certain distinctive features when applied to the study of social phenomena. Firstly, collection of numerical information about social issues or problems cannot always be done by direct observation. It has to be done through questionnaires and surveys which have their own limitations. Secondly, a social statistician is concerned with the problems of interviews also. In interviews some respondents may refuse to provide the information which they have been asked for. If such respondents are selected out of sampling, the problem of refusal becomes a significant deficiency in the whole process. Thirdly, social statisticians are often interested in the analysis of data, which can be ordered but not measured.

Case Study Method

The ‘Case study’ is a practice derived from legal studies. In legal studies a ‘case’ refers to an event or set of events involving legal acts. In sociology case study method is a holistic treatment of a subject. This method provides for the qualitative analysis of the issues. This is an in-depth study of an individual or a situation or an organization or an institution or a family or a group or a small community. The idea behind this method is that any case being studied is representative of many similar cases (if not all) and, hence, will make generalizations possible. This method involves the minute study of all the information and data collected regarding the object or case under study. Hence Burgess called this method “social microscope”.

The case study may make use of various techniques such as interviews, questionnaires, schedule, life histories, relevant documents of all kinds and also ‘participant observation’ for collecting information about the case under study. This method is essential in obtaining an insight into the problems of the alcoholic, drug addict, the criminal, the juvenile delinquent, the social deviant, or the immigrant. Thomas and Znaniecki’s *Polish Peasant in Europe and America* – (1922) is a classic work in the field of case study.

This method is often criticized by the social statisticians. According to them, this method cannot provide methodologically precise results of a general nature. Still, it could be used as a valuable preliminary approach in order to discover the significant variables that speak of human behavior. These variables may lead to the formulation of hypotheses which could be tested by making references to a large number of instances.

THE FUNCTIONAL METHOD (FUNCTIONALISM)

The functional method or functionalism has been given greater emphasis during recent times in sociological studies. This method, in social anthropology, appeared in the beginning almost as a reaction against the method of the evolutionists. In comparison with other methods such as scientific method, comparative method, etc., functionalism can be more understood as a method of analysis and interpretation than as a method of investigation.

Functionalism refers “to the study of social phenomena from the point of view of the functions that particular institutions or social structures, such as class, serve in a society.” This method is based on the assumption that the total social system of the society is made up of parts which are interrelated and interdependent. Each part performs a function necessary to the life of the group. These parts could be understood only in relations to the functions that they perform or the needs they meet with. Since this method presupposes the interdependence of parts, we can understand and study any one part of the social system only in its relationships with other parts as well as with the whole system. For example, the institution of religion in society has to be understood by means of its relationship with other institutions such as morality, family, state, law, etc., and in its relationship with the entire social system. As this method presupposes, religion has its own function to perform or need to fulfil, (and it may be the expression and reinforcement of social solidarity as Durkheim spoke of).

The 19th Century sociologists such as Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer had actually laid the foundations for this functional approach. But it was Durkheim who first gave a rigorous concept of social function in his “The Division of Labour in Society” and in “The Rules of sociological method.” Functionalism became quite popular at the hands of Radcliffe Brown and Malinowski. The extreme form of functionalism was propagated by B. Malinowski whose influence pervaded amongst a good number of social anthropologists. He spoke in terms of the functional integration of every society and its institutions. He dogmatically asserted that “every social activity had a function by virtue of its existence, and every activity was so completely integrated with all the others”.

During the recent years the concept of functionalism has been used by American sociologists such as R.K. Merton and Talcott Parsons. Because of their greater emphasis on social structures, or institutions, functionalism at their hands came to be known as ‘structural functional method.’ R.K. Merton has made functionalist approach less dogmatic and less exclusive. He has presented it as one possible approach to the study of social behaviour. He has made a distinction between “function and dysfunction”, and also between “latent and manifest functions”. These new qualities indicate that any social institutions may have several functions any one of which may be of greater importance in a particular society.

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

Sciences in general and natural science in particular follow the scientific method. The scientific method consists of certain steps or procedures which are to be followed precisely. A glance of these steps or procedures is given below.

(1) Formulation of the Problem: A ‘problem’ is a gap in knowledge, something not understood. It may be simple or complex. But this problem is to be defined properly. Otherwise, we may miss the

direction and efforts may be wasted. A casual observation and an idea regarding the existing amount of knowledge on that particular issue may help once to define the problem properly.

(2) Formulation of Hypotheses: When the problem to be tackled is known we must have some idea to the new aspects as hypothesis. It is a tentative explanation of a phenomenon. It is a provisional supposition which is not yet proved but is anticipated to be correct.

(3) Observation and Collection of Data: The formulated hypothesis will have to be tested. This requires observation and collection of facts. In social investigations we collect data by interview, schedules, questionnaires, field observations, etc. The methods of collecting data depend upon the nature of the research and the resources at our disposal.

(4) Analysis and Synthesis: After the data have been collected, processed, and analyzed, we have to draw broad inferences or conclusions or generalizations.

(5) Generalization: After the data have been collected, processed, and analyzed, we have to draw broad inferences or conclusions or generalizations.

(6) Formulation of Theory and Law: When a scientist has succeeded in describing and explaining the relation between various facts, he has formulated a theory. When these facts have been tested and accepted by the scientist as invariably true the theory may be properly regarded as a law.

Hypotheses-Theory- and Law. At this point it is necessary to distinguish between hypothesis, theory and law. A hypothesis is generally formulated before the facts are observed properly. It deals with comparatively narrower range of facts. A theory is a tested hypothesis and deals with wide range of facts. Theory is sometimes

regarded as an elaborate hypothesis. When a theory is well established and found to be correct invariably, it is regarded as a law.

We should note that we encounter some difficulties in applying scientific method to the study of social phenomena. Scientific method has a few limitations in sociology. Still, with some modifications the scientific method is being followed even in social investigations.

LIMITATIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN SOCIOLOGY

Science is defined as a systematic body of knowledge. Here the word 'system' refers to the method that is followed. This method is the scientific method. It is commonly followed in the case of physical sciences. A sociologist encounters some difficulties in applying this method in social researches. Scientific method has few limitations in sociology. This is due to the very nature of its subject-matter.

The Limitations

- (1) Difficulty in the Use of Experimental Method:** The laboratory of a sociologist is the world of everyday living. The sociologist does not have much control over the subjects of his investigation, that is, people. Here the people are not only conscious of, but also have their own motives, incentives, emotions, feelings, ideas values etc., which may affect the investigation very much. Social phenomena cannot be reproduced artificially at our will.
- (2) Interdependence of Cause and Effect:** In social investigations it is often difficult to determine which the cause is and which the effect is. Whether poverty is due to beggary, or beggary is due to poverty, we cannot be sure. Causation is reciprocal here. Further, one effect may have several causes. There is plurality of causation also.

(3) Intangibility of Social Phenomena: The social phenomena are not external tangible things that can be identified directly by our senses. We cannot see or touch relations. We cannot see or touch relations. We cannot isolate our units in a laboratory. Customs cannot be handled and institutions cannot be measured, religion cannot be preserved in a museum and values cannot be demonstrated.

(4) Complexity of Social Data: The social research is about man and his social behaviour and activities. Human behaviour is influenced by many factors: physical, social, psychological, etc., and the observer is simply confused with the complexity of data. No two persons are exactly alike. Hence generalizations are difficult to make.

(5) Unpredictability: Social behaviour is irregular and unpredictable. Society is dynamic. It is an ongoing process. Therefore, we cannot formulate laws that hold good for all societies and for all times and circumstances. Predictions are hence difficult to make.

(6) Problem of Objectivity. In social sciences the observer is a part of his data. He may have his own ideas, opinion, prejudices which are difficult to control. Hence objectivity is difficult to maintain. Hence, sociology, in addition to the scientific method makes use of other methods such as the comparative method, the statistical method, the social survey method, the case study method, questionnaire and interview methods and the functional method in order to obtain more reliable knowledge about phenomena.

Sociology as a Science

There is a controversy about the nature of sociology as a science. 'Is sociology a science?'- is an issue which is highly debated and discussed. Sociologists assert that sociology is very much a science like other social sciences such as Political Science, Economics and Psychology.

W.F. Ogburn, an American sociologist, is of the opinion that sociology is a science. According to him, a science is to be judged by three criteria:

(i) the reliability of its body of knowledge.

(ii) its organization, and

(iii) Its method.

The question whether sociology is a science or not, can be better answered if this question is thought over in the light of these criteria.

- (i) **The Reliability of Knowledge:** Science depends upon reliable knowledge. In this regard sociology has made a promising beginning. Sociological studies of population, the family, group behaviour, the evolution of institutions, the process of social change and such other topics are regarded as considerably reliable.

Science assumes that all phenomena show uniformities and regularities. It seeks to establish generalizations that are universal. But sociological generalizations are restricted to time and space unlike the generalizations of Physics or Chemistry. Social data change too much and too fast. Sociology mainly deals with the human material and this human material is irregular and illusive. Social relations are not fixed but flexible. It is difficult to control the variable, and there are many variables in social data.

In spite of the difficulties, sociologists have tried to establish generalizations, which have had great success. For instance, it is a sociological generalization that societies always regulate marriages in such a way as to prevent incest. Much of the sociological knowledge is becoming reliable.

A very good test of the reliability of knowledge is the test of prediction and control. Predictions are difficult to be made in sociology, if not impossible, so also the control.

Further, many publications are made under the title of sociology and some of them consist of only ideas, not knowledge. These are essays, ethical discussions, wise pronouncements, interpretations, theories, programmes, valuations etc. Their practical importance may be even greater than that of science.

- (i) **The Organization of knowledge:** Disjointed collection of facts cannot be a science. The science should be organized. The organization of a science rests upon the relationship, which the parts of knowledge bear to each other. The value of organization lies in a symmetry, but in its value for the discovery of more knowledge.

As regards the organization of knowledge, sociology is not disappointing. In sociology there are many inter-relationships. Which are enough to encourage more discoveries though inadequate to provide a proper synthesis for the whole field. A large collection of knowledge, it is expected, will eventually provide such a synthesis.

- (ii) **Method:** A branch of knowledge can be called science if it follows the scientific method in its studies and investigations. Scientific method starts with a hypothesis. This hypothesis is verified through experimentation. But an experimentation of laboratory situation is difficult in sociology.

The Laboratory experiment, which has been a great aid to many natural scientists, is not very common in sociology, because there are some limitations in the experimental method as related to human conduct. One limitation is that people who become aware of the fact that they are being studied, may render the experimental situation impossible. Further, the experimenter himself may have his own bias or prejudices against his subjects of experimentation.

Experimental method requires a fixed static situation. But it is difficult in sociology. Social life is actually dynamic and not static. Strictly speaking, laboratory experiment is not possible in sociology. However, in

sociology we can measure the relationships of two variables by employing statistical method.

Sociology has quite a number of other methods besides the experimental method. The historical method, case study method, social survey method, functional method, the statistical method, etc, can be cited here as examples. These methods are often found to be fruitful in sociological studies. Sociology has shown itself a growing science. Of course, sociology as a science is not as accurate as Physics or Chemistry. It is true that social phenomena are hard to measure. Still there is a relative orderliness and approximate predictability in certain classes of social phenomena. With those who charge that experimentation is impossible in sociology and experimentation is the only criterion of science, we may argue that many of the facts and generalizations even in physical science are not based on experimental at all. But their facts mostly gathered through observations and not through experiments.

To conclude, we may say that “science”, after all, is a method to discover the truth. Experimental method is not the only method of realizing the truth. There are many methods and techniques in sociology and if these are properly applied, sociology will have definitely the characteristics of a genuine science. Right application of different methods in the spirit of objectivity will certainly yield fruitful results.

Chapter 4

SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES

Social Sciences deal with the social universe or phenomena in general. They deal with forms and contents of man's interaction. They study human groups, society and social environment. The social phenomena which they study are as natural as the phenomena of magnetism, gravitation and electricity etc.

Different social sciences deal with the different aspects of the social life of man. Accordingly, History, Anthropology, Social Psychology, Economics, Political Science, etc. study the various facets of the same reality, i.e. the social milieu. Naturally, these social sciences are then very much interrelated. Sociology, as social science, has joined the family of social sciences very recently. It was born at a time when there was no other social science to study the human society in its entirety with all its complexity.

It is essential for a student of sociology to know in what respect his subject differs from the other social sciences and in what ways it is related to them. However, this is not an easy task. It is more difficult to distinguish sociology from the various social sciences, because the same content or area of investigation is sometimes studied by different social sciences with different degrees of emphasis.

Further, some of the relationships between sociology and other social sciences have been matters of controversy. For example, there are some thinkers, like Comte, Spencer, Hobhouse, who would say that sociology is the basic or the sole social science and all the others are its subdivisions. There are others like Giddings who would argue that sociology is not the 'sole' science, not the mother of other social sciences, but only their common sister. Some others regard sociology as a specialized science of social phenomena; as specialized in its interests as are economics and political science. Again, some sociologists profess to

see the closest relations between sociology and psychology on the one hand, and sociology and anthropology on the other. Still some others say that sociology and history are more interrelated than others.

In the field of social sciences interdisciplinary approach is gaining more currency today. Understanding of one social science requires some amount of understanding of the other. Further, sociology as a young science, has borrowed many things from other sciences. In return, it has enriched other sciences by its highly useful sociological knowledge. In this context, it becomes essential for us to know the interrelation between sociology and history, economics, political science, anthropology, social psychology and Philosophy etc.

SOCIOLOGY AND HISTORY

Sociology and History are very much interrelated. Like political science, sociology is becoming one of the most genuine fruits of history to which it is intimately connected.

History is the reconstruction of man's past. It is the story of the experience of mankind. It is a record of the human past. It is a systematic record of man's life and achievements from the dim past to the present. The historian studies the significant events of man in the order of time. The historian is interested in what happened at a particular time in the past.

Further, a historian is not satisfied, however, with mere description. He seeks 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. "He wants to know everything there is to know about them and to describe them in all their unique individuality". The historian concentrates only on the past. He is not interested in the present and is unwilling to look to the future. Still history provides the connecting link for the present and the future. It is said that history is the microscope of the past, the horoscope of the present and the telescope of the future.

Sociology as a science of society, on the other hand is interested in the present. It tries to analyse human interactions and interrelations with all their complexity and diversity. It also studies the historical development of societies. It studies various stages of human life, modes of living, customs, manners and their expression in the form of social institutions and associations. Sociology has thus to depend upon history for its material. History with its record of various social events of the past offers data and facts to sociologists.

History is a storehouse of records, a treasury of knowledge. It supplies materials to various social sciences including sociology. History contains records even with regard to social matters. It contains information about the different stages of human life, modes of living, customs and manners, social institutions, etc. This information about the past is of great help to a sociologist. A sociologist has to make use of the historical records. For example, if he wants to study marriage and family as social institutions, he must study their historical developments also. Similarly, if he wants to know the impact of Islamic culture on the Hindu culture, he has to refer to the Muslim conquests of India, for which he has to depend on history.

A sociologist is, no doubt, concerned with the present-day society. but the present-day society can be better understood from the knowledge of its past because what people are today is because of what they had been in the past. Further, sociologists often make use of comparative method in their studies for which they depend on history for data. Historical sociology, one of the fields of sociological inquiry, depends very much on historical data. It is true that the sociologist must sometimes be his own historian, amassing information from all the available sources.

Historian also uses sociology. Until recently it was perhaps from philosophy that the historian took his clues to important problems and historical concepts and ideas. But now these are drawn increasingly from sociology. Indeed, we can see that modern historiography and modern

sociology have both been influenced in similar ways by the philosophy of history.

Further sociology provides the social background for the study of history. History is now being studied and read from the sociological point of view. It is said that history would be meaningless without the appreciation of socially significant events. Further, it is often remarked that history would be boring, monotonous, and uninteresting unless the social events are narrated. Historical facts without reference to socially important matters would be like a body with flesh, blood and bone, but without life.

SOCIOLOGY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Political Science and Sociology are very closely related. This intimate relationship between the two social sciences may be examined here.

Political Science deals with the political activities of man. It studies social groups organized under the sovereignty of the state. It studies man as a ruler and being ruled. Laski, Gettell and Gilchrist, the eminent Political scientists, are of the opinion that the scope of political science embraces the study of both State and Government.

Political Science has its own topics such as the origin, evolution and functions of state, the forms of government, types of constitutions, administration, law, legislation, international relations, methods of political representation, elections, voting, political movements. Political ideologies, etc.

Morris Ginsberg writes: “Historically, sociology has its main roots in politics and philosophy of history”. The main works on social subjects such as Plato’s Republic, the Politics of Aristotle, Arthashastra of Kautilya, The Laws and Republic of Cicero and other classical works were treated to be complete works on political science. Only recently distinction between the two has been clearly made.

Political Science and Sociology are so intimately connected as Garner said that the “Political is embedded in the social that if political science

remains distinct from sociology, it will be because of the breadth of the field calls for the specialist, not because there are any well-defined boundaries marking it off from sociology”. Both the sciences are mutually helpful. In fact, political activity is only a part of social activity. Thus political science appears to be a branch of sociology. However, we cannot say that political science is just political sociology.

Political activity influences and is influenced by the social life of man. In fact, political activities will have no meaning outside the social context. Politics is after all the reflection of society. This is made clear by the common saying, that ‘people have the government which they deserve’. Political science gives sociology facts about the organization and functions of the state and government. Political science derives from sociology a knowledge of the origin of the political authority.

Political science is concerned with the state. But sociology also studies state as one of the human associations. The state, in its early form, was more a social institution than a political one.

Moreover, a political scientist must also be a sociologist. The laws of the state have a great influence upon society. These laws are largely based on customs, traditions, conventions and usages. But these customs, traditions, etc., are the concern of sociology. But the laws of marriage, made to regulate the family, fall within the field of political science.

There are some common topics of interest for both sociologists and political scientists. Such topics as war, mass movements, revolutions, government control, public opinion, propaganda, leadership, elections, voting, political minorities, social legislations like civil code and the like may be cited here as examples.

Further, many of the social problems are also political problems. Communal riots, racial tensions, border disputes between different states, caste conflicts, etc., are problems that have political as well as social implications. It has become quite common to use political instruments to

solve such social problems like beggary, unemployment, prostitution, poverty, crime, etc.

SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

The relation between Sociology and Anthropology is widely recognized today. In fact, anthropologist, Kroeber pointed out that the two sciences are twin sisters.

Anthropology is a general science like sociology. The word Anthropology is derived from two Greek words-Anthropos meaning 'man' and logos meaning 'study'. Thus, the etymological meaning of 'Anthropology' is the study of man. More precisely, it is defined by Kroeber as 'the science of man and his works and behaviour' Anthropology is "Concerned not with particular man but with man in groups, with races and peoples and their happenings and doings".

Though the youngest of the traditional social sciences it has developed and gone ahead of many of them. It has made outstanding contributions to the study of man. Sociology, in particular, has been immensely enriched by the anthropological studies.

Anthropology seems to be the broadest of all the social sciences. It studies man both as a member of the animal kingdom and as a member of the human society. It studies the biological as well as the cultural developments of man. Anthropology has a wide field of study. Kroeber mentions two broad divisions of anthropology: (i) Physical Anthropology and (ii) the Socio-cultural Anthropology.

- (i) Physical Anthropology studies man as a biological being, that is, as a member of the animal kingdom. Here, anthropology accepts and uses the general principles of biology; the laws of heredity and the doctrines of cell developments and evolution. Also, it makes use of all the findings of anatomy, physiology, zoology, palaeontology and the like. Its business has been to ascertain how far these principles apply to man, what forms they take in his particular case.

Physical Anthropology is concerned with the evolution of man, his bodily characteristics, racial features, and the influence of environment and heredity on the physical characteristics of man. It has two main branches: (i) Human palaeontology which concentrates on the study of fossils, and (ii) Somatology which deals with the human body in particular.

- (ii) Sociocultural Anthropology : Sociocultural Anthropology, more often referred to as 'Cultural Anthropology', studies man as a social animal. This branch of anthropology which is concerned with the more than merely-organic aspects of human behaviour seems to be more interested in ancient and savage and exotic and extinct people. The main reason for this is a desire to understand better all civilizations, irrespective of time and place, in the abstract, or as generalized principles as possible.

Sociocultural Anthropology's main concern is culture. It deals with the origin and development of man's culture. It also studies various social institutions of primitive communities of the past as well as that of the present. It has three sub-divisions:

- (i) Ethnology-the science of people and their cultures and life histories as groups, irrespective of their degree of advancement.
- (ii) Archaeology-the science of what is old in the career of humanity, especially as revealed by the excavations of prehistorical importance, and
- (iii) Linguistics-the study of language in its widest sense, in every aspect and in all its varieties, but with its main accent on the languages of the primitive peoples.

According to Hoebel, "Sociology and Social Anthropology are, in their broadest sense one and the same". Evans Pritchard considers social anthropology a branch of sociology. Sociology is greatly benefited by anthropological studies. Sociologists have to depend

upon anthropologists to understand the present-day social phenomena from our knowledge of the past which is often provided by anthropology. The studies made by famous anthropologists like Radcliffe Brown, B Malinowski, Ralph Linton, Lowie, Raymond Firth, Margaret Mead Evans Pritchard and others, have been proved to be valuable in sociology.

Sociological topics such as the origin of family, marriage, private property, the genesis of religion, etc., can better be understood in the light of anthropological knowledge. The anthropological studies have shown that there is no correlation between anatomical characteristics and mental superiority. The notion of racial superiority has been disproved by anthropology.

Further, sociology has borrowed many concepts like cultural area, culture traits, interdependent traits, cultural traits, cultural lag, culture patterns, culture configuration etc., from socio-cultural anthropology. The knowledge of anthropology, physical as well as socio-cultural, is necessary for a sociologist. An understanding of society can be gained by comparing various cultures, particularly, the modern with the primitive.

Anthropology as a discipline is so closely related to sociology that the two are frequently indistinguishable. Both of them are fast growing. The socio-cultural anthropologists, today are also making a study of the present people and their societies. In a number of universities anthropology and sociology are administratively organized into one department.

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Sociology and Psychology are contributory sciences. Psychology has been defined as the study of human behaviour. In the words “Psychology is the positive science of human experience and behaviour”.

The problem of relation between sociology and psychology is still disputed. According to Durkheim, sociology should study social facts and not psychological facts. Social facts, according to him, are something external to the individual and exercise an external constraint on the individual. On the other hand, writers like Ginsberg hold the opinion that many sociological explanations could be made firmly established by being related to general psychological laws or explanations. As such, psychological phenomenon is the result of social interaction.

Psychology, as the science of behaviour, occupies itself principally and primarily with the individual. It is interested in his intelligence and his learning, his hopes and his fears and the order and the disorder of his mind. Social psychology serves as a bridge between psychology and sociology. social psychology is the science of the behaviour of the individual in society. Social psychology deals with the mental processes of man, considering him as a social being. It attempts to determine the character of his social behaviour. It involves various aspects of social behaviour: social interaction, interaction between an individual and a group, and interaction between one group of individuals and another group of individuals. It studies the individual in his relation to his fellow-men. It also studies how an individual's personality is a function both of his basic physiological and temperamental equipment and of the social and cultural influences to which he is exposed.

The relationship between social psychology and sociology is so close that Karl Pearson asserts that the two are not separate sciences. McDougall and Freud expressed the view that the whole of the social life could be reduced finally to psychology forces. In that case, sociology would be reduced to a mere branch of psychology. This view is not an acceptable one. Social behaviour of man is affected by political, economic, biological and geographic factors also. Social life of man should not be studied exclusively with the methods of psychology. The mutual dependence of social psychology and sociology should not be interpreted to mean that one is either identical with or is the branch of the other.

Social psychology has to depend on sociology to understand properly human nature and behaviour as it is sociology which provides the necessary material regarding the structure, organization and culture of societies to which individuals belong. Similarly, the sociologists have taken the assistance from social psychology. They have recognized the importance of psychological factors in understanding the changes in social structure.

Sociologists and social psychologists may have to study together certain common topics such as-individual disorganization, crime, Juvenile delinquency, social disorganization, public opinion, propaganda, leadership, war, conflicts, socialism, suggestion, imitation, fashion and so on.

Social psychology helps us a great deal in facing several social problems. Problems such as racial conflict, religious prejudices, communal tensions, crimes, juvenile delinquency, prostitution, gambling and alcoholism are not totally isolated cases in the society. As they are inseparable from normal social processes and normal social behaviour, the knowledge of social psychology should be brought to bear on the solution of these problems. Deviant patterns such as stealing, suicide, divorce and prostitution

are also normal consequences of our institutions. As social behaviour and misbehavior are very closely interrelated, applied social psychologist must be an expert in the details of the practical problems.

SOCIOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

Sociology and economics as social sciences have close relations.

Economics deals with the economic activities of man. Dr. Alfred Marshall defines economics as “On the one side the study of wealth and on the other and more important side a part of the study of man”. Prof. Lionel Robbins defines economics as “the sciences of human behaviour in its relations with ends and scarce means which have alternative uses”. It can also be understood as the science of wealth in its three stages namely: production, distribution and consumption.

Economics studies man as a wealth-getter and a wealth disposer. Wealth constitutes the central problem of economics. It studies the interrelations of purely economic factors and forces: the relations of price and supply, money flows, input-output ratios and the like. It studies the structure and function of economic organizations like banks, factories, markets, business firms, corporations, transport, etc. Recently economists have shown more interest in motivation behind man's economic action.

Economics and sociology are helpful to each other. Economic relationships bear a close relation to social activities. At the same time social relationships are also affected by economic activities. Because of this close relation Thomas regarded economics as the branch of Sociology. But this is an extreme view. Economics, it may be specified here, is an independent science.

Some economists, like Sombart, Max Weber, Pareto, Oppenheimer, Schumpeter have explained economic change as an aspect of social change. According to them, the study of economics would be incomplete without an understanding of human society. Economic system is embedded in the social structure as a part of it. The society, its structures, its organization, its institutions, its strength and weaknesses etc., are bound to affect the economic activities of its people. That is why a celebrated modern economist has said that “Economics must be made the handmaid of Sociology”.

Max Weber, a German sociologist, made classical attempt to show how social factors, and particularly, religious beliefs and practical ethics influence the economic activities of people. He made this clear in his celebrated book. “The protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism”. His contention is that the progressive protestant ethic provided the stimulus to the rapid growth of capitalism in the west, whereas Hinduism and Buddhism, with their so called fatalistic approach, failed to stimulate the growth of capitalism in the East.

At the other end, there are environmentalists like Karl Marx and Veblen according to whom social phenomena are determined by economic forces. According to them social reality or social change can be explained in terms of economic forces. According to Marx, the infrastructure of a society is nothing but the economic relations among its people. However, there is a growing awareness among social scientists about the mutual interplay between the economic and non-economic forces of society.

Sociologists have contributed to the study of different aspects of economic organization. Knowledge of property system, division of labour, occupations, industrial organization, etc., is provided by a sociologist to an economist. Such matters as labour relations, standard of living, employer-employee relations, social classes,

socio-economic planning, socio-economic reforms, etc., are common to both economists and sociologists.

The area of co-operation between sociology and economics is widening. Economists are now analyzing the social factors influencing economic growth. Economists are working with the sociologists in their study of the problems of economic development in underdeveloped countries. Economists are more and more making use of the sociological concepts and generalizations in the study of economic problems.

Further, there are certain socio-economic problems of greater importance to be studied by both economists and sociologists. Such problems like poverty, beggary, unemployment, over-population, unregulated industrialization have both social and economic implications. Combined studies of both the experts in this regard may be of great practical help in meeting the challenges.

SOCIOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

Historically, Sociology has its closest relationship with philosophy. Sociology was once called one of the branches of philosophy, i.e., at a time when philosophy was regarded as the mother of all the sciences. In the 19th century, psychology, or the science of human behaviour; and sociology, or the science of human society, emerged out of philosophy as independent sciences. What had once been called the mental philosophy, or the philosophy of mind, became the science of sociology; and what had once been social philosophy, or the philosophy of history, became the science of sociology.

The word 'Philosophy' is derived from Greek language and it literally means 'love of wisdom'. Philosophy is concerned with the task of acquiring knowledge regarding the causes and laws of all things. Sociology can be said to have originated with some philosophical ambitions-to provide an account of the course of

human history, to explain the social crisis of the (European) 19th century, to seek out the avenues for social welfare and social reform. Three Connections between the two Sciences

1. **Philosophy of Sociology:** Any science has a philosophy of its own in the sense it is committed to acquire knowledge relevant to its field in its own legitimate ways. Sociology is ever vigilant in its examination of the methods, concepts and arguments. This philosophical scrutiny is more urgently felt in sociology than in the natural sciences because of the very nature of sociology.
2. **Sociology entertains Philosophical Thoughts:** More than any other social science, sociology raises to a greater extent philosophical problems in its studies. Hence a sociologist at studies is bound to consider the philosophical issues which are always in the background of sociological problems. For example, Marxism could invite and stimulate a lot of social research for it represents not only a sociological theory but also a “Philosophical world view” and a “revolutionary doctrine”. “Both Durkheim and Manheim seemed to claim that sociology can make a direct contribution to philosophy, in the sense of settling philosophical questions. Sociological reflection is bound to prolong itself by a natural progress in the form of philosophical reflection. In his own study of religion Durkheim transgressed the field of sociological thought and stepped into epistemological discussion.
3. **Intimate relationship between Sociology and Social Philosophy:** Social Philosophy seems to be the meeting point of sociology and philosophy. Its role in the social sciences is “the study of the fundamental principles and concepts of social life in their epistemological and axiological aspects...”. The epistemological aspects is concerned with the question of knowledge; and the axiological aspect deals with the questions

of value. The former deals with the fundamental principles and concepts of social life such as man, society, justice, happiness, etc. It also delves deep into the validity of the assumptions, principles and inferences of the social sciences. It also tries to synthesize its results with those of the other sciences that deal with man. The latter (i.e., the axiological aspect) deals with the ultimate values of social life and the means of attaining them. It thus tries to interpret and estimate the social phenomena in terms of ethical principles. The object of social philosophy is, therefore, the attainment of social good itself.

The study of society is inextricably mixed up with moral values. Because the subject-matter of sociology is human behaviour which is directed and guided by values on the one hand and impulses and interests, on the other. Thus the sociologist is bound to study values and human valuations, as facts. To do this, he must have some knowledge of values in their own context, that is, in moral and social philosophy. For example, he must know the role and influence of 'dharma' in the making of Indian institutions, and that of individualism and liberalism in the making of American institutions. Here the concepts such as "dharma", individualism and liberalism are mostly ethical in nature, but they are studied as objects of knowledge. Only a sociologist, who is capable of distinguishing between questions of fact and value questions, can make such studies more objective. As Bottomore writes, "Only by some training in social philosophy can the sociologist become competent to distinguish the different issues, and at the same time to see their relationships to each other".

In conclusion, we can say that a philosopher who is well acquainted with the social sciences and a sociologist who is sufficiently grounded in philosophy could become, more competent in their respective fields. As Vierkandt says, "Sociology is productive only when it has a philosophical

basis". In the absence of such a basis sociology can pile together facts and investigations and achieve no final meaning or end. Social sciences may deal with means, but social philosophy deals with ends without disregarding the means.

Chapter- 5

Human Society and Culture

Meaning, Nature and Characteristics:

The term 'Society' is the most fundamental one in sociology. The term 'Society' is derived from the Latin word 'socius', which means companionship or friendship. Companionship means sociability. As George Simmel pointed out, it is this element of sociability which defines the true essence of society. It indicates that man always lives in the company of other people. 'Man is a social animal', said Aristotle centuries ago. Man lives in towns, cities, tribes villages, but never alone. Man needs society for his living, working and enjoying life. Society has become an essential condition for human life to arise and to continue. Human life and society always go together.

Definition

1. "A society is a collection of individuals united by certain relations or mode of behaviour which mark them off from others who do not enter into these relations or who differ from them in behaviour".- Morris Ginsberg
2. "Society is the union itself, the organization, the sum of formal relations in which associating individuals are bound together."- Giddings.
3. "The term society refers not to group of people, but to the complex pattern of the norms of interaction, that arise among and between them."- Lapierre.
4. Society is "a web of social relationship".-Mac Iver.

Characteristics of Society:

The basic characteristics of society are as follows:

- 1) **Society consists of people:** Society is composed of people. Without the students and the teachers there can be no college and no university. Similarly, without people there can be no society, no social relationships, and no social life at all.
- 2) **Mutual interaction and Mutual Awareness:** Society is a group of people in continuous interaction with each other. It refers to the reciprocal contact between two or more persons. It is 'a process whereby men interpenetrate the minds of each other'. An individual is a member of society so long as he engages in relationship with other members of society. It means that individuals are in continuous interaction with other individuals of society. The limits of society are marked by the limits of social interactions.
Social interaction is made possible because of mutual awareness. Society is understood as a network of social relationships. But not all relations are social relations. Social relationships exist only when the members are aware of each other. Society exists only where social beings 'behave' towards one another in ways determined by their recognition of one another. Without this awareness there can be no society. A social relationship thus implies mutual awareness.
- 3) **Society Depends on Likeness:** The principle of likeness is essential for society. It exists among those who resemble one another in some degree, in body and in mind. Likeness refers to the similarities. People have similarities with regard to their need, works, aims, ideals, values, outlook towards life, and so on.
- 4) **Society Rests on Difference Too:** Society also implies difference. A society based entirely on likeness and uniformities is bound to be loose

in societies. If men are exactly alike, their social relationships would be very much limited. There would be little give-and-take, little reciprocity. They would contribute very little to one another. More than that, life becomes boring monotonous and uninteresting, if differences are not there.

Hence, we find difference in society. Family for example, rests on the biological difference between the sexes. People differ from one another in their looks, personality, ability, talent, attitude, interest, taste, intelligence, faith and so on. People pursue different activities because of these differences. Thus we find farmers, labourers, teachers, soldiers, businessmen, bankers, engineers, doctors, advocates, writers, artists, scientists, musicians, actors, politicians, bureaucrats and others working in different capacities, in different fields in society. However, difference alone cannot create society it is subordinate to likeness.

- 5) **Co-operation and Division of Labour:** Primarily likeness and secondarily difference create the division of labour. Division of labour involves the assignment to each unit or group a specific share of a common task. For example, the common task of producing cotton clothes is shared by a number of people like the farmers who grow cotton, the spinners, and weavers, the dyers, and the merchants. Similarly, at home work is divided and shared by the father, mother and children. Division of labour leads to specialization. Division of labour and specialization are the hallmarks of modern complex society. Division of labour is possible because of co-operation. Society is based on co-operation. It is the very basis of our social life. As C.H. Cooley says, 'co-operation arises when men realize that they have common interests'. It refers to the mutual working together for the attainment of a common goal. Men satisfy many of their desires and fulfil interests through joint efforts. People may have direct or indirect co-operation among them. Thus co-operation and division of labour have made possible social solidarity or social cohesion.

- 6) **Society Implies Interdependence Also:** Social relationships are characterized by interdependence. Family, the most basic social group, for example, is based upon the interdependence of man and women. One depends upon the other for the satisfaction of one's needs. As society advances, the area of interdependence also grows. Today, not only individuals are interdependent upon one another, but even, communities, social groups, societies and nations are also interdependent.
- 7) **Society is Dynamic:** Society is not static; it is dynamic. Change is ever present in society. Changeability is an inherent quality of human society. No society can ever remain constant for any length of time. Society is like water in a stream or river that forever flows. It is always in flux. Old men die and new ones are born. New associations and institutions and groups may come into being and old ones may die a natural death. The existing ones may undergo changes to suit the demands of time or they may give birth to the new ones. Changes may take place slowly and gradually or suddenly and abruptly.
- 8) **Social Control:** Society has its own ways and means of controlling the behaviour of its members. Co-operation, no doubt exists in society. But, side by side, competitions, conflicts, tensions, revolts, rebellions and suppressions are also there. They appear and re-appear off and on. Clash of economic or political or religious interests is not uncommon. Left to themselves, they may damage the very fabric of society. They are to be controlled. The behaviour or the activities of people are to be regulated. Society has various formal as well as informal means of social control. It means, society has customs, traditions, conventions and folkways, mores, manners, etiquettes and the informal means of social control. Also it has law, legislation, constitution, police, court, army and other formal means of social control to regulate the behaviour of its members.
- 9) **Culture:** Each society is distinct from the other. Every society is unique because it has its own way of life, called culture. Culture refers

to, as Linton says, the social heritage of man. It includes the whole range of our life. It includes our attitudes, judgements, morals, values, beliefs, ideas, ideologies and our institutions: political, legal, economic; our sciences and philosophies. Culture is the expression of human nature in our ways of living and thinking, in behaving, and acting as members of society.

- 10) There is yet another attribute on which society depends. It is the gregarious nature of man. Aristotle said that “man is a social animal”. Psychologists like McDougall, say that man is social because of the basic human instinct called the gregarious instinct. Gregariousness refers to the tendency of man to live in groups. Man always lives amidst men. He cannot live without it. This internal nature of man has forced him to establish social groups and societies and to live in them. Human life and society almost go together. Man is born in society and bred up in society, nourished and nurtured in society. From childhood to adolescence, from adolescence to youth, from youth to maturity, from maturity to old age, from old age up to death, man lives in society. He depends on society for protection and comfort, for nurture and education. Participation in society is necessary for the development of personality. Various cases show that man can become man only among men.

Society makes our life livable. It is the nurse of youth, the arena of manhood and womanhood. Society is, therefore, as MacIver puts it, more than our environment. It is within us as well as around us. Society not only liberates the activities of men, but it limits their activities also. It controls their behaviour in countless ways. It shapes our attributes, our beliefs, our morals and our ideals. Emotional development, intellectual maturity, satisfaction of physical needs and material comforts are unthinkable without society. Society is a part of our mental equipment and we are a part of society. It stimulates the growth of our personality. It liberates and controls our talents and capacities.

CULTURE

MEANING OF CULTURE

The study of human society immediately and necessarily leads us to the study of its culture. The study of society or any aspect of it becomes incomplete without a proper understanding of the culture of that society. Culture and society go together. They are inseparable.

Culture is a unique possession of man. It is one of the distinguishing traits of human society. The dictum Man is a social being can thus be redefined as 'man is a cultural being'. Every man can be regarded as a representative of his culture. Culture is the unique quality of man which separates him from the lower animals

Culture is a very broad term that includes in itself all our walks of life, our modes of behaviour, our philosophies and ethics, our morals and manners, our customs and traditions, our religious, political, economic and other types of activities. Culture includes all that man has acquired in his individual and social life. In the words of MacIver and Page, culture is "the realm of styles, of values, of emotional attachments, of intellectual adventures". It is the entire 'social heritage' which the individual receives from the group.

Definition of Culture

1. B. Malinowski has defined culture as the 'cumulative creation of man'. He also regards culture as the handiwork of man and the medium through which he achieves his end.
2. Graham Wallas, an English sociologist has defined culture as an accumulation of thoughts, values and objectives; it is the social heritage acquired by us from preceding generations through

learning, as distinguished from the biological heritage which is passed on to us automatically through the genes.

3. Edward B. Tylor, a famous English anthropologist, has defined culture as 'that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society'.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURE

The definitions cited above reveal some of the characteristics of culture. For a clear understanding of the concept of culture, it is necessary for us to know its main features.

1. **Culture is not a biological inheritance, rather it is a social inheritance:**

Culture is not inherited biologically, but learnt socially by man. It is not an inborn tendency. There is no cultural instance as such. Culture is often called 'learned ways of behaviour'.

2. **Culture is social**

Culture does not exist in isolation. Neither is it an individual phenomenon. It is a product of society. It originates and develops through social interactions. It is shared by the members of society. No man can acquire culture without association with other human beings. Man becomes man only among men. It is the culture which helps man to develop human qualities in a human environment. Deprivation of company or association of other individuals to an individual is nothing but deprivation of human qualities.

3. **Culture is Shared**

Culture in the sociological sense, is something shared. It is not something that an individual alone can possess. For

example, customs, traditions, beliefs, ideas, values, morals, etc., are all shared by people of a group or society.

4. Culture is Transmissive

Culture is capable of being transmitted from one generation to the next. Parents pass on culture traits to their children and they in turn to their children, and so on. Culture is transmitted not through genes but by means of language. Language is the main vehicle of culture. Language in its different forms like reading, writing and speaking makes it possible for the present generation to understand the achievements of earlier generations. But language itself is a part of culture. One language is acquired; it unfolds to the individual its wide field. Transmission of culture may take place by imitation as well as by instruction.

5. Culture is Continuous and Cumulative

Culture exists as a continuous process. In its historical growth it tends to become cumulative. Culture is a 'growing whole' which includes in itself, the achievements of the past and the present and makes provision for the future achievements of mankind. "Culture may thus be conceived of as a kind of stream flowing down through the centuries from one generation to another". Hence some sociologists like Linton called culture 'the social heritage' of man. As Robert Bierstadt writes, culture is 'the memory of the human race'. It becomes difficult for us to imagine what society would be like without this accumulation of culture, what our lives would be without it.

6. Culture is consistent and Integrated

Culture, in its development has revealed a tendency to be consistent. At the same time different parts of culture are interconnected. For example, the value system of a society is

closely connected with its other aspects such as morality, religion, customs, traditions, beliefs, and so on.

7. Culture is Dynamic and Adaptive

Though culture is relatively stable it is not altogether static. It is subject to slow but constant changes. Change and growth are latent in culture. We find amazing growth in the present Indian culture when we compare it with the culture of the Vedic times. Culture is hence dynamic.

Culture is responsive to the changing conditions of the physical world. It is adaptive. It also intervenes in the natural environment and helps man in his process of adjustment. Just as our houses shelter us from the storm, so also does our culture help us from natural dangers and assist us to survive. Few of us, indeed, could survive without culture.

8. Culture is Gratifying

Culture provides proper opportunities and prescribes means for the satisfaction of our needs and desires. These needs may be biological or social in nature. Our need for food, shelter, and clothing on the one hand, and our desire for status, name, fame, money, mates, etc., are all, for example, fulfilled according to the cultural ways. Culture determines and guides the varied activities of man. In fact, culture is defined as the process through which human beings satisfy their wants.

9. Culture Varies from Society to Society

Every society has a culture of its own. It differs from society to society. Culture of every society is unique to itself. Cultures are not uniform. Cultural elements such as customs, traditions, morals, ideals, values, ideologies, beliefs, practices, philosophies, institutions, etc., are not uniform

every where. Culture varies from time to time also. No culture ever remains constant or changeless.

10. Culture is Super organic and Ideational

Culture is sometimes called 'the super organic' Herbert Spencer meant that culture is neither organic nor inorganic in nature but above these two. The term implies the social meaning of physical objects and physiological acts. The social meaning may be independent of physiological and physical properties and characteristics. For example, the social meaning of a national flag is not just 'a piece of coloured cloth'. The flag represents a nation. Similarly, priests and prisoners, professors and professionals, players, engineers and doctors, farmers and soldiers, and others are not just biological beings. They are viewed in their society differently. Their social status and role can be understood only through culture.

Further, every society considers its culture as an ideal. It is regarded as an end in itself. It is intrinsically valuable. The people are also aware of their culture as an ideal one. They are proud of their culture heritage.

CULTURE CONTENTS

Every society has a culture of its own. Thus people in different societies all over the world have different cultures. These cultures are not only diverse but also unequal. Along with cultural diversities and disparities that are found in societies throughout the world, we observe certain cultural similarities. People may worship different gods in different ways, but they all have a religion. They may pursue various occupations, but they all earn a living. Details of their rituals, ceremonies, customs, etc., may differ, but they all nevertheless have some ritual, ceremonies, customs, etc. Every culture consists of such of such no-material things.

Similarly, people of every society possess material things may be primitive or modern and simple or complex in nature. These material and non-material components of culture are often referred to as “the content of Culture”.

A number of sociologists have classified the content of culture into large components ‘material culture’ and ‘non-material culture’. Ogburn has even used this distinction as the basis for a theory of culture change. As Robert Bierstedt has pointed out, the concept of ‘material culture’ is relatively more precise and less ambiguous, but the concept of non-Material culture is more ambiguous and less clear. It may be used as a ‘residual category’ that is to mean ‘Everything that is not material’.

Material and Non-Material Culture

(i) **Material Culture**

Material culture consists of man-made objects such as tools, implements, furniture, automobiles, buildings, dams, roads, bridges, and in fact, the physical substance which has been changed and used by man. It is concerned with the external, mechanical and utilitarian objects. It includes technical and material equipments like a printing press, a locomotive, a telephone, a television, a tractor, a machine gun, etc. It includes our banks, parliaments, insurance schemes, currency systems, etc. It is referred to as civilization.

(ii) **Non-Material Culture**

The term ‘culture’ when used in the ordinary sense, means ‘non-material culture’. It is something internal and intrinsically valuable, reflects the inward nature of man. Non-material culture consists of the words the people use or the language they speak, the beliefs they hold, values and virtues they cherish, habits they

follow, rituals and practices that they do and the ceremonies they observe. It also includes our customs and tastes, attitudes and outlook, in brief, our ways of acting, feeling and thinking.

FUNCTIONS OF CULTURE

Man is not only a social animal but also a cultural being. Man's social life has been made possible because of culture. Culture is something that has elevated him from the level of animal to the heights of man. Man cannot survive as man without culture. It represents the entire achievements of mankind. Culture has been fulfilling a number of functions among which the following may be noted.

1. Culture is the Treasury of Knowledge. Culture provides knowledge which is essential for the physical, social and intellectual existence of man. Birds and animals behave instinctively. With the help of instincts they try to adapt themselves with the environment. But man has greater intelligence and learning capacity. With the help of these he has been able to adapt himself with the environment or modify it to suit his convenience. Culture has made such an adaptation and modification possible and easier by providing man the necessary skills and knowledge. Culture preserves knowledge and helps its transmission from generation to generation through its element, that is, language. Language helps not only the transmission of knowledge but also its preservation, accumulation and diffusion. On the contrary, animals do not have this advantage. Because, culture does not exist at sub-human level.
2. Culture Defines Situations. Culture defines social situation for us. It not only defines but also conditions and determines-what we eat and drink, what we wear, when to laugh, weep, sleep love, to make friends with, what work we do, what God we worship, what knowledge we rely upon, what poetry we recite and so on.
3. Culture Defines Attitudes, Values and Goals. Attitudes refer to the tendency to feel and act in certain ways. Values are the measure of goodness or desirability. Goals refer to the attainments which our values define as worthy. It is the culture which conditions our attitude towards various issues

such as religion, morality, marriage, science, family planning, prostitution and so on. Our values concerning private property, fundamental rights, representative government, romantic love, etc., are influenced by our culture. Our goals of winning the race, understanding others, attaining salvation, being obedient to elders and teachers, being loyal to husband, being patriotic, etc., are all set forth by our culture. We are being socialized on these models.

4. **Culture Decides our Career.** Whether we should become a politician, a social worker, a doctor, an engineer, a soldier, a farmer, a professor, an industrialist, a religious leader, and so on is decided by our culture. What career we are likely to pursue is largely decided by our culture. Culture sets limitations on our choice to select different careers. Individuals may develop, modify or oppose the trends of their culture but they always live within its frame work. Only a few can find outlet in the culture.
5. **Culture Provides Behaviour Pattern.** Culture directs and confines the behaviour of an individual. Culture assigns goals and provides means for achieving them. It rewards his noble works and punishes the ignoble ones. It assigns him statuses and roles. We see, dream, aspire, work, strive, marry, enjoy according to the cultural expectation. Cultures not only control but also liberate human energy and activities. Man, indeed, is a prisoner of his culture.
6. **Culture Moulds Personality.** Culture exercises a great influence on the development of personality. No child can develop human qualities in the absence of a culture environment. Culture prepares man for group life and provides him the design of living. It is the culture that provides opportunities for the development of personality and sets limits on its growth. As Ruth Benedict has pointed out, every culture will produce its special type or types of personality. This fact has been stressed by her in her “Patterns of culture”- an analysis of the culture of three primitive societies. Yet another American anthropologist by name Margaret mead has stated that ‘a culture shapes the character and behaviour of individuals living in it...’. This fact she has

established in her “Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies”-a study of New Guinea tribal life.

It is true that the individual is exposed to and moulded by the culture of the group into which he is born. But the culture provides not only for ‘universals’ but also for ‘alternatives’ There is not only conformity in cultural learning but also variations. Still no individual is completely culturally determined. Every individual is unique in any culture. The uniqueness may be based on individual differences in ability, aptitude and learning. The impact of culture on the individual is not always identical in every case. Every individual is sooner or later exposed to influences which are not completely predetermined by culture. He meets other people outside the culture. Travelling, books, radio, cinema, television, theatre, newspapers expose an individual to many influences outside the culture. Various biological and social factors bring about the uniqueness of the individual in any culture.

Chapter-6

INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY

Man is a social animal. He lives in social groups, in communities and in society. Human life and society almost go together. Man cannot live as man, without society. Solitary life is unbearable to him. Man is biologically and psychologically equipped to live in groups, in society. Society has become an essential condition, for human life to arise and to continue. Society is more than our environment.

There is a vast literature on the questions such as the nature or the essence of man's social life, its origin and sources. It is essential to study the deepest relations that exist between the individual and society. It is equally significant to know the nature of man's motives or impulses towards society

It was Aristotle who said long back that man is a social animal. This proposition gives room to the central problem of sociology i.e., the sociability or the sociality of man. The essential fact is that man always belongs to a society or a group of one kind or the other, and without it, he cannot exist. Several questions of great sociological importance arise in this regard. "In what sense man is a social animal? In what sense do we belong to society? In what sense society belongs to us? What is the nature of our dependence upon it?" These questions take us to a more fundamental question of the relation between the individual and society.

The relationship between individual and society is ultimately one of the most profound of all the problems of social philosophy. It is, in fact, a philosophical rather than a sociological problem, because 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 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? When we accept the statement of Aristotle that man is a social animal, what does this proposition ultimately mean? These are

some of the difficult questions. The sociologist cannot remain silent when confronted with these larger issues of human worth and human destiny.

It is a thing of common observation of every one that the individual is living, breathing, working, playing, resting, praying, enjoying, suffering, sometimes sweating, sometimes swearing with millions like him in society. It is in the society that an individual is surrounded and encompassed by culture, a societal force. It is in the society again, that he has to conform to the norms, occupy statuses and become members of groups.

It is a self-obvious fact that man has not only a capacity for social life but also an intrinsic need of it. Emotional development, intellectual maturity and certain amount of material goods and comforts for the full exercise of his liberty and progress are unthinkable without society. No human being is known to have normally developed in isolation.

The question of the relation between the individual and the society is the starting point of many social investigations. The question of the nature of society is closely connected with the question of the relationship of man and society. There are two main theories regarding the relationships of man and society which have been propounded by several thinkers and writers. They are (i) The Social Contract Theory, and (ii) The Organismic Theory.

SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

The 'Social contract theory' throws light on the origin of the society. According to this theory, all men are born free and equal. Individual precedes society. Society came into existence because of an agreement entered into by the individuals. The classical representatives of this school of thought are Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and J.J. Rousseau. The three of them thought in various ways that before the existence of civil society men lived in a sort of pre-social state, called the state of nature, and in virtue of a contract among themselves, society came into existence. The essence of their argument is as follows:

- (a) Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679):** Thomas Hobbes, an English thinker, was of the opinion that society came into being as a means for the protection of men

against the consequences of their own nature. Man in the state of nature was in perpetual conflict with his neighbours on account of his essentially selfish nature. To quote Hobbes, the life of man was “solitary poor, nasty, brutish and short”. Every man was an enemy to every other man.

Hobbes in his book “Leviathan” has made it clear that man in the state of nature was not at all social. According to him, man found “nothing but grief in the company of his fellows”- all being almost equally “selfish, self-seeking, cunning. Egoistic, brutal and aggressive”. Thus, men in the state of nature were like hungry wolves each ready to pounce on the other with all its ferocity.

Since the conditions in the state of nature were intolerable and men longed for peace, the people entered into a kind of social contract to ensure for themselves security and certainty of life and property. By mutual agreement they decided to surrender their natural rights into the hands of a few or one with authority to command. The covenant or agreement was of each with all and of all with each. The covenant was, of course, a social contract and a governmental contract. The contract became binding on the whole community as a perpetual social bond. Thus, in order to protect himself against the evil consequences of his own nature man organized himself in society in order to live in peace with all.

b) John Locke (1632-1704): John Locke, another English political philosopher, believed that man in the state of nature was enjoying an ideal liberty, free from all sorts of rules and regulations. The state of nature was a state of “peace, goodwill, mutual assistance, and preservation”. But there was no recognized system of law and justice. Hence his peaceful life was often upset by the “corruption and viciousness of degenerate men”. Man was forced to face such an “ill condition”.

John Locke, the British writer who supported the cause of limited monarchy in England, maintained in his “On Civil Government” that the “ill condition” in which men were forced to live was “full of fears and continual dangers”. In order to escape from this and to gain certainty and security men made a

contract to enter into civil society or the state. This contract Locke called 'social contract'. This contract put an end to the state of nature and substituted it by civil society. The social contract was no more than a surrender of certain rights and powers so that man's remaining rights would be protected and preserved. The contract was for limited and specific purposes, and what was given up or surrendered to the whole community and not to a man or to an assembly of men (as Hobbes said). Locke made it clear that the social contract later on contributed to the government and selected a ruler to remove the inconveniences of "ill-condition".

(C) Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778): J.J. Rousseau, the French writer of the 18th century, in his famous book "The Social Contract" (1762) wrote that man in the state of nature was a 'noble savage' who led a life of "primitive simplicity and idyllic happiness". He was independent, contented, self-sufficient, healthy, fearless and good. It was only primitive instinct and sympathy which united him with others. He knew neither right nor wrong and was free from all notions of virtue and vice. Man enjoyed a pure, unsophisticated, innocent life of perfect freedom and equality in the state of nature, Rousseau argued. Men were free from the influence of civilization, and sought their own happiness uncontrolled by social laws and social institutions.

But these conditions did not last long. Population increased and reason was dawned. Simplicity and idyllic happiness disappeared. Families were established, institution of property emerged and human equality was ended. Man began to think in terms of 'mine' and 'think'. Difference between stronger and weaker, rich and poor, arose.

Emergence of Civil Society. When equality and happiness of the early state was lost, war, murder, conflicts, wretchedness, etc., became the order of the day. The escape from this was found in the formation of a civil society. Natural freedom gave place to civil freedom by a social contract. As a result of this contact a multitude of individuals became a collective unity-a civil society. Rousseau said that by virtue of this contract "everyone while uniting himself to all, remains as free as before".

General Will. There was only one contract according to Rousseau which was social as well as political. The individual surrendered himself completely and unconditionally to the will of the body of which he became a member. The body so created was a normal and collective body and Rousseau called it the 'general will'. The unique feature of the general will was that it represented collective good as distinguished from the private interests of its members. The will was 'inalienable and indivisible' according to him.

THE ORGANISMIC THEORY OF SOCIETY

The English social philosopher Herbert Spencer has been the chief exponent of this theory. He said that society is an organism and it does not differ in essential principle from the other biological organisms. The attributes of an organism and the society, he maintained, are similar. Both exhibit the same process of development. The animal and social bodies, Spencer affirmed, begin as germs, all similar and simple in structure. As they grow and develop, they become unlike and complex in structure. Their process of development is the same, both moving from similarity and simplicity to dissimilarity and complexity. "As the lowest type of animal is all stomach, respiratory surface, or limb, so primitive society is all warrior, all hunter, all builder, or all tool-maker. As society grows in complexity. Division of labour follows..."

In each case there is mutual dependence of parts. Just as the hand depends on the arm and the arm on the body and head, so do the parts of social organism depend on each other. Every organism depends for its life and full performance of its functions on the proper co-ordination and interrelation of the units. As the diseased condition of one organ affects the health and proper functioning of other organs, similarly, individuals who form society are inseparably connected with one another for the realization of their best self. There is so much dependence of one on the other that the distress of one paralyses the rest of the society. The society and organism, it is pointed out are subject to wear and tear and then replacement. (Just as cell tissues and blood corpuscles in the animal organism, wear out and are replaced by new ones, in the same manner, old, infirm, and diseased persons die giving place to newly born persons).

Spencer gives striking structural analogies between society and organism. He says, society, too, has three systems corresponding to the (1) sustaining system. (2) the distributary system, and (3) the regulating system in an organism.

- (1) The sustaining system in an organism consists of mouth, gullet, stomach and intestines. It is by means of this system that food is digested and the whole organic machine is sustained. Society has its own sustaining system which refers to the productive system comprising the manufacturing districts and agricultural areas. The workers, i.e., the men who farm the soil, work the mines and factories and workshops are the alimentary organs of a society.
- (2) The distributary system in an organism consists of the blood vessels, heart, arteries and veins and they carry blood to all parts of the body. Means of communication and transport and long with them the wholesalers, retailers, bankers, railway and steamshipmen and others may correspond to the distributary or vascular system of an organism. Society's Cells are individuals only. And what the arteries and veins mean to the human body, roads, railways, post and telegraph services, institutions and associations, mean to society.
- (3) Finally, the regulating system is nerve-motor mechanism which regulates the whole body. Government in society, regulates and controls the activities of the individuals. The professional men-doctors, lawyers, engineers, rulers, priests, the thinkers, in short perform the functions of the brain and the nervous system. further, as Spencer opined society also passes through the organic processes of birth, youth, maturity, old age and death. Murray sums up the points of resemblance between a society and an individual organism as noted by Spencer in the following ways:-
 - (i) Society as well as individual organism grow in size.
 - (ii) They grow from comparatively a simple structure to that of an increasingly complex one.

- (iii) Increasing differentiation leads to increasing mutual dependence of the component parts.

The life and normal functioning of each becomes dependent on the life of the whole.

- (iv) The life of the whole becomes independent and lasts longer than the life of the component parts.

Spencer hence argued that society is a social organism. Individuals are the limbs of the society and behave as cells of the body whose activity and life are meant for the sake of the whole. Limbs separated from body have no life, and similarly individuals separated from society have no life. The individuals exist in and within society.

Limitations of the Theories

Both the theories have their own limitations. No sociologists subscribes to them today. Historically, the social contract theory seems to be a mere fiction. We have no evidence to prove that society came into being due to a deliberate contract or voluntary agreement among the early people.

The organismic theory is equally imaginary. Society is like an organism, but is not an organism. Society has no specific form, no fixed organs, no central organ of perception comparable to the body of an organism. This organic analogy is well appreciated, but the theory is almost rejected.

The Inseparable Individual and the Society

The relation or the type of unity between the part and the whole, between the individual and society is not merely a physical unity, or a functional unity, or organic or systematic unity, but it is something more than these. It is sui generis peculiar; of its own kind. It is simply social, that is, without the company of his fellowmen, the individual cannot live at all, nor develop his personality. Still, the individual has a life of his own; his autonomy and character which cannot be fused or confused with the lives of other men. Social values are in the ultimate analysis personal values. Even quality or powers which belong to society as such are

realized only in its members, present or future. The life of society has no meaning except as an expression of the lives of individuals.

The truth is that society is not and cannot be an organism; it is like an organism. Society has no body; it is an organization of minds for a common purpose. “Society is the sum of interacting individuals, and this interaction is, what differentiates society from the mere aggregation of individuals”. Society is a reality of its own kind, itself unique, and different from every other natural object. Society gives us choices, inviting us to accept or decline, and in our selections we become ever more completely what we are.

Chapter-7

HEREDITY AND ENVIRONMENT

Human society is not only dynamic but also diverse. Differences are found between societies and within the same society among peoples and groups. In fact, society is based on the principle of difference. Society exhibits diversity because, people who constitute society themselves differ.

The physical traits of people such as stature, skin, colour, height, weight, texture of hair and its colour, structure of eyes, perimeter of the chest and so on do differ. Their psychological qualities such as intelligence, ability, aptitude, interest, taste, attitude, temperament, mental health, etc., also differ significantly.

Differences between personalities are obvious because each individual represents a unique combination of these physical and psychological traits or qualities

It is generally believed that the following factors contribute enormously to the formation and development of human personality. They are: biological inheritance, physical environment, culture, group experience and unique experience of the individual. These have often been reduced into only two factors namely; (i) heredity, and (ii) environment.

INFLUENCE OF ENVIRONMENT ON PERSONALITY

Environment of both the types-geographic and social or natural and man-made has a tremendous bearing on human personality. The natural environment sets limits to the personality and also provides opportunities for its development. The social environment provides enough conditions for its proper expression. The family, school, neighbourhood, friends, various persons in contact, social customs, practices, values, institutions, etc., all effect an individual's personality. The status of the child, young man, and adult, and old man in the family and in society is not the same. As a result of this difference a man's temperament, attitudes, tendencies, ways of thinking, acting inclinations, and character, in brief, his personality is affected. In the same way, the status of the person in places like school, office, occupation, etc., affects his behaviour to a great extent.

The famous psycho-analyst Sigmund Freud has expressed the opinion that the personality of a person is fashioned in the first few years, the rest of the life being an expression of the tendencies already developed. The present psychologists also agree that the influence of environment of family upon the character, nature, mental tendencies, habits, behaviour of the individual is very great. This view has been verified by comparison of children brought up in families and those bred in government institutions. In childhood, parental love affects the stability of the emotions of the child. It has been observed that excessive love and care spoil the children and lack of affection leaves their feeling undeveloped which are then unnaturally expressed. Alfred Adler, a famous psychologist, maintained that even the birth order of the child in the family affects its personality. This may be understood by remembering that in the family mother, father, husband, wife, elder and younger brother, elder and younger sister, loved child, and unwanted offsprings all have their respective statuses which affect their personality.

These differences in outlook, temperament, attitudes, tendencies, etc., found in various peoples as mentioned above, cannot be attributed to the hereditary factors. Rather they are more affected by environment, that too by the social or cultural environment. People tend to develop in them qualities in accordance with the values, goals, objectives set forth by their culture.

Individual differences arise not only between different societies, even within the society variations in personality may be found. How to account for these differences? The answer lies in differences in (i) constitutional characteristics, (ii) emotional relationships with members of the family and other groups, and (iii) socialization in distinctive sub-cultures.

Culture varies within a society and not just between societies. It is a point of the first importance to recognize that culture is not a single massive die that cuts all the members of the group of precisely the same specifications. There is in every culture what may be called a division of learning according to social classification. Both sexes and all age groups learn certain things in common but in addition each sex and age group learns different things. Age-grading and sex-typing are perhaps the most important classifications for determining social roles. Occupation, education, income and family background are additional selective factors which are highly important in determining what aspects of the culture an individual will

be exposed to. All cultures accordingly produce variety as well as uniformity of personality.

It is well to note that the same personality trait can often be produced by varying the environmental factors. A child who is not dominant naturally may be made more aggressive by increasing the domination at home or ridicule by the gang; that is, by varying interpersonal, or group, factors. Again a child who is normally not assertive may perhaps be rendered more energetic by environmental pressures, (such as the frequent prospects of famine or constant danger from attack by wild animals, as may be the case in primitive society). Finally, training or cultural experience may convert a submissive child into an assertive one.

Most of the studies have revealed that environment and heredity both play an important role in determining human personality. If mental factors are much influenced by environment physical and physiological characteristics are more affected by heredity. Environment alone cannot determine an individual's personality. But it gives opportunities to the individuals to express themselves and to develop their personality. Environment brings out the hidden potentialities into a definite form. All the inherited qualities become actualities only within and under the conditions of environment. Different aspects of an individual's personality like interests, intelligence, skill, dexterity, attitudes, beliefs, faith, inspirations, etc., are very much influenced by the environment.

INFLUENCE OF HEREDITY ON PERSONALITY

Biological inheritance provides the raw materials of personality and these raw materials can be shaped in many different ways. All normal healthy human beings have certain biological similarities. Still every person's biological inheritance is unique. It means that no other person (except an identical twin) has exactly the same inherited physical characteristics. People believed for a very long time that a person's personality was nothing more than the unfolding of that person's biological inheritance. Such personality traits as –perseverance, ambition, honesty, criminality, intelligence, sex deviation, physical energy, and most other traits were believed to arise from inherited predispositions. Such an idea, of course, is rarely believed today.

The influence of heredity in shaping human personality and determining human behaviour has been highlighted by the supporters of heredity such as Francis Galton, Karl Pearson, William MC Dougall, and others.

Francis Galton (1822-1911) in his book “Hereditary Genius” pointed out that human differences are inborn. In his opinion men who achieve greatness are naturally capable. He argues that human beings are fundamentally unequal. This inequality is due to two factors namely: heredity and environment, among which heredity is more domination. He also gives evidences to support his views. According to him, an able father produces able children. Further, royal families produce more men of intelligence than the ordinary families. He says the environment has little to do with the achievements of the people. He even tried to show that the children would be greatly gifted when the father was of higher intelligence. “Nature prevails enormously over nurture”, he maintained. He, however, concluded that “no man can achieve a very high reputation without being gifted with very high ability”.

Karl Pearson (1857) continued the works of Francis Galton. Pearson and his followers after making some studies concluded that “man varies; that these variations favourable or unfavourable are inherited”. He tried to show that heredity is more than seven times more important than environment.

Interplay Between Heredity and Environment

The above-mentioned and several other studies do not tell us whether heredity or environment is the ‘more’ important factor. But they tell us why each is important. Individual differences in biological inheritance are real regardless of whether this fact makes one happy or unhappy. For more traits, biological inheritance is more important than others. While individual differences in I.Q. are more highly determined by heredity than by environment, other trait differences are almost entirely environment. One recent study has revealed that certain qualities such as sociability, compulsiveness, and societal ease are said to be more influenced by heredity, while certain traits such as leadership impulse control, attitudes and interests are believed to be more sensitive to environmental influence.

We may conclude that biological inheritance is important for some personality traits and unimportant for other. In no case the respective influence of heredity and

environment be precisely measured. But most scientists agreed that the degree to which one's inherited potentials are fully developed is determined by one's social experience.

It is evident that those who study the influence of environment see only one side of the coin and those who study the effect of heredity see only the other side. They have failed to realize that they are inseparable. "Neither can ever be eliminated and neither can ever be isolated".

Environment is complex and changing, heredity is not completely known. Hence we must take into account the interaction of two factors rather than the absolute action of any one factor. Heredity is what the new life starts with, and environment is what makes its maintenance and development possible. Both are equally essential.

Personality is the product of both environment and heredity. Heredity provides the potentialities and environment brings them out into a definite form. All the inherited qualities become actualities only within and under the conditions of environment. No amount of environment can turn a mediocre person into a genius." Heredity determines what we can do, and environment what we do do".

Heredity is potentiality made actual within an environment. Hidden potentialities are revealed when the favourable opportunities are given. Man being the final product of evolution has greater capacity of adaptability and he can adjust himself with any environment. Hence heredity and environment are equally important. Each human trait requires both heredity and environment for its development.

We may conclude that "Nature and nurture are so obviously necessary and inseparable that the important question is not which is more important but rather how together they determine our qualities."

Chapter-8

STRUCTURE OF HUMAN SOCIETY

SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

The twin concepts of 'structure' and 'function' have assumed tremendous significance in the modern sociological literature.

These concepts of 'structure' and 'function' as applied in sociological studies draw their original inspiration from the works of Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim. Spencer compared societies to living organisms. Any organism has a 'structure'- that is, it consists of a number of interrelated parts, such as a head, limbs, a heart, and so on. Each of these parts has a 'function' to play in the functioning of the total organism. In the same way, Spencer argued, a society has a structure-it also consists of interrelated parts, such as the family, religion, the state and so on. Ideally, each of these components also has a function that contributes to the overall stability of the social system. This idea has been stressed much by the sociologists who are called "functionalists"

Definitions of social Structure

The concept of social structure has been defined in different ways by different thinkers. We may consider some of these definitions:

1. Radcliffe-Brown defines social structure as "an arrangement of persons in institutionally controlled or defined relationships.
2. Morris Ginsberg regards social structure as "the complex of principal groups and institutions which constitute societies".
3. In current sociological usage the concept of social structure is applied to small groups as well as larger associations, communities and societies. Thus, Ogburn and Nimkoff are of the opinion that "In society, the organization of a group of persons is the social structure.

What the group does is the function.” They use the terms ‘social organization’ and ‘social structure’ almost interchangeably.

4. Many sociologists have used the term ‘social structure’ to refer to “the enduring, orderly and patterned relationships between elements of a society.

The term ‘structure’ refers to “some sort of ordered arrangements of parts or components”. In the same way, society too has its own structure called ‘social structure’. The components or units of social structure are “persons”.

ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE:

According to H.M. Johnson, the main elements of social structure are as follows.

1. Sub-groups of various Types. Society can be understood as a big group which consists of people. This big group or larger system consists of various sub-groups. Various political, economic, religious, educational, familial and other groups and associations represent such sub-groups. People who enact roles are organized in these sub-groups within the larger system. Some of these subgroups persist longer than any particular members.
2. Social structure consists of roles of various types. Social structure consists of not only sub-groups but also roles. Roles are found within the larger system and also within the sub-groups. The concepts of role and sub-group imply interrelationship. Role occupants are expected to fulfil obligations to other people. For example, in family, the husband has obligations towards his wife and children; in the college teacher has obligations towards students, principal and the management and vice versa. Further, the numbers of sub-groups that are there are not only interrelated but also subject to social norms. The political, economic, educational and other groups, for example, are interrelated through social norms.

3. Regulative norms governing sub-groups and roles. Sub-groups and roles are governed by social norms. Social norms are of two types: (i) obligatory or relational, and (ii) permissive or regulative.

Some norms specify positive obligations. But they are not commonly applied to all the roles and sub-groups. Example: The positive obligations of a family are not the same as those of business firm. Similarly, the obligations of a father are not the same as those of a son. Norms of this kind are obligatory or relational in nature.

Some other norms specify the limit of permissible action. A role-occupant of a sub-group in this case, 'must' do certain things, 'may' do certain things, and 'must not' do still others. They are called "relative norms". They do not differentiate between roles and between sub-groups. For example, in our society, regardless of one's role, one must not seek to influence others by threats of violence or by violence itself.

4. Cultural values. Every society has its own cultural values. 'Values' refer to the measures of goodness or desirability. Individuals or groups are often found to be emotionally committed to values. They help to integrate a personality or a system of interaction. They provide a means by which conflicts tend to be resolved. Still some conflicts persist, because no system of action is perfectly integrated. Values are closely related to norms, In fact, they may be regarded as "higher-order norms".

According to Radcliffe-Brown, social structure "denotes the network of actually existing relations" between people. Culture is not a concrete reality, but only an abstraction. Hence what we observe concretely in society is not very much culture, but "the acts of behaviour of the individuals" who compose society. The human beings are connected by a

complex network of social relations which itself could be social structure, according to Brown.

Brown considers as a part of the social structure (i) all social relations of person to person. For example, the kinship structure of any society consists of interpersonal relations between father and son, or a mother's brother and his sister's son, etc. (ii) Brown includes under social structure the different social roles of individuals. (iii) The differentiated social positions of men and women, of chiefs and commoners, of employers and employees etc., no doubt determine the different clans or nations, or groups to which they belong. But more than that they work as the determinants of social relations.

THE CONCEPT OF FUNCTION

The term 'function' has different meanings in different contexts. Its ordinary dictionary meaning is—"doing a thing". or 'activity' or 'performance'

The concept of 'function' applied to human societies is based on an analogy between social life and organic life. The recognition of this analogy is quite old. Even during the 19th century, the analogy and the concept of and the word 'function' were used very commonly in social philosophy and sociology. But the systematic formulation of the concept of 'function' in the study of society can be said to have been made by Emile Durkheim in 1895 in his 'Rules of sociological Method'

Definitions of Function

1. Durkheim's definition of function is that "the 'function' of social institutions is the correspondence between it and the needs of the social organism".
2. R.K. Merton defines function as "those observed consequences which make for the adaptation and adjustment of a given system".

The concept of 'function' has become quite popular in modern sociology due to the contributions of Malinowski, A.R. Brown, Talcot Parsons, Robert K. Merton, and Kingsley Davis. Durkheim's views of 'function' have deeply influenced the thoughts of all these writers.

The concept of 'function' has been further elaborated by some of the sociologists which ultimately led them to establish a "functionalist theory" as such. The functionalist theory which is often referred to as 'functional approach', or "structural-functionalism", or "functionalist perspective", or "functionalism" has been associated with the work of American sociologists such as Talcott Parsons, Robert K. Merton, and Kingsley Davis.

"The functionalist theory implies that society tends to be an organized, stable, well-integrated system, in which most members agree on basic values". Sociologists with a functional approach study the way in which each part of a society contributes to the functioning of the society as a whole. They stress much the role of balance or equilibrium in society. They view society as a system of interrelated parts. They are mainly interested in the 'contributes' or 'purposes' these parts serve for ongoing social life. They focus on the 'functions' or 'consequences', that a given element has in society. to make it more specific, the functionalists say that each group or institution persists because it is functional.

SOCIAL FUNCTIONS AND DYSFUNCTIONS

The concepts of social functions and dysfunctions are essentially related to the functional theory of R.K. Merton has drawn our attention to the fact that not all elements in the social system are functional at all times. On occasion some element may actually disrupt the social equilibrium and may therefore be dysfunctional.

As H.M. Johnson has explained, “Any partial structure-a type of sub-group, or a role, or a social norm, or a cultural value-is said to have a function if it contributes to the fulfillment of one or more of the social needs of a social system;-nay partial structure is said to have a dysfunction if it hinders the fulfillment of one or more of these needs”.

As Merton has made it clear ‘function’ of any element has to be distinguished from “purpose”. A purpose is something subjective that is, something in the mind of the participant or participants in a social system. But a function or dysfunction is an objective consequence of action. When we attribute functions to sub-groups, roles, norms or any partial structure, we mean that its action has certain consequences for a social system irrespective of the motives of the actor or actors. Motives are important, no doubt, but they are not the same thing as functions or dysfunctions.

LATENT AND MANIFEST FUNCTIONS

The functional theory presupposes that every element in a social system fulfils certain functions.

The assumed purposes of some component in the social system do not necessarily tell us what its functions are. Because the component can have consequences other than those that were intended. This fact has made R.K. Merton to make a distinction between ‘manifest functions’ and ‘latent functions’.

According to Merton, “Manifest” functions are those that are intended and recognized; “latent” functions are unrecognized and unintended”.

Manifest Functions

These are “intended and recognized” functions. These are functions which people assume and expect the institutions to fulfill. Examples: (i) Schools are expected to educate the young in the knowledge and skills that they need. It is its manifest function. (ii) Economic institutions are expected to produce and distribute goods and direct the flow of capital wherever it is needed.

Latent Functions

These are “unrecognized and unintended” functions. These are the unforeseen consequences of institutions. Examples: (i) Schools not only educate youth, they also provide mass entertainment and keep the young out of employment market. (ii) Economic institutions not only produce and distribute goods, but also promote technological, political and educational changes, and even philanthropy.

Chapter 10

Basic Concepts

COMMUNITY

Definition

- 1) Community is “a social group with some degree of “we-feeling” and living in a given area”. – Bogardus
- 2) Community is “the smallest territorial group that can embrace all aspects of social life”.- Kingsley Davis
- 3) Community is “an area of social living marked by some degree of social coherence”. – R.M. MacIver
- 4) “A community is a group or collection of groups that inhabits a locality”. – Ogburn and Nimkoff

Community is, therefore, a geographic area having common centres of interests and activities. A community is essentially an area of social living. It is marked by some degree of social coherence. Thus community is a circle in which common life is living. ‘Community’ is an all-inclusive term. It includes in itself all our social relationships. It includes a variety of associations and institutions. Within the range of a community the members may carry on their economic, religious, political, educational and other activities. Hence community is the total organization of social life within limited space. Examples: village, town, tribe, city, district.

Elements of Community:

The main bases of Community are: (i) Locality, and (ii) Community Sentiment.

(i) Locality

A community is a territorial group. It always occupies some geographic area. Locality is the physical basis of community. A

group of people forms community, only when it begins to reside in a definite locality. In contrast with society, a community is more or less locally limited living together facilities people to develop social contacts, gives protection, safety and security. It helps the members to promote and fulfil their common interests. Further, the very physical conditions may influence social life to a great extent. Most communities are settled and derive from the conditions of their locality a strong bond of solidarity.

(ii) **Community Sentiment**

Locality alone cannot make a group, a community. A community is essentially an area of common living with a feeling of belonging. There must be the common living with its awareness of sharing a way of life as well as the common earth.

Community Sentiment means a feeling of belonging together. The members must be aware of their staying together and sharing common interests. The members develop a sense of we-feeling. It means a kind of identification with the group. Without a sense of identification, a sense of awareness, a sense of living and sharing some common interests in life, there cannot be any community.

Other Aspects of Community

- (i) **Stability:** A community has not only locality and community sentiment, but also has stability. It is not a temporary group like a crowd or a mob. It is relatively stable. It includes a permanent group life in a definite place.
- (ii) **Naturalness:** Communities normally become established in a natural way. They are not deliberately created. They are not made or created by an act of will or by planned efforts. Individuals become its members by birth itself. Membership, hence, is not voluntary. Communities are

spontaneous in their origin and development. Of course, they cannot come into being suddenly and automatically.

- (iii) **Size of the Community:** Community involves the idea of size. A community may be big or small. A small community may be included in a wider community. A city and a village may be included in a wider community called the district. Hence, there are communities within communities. District, as a big community may enclose small communities like villages, towns, cities, tribes, etc. thus the term community is used in a relative sense.
- (iv) **Regulation of Relations:** Every community develops in course of time, a system of traditions, customs, morals, practices; a bundle of rules and regulations to regulate the relations of its members. The sense of what they have in common memories and traditions, customs and institutions shapes and define the general need of man to live together.

However, in modern times, the nature of community sentiment is gradually changing. Today, the interests of men are diverse and complex. Their attachment towards their community is gradually fading. In modern highly industrialized urban communities, the spirit of community sentiment is very much lacking.

ASSOCIATION

We use the words association and institution very commonly in our daily talks. Sometimes, these words are used interchangeably to mean one and the same. But these words are used in a specific way in sociology. Hence it is necessary for us to know the meaning and nature of and difference between these two terms.

Association as a Means of Pursuing Ends

Men have diverse needs, desires and interests and ends which demand their satisfaction. They have three ways of fulfilling their ends. Firstly, they may act independency, each in his own way without bothering about others. This is unsocial and has its own limitations. Secondly, men may seek their ends through conflicts with one another. One may clash with another or others to snatch things or objects which one wants from others. Finally, men may try to fulfil their ends through co-operation and mutual assistance. On the basis of this co-operative effort each individual will be contributing to the ends of his fellow-men. This co-operative pursuit has a reference to association. When a group or collection of individuals organizes itself expressly for the purpose of pursuing certain of its interests together on a co-operative pursuit, an association is said to be born.

Definition

- 1) An association is “an organization deliberately formed for the collective pursuit of some interest, or a set of interests, which its members share”.
- 2) An association is “a group of social beings related to one another by the fact that they possess or have instituted in common an organization with a view to securing a specific end or specific ends”. – Morris Ginsberg.
- 3) An association is “a group of people organized for the achievement of a particular interest or interests.
- 4) An association is “a group organized for the pursuit of an interest or group of interests in common”.

Men have several interests. Hence they establish different associations to fulfil them. They have a number of associations of different kinds. Some examples may be cited here.

Examples

- 1) Political Associations
- 2) Religious Associations
- 3) Students' Associations
- 4) Labourers' Associations
- 5) Professional Associations
- 6) Economic Associations
- 7) International Associations

Main Characteristics of Association:

The main characteristics of association are as follows

- 1) **Association-a Human Group:** An association is formed or created by people. It is basically a social group. Without people there can be no association. However, all groups are not associations, because, an association is basically an organized group. An unorganized group like crowd or mob cannot be an association.
- 2) **Common Interest or Interests:** An association is not merely a collection of individuals. It consists of those individuals who have more or less the same interests. According, those who have political interests may join political associations, and those who have religious interests may join religious associations, and so on.
- 3) **Co-operative Spirit:** An association is based on the co-operative spirit of its members. People work together to achieve some definite purposes. For example, a political party has to work together as a united group on the basis of co-operation in order to fulfil its objective of coming to power.

- 4) **Organization:** Association denotes some kind of organization. An association is known essentially as an organized group. Organization gives stability and proper shape to an association organization refers to the way in which the statuses and roles are distributed among the members.
- 5) **Regulation of Relations:** Every association has its own ways and means of regulating the relations of its members. Organization depends on this element of regulation. They may assume written or unwritten forms.
- 6) **Association as Agencies:** Associations are means or agencies through which their members seek to realize their similar or shared interests. Such social organizations necessarily act not merely through leaders, but through officials or representatives, as agencies. Associations normally act through agents who are responsible for and to the association. This fact gives association a distinctive character and its peculiar legal status. Further, association may have its own methods of operation peculiar to it as an association.
- 7) **Durability of Association:** An association may be permanent or temporary. There are some long-standing associations like the state, family, religious associations etc. Some associations may be purely temporary in nature. Ex. Associations that are established to felicitate some great writers, scientists, and religious leaders and associations created for performing some social, religious or other ceremony or fair on a grand scale.
- It is clear from the above, that an association is not merely a group, it is something more than that. It is a group expressly organized around a particular interest.

In modern society, the number of associations is on the increase. Not only their numbers is increasing, but their varieties are also increasing. In almost all the fields of our social life we have associations. The rapid changes that are taking place in different fields of our social life have necessitated the birth of a large number of associations. In modern democratic countries associations have a distinct role to play.

INSTITUTION

Definition

1. According to Ginsberg, Institutions “may be described as recognized and established usages governing the relations between individuals and groups”.
2. According to MacIver and Page, Institutions may be defined as the “established forms or conditions of procedure characteristics of group activity”.
3. According to Kingsley Davis. Institution can be defined as “a set of interwoven folkways, mores, and laws built around one or more functions”.
4. H.E. Barnes. Institutions represent “the social structure and the machinery through which human society organizes, directs and executes the multifarious activities required satisfying human needs”.

Characteristics of Institutions

The main characteristics of social institutions may be described as follows:

1. **Social in Nature:** Institutions come into being due to the collective activities of the people. They are essentially social in nature. After all, institutions are the products of the secular and repetitive forms of social relationships of the individuals.

2. **Universality:** Social institutions are ubiquitous. They exist in all the societies and existed at all the stages of social development. The basic institutions like family, religion, property and some kind of political institutions are observed even in the tribal or primitive societies.
3. **Institutions are Standardized Norms:** An institution must be understood as standardized procedures and norms. They prescribe the way of doing things. They also prescribe rules and regulations that are to be followed. Marriage, as an institution, for example, governs the relations between the husband and wife. Similarly, the school or college has its own rules and procedures.
4. **Institutions as means of Satisfying Needs:** Institutions are established by men themselves. They cater to the satisfaction of some basic and vital needs of man. These basic needs are-(1) the need for self-preservation, (2) the need for self-perpetuation, and (3) the need for self-expression.
5. **Institutions are the Controlling Mechanisms:** Institutions like religion, morality, state, government, law, legislation, etc., control the behaviour of men. These mechanisms preserve the social order and give stability to it. Institutions are like wheels on which human society marches on towards the desired destination.
6. **Relatively Permanent:** Institutions normally do not undergo sudden or rapid changes. Changes take place slowly and gradually in them. Many institutions are rigid and enduring. They, in course of time, become the conservative elements in society. Ex: caste, religion, etc. But under the pressure of circumstances they also undergo changes.
7. **Abstract in Nature:** Institutions are not external, visible or tangible things. They are abstract. Thus marriage cannot be kept in a museum, religion cannot be rated or quantified; war cannot be weighed and law cannot be brought to the laboratory experiments and so on.
8. **Oral and Written Traditions:** Institutions may persist in the form of oral and/or written traditions. For the primitive societies they may be largely oral. But in modern complex societies they may be observed in written as well as unwritten forms. There may be written institutional forms like constitutions, sacred text books, syllabus, governmental orders, business contracts,

examination system, etc., relating to political, religious, educational and economic institution and so on.

9. **Synthesizing Symbols:** Institution may have their own symbols, material or non-material. Ex the state has flag emblem, national anthem as its symbols, religion may have its own symbols like crucifix, crescent, star, swastika; the school may have its own flag or school prayer, marriage may have its own wedding ring or mangala-sutra, and so on.
10. **Institutions are interrelated:** Institutions, though diverse, are interrelated. Understanding of one institution requires the understanding of the other related institutions. The religious, moral, educational, political, economic and other types of institutions are essentially interlinked.

FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Institutions have great functional importance. Their main functions are as follows:

- 1) **Institutions Cater to the Satisfaction of Needs.** Institutions contribute to the fulfillment of the fundamental human needs such as (i) The need for self-perpetuation, (ii) perpetuation, and (iii) self-expression. They provide and prescribe the ways and means of fulfilling them.
- 2) **Institutions Control Human Behaviour.** Institutions organize and regulate the system of social behaviour. Through the institutions the unexpected, spontaneous, and irregular behaviour of people is replaced by expected, patterned, systematic, regular and predictable behaviour. Thus, the interpersonal relationships of the individuals are regulated by institutions. They make clear for the members what is allowed and what is not; what is desirable and what is undesirable. This is particularly true of the governmental institutions.
- 3) **Institutions Simplify Actions for the Individual.** Since the institutions prescribe a particular way of behaviour for the fulfillment of our basic needs, they save much of our energy and also time. They avoid confusion and uncertainties and contribute to a system and order in society.
- 4) **Institutions Assign Roles and Statuses to the Individual.** Institutionalization of the social behaviour consists of the establishment of definite norms. These norms assign status positions and role-function in connection with such behaviour. Institutions such as family, marriage, education, property,

division of labour, caste, religion, etc. provide some social standing for the individuals concerned.

- 5) Institutions Contribute to Unity and Uniformity. Institutions which regulate the relations between individuals have largely been responsible for unity and uniformity that are found in a society.
- 6) Manifest Functions of Institutions. Every institution has two types of manifest functions-(i) the pursuit of its objectives or interests, and (ii) the preservation of its own internal cohesion so that it may survive. For example, the state must serve its citizens and protect its boundaries. At the same time, the state must escape the danger of internal revolution and external conquests.
- 7) The Negative Functions of Institutions. Institutions may cause harmful effects also. They do not undergo changes easily and quickly even if the circumstances demand change. When they become too conservative they retard progress. They even hamper the growth of personalities of the people. Religion and caste can be mentioned here as examples to show how they often discourage people to do achievements or adventures.

ROLE AND STATUS

The Human society exhibits an 'order' because the social relations of its members and their activities are normally integrated. Members of society occupy different places and discharge different responsibilities in the mutual interest of all. Thus the coordination of division of labour is achieved primarily through the assignment of duties and rights to positions or statuses. Society itself is a network of such statuses. Each status has a set of expected behaviours called 'roles'. By providing for such 'roles' associated with each status, the many things which a society wants to done will be distributed among people and group in an agreed manner. This contributes to the orderliness in society. Thus, statuses and roles constitute an important element in social structure.

1. THE CONCEPT OF ROLE

Definitions:

1. According to Young and Mack, "A role is the function of a status".

2. Robert Bierstedt says that a “role is the dynamic or the behavioural aspect of status.... A role is what an individual does in the status he occupies”.
3. Duncan Mitchell writes that “a social role is the expected behaviour associated with a social position.
4. For Kingsley Davis role refers to “the manner in which a person actually carries out the requirements of his position”.

Nature of Role:

An analysis of ‘Role’ would reveal to us the following things:

1. Every individual member of social group or society is bound to play social roles. It means role-playing is obligatory for all members. The number of roles that one plays depends on the statuses that he assumes.
2. Some social roles are shared by a great many people. Ex: There are many adults, citizens, voters, authors, ministers, teachers, and so on.
3. Some social roles are enacted only by one or by comparatively a few individuals at a particular time in a particular place. Ex: In India, there can only a few governors at a time depending upon the number of states.
4. Some social roles may be assumed voluntarily. The individual may choose to enact or not enact certain roles. Ex: one may choose to live in city as city dweller, play as a bowler in a cricket team, join a voluntary association and play the role of its executive member or not.
5. The assumption of certain roles is largely involuntary. The enactment of many such roles has to take place continuously.

Interrelationship between Roles and Statuses:

- (a) The Terms ‘role’ and ‘status’ are interrelated. A status is simply a position in society or in a group. A ‘role’ is the

behavioural aspect of status. Status are occupied and roles are played. A role is the manner in which a given individual fulfills the obligations of a status and enjoys its privileges and prerogatives. A position or status is simply the means of identifying a particular social role. The two terms are often used interchangeably. For example, the position of 'advocate' identifies a particular body of expected behaviour or the role of advocate. To define a social role is actually to define the essential or minimal features of the expected behaviour or role.

- (b) Role is a relational term. An individual plays a role vis-à-vis another person's role which is attached to a 'counter-position'. For example, an advocate plays his role as advocate in relation to the client's role. Role concept is relevant at the level of individual when he is in interaction. Because, it is individuals, not organizations, institutions, or sub-systems, who play roles and occupy positions.
- (c) 'Role' and 'Status'-in a way point out the divergent interests of the two sciences-social psychology and sociology. Status is a sociological concept and a sociological phenomenon. On the contrary, role is a concept and a phenomenon of social psychology. Individual differences in personality, ability, talents and behaviour can alone explain as to why different individuals play different roles in the same status.
- (d) Both status and role are dynamic and constantly changing. Hence, role changes with each new incumbent in a status. The status changes as the norms attached to it are altered. It is quite likely that in course of time, new obligations and new responsibilities may be added to a status or old ones may be removed. Sometimes more rigorous role playing may expand the functions of a status. Similarly, these functions may change due to the newly felt needs of the system of which status is a part. Thus, both status and role are dynamic elements in the life of a society. But the statuses are cultural and roles are behavioural in nature.

Role Conflict:

Role conflict refers to the conflict experienced by the individual at the time of role playing. This may be experienced by the individual at two levels: (a) within his own body of roles, and (b) between his own roles and those of other actors.

Firstly, an individual may experience conflict if there is a discrepancy between his perception of his role and his perception of his actual role behaviour. This conflict may have harmful effects upon his self-image. For example, if a person finds a vast difference between-how he should act as a husband and how he actually does behave-he may experience an inner conflict. In extreme cases, one may even become neurotic.

Secondly, an individual may experience conflicts within his own body of roles. An individual may perceive some incompatibility between the role-requirements of two or more roles when he is playing them together. For example, one's role as a doctor may come into clash with one's role as a husband or wife at home. The doctor is expected to serve the patients even during the non-working hours, if the need arises. It is equally expected of the same person as a husband or wife to pay attention to the needs of the family and family members at least during the non-working hours. Conflicts of this kind arise only when the occupants in the counter-positions perceive the role of the individual concerned in a different way.

In a simple, culturally homogeneous and relatively 'immobile' society, there may be comparatively less role conflicts. But in a comparatively complex and heterogeneous social system role conflicts have increased a great deal. These have led to more and more group tensions as well as individual discomforts.

SOCIAL STATUS

Definition

1. According to Duncan Mitchell, social status refers to “the position occupied by a person, family, or kinship group in a social system relative to others. This determines rights, duties and other behaviours, including the nature and extent of the relationships with persons of other statuses’.
2. Ralph Linton says that “status is the place in a particular system, which a certain individual occupies at a particular time”.
3. Robert Bierstedt is of the opinion that “A status is simply a position in society or in a group... the status is the position afforded by group affiliation, group membership, or group organization. It is ‘set’ in the structure of the group or of the society before a given individual comes along to occupy it”.

Nature of Status:

1. **External Symbols to identify the status:** As Kingsley Davis has said, a person’s identity in a social situation reveals his status. Though not always certain external symbols help the identification of one’s statuses in society. The style of dress is one such indicator. Soldiers and army officers, nurses, doctors, advocates, policemen, religious missionaries, priests wear different dresses. Their statuses could be understood by means of their dresses.
2. **Every status has its own rights, duties and obligations:** The nature of these rights and duties is decided by the normative system of society. A right is a legitimate expectation that one can entertain as an occupant of a status in relation to the behavior of a person in another position. From the viewpoint of another person their claim represents only an obligation. For example, it is the right of an employer to expect a particular behavior from his employee and it is the obligation of the employee to behave in the so desired manner.

Similarly, it is the right of an employee to expect some rewards for his labour from his employer, and it becomes the obligation; but it becomes a duty on the part of the employer to give the rewards to the employee. Thus, 'rights' and 'obligations' are only different definition of the same relationship.

3. **Social statuses are governed by norms:** These norms vary with persons, situation and statuses, even though they are believed to be common to all. For example, the norms like 'be honest' 'be truthful' etc. are believed to be common to all. But in practice we know that a doctor cannot always tell the truth to the patient regarding the state of his disease. Similarly, a merchant cannot practice honesty always in his trade. Thus norms are always relative to situations. Which norms apply in a given case depends upon the relations between the statuses of the interacting persons and the situations in which they interact.
4. **One individual may have several statuses:** Since society can be understood as the network of statuses, it is quite natural that in every society we find a large number of groups which have many statuses. Every individual occupies many such statuses. His status will differ with the type of group.

In a modern complex society each individual during the course of a single day may find himself in a large number of statuses. Example : A College student may be a student to his teachers , a customer to the shop owner , a depositor to his banker , a passenger to the bus driver, a brother to his sister , a son to his father and mother , a secretary to the members of the cricket club , a male to all females , patient to his doctor , and so on . It means the individual occupies the statuses such as student, customer depositor, passenger, brother, son, secretary of the cricket club, patient and many such statuses in the course of a single day.

5. **Statuses exercise an influence upon the careers of individuals:** The behavior of individuals can be understood only by understanding the statuses that they assume in their respective groups or societies.

6. **Statuses differ with their degree of importance:** Sociologist E.T. Hiller has made use of the concept of 'key status' to denote a man's position in society. In most of modern industrial societies, for example, 'occupational status' has become the 'key status'. It mostly influences his various other statuses. In some societies, kinship statuses, religious statuses or even political statuses may be more important and hence become 'key statuses'. In India, caste status and occupational status may be more important. Russians may attach more weight age to political status and so on. In Primitive societies age, Sex and kinship statuses are important than others.
7. **Statuses add to social order and social stability:** We are all born into a society in which the statuses are already there .They are the part of the structure of our society .we are not creating them afresh .The statuses of farmers, soldiers, teachers, clerks etc., are not our creations In exceptional cases some may find out new ways and new paths of living and thus may create new statuses. Like other elements of culture, status, which is cultural item, is also dynamic .Some statuses, May in course of time, become obsolete, and disappear from the social structure. But most of the individuals in most of the cases occupy statuses that are already there established in the societies in which they are born.
8. **Social status has a hierarchical distribution also:** All the statuses in society are not equally distributed among all. Thus a few persons occupy the highest positions while the majorities assume the so called 'ordinary' statuses. The theoretical assumption behind the distribution of the statuses is that the statuses are determined competitively by the possession of abilities relative to the demand for abilities and qualities in society. Thus , it could be said in the competitive struggle those who possess greater abilities and assume higher status has not been found to be invariable .The factors such as private property, inheritance , social services, etc., all modify the form of the distribution of statuses.

Ascribed and achieved statuses

There are two ways in which an individual in society can get his status, that is, through 'ascription' or 'achievement'. Some statuses are inevitable for the individual while others can be selected by him more or less freely. Linton uses the concepts of 'ascribed' to individuals while others are achieved by them. It is possible to find in some societies more of ascribed statuses than achieved statuses and the converse may be true in some others. Not strictly speaking, all the societies make use of both the principles – of ascription and achievement – in providing for the statuses of their members.

(a) Ascribed Status

Ascribed statuses are those over which the individual has absolutely no choice. They are derived from membership in involuntary groups such as sex group, age group, racial group, etc. At the beginning stages of socialization itself the new born individual derives such statuses. Virtually these statuses are 'ascribed' to the individual before knowing his potentialities. These statuses definitely "determine and limit the range of statuses" which he may subsequently achieve or try to achieve.

(b) The Achieved Status

The statuses about which the person has some choice, however much or little, are achieved statuses. All Societies have some achieved statuses and no society depends completely on ascribed statuses. The proportion of the statuses in a social structure which are open to achievement varies widely around the world.

In Primitive societies one can find that greater stress is laid on ascribed statuses. The civilized societies on the contrary, have placed high premium on achieved statuses. Factors such as the dominance of commercial activities, urban conditions of life, greater division of labour, and rapid social change have compelled the individuals to achieve their statuses on the

basis of accomplishments in the modern societies. Division of labour offers a chance to a talented man for a competitive advantage to work with efficiency to secure a status. Rapid change provides continually new statuses.

POWER AND AUTHORITY

Meaning of Power:

Power is a fundamental entity of human society. It is a universal phenomenon. Society itself is built of power relations

- (i) Max Weber defined power as “the ability to control the behaviour of others, even in the absence of their consent”.
- (ii) As Ian Robertson says, “power is the capacity to participate effectively in a decision-making process”.
- (iii) According to N.J. Demerath and Gerald Marwell, “power may be defined as the capacity to get things done despite obstacles and resistance”.
- (iv) Power may be exercised blatantly or subtly, legally or illegally, justly or unjustly. It may derive from many sources, such as wealth, status, prestige, numbers, or organizational efficiency. Its ultimate basis is the ability to compel obedience, if necessary through the threat or use of force.
- (v) Social power has been identified in different ways with prestige, influence, eminence, competence, dominance, rights, strength, force, and authority.

AUTHORITY:

The exercise of authority is a constant and pervasive phenomenon in the human society. Human society maintains itself because of ‘order’- and it is the authority that serves as the foundation of social order. It is wrong to assume that ‘authority’ is purely a political phenomenon. In fact, in all kinds of organizations, political as well as non-political,

authority appears. Every association in society whether it is temporary or permanent, small or big, has its own structure of authority.

Definitions:

1. “Authority is that form of power which orders or articulates the actions of other actors through commands which are effective because those who are commanded regard the commands as legitimate” – By E.A. Shils in Dictionary of Sociology.
2. Max Weber used the term authority to refer to legitimate power.
3. In simple words, it can be said that authority refers to power which is regarded as legitimate in the minds of followers.

Weber’s notion of authority does not imply that power is legitimate and that illegitimate power plays no role in society. “Weber only argued that legitimacy is a general condition for the most effective and enduring manifestations of power. Still this legitimacy may take different forms and different justifications.

Types of Authority

Max Weber distinguished three basic types of legitimate authority: which also correspond to three types of dominance or leadership. Weber spoke of traditional authority, legal-rational authority, and charismatic authority. Each type of authority is legitimate because it rests on the implicit or explicit consent of the governed. One who can successfully claim any these types of authority is regarded as having the right to compel obedience at least for some time.

1. Traditional Authority:

Of all the legitimations of authority, the appeal to tradition is certainly the most common. People obey traditional authority because “it has always been that way”. The right of the king to rule is not open to question. People obey a ruler because they know that doing so in past generations has given their society order and continuity. Thus it is not tradition alone here that is at issue, rather the stability of the social order that is being accepted for its own sake.

In a political system based on ‘traditional authority’ power is legitimated by ancient custom. The authority of the ruler is generally founded on unwritten laws and it has almost a sacred quality. Tribal leaders and monarchs have always relied on traditional authority. From the historical point of view it has been the most common source of legitimation of power.

2. Rational – Legal Authority

In this kind of authority power is legitimated by explicit rules and procedures that define the rights and obligations of the rulers. Such rules and procedures are commonly found in a written constitution, and set of laws. Legal – rational authority stresses a “government of laws, not of people”. Officials here can exercise power only within legally defined limits that have been formally set in advance. This kind of authority is commonly found in most of the political systems of modern societies.

3. Charismatic Authority

In a system based on charismatic authority, power is legitimated by the unusual, exceptional, or even supernatural qualities that people attribute to political, religious, or military leaders”. Weber called this extra ordinary ‘Charisma’. Human history provides classical examples of such leaders with that quality of Charisma’. Example: Jesus Christ, M.K.Gandhi, Hitler, Napoleon, Mao, Castro, Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Churchill, and so on. The charismatic leader is seen as a person of destiny who is inspired by usual vision, by lofty principles or even by God. The charisma of these leaders is itself sufficient to make their authority seem legitimate to their followers.

Social Norms & Values

NORMS

The Meaning of Norms

A norm is a rule, standard, or pattern for action. Social norms are rules of conduct. The norms are the standards by reference to which behavior is judged and approved or disapproved. A norm in this sense is not a statistical average of actual behavior but rather a cultural (shared) definition of desirable behavior.

Norms are mental models or guidelines by which, ideally we control and evaluate our action and that of others. Normative order is control because upon it largely depends the possibility of mutual co-operation, which should be taken here to include mutual non-interference of action units that are engaged in distinct activities nor directly relative.

Norms are prescriptions serving as common guidelines for social action. Culture provides us with a set guide posts ready-made definitions of situations – by which we align our individual actions to create social or joint actions. These guide posts are norms. Norms are rules that specify appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Norms are expectations- conception of ideal behaviours- that are shared by the members of a society at large or by the members of particular groups within a society.

Human behavior exhibits certain regularities, which are the product of adherence to common expectations or norms. In this sense human action is 'rule governed'. A social norm is not necessarily actual behavior and normative behavior is not simply the most frequently occurring pattern. Since the term refers to social expectations about 'correct' or 'proper' behavior, norms imply the presence of legitimacy, consent and prescription while deviation from norms is punished by sanctions, norms are acquired by internalized and socialization.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NORMS

Following are the essential characteristics of social norms:

- 1. Norms are Standards of Group Behaviour:** An essential characteristic of group life is that it is possessed of a set of values which regulate the behavior of individual members. When a number of individuals interact, a set of standards develop that regulate their relationships and modes of behavior. These standards of group behaviour are called social norms.
- 2. Norms Incorporate Value Judgement:** A norm is a standard of behavioural expectations shared by group members against which the validity of perceptions is judged and the appropriateness of feeling and behavior is evaluated. Members of a group exhibit certain regularities in their behavior. Such regularities in behavior have been explained in terms of social norms. Norm, ere presents “standardized generalizations” concerning expected modes of behaviour. It may said that norms are based on social values which are justified by moral standards or aesthetic judgments.
- 3. Norms are Related to Factual World:** It may not, however, be presumed that norms are abstract representing imaginary construct. Sociologists are interested mainly in ‘operative’ norms, that is, norms that are sanctioned in such a way that violators suffer penalties in the group. Norms, in order to be effective, must represent correctly the relations between real events. They must take into account the factual situation. Normative system, since it is meant to achieve results in the factual world should be related to the events in the real world.
- 4. Norms are both Generalized and Generalizable:** Norms are always to some extent both generalized and generalizable. They may refer to all human beings at all times and in all places or they may refer only to a specific type of situation. A norm calls for “right action” and implies a generalizable reason for the rightness of the indicated conduct. Ultimately this propriety or rightness traces back to some standard of value that is taken without further justification as valid by the individual or group in question.

- 5. Norms are More than an Idiosyncractic Expression:** Norms are more than an idiosyncratic expression of the wants or desires of a particular person. Even quite specific norms imply a basis for assent by someone other than the norm sender himself. At the same time, norms actually can guide conduct only if they prescribe or proscribe identifiable courses of action; therefore norms are more specific and socially imperative than values or ideals. For example, ‘honesty’ is a generalized value (a conception of desirability) but it is still found socially necessary to have specific rules for concrete situations such as student’s behaviour in examinations or the financial responsibility of banking officials.
- 6. Norms are learned:** Norms are learned by individuals in social intercourse with others- that is, in the process of socialization. By definition, then , norms are shared by two or more individuals . Some norms are particular to quite small groups, such as a husband – wife pair or a clique of friends, while other norms may be held by a large collectively that is one of several existing in one nation. Still other norms may be shared by most adult members of a nation or of an entire civilization.
- 7. Norms may Arise in Relation to any Aspect of Human Activity:** Norms may arise in relation to any aspect human activity and experience that comes to be regarded as of any importance or consequence. There are norms for perceiving, feeling, thinking, judging, evaluating, and acting. Thus, there are cognitive and logical norms for carrying on scientific investigations, aesthetic norms for judging music etc. There are the norms of moral conduct which guide direct social interaction. The term “social norm” may refer to any of these, but most commonly is used to designate rules for social interaction.
- 8. Norms are Diverse:** Norms are exceedingly diverse not only in their objects but in respect to their important properties different societies and in different historical periods. Some norms are widely know, accepted and fool owed where as others are characterized by low consensus and only partial conformity. Some norms are learned early in life through identification and socialization others are acquired in later life through secondary social

relations. To understand any particular norm it is important to know whether it has been ‘internalized ‘ so as to become part of the conscience or self-ideal of the individuals in question; if so there will be much conformity even if there is no external surveillance of conduct or punishment behaviour. Norms not thus internalized can be enforced only through external rewards and penalties. Those norms that are primarily enforced through punishment and threat contrast with standards that are maintained by a flow of positive social rewards such as wealth, prestige or social approval. Great variations exist in consistency of enforcement, source at authority, degree of allowable variation in conformity, extent of deviance and type of enforcing agency.

Values

Generally, value has been taken to mean moral ideas, general conceptions or orientations towards the world or a sometimes simply interests, preferences, needs, sentiments and dispositions.

Values are collective conceptions of what is considered good, desirable, and proper or bad, undesirable, and improper in culture.

According to M. Haralambos “a value is a belief that something is good and desirable”. For R.K. Mukerjee “values are socially approved desires and goals that are internalized through the process of conditioning, learning or socialization and that become subjective preferences, standards and aspirations”. A value is a shared idea about how something is ranked in terms of desirability, worth or goodness.

Values may be specific, such as honoring one’s parents or owning a home or they may be more general. Individual achievement, individual happiness and materialism are major values of modern industrial society. Value systems can be different from culture to culture.

One society may value individual achievement (as in USA), another may emphasise family unity and kin support (as in India). The values of hard

work and individual achievement are often associated with industrial capitalist societies.

The values of a culture may change, but most remain stable during one person's lifetime. Socially shared, intensely felt values are a fundamental part of our lives. Values are often emotionally charged because they stand for things we believe to be worth defending.

Most of our basic values are learnt early in life from family, friends, neighbourhood, school, the mass media and other sources within society. These values become part of our personalities. They are generally shared and reinforced by those with whom we interact.

Values can be classified into broad categories:

1. Individual values

These are the values which are related with the development of human personality or individual norms of recognition and protection of the human personality such as honesty, loyalty, veracity and honour.

2. Collective Values

Values connected with the solidarity of the community or collective norms of equality, justice, solidarity and sociableness are known as collective values.

Values can also be categorized from the point of view their hierarchical arrangement:

1. Intrinsic Values

These are the values which are related with goals of life. They are sometimes known as ultimate and transcendent values.

2. Instrumental Values

These values come after the intrinsic values in the scheme of gradation of values. These values are means to achieve goals (intrinsic values) of life. They are also known as incidental or proximate values.

Importance and Functions of Values

Values are general principle to regulate our day-today behavior. They not only give direction to our behavior but are also ideals and objectives in themselves. In other words, they express moral imperatives. They are the expression of the ultimate ends, goals or purposes of social action. Our values are the basis of our judgments about what is desirable, beautiful, proper, correct, important, worthwhile and good as well as what is undesirable, ugly, incorrect, improper and bad. Pioneer sociologist Durkheim emphasized the importance of values (though he used the term ‘morals’) in controlling disruptive individual passions. Modern sociologist E. Shills calls ‘the central value system’ (the main values of society) are seen as essential in creating conformity and order. Indian sociologist R.K Mukerjee writes: “By their nature, all human relations and behavior are imbedded in values”.

The main functions of values are as follows:

1. Values play an important role in the integration and fulfillment of man’s basic impulses and desires in a stable and consistent manner appropriate for his living.
2. They are generic experiences in social action made up of both individual and social responses and attitudes.
3. They build up societies, integrate social relations.
4. They mould the ideal dimensions of personality and range and depth of culture.
5. They influence people’s behavior and serve as criteria for evaluating the actions of others.

6. They have a great role to play in the conduct of social life.
7. They help in creating norms to guide day-to- day behavior.

Chapter-11

Social Institution

The term institution like many other sociological terms, has been given different meanings. The term is widely used to describe practices that are regularly and continuously repeated, are sanctioned and maintained by social norms and have a major significance in the social structure.

A social institution is a complex. It is an integrated set of social norms organized around the preservation of a basic social value. Sociologists often reserve the term 'institution' to describe normative systems that operate in five basic areas which may be designated as the primary institutions:

- (a) In determining Kinship;
- (b) In providing for the legitimate use of power;
- (c) In regulating the distribution of goods and services;
- (d) In transmitting knowledge from one generation to the next;
- (e) In regulating our relations to the supernatural.

As concepts, these five basic institutions are called family, government, economy, education and religion.

Sociologists agree that institutions arise and persist because of a definite felt need of the members of a society. The need is not equally pressing in every case, but it must be present if an institution is to arise and develop. The family, for instance, is an institution which is tied up with the very survival of the human species, whereas an institution such as the theatre does not approach it in importance. Nevertheless, the latter certainly arose in response to a definite need for recreation.

NEEDS AS THE BASIS OF INSTITUTIONS

Attempts have been made to classify the interests or needs which are responsible for the rise of institutions and which are as follows:

- 1. Emotional Needs:** Summer and Keller have given us a succinct and inclusive classification. According to them the chief interests that have given

rise to institutions are hunger, love, vanity, and fear, which correspond to the impulses of self-preservation, of sex, of self-gratification, and the dread of the supernatural. These socializing forces have operated in all human beings, and as a result institutions arose to satisfy as well as to regulate and control them.

2. **Economic Needs:** The institutions that developed as an outgrowth of these interests are the economic and governmental systems (concerned with the food supply, property, class, and law system).
3. **The Familial Needs:** The Family concerned with courtship, marriage and divorce, training of the young and treatment of the aged.
4. **Aesthetic and Intellectual Needs:** Aesthetic and intellectual expressions and recreational needs which find outlets in dancing, acting, poetry, art, science, philosophy, social activities, games, and entertainment.
5. **Religious Needs:** Religion and its accompanying beliefs and practices.

The five major interests enumerated above account for practically all the institutions found in even the most highly civilized societies. As a society develops, new interests arise, but they all fit into the major categories.

KINDS OF INSTITUTIONS

There are five primary institutions. These are (i) the family, (ii) economy, (iii) religion, (iv) education, and (v) state.

An institution never dies. New institutional norms may replace the old norms, but the institution goes on. For example, the modern family has replaced the norms of patriarchal family, yet family as an institution continues. When feudalism died, government did not end. The governmental and economic function continued to be fulfilled, although according to changed norms. All the primary institutions are thousands of years old, only the institutional norms are new.

FUNCTIONS OF INSTITUTIONS:

1. Institutions Serve Chiefly as a Means of Meeting the Needs of a Society:

Those needs range from the essential ones, without which social life could not go on, those relatively unimportant, which are more or less dispensable. No institution arises unless a need is felt. This is not to say, however, that there are no institutions or institutional forms in existence in a society which fail to meet a present need. On the contrary, some are mere survivals of the past; although they had utility at one time, they have become useless or even harmful. (An example of a harmful institution is the caste in the South.) Moreover, even many of the fundamental institutions may need modification in order to make them function more satisfactorily under changed conditions.

2. Institutions Serve as a Means of Regulating and Controlling Man's

Activities: This is particularly true of governmental institutions, but in a broader sense all institutions exercise control over the members of society by making it clear to them what is and what is not allowed, or what is and what is not desirable. Finally it must be remembered that the various institutions are not independent entities, but are interrelated as well as interdependent.

Chapter- 12

FAMILY, MARRIAGE AND KINSHIP

THE FAMILY

The family is the most important primary group in society. It is the simplest and the most elementary form of society. It is the most basic of all social groupings. IT is the first and the most immediate social environment to which a child is exposed. IT is an outstanding primary group, because, it is in the family that the child develops its basic attitudes.

The family, as an institution is universal. It is the most permanent and the most pervasive of all social institutions. All societies large and small, primitive and civilized, ancient and modern have some form of family or the other.

MEANING AND CHARACTERISTICS

The word 'Family' has been taken over from Latin word 'Famulus' which means a servant Thus, original, family, consisted of a man and woman with a child or children and servants. The meaning of family can be explained better by the following definitions:

1. M.F. Nimkoff says that "Family is a more or less durable association of husband and wife with or without child, of a man or woman alone, with children".
2. Burgess and Locke " Family is a group of Persons united by ties of marriage, blood or adoption constituting a single household interacting and intercommunicating with each other in their respective social roles of husband and wife, father and mother, son and daughter, brother and sister, creating a common culture".

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE FAMILY

The family is an organization par excellence. Of all the social organization, large or small, family is of the greatest sociological significance. It occupies the central

position in our social structure. The family, unlike other institutions, enjoys a unique position in society. Its distinctive features may be noted here.

1. Universality. After having made an analysis of more than 250 societies, Murdock concludes that the family is universal.
2. Emotional Basis. The family is grounded in emotions and sentiments.
3. Limited Size. The family is smaller in size. As a primary group its size is necessarily limited.
4. Formative Influence. The family is the earliest social environment which surrounded. Trains and educates the child. It shapes the personality and character of its members. It emotionally conditions the child.
5. Nuclear Position in the Social Structure. The family is the nucleus of all other social organizations. The whole social structure is built of family units. It influences the whole life of society.
6. Responsibility of the Members. The member of the family has certain responsibilities, duties and obligations. The smooth running of family depends on how best the members discharge their responsibilities in co-ordination with the other individual of the family.
7. Social Regulation. The family is peculiarly guarded both by social taboos and by legal regulations. The society takes precaution to safeguard this organization from any possible breakdown: by divorce, desertion or separation.
8. The Permanent and Temporary Nature of the Family. The family as an institution is permanent. Since it is based on the organic and emotional nature of man, it continues to exist. But family as an association may be temporary in character. These characteristics indeed reveal the sociological significance of the family.

FUNCTIONS OF THE FAMILY

The family as a social institution performs several function. Kinsley Davis speaks of four main functions of the family: (i) Reproduction, (ii) Maintance, (iii) Placement, and (iv) Socialization.

Ogburn and Nimkoff have mentioned six major functions of family: (i) Affectional, (ii) Economic, (iii) Recreational, (iv) Protective, (v) Religious, and (vi) Educational

MacIver classifies the functions of family into two types: Essential and Non-essential functions. According to him, the essential functions include (i) the satisfaction of sex need (ii) production and rearing of children, and (iii) provision of a home. Under the non-essential functions he includes, religious, educational, economic, health and recreation, and other functions.

The Primary Functions

Some of the functions of family are basic to its continued existence. They are referred to as essential functions by MacIver. They may also be regarded as Primary functions of family. They are explained below.

(i) Stable Satisfaction of Sex Need. Sex drive is powerful in human beings. Man is susceptible to sexual stimulation throughout his life. The sex need is irresistible also. It motivates man to seek an established basis of its satisfaction. Family regulates the sexual behavior of man by its agent, the marriage. Thus it provides for the satisfaction of the sex need for man.

(ii) Reproduction or Procreation. The result of sexual satisfaction is reproduction: The process of reproduction is institutionalized in the family. Hence it assumes a regularity and a stability that all societies recognize as desirable. Thus family introduces a legitimacy into the act of reproduction. By fulfilling its reproductive function family has made it possible to have the propagation of species and the perpetuation of the human race.

(iii) Production and Rearing of the Child . The family gives the individual his life and a chance to survive. The child which is helpless at the time of birth is given the needed protection of the family. Further, family is an institution par excellence, for the production and rearing of children. No other institution can as efficiently bring up the child as can the family.

(iv) Provision of Home: Family provides the home for its member. Children are born brought up in homes only.

(v) Family: An Instrument of Culture Transmission and An agent of Socialization. The family serves as an instrument of culture transmission. The family guarantees not only the biological continuity of the human race but also the cultural continuity of the society of which it is a part. IT transmits ideas and ideologies, folkways and mores, customs and traditions, beliefs and values from one generation to the next. The family is an agent of socialization also. The family indoctrinates the child with the values, the morals, beliefs and ideals of the society. It prepares its children for participation in larger world and acquaints them with a larger culture. Indeed, it shapes the personality of the child; family is a mechanism for disciplining the child in terms of cultural goals.

(vi) Status Ascribing Function : The family also performs a pair of functions – (i) status ascription for the individual, and (ii) societal identification for the individual. The family provides the ascribed statuses.

(vii) Affection Function: Family is an institution which provides the mental or the emotional satisfaction and security to its individual members. The individual first experience affection in his parental family as parents and siblings offer him love, sympathy and affection.

Secondary Functions of Family:

In addition to the above described essential or primary functions the family performs some secondary or non- essential functions in some way or the other. Of these, the following may be noted

(i) Economic Functions. The family fulfils the economic needs of its members. This has been the traditional function of family. Previously was an economic unit. But today, the situation has changed. The family members do not work together at home. They are engaged in different economic activities outside the home. They are no longer held together by divisions of labour.

(ii) Educational Functions. The functions provide the basis for the child's formal learning. In spite of great changes, the family still gives the child his basic training in the social attitudes and habits important to adult participation in social life.

(iii) Religious Functions. The family is a centre for the religious training of the children. The children learn from their parents various religious virtues. Even

today, it is in the family that the foundations are laid down for the moral standards that are to guide the children throughout their life. The family meets the spiritual needs of its members. It is through the family that the religious inheritance is passed on to the next generation.

(iv) The Recreational Functions : At one time, recreation was largely family based. It fostered a close solidarity. Elders would organize social gathering among themselves in each other's homes. Children would organize their own recreations among themselves or together with other Children. Often presents and children would join together in the same recreational activities. The effect of this on the cohesion of the family was considerable.

THE CHANGING FAMILY PATTERNS

The family as a basic social institution has undergoing change. The modern family radically differs from that of the traditional one. Both in its structure and functions changes have taken place. Some of these changes may be examined here.

1. The Sexual Regulation Function of the family has not changed much. The family through its agent, marriage, still regulates the sexual impulse of the people.
2. The Reproductive Function of the family has suffered particularly in the Western societies. In the Western societies, it is said, parents no longer desire more children. Absence of children has become the most glaring feature of the Western families.
3. In the past fifty years the parental and the Educational Functions of the family have been shifted to certain external agencies like hospitals, out-patient clinics for mothers, maternity homes, the baby clinics, nurseries, Kindergartens, etc.
4. The Protective Functions of the family have declined particularly in the West. Families are no more the place of protection for the physically handicapped, mentally retarded, aged, diseased, infirm and insane people. Other agencies have taken over this function. But, for the Young children it continues to provide physical and emotional protection.
5. The Economic Function of the family has been disturbed a great deal. The family is no longer the economic unit, neither is it self- sufficient. IT is no longer

united by shared work, for its members work separately. It is more a consuming unit than a producing centre.

6. It seems that the Socialization Function of the family is gaining increased attention particularly in the Western society.

7. The Status- Ascription Function has been weakened since in modern society much emphasis is laid on achieved status.

8. The Recreational Function of the family is losing importance. External agencies have taken away this function. Modern recreation is highly commercialized.

9. Industrialization and urbanization very often go together; cities are growing in size and in number. Family is cut to size. Families are now the smallest and home ties are the weakest. Trends towards disorganization are set in motion.

10. Democratic ideals and values are in currency today. Democracy assures equality and provides liberty to all, to women too. Women now play not only domestic roles but also economic and political roles. They have now become property owners and business managers. They have the voting power and with it, they have entered politics.

11. The Decline of the influence of Mores and the Religious Beliefs, and the Spread of Secular Attitude. Morality and religion are slowly losing grounds. Family members have become more secular in outlook. The religious functions of the family have diminished. Religious sentiments, beliefs and attitudes have come to be dissected with family.

12. The Spirit of individualism and Romantic Love. Today individualism and romanticism are widespread. Their very spirit has destroyed the authority of the family over the individual members. Marriage has become as easily dissolvable as it is entered into by a mutual consent of the partners.

13. Emancipation of Women, Women are now liberated from the chains of traditionalism. They stand on an equal footing with men. Aggressive leaders of the Women's Liberation Movement have attacked the double standard of morality. They are demanding more rights and liberty for women.

14. Decline in Birth Rate. The size of the family is becoming smaller. Joint family is fairly uncommon. The birth is adversely affected. Absence of children is a glaring feature of the Western families.

15. Divorce; Today, more stress is laid on romantic Love. Instances of divorce, desertion and separation are mounting in the West. Marriage has become a civil contract only.

16. Parent- Youth Conflict: Inter – Personal conflicts in the family are increasing. An unusual amount of conflicts between parents and their adolescent children is taking place. This is often denoted in terms of the generation gap. Kingsley Davis says that “The stress and strain in our culture is symptomatic of the functions instability of the modern small family”.

TYPES OR THE FORMS OF THE FAMILY

Sociologists have spoken of different forms or types of family. They have taken into consideration different factors as the basis for the classification of the family. A few classifications can be mentioned as follows:

(i) On the basis of marriage . (I) Polygamous or Polygynous Family. (ii) Polyandrous Family, (iii) Monogamous Family.

(ii) On the basis of the nature of residence: Matrilocal Residence, Patrilocal Residence.

(iii) On the basis of Ancestry or descent: (i) matrilineal Family, (ii) Patrilineal Family.

(iv) On the basis of Nature of authority (i) matriarchal Family (ii) patriarchal Family.

(v) On the basis of the structure: (i) Nuclear family (ii) joint family. (iii) Extended Family.

(vi) On the basis of the Nature of Relations: (i) The Conjugal Family. (ii) Consanguine Family which consists of members with “blood relationship” .

MARRIAGE

Marriage is one of the universal social institutions. It is established by the human society to control and regulate the sex life of man. It is closely connected with the institution of family. In fact, family and marriage are complementary to each other.

As Westermarck has remarked, “Marriage is rooted in the family rather than the family in the marriage”. Marriage is an institution of society which can have very different implications in different cultures. Its purposes, functions and forms may differ from society to society, but it is present everywhere as an institution.

DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIAGE

Definition of Marriage

- (i) Edward Westermarck in his “History of Human Marriage” defines marriage as “the more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of offspring”.
- (ii) Malinowski says that marriage is a “contract for the production and maintenance of children”.
- (iii) According to Robert H. Lowie, “Marriage is a relatively permanent bond between permissible mates”.
- (iv) Broadly speaking however, marriage may be defined as “a socially sanctioned sex relationship involving two or more people of the opposite sex, whose relationship is expected to endure beyond the time required for gestation and the birth of children”.

Characteristics of Marriage

1. Universality. Marriage is more or less a universal institution. It is found among the preliterate as well as literate peoples. It is enforced as a social rule in some of the societies.

2. Relation between Man Women. Marriage is a union of man and women. It indicates relationship between one or more men to one more women.

3. Marriage Bond is enduring. Marriage indicates a long lasting bond between the husband and wife. Hence it is not coextensive with sex life. Marital relationship between man and woman lasts after the sexual satisfaction is obtained. The Hindus, for example, believe that marriage is a sacred bond between the husband and wife which even the death cannot break.

4. Marriage Requires Social Approval. A union of man and woman becomes a marital bond only when the society gives its approval. When marriage is given the hallmark of social approval, it becomes a legal contract.

5. Marriage is Associated with Some Civil or Religious Ceremony. Marriage gets its social recognition through some ceremony. This ceremony may have its own rites, rituals, customs, formalities, etc. It means marriage has to be concluded in a public and solemn manner. Sometimes it receives as a sacrament the blessings of religion.

6. Marriage Creates Mutual Obligations. Marriage imposes certain rights and duties on both the husband and wife. Both are required to support each other and their children.

FUNCTIONS AND IMPORTANCE OF MARRIAGE

The importance of marriage consists in the functions that it performs. The main functions of marriage are as follows:

1. Regulation of Sex Life. Marriage is the powerful instrument of regulating the sex life of man. Sexual impulse is powerful in man. He is exposed to its influence throughout his life. It is an urgent and an irresistible need of man. It has to be controlled and regulated in a proper manner to avoid chaos and confusion in society. Marriage has come to be such a regulative means.

Marriage regulates sex relations also. It prohibits sex relations between the classiest relative. Marriage also puts restrictions on the premarital and extra-marital sex relations.

2. Marriage leads to the Establishment of the Family. Sexual satisfaction offered by marriage results in self perpetuation. It means marriage insists on the couple to establish a family of procreation. It is the marriage which determines the descent of the new born individual,. Inheritance and succession follow the rule of descent.

3. Provides for Economic Cooperation. Marriage makes division of labour possible on the basis of sex partners of marriage distribute and divide work among themselves and perform them. In some of the primitive tribes we find a clear-cut division of work between the husband and wife.

Even in the modern industrial societies, we find husband and wife working outside the family to get more income to elevate their economic status.

4. Marriage Contributes to Emotional and Intellectual Inter-stimulation of the Partners. Marriage brings life-partners together and helps them to develop intense love and affection towards each other. It deepens the emotions and strengthens the companionship between the two. It also helps them to develop intellectual cooperation between them.

5. Marriage aims at Social Solidarity. Marriage not only brings two individuals of the opposite sex together but also their respective families, groups and Kindred's.

FORMS OF MARRIAGE

The main forms of marriage are: Polygyny, Monogamy, and Group Marriage. Each of these types may be analyzed here.

1. POLYGyny

Polygyny is a form of marriage in which one man marries more than one woman at a given time. It was in practice in most of the ancient civilizations. It prevailed among the ancient Hebrews, Assyrians, Babylonians, Indians and other. At Present, it is widespread among the Eskimo tribes, Crow Indians, Hidatsa of North America, African Negroes, the Nagas, Gonds and Baigas of India. However, it is permitted in Muslim Community.

Types of Polygyny

Polygyny is of two types: (i) Sororal Polygyny and (ii) Non- Sororal Polygyny.

(i) Sororal Polygyny is a type of marriage in which the wives are invariably the sisters. It is often called 'sororate'.

(ii) Non- Sororal Polygyny as the term indicates, is a type of marriage in which the wives are not related as sisters. For social, economic, political and other reasons, both the types are practiced by some people.

2. POLYANDRY

Polyandry is the marriage of one woman with several men. It is practiced among the Tibetans, Marquesan Islanders of Polynesia, the Bahama of Africa, the tribals of Somoa and others. In India, the tribes such as tiyan, the Toda, the Kota, the Khasa and Ladakhi Bota also practice polyandry.

Types of Polyandry

Polyandry is of two types (i) Fraternal Polyandry, and (ii) Non- Fraternal Polyandry.

(i) Fraternal Polyandry . When several brothers share the same wife, the practice can called fraternal polyandry. It is prevalent among the Todas.

(ii) Non-Fraternal Polyandry. In this type , the husbands need not have any close relationship prior to the marriage. The wife goes to spend some time with each husband. So Long as a woman lives with one of her husbands the others have no claim over her Tibetans have this type.

3. MONOGAMY

Monogamy is the form of marriage in which one man marries one woman. This is the most widespread form of marriage found among the primitives as well as the civilized people.

4. GROUP MARRIAGE

Theoretically group marriage means the marriage of two or more women with two or more men. But this arrangement is practically rare. Here the husbands are common husbands and wives are common wives. Children are regarded as the children of the entire group as a whole. Some of the tribal's in Australia, India, Tibet and Ceylon are believed to have practiced group marriage.

Rules of Marriage

1. ENDOGAMY

Endogamy is a rule of marriage in which the life-partners are to be selected within the group. It is marriage within the group, and the group may be caste, class, tribe, race, village, religious group, etc. Thus , we have caste endogamy, class endogamy, sub caste endogamy, race endogamy, tribal endogamy and such other forms.

2. EXOGAMY

Exogamy is a rule of marriage in which an individual has to marry outside his own group. IT prohibits marrying within the group.

The rule of exogamy insists that the so-called blood relatives shall neither have marital connections nor sexual contacts among themselves.

Forms of Exogamy

Exogamy assumes various forms in India.

- (i) **Gotra Exogamy.** The Hindu practice of one marrying outside one's own 'gotra' is gotra exogamy.
- (ii) **Pravara Exogamy.** Those who belong to the same pravara (uttering the name of a common saint at religious functions) cannot marry among themselves.

- (iii) **Village Exogamy.** Many Indian tribes (Example: naga, Garo, Munda) have the practice of marrying outside their village.
- (iv) **Pinda Excogamy.** Those who belong to the same 'Pinda' (or sapinda) cannot marry within themselves ('Pinda' means common percentages).

KINSHIP SYSTEM

1. The social relationships deriving from blood ties (real and supposed) and marriage are collectively referred to as kinship.
2. Therefore, the bond of blood or marriage which binds people together in group is called kinship.

Rule of Descent

'Descent' Refers to the social or the biological relationship that exists between the individuals. The 'rule of descent' refers to a set of principles by which an individual traces his descent. There are three basic rules of descent: patrilineal descent, matrilineal descent and bilateral descent.

- (a) **Patrilineal Descent:** According to this rule, descent is traced through the father's or male line. Here the descent criterion is restricted to males, and only descendants of a common ancestor in the male line will be recognized as kin. These are known as agnatic or patrilineal kin.
- (b) **Matrilineal Descent:** Here the descent of the individual is traced through the mother or female exclusively. The descendants are called here uterine or matrilineal kin.

These two modes of tracing the descent are called "unilineal". That, they select one "line" only either the male or female. These principles or rules are not necessarily mutually exclusive within a society.

- (c) **Bilateral Descent.** This is a rule in which the descent is traced through both the lines, the female line and also the male line for some or the other purpose.

What is important here is that almost all kinship system recognize 'bilateral' relationships, that is, relationships to both maternal and paternal kins. Ex: some societies such as the "Yako" of Nigeria, utilize matrilineal descent for some purposes and patrilineal descent for others. Here there exists a system of 'double unilineal descent' which is normally known as "double descent".

Kinship Usages

1. **Rule of Avoidance:** Avoidance means that two kins normally of opposite sex should avoid each other. "In almost all societies avoidance rules prescribe that men and women must maintain certain amount of modesty in dress, speech, and gesture in a mixed company".

Example, the father-in-law should avoid daughter –in-law. The bride must also avoid mother-in-law's brothers. The son-in-law must also avoid his mother-in-law and other female relatives of his wife.

In some societies, even the husband and wife are not supposed to touch each other or show affection in the presence of others. Calling of the personal name is also tabooed. Example: The Hindu wife is not supposed to call her husband by his name.

The rule of avoidance is believed to serve two purposes:

1. Avoidance rules serve to stop the development of complications in the relations between the parties concerned. It is said it seeks to minimize the chance of the development of open hostility in the relations between the parties.

2. According to the Murdock G.P., Rules of avoidance exists because they reinforce incest taboos.

JOKING RELATIONSHIPS

A Joking relationship involves a particular combination of friendliness and antagonism between individuals and groups in certain social situations. In these situations one individual or group is allowed to mock or ridicule the other without offence being taken”.

The usage of the joking relationship permits to tease and make fun of the other. Such relationships prevail between a grandson or grand-daughter on the one hand, his or her grand-father and grand-mother, on the other.

Example:

- (i) Amongst the Oraons of Orissa and the Baigas of Madhya Pradesh such relationships prevail between the grandfather and grandmother and their grand children.
- (ii) Amongst the Crow-Indians ‘such relationships may prevail between a man and his wife’s sisters. They could be very friendly and even talk freely about several things.
- (iii) Amongst the original inhabitants of Fiji Island a son-in-law could be very friendly with his father-in-law and could ask for anything in his house and he may even spoil a few articles just for fun. The father-in-law is expected to bear with that and not to react harshly.
- (iv) A.R. Radcliffe Brown in his book “structure and function in Primitive Society”, has thrown much light on this type of relationship. The origins and cause of joking relationships are not clearly known. Some anthropologists say this kind of relationship acts as a “safety valve” for giving expression or release their may inner also pent up feelings and emotions. These relationships help the individuals to develop intimacy and closeness among themselves.

TEKNONYMY

According to this usage, a kin is not referred to directly but is referred to through another kin.

Examples:

- (i) In a traditional Hindu family, wife does not directly utter the name of her husband but refers to her husband as the father of so and so.
- (ii) Amongst the Hopi, a woman refers to her mother-in-laws as the grandmother of so and so.

AVUNCULATE (AVUNCULATE)

This refers to “the special relationship that persists in some societies between a man and his sister’s Children”.

This term, from the Latin “avunculus” [mother’s brother] is sometimes used to describe the authority of the mother’s brother over his sister’s children in a matrilineal society. This usage is found in a matriarchal system in which prominence is given to the maternal uncle in the life of his nephews and nieces.

AMITATE

Amitate is a usage which gives special role to the father’s sister. Here the father’s sister is given more respect than the mother. Examples: This usage is more prevalent amongst the kongs of Polynesia, Thodas of Nilgiri, and amongst the Crow-Indians. Amongst the Thoda, the child gets its name not through its parents but through the father’s sister. Because, naming the child is her privilege. This usage is normally prevalent in patrilineal systems.

COUVADE

This kinship usage involves only husband and wife. According to this usage, the husband is made to lead the life of an invalid along with his wife whenever she

gives birth to a child. He is then not supposed to engage himself in any work but expected to observe dieting and certain other taboos.

Anthropologists have observed the practice of this usage amongst the Khasis and Thodas of India, the Karbis of South Africa.

Chapter- 13

RELIGION

Man, the social animal, is also a religious or spiritual being. Religion is a major concern of man. It is one of the earliest and the deepest interest of the human beings. Religion is universal permanent, pervasive and perennial interest of man. Man not only, has biological, economic and social needs, but also, what is known as a religious need. He has religious quest which makes him to become restless even beyond the satisfaction of his basic physical needs.

The institution of religion is universal. It is found in all the societies, past and present. Religious beliefs and practices are, however, far from being uniform. Laws, customs, conventions and fashion, etc., are not the only means of social control. Overriding them all, are religion and morality which formulate and shape all of them. They are not only the most influential forces of social control, but also the most effective guides of human behavior. The social life of man in addition to its economic, political, philosophical, scientific and other aspects has also the religious aspect.

Religion revolves round man's faith in the supernatural forces. Religion is a concrete experience which is associated with emotions, especially with fear, awe, or reverence. Many societies have a wide range of institutions connected with religion and a body of special officials, with forms of worship, ceremonies, sacred objects, tithes, pilgrimages, and the like. In modern civilized societies, religious leaders have developed elaborate theories or theologies to explain man's place in the universe. Religion is closely associated with morality and has elaborate rules of conduct.

DEFINITIONS AND THE BASIC COMPONENTS OF RELIGION

1. Durkheim in his book. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* defines religion as a "unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden".

2. James G. Frazer, in his *The Golden Bough* considered religion a belief in “powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and human life”.

3. According to Ogburn, “Religion is an attitude towards superhuman”.

4. Max Muller defines religion as “a mental faculty or disposition which enables man to apprehend the infinite”.

Basic Components of Religion

(i) Beliefs in Supernatural Forces. Religion is a matter of belief. IT is a belief in supernatural or superhuman forces. Some people believe in several kinds of forces and accordingly worship them all. They are called polytheists. Some others believe in only one force, or the God or the Almighty. He is formless and shapeless. They consider Him omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent. They worship Him in different way. They are called monotheists.

(ii) Man’s Adjustment with the Supernatural Force. Man believes that he is at the mercy of the supernatural force. He expresses his subordination to them by means of prayer, hymns, and other acts. Work ship is the essence of religion. Man believes that his disrespect to and negligence of them would bring him disaster. He is, hence, engaged in endless Endeavour to adjust himself with the divinity or the supernatural. His adjustment is one sided.

(iii) Acts, Defined as Rights and Sinful or Sacred and the Profane. Religion considers some acts as righteous and sacred and encourages such acts. It regards some other acts as sinful and profane and denounces such acts. Behaving in accordance with the religious code or standards is righteous; going against them is sinful. The good or the righteous acts are believed to bring man good result, while the sinful acts result in disaster. As Durkheim says, a distinction between the scared and the profane is made in all the societies. The conceptions of heaven and hell are woven around the righteous and the sinful acts.

(iv) Some Methods of Salvation. Every religion has its own explanation regarding salvation. It is regarded as ultimate aim of a devotee. The Buddhists called it Nirvana, a process of becoming one with the God. The Hindus termed Mukti or Moksha- release from the chain of birth and death. They have prescribed four paths

for its attainment – the Yoga Marga, the jana Marga, the Bhakti Marga and the Karma Marga.

Religion is a matter of belief. It is nothing but man's belief in supernatural or superhuman forces. As Durkheim has said the concepts of sacred or holy and profane or unholy are central to religion. What makes a thing holy or unholy is our attitude; an aspect of our mind. It is a quality which we attribute to thing. It is not inherent in the thing. It is an attitude packed with emotion and sentiment that makes us feel that certain things are above and apart from the ordinary matters of every life. In the light of this subjective attitude two different aspects of the holy can be recognized. They are: belief and ritual.

(i) Religion as a system of Belief

All religious organizations depend upon beliefs, knowledge, and training to exercise influence upon their members. Religious belief is the cognitive aspect of religion. It tries to explain the nature and origin of sacred things. It assumes that the sacred things do exist. It tells us what this world is like, what kind of creatures inhabit it, and what their past history and present interests are. It gives us information about the universe, creation, life and death, future of the world and such other deep but subtle matters. This is the information that belief gives about the super empirical world.

(ii) Religion as a System of Ritual

Religious ritual is the practical side of religion. As M. Douglas in his *Purity and Danger*, 1966, says ritual refers to symbolic actions concerning the sacred. Kingsley Davis says that ritual is behavior with reference to super empirical entities and sacred objects. Like the belief itself, it has a sacred character. "It expresses in internal attitude symbolic of the unseen powers". It can include any kind of behavior known, such as the wearing of special clothing, the recitation of hymns or special formulas, and the immersion in certain rivers. It can also include singing, dancing, weeping, bowing, prostrating, crawling, feasting, reading, etc. The religious character of the behavior does not come from the behavior itself, but from the attitude taken towards it. The same actions, the same

motions or the same behavior may be holy in one context but ordinary or unholy in another.

Ritual is a means to remind the individual of the holy world. It strengthens and supports his faith in this world. It helps him to give expression to his religious sentiments and emotions. This brings him emotional ecstasy. Ritual when performed together (as when the Muslims do Namaz together in a Mosque and Christians their Prayers in a Church, and Hindus Their Bhajanas in a Temple) by several individuals becomes effective as a unifying factor. This collective aspect of religion was very much stressed by Durkheim. He said that “The function of religious rituals is to affirm the moral superiority of the society over its individual members and thus to maintain the solidarity of the society”. “The god of the clan can be nothing but the clan itself”.

FUNCTIONS OF RELIGION

The universal existence of religion shows that religion has a great survival value. “The universality of religion is not based up on the forms of belief and practice, but upon the social functions which religion universally fulfils”. These functions are of great individual as well as social significance.

1. Religion Provides Religious Experience. This is the basic function of religion, Prayer, worship and meditation are the summary of religious experience. Through these means man expresses awe, reverence, gratitude and allegiance to the Almighty or the God, or the Supernatural Force. When an individual comes into contact with the supernatural he undergoes some sort of peculiar, inexplicable experience. HE converses with the divine through prayers. HE forgets the world life and its problems. This religious experience ennobles the human desires, ideals and values. It facilitates the development of personality, sociability and creativeness.
2. Religion Provides Peace of Mind. Religion provides for the individual the most desired peace of mind. At every crisis, personal or collective, religion is called in for consolation and peace of mind. It promotes goodness and helps the development of character.

3. Religion Promotes Social Solidarity, Unity and Identity. Religion uploads and validates the traditional ways of the life. More than that it unites people. IT is known that a common faith. Common value – judgments, common sentiments, common worship are significant factors in unifying people. By their participation in religious rituals and worship, people try to identify themselves as having something in common.
4. Religion Conserves the Value of Life. Religion is an effective means of preserving the values of life .Religion defines and redefines the values. Moral, spiritual and social values are greatly supported by religion. IT exercises a tremendous influence over the younger ones and their behavior. Through such agencies like the family and the Church, religion inculcates the values of life in the minds of the growing children.
5. Religion: As an Agent of Social Control. Religion is one of the forms of informal means of social control .It regulates the activities of people in its own way. It prescribes rules of conduct for people to follow. The conceptions of spirits, ghosts, taboos, souls, commandments, sermons etc., control human action and enforce discipline. Ideas of hell and heaven have strong effect on the behavior of people. Thus, religion has a great disciplinary value.

Religion has its own methods to deal with those individuals who violate its norms. It has its own ways to reintegrate the disobedient into the social group. Further religious sanctions are widely made use of to support the ethical codes and moral practices among many peoples.

6. Priestly Function of Religion .By performing is priestly function religion contributes to the stability and order of the society. Religion offers a kind of relationship with the beyond through different kinds of worships and beliefs. By this it provides the emotional ground for a new security .Through its authoritative teaching of beliefs and values; it provides similar points of

opinion and avoids conflicts. It contributes to the maintenance of the status quo.

7. Religion Promotes Welfare. Religion renders service to the people and promotes their welfare. It appeals to the people to be sympathetic, merciful and co-operative. IT rouses in them the spirit of mutual help and Co-operation. It awakens the philanthropic attitude of the people. It reinforces the sense of belonging to the group. It promotes ar., culture and provides means for the development of character on the right lines.
8. Religion Provides Recreation. Religion promotes recreation through religious lectures, kirtana, dramas, dance, music, bhajanas, puranas, harikathas, fairs, festivals, musical concerts, art exhibitions and so on. It tries to make men sorrow less and fearless. Various religious festival and rituals can provide relief to the disturbed mind.
9. Religion Explains Individual suffering and Helps to Integrate Personality. Man has never lived by Knowledge alone. Man is a rational as well as an emotional creature. The things for which men strive in this world are in some measure denied top them. If the aim is to propagate a faith, Persecution may bring failure.
10. Religion Enhances Self- Importance. Religion expands the self to infinite proportions. Religious beliefs relates the self to the infinite or Cosmic Design. Through unity with the infinite the self is ennobled, made majestic. Man considers himself the noblest work of God with whom he shall be united. His self thus becomes grand and elevated.

Chapter-14

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Educational is one of the basic activities of people in all human societies. The continued existence of society depends upon the transformation of culture to the young. It is essential that every new generation must be depends training in the ways of the group so that the same tradition will continue. Every society has its own ways and means of fulfilling this need. 'Education' ahs come to be one of the ways of fulfilling this need.

Definition of Education:

Durkheim conceives of education as “the socialization 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”.

Samuel Koeing. “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 processes whereby the child becomes socialized, i.e., learns the rules of behaviour of the group into which he is born”.

EDUCATION AS A SOCIAL PROCESS:

Education stands for deliberate instruction or training. Man does not behave in society impulsively or instinctively. He behaves in away according to which he is trained. Some thinkers have equated it with socialization. A few others regard education as an attempt to transmit the cultural norms of the group to its younger members. It is also understood as a continuous effort on the part of the individuals to acquire more and more knowledge. All these three interpretations of education stress upon education as a process or a continuous entity. The word proceed stresses continuity.

Firstly, education, viewed as socialization, is continuous. Socialization is social learning. This social learning is not intermittent but continuous. Perfection in social learning is rarely achieved. The more we try to learn about our own society

and fellow beings the more remains to be learned. Social learning begins at birth and ends only at death. It continues throughout life.

Secondly, education, viewed as an agent of cultural transmission, is also continuous. Culture is a growing whole; there can be no break in the continuity of culture. The cultural elements are passed on from generation to generation. The family, school, and various other associations acts as the agents of cultural transmission. Education can be looked upon as process from this point of view also.

Thirdly, education, implied as an attempt to acquire knowledge, is also continuous. Knowledge is like an ocean, boundless or limitless. The universe is a miraculous entity. The more one tries to know of it, the more it becomes mysterious. Not only the Natural Universe but also the social Universe is complex. The human experience is limited to have a thorough knowledge of this universe. Hence, man since time immemorial, has engaged in this endless endeavor of acquiring more and more knowledge about the universe with all its complexity. Education, thus, is continuous endeavor, a processes.

SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF EDUCATION

Education, as a social institution has a great social importance especially in the modern, complex industrialized societies. Let us now examine some of the significant functions of education:

1. To Complete the Socialization process. The main social objective of education is to complete the socialization process. The school and other institutions have come into being in place of family to complete the socialization process, now; the people feel that it is “the school’s business to train the whole child even to the extent of teaching him hones fair play, consideration for others and a sense of right and wrong”.

2. To Transmit the Central Heritage. All societies maintain themselves by the exploitation of a culture. Education has this function of cultural transmission in all societies.

3. for the Formation of Social Personality. Individuals must have personalities shaped or fashioned in ways that fit into the culture. Education, everywhere, has the function of the formation of social personalities. Education helps in transmitting culture through proper moldings of social personalities.

4. Reformation of attitudes. Education aims at the reformation of attitudes wrongly developed by the children already. For various reasons the child may have absorbed a host of attitudes, beliefs and disbelief, loyalties and prejudices, jealousy and hatred, etc.

5. Education for Occupational Placement- An Instrument of Livelihood. Education has a practical end also. It should help the adolescent for earning his livelihood. Education has come to be today as nothing more than an instrument of livelihood. It should enable the student to eke out his livelihood. Education must prepare the student for future occupational positions. The youth should be enabled to play a productive role in society. **6. Conferring of Status.** Conferring of status is one of the most important functions of education. The amount of education one has, is correlated with his class positions.

7. Education Encourages the Spirit of Competitions. The school instills co-operative values through civic and patriotic exhortation or advice. Yet the school's main emphasis is up on personal competition.

8. Education Traits in Skills that are required by the Economy. In planned economy, normally, it is planned years in advance to produce a definite number of doctors, engineers, teacher, technicians, scientist, etc. to meet the social and economic needs of the society.

9. Education fosters participant democracy. Participant democracy in any large and complex society depends on literacy. Literacy allows full participation of the people in democratic processes and effective voting. Literacy is a product of education. Educational system has thus economic as well as political significance.

10. Education Imparts Values. The curriculum of a school, its "extra-curricular" activities and the informal relationships amongst students and teachers communicate social skills and values.

11. Education acts as an Integrative Force. Education acts as an integrative force in society by communicating values that unite different sections of society. The school or the educational institutions can help the child to learn new skills and learn to interact with people of different social backgrounds.

Chapter-15

ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Man has been a creative animal since historical time and has improved upon his creativity slowly. With the help of the labour he acts upon the nature and tries to alter it. Marx is of opinion that man never gets satisfied with the existing conditions and his nature he is potentially revolutionary. The work provides the most important and vital means for man to fulfill his basic needs, his individuality and humanity. Labour is the essence of human being. Man's work becomes a fully satisfying activity because man lives in society. Work gets the status of fully satisfying activity when an individual's work is both for meeting his needs as well as needs of the others. But whether human wants derive from biological or social services, people are confronted with the fact that many things are not available in unlimited amount; they are scarce.

The fact of human wants and the scarcity of goods and services must be faced by every society. In the process man engages himself in social production. It has been seen that in the process of acting upon nature man gets involved in interaction process with other and society moves towards complexity, leading towards the growth of culture etc. The production of material things cannot be comprehended without turning to the values of the people.

Human beings are in the process of social productions which include society, culture, religion, economic production and they are linked with economic production. Nature also plays a role in affecting the type of social relations that develop in any kind of society.

Social life confronts us with three functional imperatives.

1. Production: It involves the assembling and applying of human and natural resources from nature through agriculture, mining, fishing and forestry.
 - (i) Primary Industry of Production: The extracting or gathering of developed nature through agriculture, mining, fishing and forestry.

- (ii) Secondary Industry of Production: The processing or converting of raw materials in a fashion that enhances their final consumption value.
 - (iii) Tertiary Industry of Production: Service activities of one sort or another e.g. marketing, banking, medical care etc.
2. Distribution: IT involves channeling inputs. i.e., natural resources and labour, to producing agencies and outputs (goods and services) to consuming agencies. The function derives from certain unavoidable conditions. Distribution requires social mechanisms by which goods and services are exchange. One such mechanism is money. However societies differ in the emphasis they place on individual “private property” rights as opposed to “collective property” holding of property by clans, communities or nation states.
 3. Consumption: It involves the “using up” of goods and services. Production requires consumption while consumption necessitates production. The accumulation of possessions becomes the foundation for system of social stratification.

TYPES OF ECONOMIES

Economic institution refers to ordering and organization of human relations and human effort in order to procure as many of the necessities of day-to-day life as possible with the expenditure of minimum effort. This definition holds good for any prehistoric, primitive or modern society: only the conception of what is regarded as necessary for life, and what as a luxury, differs.

Various classifications of economic systems have been given since Adam Smith talked about hunters, pastoralists and agriculturists. Hildebrand gave a very useful clarification economic systems classified into those based on barter, money credit. Gross postulated an evolutionary scheme with, the following stages of development collection economy, cultural nomadic economy settled village economy, town economy and metropolitan economy. Marx has

classified five major types of society: primitive society, ancient society, Asiatic society, feudal society and capitalist society.

ECONOMY IN SIMPLER SOCIETIES

The complex economic organization had its humble beginning in the food gathering and hunting societies. In the primitive days man satisfied his hunger by searching for living upon what he could raise. In food gathering and hunting societies, procurement of fruits, roots, grains was supplemented by some hunting and trapping of land and water animals. These hunting societies were economically self-sufficient. Indeed where animals were in abundance, the technique of hunting became highly developed. The primitive economic organizations are of subsistence type; that is, they fall into the broad category of production- consumption economies.

Some of the characteristic traits of primitive economic systems, as found in tribal India are as below:

1. The exploitation of nature is carried on the absence of technological aids and, therefore inefficiently, consequently, the bare minimum necessary for substance is raised with considerable difficulty.
2. Money as a store and measurement of value and a medium of exchange is not widely used in simple primitive society. The intra – tribal economic relations are always based on barter and exchange.
3. The profit motive in economic dealings is generally absent. The role of an incentive is fulfilled by a sense of mutual obligation, sharing and solidarity.
4. Co-operative and collective behaviour is one of the main characteristics of the tribal economic organization in India.
5. The rate of innovation internal or induced is very low in these societies and consequently they are stabler and there is little of quick progress. It also results from the simplicity and uniformity of the techniques used,

6. The regular market as an institution is absent. It is usually in the form weekly market or the festival or seasonal markets.
7. Most of the economic activities of a primitive people are directed to words the manufacture of consumptions rather than production goods.
8. Specialization based on specially acquired specific technical abilities is absent. However, a simpler form of division of labour exists.

COMPONENTS OF PRIMITIVE ECONOMY

Sex Based Division of Labour: In simple and primitive societies, an early organization in the procuring of food and its preparation is the division of labour between men and women. The only specialization has based on the compulsion of physiological factors like sex, infancy or old age. In hunting societies man and not women, are generally the hunters where hunting is an important source of food. Similarly, preservation and cooking are predominantly female specialization.

The Family and the Community as Economic Institutions: In simpler societies the family is an important institution in both the production and consumption of goods. The wife ordinarily prepares food, which the men or women bring in. However family is not the only producing and consuming organization. Some hunting for instance, that the buffalo is undertaken by parties of men larger than the number of men in a single family. The consuming organization may be family alone or the group of eaters who join at festivals and ceremonies.

The Origin of Trade: The early societies were economically self – sufficient and hence did not depend on trade. Moreover distances between settlements was often great and transportation rudimentary. Another obstacle were the absence of a standard medium of exchange. Generally, however the trade was between neighboring tribes and procedure was barter. The trade resulted from differences in natural resources in particular areas, which occasion abundance or scarcity of desired commodities.

The Gift as a Medium of Exchange: For many early cultures the mechanism of exchange seemed to have been effected by hospitality or by gifts: A gift was a social substitute for money among money cultures.

Hospitality as an Economic Service: The purpose of money was also rendered by the practice of hospitality. Hospitality was the rule in hunting communities. This system of extending hospitality works out reciprocally in the long run and is not wholly one sided.

MARKET ECONOMY

This is an economic system in which the price of the resources is determined on the basis of supply and demand. In practice there are some Limitations on market freedom in almost all countries. Capitalism is the main features of free market economy.

Capitalism, as an institution is the product of the Industrial Revolution.

This type of economic organization in its pure form may briefly be defined by:

- (1) Private ownership and control of the economic instruments of productions, i.e. capital;
- (2) The gearing of economic activity to making profits;
- (3) A market framework that regulates this activity;
- (4) The appropriation of profits by the owners of capital (subject of taxation by the state);
- (5) The provision of labour by workers who are free agents.

Historically, capitalism has developed and expanded to dominate economic life along with the growth of industrialization, although some of its features were to be found in the commercial sector of the pre-industrial European economy, perhaps as long ago as the medieval period.

In capitalism, the economic functions of society are served by numerous, highly differentiated and relatively small producers. Each producer, either wholly or in part owns and controls his enterprise and bears the full risk and benefits of his activity. Control and 'coordination of the many activities and decisions of both producers and consumers are achieved.

The operations of the free market in which – what is supplied, in what quantities and what price,- are largely determined by demand on the part of consumers and by competition between producers. Essential to such a system is a monetary unit which acts both as a source of wealth and as an accounting medium measuring the profit and loss of the enterprise.

CAPITALISM:

Sociological concern with capitalism has been mainly directed towards its origin and its development. Weber, in *The Protestant Ethic and the spirit of Capitalism*, saw origins of capitalism to be, at least in part, due to the rise of Pietistic Protestantism in Europe. He suggested that the Calvinist 'ethic' of asceticism and increasing activity in the world for the glory of God gave rise to a secular variant which formed the 'spirit of capitalism', the idea that hard work carried its own reward. It was this spirit, coupled with 'rationality' which was distinctive in nineteenth-century capitalism.

Sombart also laid great stress upon the 'spirit' which inspired the whole epoch of capitalism, a spirit which combined daring and adventure with rationality and calculation.

Probably the best known writer on capitalism and its development is Karl Marx. Marx agreed that the essential feature of capitalism and indeed, any other type of society was the social relation of production. The ways in which the means of production were owned and controlled. It was these relationships which formed the basis for the rise of proletariat respectively.

Capitalism can also be regarded as an ideology which contains doctrines of social justice and individuals rights. This ideology suggests that existing inequalities of income and wealth represent the socially just returns for the different contributions that people make to economic activity. It also contains the

idea that certain freedoms and rights are necessary for the continued well-being of capitalist society, notably that individuals must be protected from the arbitrary power of the state and while the state protects their economic interests by safeguarding property rights and guaranteeing the enforcement of commercial contracts. Political democracy provides safeguards against arbitrary state power and historically, capitalism has been associated with democratic political forms.

THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF CAPITALISM:

The following factors may be said to be the economic basis of capitalism.

1. Private property: It is the first basis of capitalism. In capitalism, every person has the right to maintain private property and aggrandize it to any extent.
2. Large-Scale Production: IT is the production of goods on a large scale that has led to the development of the institution of private property.
3. Money and credit: So long as the form of exchange was barter, capitalism could not develop. But as soon as money became the medium of exchange and it became possible for people to borrow money, industry developed.
4. Profit Institution: According to Marx, capitalism for the absence of the institution of profit. Production under capitalism is profit-oriented.
5. Competition: Competition is a necessary condition for the economic system of capitalism. Artificial scarcity is created and demand is increased which leads to cut throat competition between capitalists.
6. Price Mechanism: In capitalism, the price of the commodity is determined not by its cost of production of utility but by the law of demand and supply.

7. Wages Institution: In capitalism, the worker is haggled about his payments. The objective of the capitalist is to pay as less wages as possible and to take the maximum work out of him. Here is exploitation of labour in capitalism.
8. Antithesis between Group Interest and social Function: The idea of profit brings out clearly the antithesis between group-interest and social function. The specific function of this economic order is to maximize production so as to lead to maximization of profit. There is no guarantee, however, that, profit will correspond to service, that these economic activities will automatically further the interests of the community.
9. Safeguards in capitalist System: Because of the various tensions within the economic system, the state has to pass laws, 'to safeguard the life and wealth of 'workers' to prevent employment of children and to provide security in case accidents, sickness and old age'.
10. Division of Labour: Minute division of labour which is both a cause and consequence of modern technological method of production, is an important feature of all modern economics.

In short, capitalism contains two essential ingredients. The deliberate pursuit of personal profit as the goal of economic activity, and free competition among both the buyers and sellers of goods and services. Max Weber remarked. "The outstanding characteristic of capitalism is production for the pursuit of profit, and ever renewed profit". There is nothing unusual about people seeking their own self-interest, but the distinguishing feature of capitalism is that it defines this activity as normal, morally acceptable, and social desirable.

CONTROLLED OR PLANNED ECONOMY:

The controlled or planned economy is an economy in which state authorities rather market forces directly determine process, output and production. Socialism is one aspect of the planned economy.

Socialism rests on entirely different assumptions. Production should not be for private profit and competition between different firms producing similar products is a waste of resources. The pursuit of private profit is regarded as fundamentally immoral because one person's profit is another person's loss. Under capitalism, it is argued workers are paid less than the value of what they produce and the surplus wealth is seized as profit by the owners. The result is social inequality and social conflict. The aims of a socialist economy is efficient production of needed goods and services and the achievement of social equality by preventing accumulation of private wealth.

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

A compromise between the capitalist and socialist models is that of democratic socialism which is practiced by nearly all the countries of Western Europe. Under this system, the state takes only strategic industries and services into public ownership as airlines, railways, mines, banks, T.V., radio, etc. Private ownership of other means of production is permitted or even encouraged, but the economy is closely regulated in accordance with national priorities. Very high tax rates are used to prevent excessive profits or an undue concentration of wealth.

COMMUNISM

Another alternative which is hypothetical is communism. The socialist societies of Eastern Europe and Asia are usually but incorrectly described as 'communist' in the United States, but they never describe themselves in this manner. They believe that they are still at the earlier stage of socialism, a preparatory step before a truly communist society is achieved. So far no communist society has existed, so it is difficult to define its characteristics.

However, it is implied that in communist society, the role of state will shrink, there would be an abundance of goods and services, people would no longer regard property as 'private' and wealth and power would be shared in harmony by the community as a whole. Under such system, people would work according to their abilities and would receive rewards according to their needs. The history of alienation and strife would be over.

MODERN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

There has been a radical change in the way of life of the average individual, in the most developed nations. At the same time, the diffusion of this form of economic organization throughout the world has drastically altered international relations and created interdependence on an unprecedented scale. Although it is true that the majority of the world's population has so far only begun to be touched the rate of diffusion compared with previous epochs, such as that of settle agriculture, has been very rapid.

The main contributing factor appear to be the virtual explosion in the stock of knowledge, and particularly in scientifically established knowledge, which has occurred in the past three centuries. In the developments of the 17th century now described a the scientific revolution, man mastered procedures for establishing the "laws of nature" Progress in the scientific comprehension of natural phenomena went hand in hand with the use of this knowledge to direct and control man's physical environment in time with material needs.

This scientific revolution helps account not only for the appearance of modern economic development as a distinctive epoch but also for its spread. Modern economic development makes its appearance in the western world where the scientific revolution is occurring and spreads rapidly to those areas where educational development has made the transfer of new knowledge more feasible. The gains to be had from modern technology are not costless however. Modern changes are accompanied by painful adjustments on the part of individuals or groups in family life, economic activity generally to change.

So, modern economic growth is the manifestation in production of the growth and diffusion of the stock of knowledge stemming from the scientific revolution, or more generally, from the intellectual revolution which began with the renaissance.

Chapter-16

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

Political or governmental institutions are societal arrangements for making and enforcing laws, protecting the public health and welfare, distributing public and tax burdens, conducting foreign affairs, and deciding the issue of war and peace. Political Institutions are the ultimate source of legitimate power in a social system, whether the system is based upon rule by the many or rule by the few.

Political institutions are concerned with the distribution of power in society. Max Weber defined the state as “a human community which successfully claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory”. The state is one of the important agencies of social control, whose functions are carried out by means of law, backed ultimately by physical force.

State can be viewed as a political form of human association by which a society is organized under the agency of a government that claims legitimate sovereignty over territorial area, authority over all the members of the society, and the right to use physical force when necessary to insure the effective exercise of its legitimate control.

DEFINITION OF STATE:

According to Laski: The state is a “territorial society divided into government and subjects claiming, within it allotted physical area a supremacy over all other institutions”.

According to MacIver: The state is “an association which, acting through law as promulgated by a government endowed to this end with coercive power, maintains within a community territorially demarcated the universal external conditions of social order”.

ELEMENTS OF THE STATE:

The state is used as a synonym for nation, society, government etc. The term state is very commonly used to express the collective action of the community, though the agency of government. The state is a necessary, natural and a universal institution. The state must, possess the elements of:

1. **Population:** The state is a human institution and population and land are the starting point to any study of man in an organized group. The members of one family do not make a state; there should be a series of families. No absolute criterion can be laid down regarding the number of people in a state. Increase or loss in population makes no difference in its statehood, though the population must be sufficient to maintain the state organization.
2. **Territory:** There can be no state without a fixed territory. Territory gives state some specification. In the words of Prof. Elliot, 'A territorial sovereignty or the superiority of the state over all within its boundaries and complete freedom from external control has been a fundamental principle of the modern state life'.
3. **Government:** Government is an essential element of the state. People live together but cannot be recognized unless they are properly organized and accept certain rules of conduct. The agency created to enforce such rules of conduct and to ensure obedience is called government. Government is the focus of the common purpose of the people occupying a definite territory and it is through this medium that common policies are determined; common affairs are regulated and common interests promoted.
4. **Sovereignty:** Sovereignty of the state is the most essential and distinguishable feature. People inhabiting a definite portion of the territory and having a government do not constitute a state. They must be internally supreme and free from external control. The state has two aspects, internal sovereignty, i.e., states' monopoly of authority inside its boundaries and external sovereignty.

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN SIMPLE SOCIETIES:

Social order is dependent on power, authority decision making. IT is concerned with the maintenance of order which has many ramifications. In the past when society was very simple and problems not many, all issues were decided by the community as a whole.

Political institutions of simple societies have been a subjects of interest with the historical sociologists and the rest. While kinship as recognized is the basis of their political institutions, emphasis is laid on the territorial homogeneity also having contributed to it. Spencer began his classification of simple societies on the criteria of the degrees of centralized control. Therefore, he divided the simple societies into three categories: the societies without headship, those with stable headship and those with unstable headship. But in this classification even he had no confidence. He held that it “should not be taken as more than an approximation of the truth”. Maine laid full emphasis on kinship being the basis of primitive political system. According to him kinship was “the sole possible ground of community in political functions”. Lowie, while not disregarding kinship, emphasises the role of territory in the development of political institutions.

The general consensus is that kinship and territorial homogeneity made the exercising of political function possible. In the Rigvedic society, “Kulapa” the head of the family, and “vispati” the head of the vis, that is the head of the settlement had a political role.

Simple societies have been categorized into two groups –those who have no distinct political structure and authority and those who have a permanent political structure.

One distinctive feature in primitive society with political authority is that it is closely bound up with kinship, religion and other institutions. Maine, in his Ancient law, argued that in early societies kinship was ‘the sole possible ground of community in political functions’.

The position in relation to the societies with distinct and permanent political institution is different. Kinship in these societies also plays a singnifact part in the maintenance of the social order.

Thus even when there is not very clearly formed political organization capable of sustaining permanent legal institutions, there are nevertheless, institutional means for dealing with offences.

POLITICAL INSTITUTION IN COMPLEX SOCIETIES:

Some of the early sociologists maintained that as in the case of other institutions, the state evolved from a very simple organization and passed through certain definite stages until it reached a high level of development. One of the outstanding exponents of such a theory was the English sociologist and political scientist Walter Bagehot. In his *Physics and Politics*, Bagehot asserted that government passed through three distinct stages in societal evolution (i) the age of custom-fixing when government was practically nonexistent ;(ii) the age of conflict between groups with diverse folkways and mores and the resultant conquest and subjugation of certain groups by others, which marked the beginning of the state; and (iii) the age of discussion, when government by discussion and compromise came into existence, this being the highest form of political development

Spencer, in his *Principles of sociology*, applied his principles of social evolution to the state, postulating certain stages, similar to those propounded by Bagehot. These (1) the tribal, when groups are unorganized bands and no government exists; (2) the military, When conquest and subjection give rise to states organized around powerful war leaders and, eventually, hereditary kings; and (3) the industrial, when military tends to be displaced by economic influence. According to Bagehot Spencer, the state, like society itself, passed through a process of evolution from simple and crude beginnings to the highest stage, which they believed to be still in the making and in which peace and harmonious development will prevail.

The theory of linear evolution of the state has been entirely discredited, particularly by Lowie in *The Origin of the State*. The state is now believed to have developed gradually from a simple to a complex type. Even today it exists in different stages of development among various peoples.

The emergence of the state as a separate institution is closely linked to the level of cultural evolution of a society and in particular to its means of subsistence. As pointed out earlier, political institutions were absent in hunting and gathering societies. Each group was autonomous and independent and decisions were made

by group consensus. In pastoral and horticultural societies, where populations were larger and there would have been food surplus, some individuals became more powerful than others. They passed their status on to their descendants and a pattern of chieftainship emerged. In agricultural societies, a very large food surplus was possible and this could be stored and converted into wealth and power. Entire categories of the Population became wealthier than others and social classes appeared for the first time. Societies contained millions of people and a central political authority is needed to maintain social order and organize social life. The state thus emerged as a distinct social institution. The power of the ruler was legitimated by traditional authority and an elaborate court bureaucracy and a full-time military organization was established.

In industrial societies, the nature of the state changed radically. The unprecedented wealth produced by industrialism permitted the emergence of a large middle class. Rising levels of aspiration, combined with mass education, produced a more politically sophisticated population. Traditional authority was replaced by legal rational authority as a basis of state legitimacy. The state became one of the most powerful and central institutions in a modern society.

POWER, AUTHORITY AND LEGITIMACY

Power: According to Weber's classic definition, power is "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his will despite resistance regardless of the basis on which this probability rests". Power is always relational. To exercise power it is necessary to have some control over whatever it is that others desire, to be able to withhold what they need. Weber's definition of power has following characteristics:

- (i) Power is exercised by individual and therefore involves choice, agency and intention;
- (ii) Power is exercised over other individuals and may involve resistance and conflict;
- (iii) It implies that there are differences in interests between powerful and powerless;
- (iv) Power is negative, involving restrictions and deprivations for those subjected to domination.

Power may be exercised blatantly or subtly, legally or illegally, justly or unjustly. It may be derived from many sources, such as wealth, status, prestige, numbers or organizational efficiency. Its ultimate basis, however, is the ability to compel obedience, if necessary through the threat or use of force.

The use of power may be either legitimate or illegitimate. Power is considered legitimate; only people generally recognize that those who apply it have the right to do so. Weber called illegitimate power, coercion.

AUTHORITY:

If power is the exercise of constraint and compulsion against the will of an individual or group, authority is the sub-type of power in which people willingly obey commands because they see the exercise of power as legitimate. Power without authority remains institutionalized, and relative. Because it is instrumental and conditional, its effectiveness is uncertain. Authority being institutionalized is fixed in its scope, character and distribution.

Authority represents the set of rules, produces, traditions and norms are regarded as binding when they are applied within a given social unit. Parsons defines authority as “morally justified by both the powerful and the powerless”. But according to the conflict theory, power is never endorsed morally by the powerless. Instead this theory defines it as thoroughly institutionalized. Its use is unquestioned.

TYPES OF AUTHORITY

Max Weber has distinguished three types of legitimate authority which are as follows:

1. **Traditional Authority:** in political system based on traditional authority, power is legitimized by ancient customs. The authority of the ruler is generally founded on unwritten laws and it has almost a sacred quality. Chieftainships and monarchies have always relied on traditional authority. Claim to traditional authority is usually based on birth with the status of ruler generally passing to the eldest son of the incumbent.
2. **Legal-Rational Authority:** In a system based on legal-rational authority, power is legitimized by explicit rules and procedures that define the rights

and obligations of the ruler. This form of authority is characteristic of the political systems of most modern societies. This type of authority stresses a “government of laws, not of people”.

3. Charismatic Authority: In a system based on charismatic authority, power is legitimized by the unusual, Exceptional or even super- natural; qualities that people attribute to particular political, religious or military leaders. Typical charismatic leaders are such persons as Jesus, Joan of Arc, Napoleon, Hitler and Gandhi. The charismatic leader is seen as a person of destiny, who is inspired by unusual vision, by lofty principles or even by God. It is spontaneous, irrational phenomenon that often poses a threat to systems based on traditional or legal rational authority.

Chapter-17

SOCIALISATION

Man is not only social but also cultural. It is the culture that provides opportunities for man to develop the personality. Development of personality is not an automatic process. Every society prescribes its own ways and means of giving social training to its new born members so that they may develop their own personality. This social training is called 'Socialisation'.

THE CONCEPT OF SOCIALISATION

At birth the human child possesses the potentialities of becoming human. The child becomes a man or a person through a variety of experiences. He becomes then what the sociologist calls 'socialized'. Socialization means the process whereby an individual becomes a functioning member of the society. The individual becomes socialized by learning the rules and practices of social groups. By this process the individual develops a personality of his own.

Socialization is often referred to as the 'transmission of culture', the process whereby men learn the rules and practices of social groups. Socialization is an aspect of all activity within all human societies. Just as we learn a game by playing it, so we learn life by engaging in it. We are socialized in the course of the activities themselves.

Definition

- (i) Bogardus: Socialization is the "process of working together, of developing group responsibility, or being guided by the welfare needs of others".
- (ii) W.F. Ogburn: "Socialization is the process by which the individual learns to conform to the norms of the group".

- (iii) Peter Worsley explains socialization as the process of “transmission of culture, the process whereby men learn the rules and practices of social groups”.
- (iv) Harry M. Johnson understands socialization as “learning that enables the learner to perform social roles”. He further says that it is a “process by which individuals acquire the already existing culture of groups they come into”.
- (v) Lundberg says that socialization consists of the “complex processes of interaction through which the individual learns the habits, beliefs, skills and standards of judgment that are necessary for his effective participation in social groups and communities”.

Every man tries to adjust himself to the conditions of his social environment. This process of adjustment itself socialization. The social order is maintained largely by socialization. Individuals learn to conform to the norms of the group. This helps the group to maintain its order. Socialization is a process of transforming the human animal into a human being, of converting the biological being into a social being. Man, as an organism, has some internal factors or forces which limit or help his socialization. These internal forces relevant to the process of socialization are: (i) reflexes, (ii) instincts, (iii) urges, (iv) capacities, and (v) comprehension and educability.

Socialization is a process of inducting the individual into the social world. It consists in teaching culture which he must acquire and share. Socialization is social learning. This learning is not intermittent but continuous. The more we try to learn the more remains to be learnt. Perfection in social learning is already achieved. The process of socialization is something that continues through outlife. We must not think that there is a stage in learning at which a man has learnt everything about his group and that thereafter, he ceases to learn.

Man belongs to different groups at different stages of his life. As these groups change, so we must learn new rules, new patterns of behaviour. Moreover, we do not remain within the same role. Even though, we are members of family all our life, we are constantly changing our roles within it, acquiring new roles, dropping or modifying old ones.

The heart of the process of socialization is the emergence and gradual development of the 'self' or 'ego'. It is in terms of the self that personality takes shape and mind comes to function. The notion of self begins to arise as the child learns something of the world of sensations about him.

Everyone who is alive, in any society, has a consciousness or self. When a child is born it has no consciousness of itself or of others. He does not possess those behaviour mechanisms which make an individual a part and member of any group. The child at birth is not conscious of any of the self and other relationships. These relationships the child learns through the process of socialization.

The term 'self' is often used to mean 'self-image'. Some writers like G. Murphy view the self simply as the person's conception of himself as a totality. But G.H. Mead would rather regard self as purely 'social' in nature. It is true that the self develops out of the child's communicative contact with others. The idea of self develops in conjunction with the idea of other things. He learn that they are distinct beings and that he too has individuality. Acquaintance with his name and use of pronouns such as 'I', 'Me', 'myself, etc. help the process of self-discovery. Little children's answers to such questions as 'what is your name?' and 'whose boy are you?' etc., would emphasise the idea of self in relation to others.

Socialization is often described as the process whereby an individual internalizes the norms of the group. As a result of this a distinct 'self' emerges unique to the individual. In the process of socialization, the

individual learns culturally approved habits, ideas and attitudes. He is fitted into the social group by being taught the rights and duties of his position. His drives are guided into approved channels of expression. The cultural rules and restrictions are so internalized that they become part of his personality.

Thus, internalization of norms' refers to the process in which the norms become a part of the personality. To begin with, the human child does not have the sense of right and wrong, desirable and undesirable, moral and immoral, acceptable and unacceptable, good and bad, justifiable and unjustifiable and so on. By trial and error and by direct or indirect observation and experience the child slowly learns the approved way of behaving. He learns to distinguish between the right and wrong. Parents and other members also help the child to learn the norms of the groups. They reinforce the child's learning by rewards and punishment or by means of approval and disapproval. The repeated experiences of the child help him to internalize the norms in his personality. Internalization of norms is an important aspect of socialization. It lessens the problems of social control for society. Ultimately, social control is achieved when self-control is mastered. The individual is able to exercise discipline by himself over his own actions and behaviour. More than the enforced means of social control such as customs and traditions or laws and legislations, the internalized norms are more effective. They have an enduring effect on the personality of the child. Internalized norms provide the best explanation to certain widely accepted and obeyed social taboos such as the 'incest'.

TYPES OF SOCIALISATION

Ian Robertson in his book "Sociology" (1977), has mentioned four types of socialization. According to him, the socialization that a person undergoes in the course of his lifetime may be one or more of four different types: Primary Socialization, Anticipatory Socialization, Developmental socialization and re-socialization.

- (i) **Primary Socialization.** This is the most essential and basic type of socialization. It takes place in the early years of life of the newborn individual. It concentrates on the teaching of language and cognitive skills, the internalization of cultural norms and values, establishment of emotional ties, and the appreciation of other roles and perspectives.
- (ii) **'Internalization of norms'** is the most important aspect of primary socialization. Internalization of norms refers to the process in which the norms of society become a part of the personality of the individual. The Socializing agents reinforce the child's learning by rewards and punishments or by means of approval and disapproval.
- (iii) **Anticipatory Socialization** Men not only learn the culture of the group of which they are immediate members. They may also learn the culture of groups to which they do not belong. Such a process whereby men socialize themselves into the culture of a group with the anticipation of joining that group, is referred to by sociologists like Merton as 'anticipatory socialization'.
- (iv) **Developmental Socialization.** This kind of learning is based on the achievements of primary socialization. "It builds on already acquired skills knowledge as the adult progresses through new situation such as marriage or new jobs. These require new expectations, obligations, and roles. New learning is added to and blended with old in a relatively smooth and continuous process of development"
- (v) **Re-socialization.** Not only do individuals change roles within groups, but they also change membership-groups. In some instances, 'resocialisation'- "the stripping away of learned patterns and substitution of new ones for them"-must occur. Such re-socialization takes place mostly when a social role is

radically changed. It may also happen in periods of rapid social mobility.

THEORIES OF SOCIALISATION:

1. C.H. Cooley's Theory of 'Looking-Glass Self':

The 'self' might be regarded as the internalized object representing one's own personality. Where does this self arise? Are we born with it? Is it something we have to learn to recognize and to know?

C.H. Cooley has placed before us two primary propositions- (i) The mind is social, and (ii) Society is mental. of the two, the first one has impressed a good number of sociologists. He wrote in his Social Organization, that "self and society are twin-born, we know one as immediately as we know the other, and the notion of a separate and independent ego is an illusion". Observing his own children, he concluded that the very idea of 'self' or 'ego'-of I-can arise only in relationship with other people.

Three Main Elements of 'Looking-Glass Self':

Cooley held that self and social are two sides of the same coin. Our ideas, loyalties, attitudes, and points of view are derived from others. One means of their transmission Cooley called the 'looking-glass self. According to him, self-ideas or self-attitudes develop by a process of imagining what others think of us by a kind of 'looking-glass' process. A self-idea of this sort seems to have three main elements:

1. The imagination of our appearance to the other person.
2. The imagination of his judgment of that (imagined) appearance.
3. Some kind of self-feeling such as pride or mortification.

As Cooley has stated in his 'Human Nature and the Social Order', the individual develops the idea of self through contact with the primary group, particularly with the members of the family. This he does by becoming conscious of their attitudes

towards him. In other words, the child gets his conception of his self, and later of the kind of person he is, by means of what he imagines others take him to be. Cooley, therefore, called the child's idea of himself the 'looking-glass self'. The child conceives of himself as better or worse in varying degrees, depending upon the attitudes of others towards him. Thus, the child's view of himself may be affected by the kind of name given by his family or friends.

The 'looking-glass self' assures the child which aspects of the assumed roles will bring him praise, which blame; which ones are acceptable to others, which ones unacceptable. People normally have their own attitudes towards social roles and adopt the same. The child first tries out these on others and in turn adopts towards his self. The self thus arises when the person becomes an 'object' to himself. He is now capable of taking the same view of himself that he infers others do. The moral order which governs the human society, in large measure, depends upon the 'looking-glass self'

2. George Herbert Mead's Theory of 'Self'

G.H. Mead, the famous philosopher and psychologist at the University of Chicago, also held the opinion like that of Cooley that the society is the determining factor in the socialization of the individual. He agreed with Cooley that 'self' is social. Mead has stated, 'the individual, largely through interaction, becomes aware of himself'. It means the individual comes to know about himself by what is known as 'role playing'.

'Role-playing'. Mead has said that the individual in order to get a picture of himself plays the roles of others. In seeing himself as others see him, the individual is actually putting himself in the place of others, and imagining what their response might be. This is 'role-playing'. The 'others' may be his parents, close associates, and finally, society as a whole. As the child gets older, he can be observed to act towards his dolls or toys as the mother or other members of the family have acted towards him. The child, in his play, is taking the role of another person. Though 'role-playing'. That is, by playing the role of the mother, father or other persons, the child is enabled to see himself objectively through the eyes of others. Of these 'others' some are more "significant".

Significant Others

The New-born infant has needs like those for food, clothing that press for satisfaction. The mother satisfies these needs and the child comes to depend upon her and 'identifies himself' with her emotionally. But in course of time, the child differentiates himself from his mother and comes to know that he has a subordinate role to the superior role of the mother. Then the child understands the role of the father. He differentiates his father from his mother and then integrates him into the social system. In this way, the number of the 'significant others' increase for the child.

The Generalized Others.

The child not only differentiates itself from others but also begins to act towards himself from the viewpoint of the whole group. The child tries to understand the relative roles of various individuals in the same social context. The child begins to anticipate the behaviour of all the members of a group in a particular context. In other words, the child generalizes the roles of others. For example, if the child is playing the role of a 'bridegroom' in its game of marriage, he must know not only the role of the bridegroom but also that of the bride, the father-in-law, priest, relatives, etc.

In the above example, the child plays a number of roles simultaneously, a generalized role of a number of people. The roles, moreover, are built around the rules of the game. According to the rule, the child generalizes his behaviour. He plays the role of what Mead calls 'the generalized other'. The whole community is 'generalised other' with which the child becomes identified. 'Self' and 'society', in the child's experience, are the two sides of the same coin.

It is clear from the above description that the self is not something that exists first and then into relationship with others. The 'self' is a product of social interaction. 'It arises in social experience'. "It is something that develops out of social interaction and is constantly changing and adjusting as new situation and conflicts arise... "The self develops and grows in a social context.

3. Sigmund Freud's theory of Human Mind:

Sigmund Freud was an Austrian Psychiatrist and the founder of psychoanalysis. Much of the works of Freud centre around the 'Human Mind' rather than the process of socialization. Though Freud has not established any theory concerning socialization as such his ideas have contributed much towards the clarification of that process. This can be ascertained by an understanding of his analysis of the human mind.

Freud has divided human mind into three compartments. They are as follows:

- (i) Id: The 'id' is concerned only with satisfying the animal impulses of man.
- (ii) Ego: The 'ego' serves as the mediator between desire and action. It represses the urges of the 'id' when necessary.
- (iii) Super Ego: The 'super ego' always holds up the behaviour norms of society. It provides the 'ego' the idea of moral and immoral and this in turn intervenes with the id.

The Super Ego

In the Freudian analysis of the human mind the concept of 'super ego' is of great sociological importance. It is significant in the study of socialization also. According to Freud, the individual's super ego is a reflection of his parents' standards of right and wrong. The individual imbibes these into his own personality by identifying himself with his parents. The parents' standards are no other than the society's or one of its sub-group's in which the individual happens to live. Thus, logically the child, in its socialization process adopts the norms of conduct of the society through the super ego.

THE AGENTS OF SOCIALISATION

Socialization helps the child to become a useful member of the society. it gives him social maturity. Hence it is quite natural that the child's socialization has not been left to mere accident. Rather, it has been given an institutional framework and controlled through institutional channels. The following are the agencies that have been established by culture which socialise the new born child.

1. **Family and Parents:** The process of socialization begins for every one of us in the family. Here, the parental and particularly the material influence on the child is very great. The intimate relationship between the mother and the child has a great impact on the shaping of child's abilities and capacities. The parents are the first persons to introduce to the child the culture of his group. The child receives additional communications from his older siblings, i.e. brother and sisters, who have gone through the same process-with certain differences due to birth order and to the number and sex of the siblings.
2. **Peers or Agemates:** 'Peer groups' 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, facts and facets of culture that they have previously learnt at different times from their parents. The members of peer groups have other sources of information about the culture-their peers in still other peer groups-and thus the acquisition of culture goes on.

As times passes by, of course, the peer group surpasses the parental and family groups in importance. It is true that the 'peer culture' becomes more important and effective than the 'parental culture' in the adolescent years of the child. The advice of one's agemates whether overtly or covertly communicated, sets the standards in almost every aspect of conduct. However, we should not assume that the socialization process is completed by the time the teen ages are reached. On the other hand, this is the time when pressures for conformity are perhaps, at their heights.

3. **Teachers:** The teachers also play their role in socialization when the child enters the school. It is in the school that the culture is formally transmitted and acquired, in which the lore and the learning, the science and art, of one generation is passed on to the next. It is not only the formal knowledge of the culture that is transmitted there but most of its premises as well –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 skepticism. 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.

4. **Literature and Mass Media of Communication:** There is another source of socialization. This is, of course, found only in literate societies and that is the literature. The civilization that we share is constructed of words or literature.

The media of mass communication give us their messages. These messages too contain in capsule form, the premises of our culture, its attitudes and ideologies.

Chapter-18

Social Control

CONCEPT OF ANOMIE

Meaning of Anomie

The French sociologist Emile Durkheim used the term ‘anomie’ for the first time in his book “The Division of Labour in Society” (1893), and again in his sociological study of suicide rates (1897). According to Durkheim, ‘anomie’ refers to “Any state where there are unclear, conflicting or unintegrated norms, in which of the individual had no normally significant relations with others or in which there were no limits set to the attainment of pleasure...”

‘Anomie’ literally means normlessness. It signifies a state of normlessness in both the society and the individual. In such a state social norms become confused or breakdown and people feel detached from their own fellows. Having little commitment to shared norms, people lack social guidelines for personal conduct. They are inclined to pursue their private interests without regard for the interests of society as a whole. Social control of individual behaviour becomes ineffective. Hence, the society is threatened with or even disorganization.

Durkheim’s viewpoint is that the traditional societies are held together by what he calls “mechanical solidarity”. These societies are small and everyone does much the same work. The members are socialized in the same way, share the same experiences, and hold common values. There is little individuality for the society itself consists of a collection of kinship groups which are strongly welded together.

Modern societies, according to Durkheim, are held together by “Organic solidarity”. If mechanical solidarity denotes a strong bond, ‘organic solidarity’ indicates a much looser bond. Here, societies are larger the members have quite different experiences, hold different values, and socialize their children in different ways. The ‘collective consciousness’ has much less binding power on the community. People think of themselves as individuals first and only then as members of wider social group. The basis for social solidarity and cohesion is no

longer the similarity of the members but rather their differences. People are now interdependent. They must depend on one another if their society is to function effectively.

According to Durkheim, the main problem in modern society is that, the division of labour leads inevitably to feelings of individualism. This individualism can be achieved only at the cost of shared sentiments, or beliefs. Hence the result is 'anomie' – a state of normlessness in both the society and the individual.

Durkheim's views seem to be reasonable. It is true that the division of labour and the resulting growth of individualism would breakdown shared commitment to social norms. We do notice that there is widespread anomie in modern societies. Still it is wrong to conclude that modern societies with very degree of division of labour are heading towards 'distintegration' or breakdown. Because even these societies do retain some broad consensus on norms and values. Durkheim's analysis is significant for it throws light on the far-ranging effects that the division of labour has on social and personal life.

CONCEPT OF SOCIAL DEVIANCE:

It is true that the social order is mainly maintained by means of social control and socialization. It is equally true that most of the people follow or conform to most of the norms most of the times. But all the people or even most of people do not conform to all the norms always. As young and Mack have pointed out, "No norm is always obeyed; no individual always conforms to every set of expectations". Hence, deviance, that is, the act of going against the rules or norms is there everywhere. Deviant behaviours such as knavery, cheating, adultery, unfairness, crime, malingering, immorality, dishonesty, betrayal, burglary, corruption, cunningness, sneakiness, wickedness, gambling, drunkenness etc., go along with conformity.

Definition of Deviance

Horton and Hunt: “The term deviation is given to any failure to conform to customary norms”.

Louise Weston: “Deviance can be defined as behaviour that is contrary to the standards of conduct or social expectations of a given group or society’.

M.B. Clinard suggests that the term deviance should be reserved for “those situations in which behaviour is in a disapproved direction and of sufficient degree to exceed the tolerance limit of society”.

In simple words, deviance may be defined as the act of going against the group shared expectations and norms.

FACTORS FACILITATING DEVIANCE

Social deviance refers to the non-conformity to or violating of the norms of the group. H.M. Johnson had listed a few factors that facilitate deviance among which the following may be noted:

1. Faulty socialization. Socialisation is the process by which the individual learns to conform to the norms of the group. When he fails to conform to the norms systematically he becomes a social deviant. Socializing agents themselves may directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, consciously or half-consciously encourage such deviant behaviour of the new members.
2. Weak Sanctions. Sanctions refer to the rewards or punishments used to establish social control or to enforce norms in a society. If the positive sanctions (rewards) for conformity and the negative sanctions (punishments) for deviance are weak, the individual may simply neglect them.

3. Poor Enforcement. Even though the sanctions are stronger they are often not enforced effectively due to the too small enforcement staff. Because of this the validity of the norm is weakened.
4. Ease of Rationalisation. The violators of norms try to soothe or satisfy their conscience by inventing some plausible rationalizations. Such people have constructed an intricate system of 'ego defense' which they use to brush aside the reactions and comments of other people.
5. Unjust or Corrupt Enforcement. People may lose respect for law and norms when they have no faith in law enforcement agency or authority. It is known that police corruption and illegal violence damage very much respect for the law in the areas affected by such practices. It is also observed that in some instances police maintain 'informal relations' or secret understandings with the violators. As a result, such relations condole the activities which the police are supposed to suppress.
6. Ambivalence of the Agents of Social Control. Ambivalence refers to co-existence in one person of opposing emotional attitudes towards the same object. For example, a person may consider woman not only as an object of respect, but also as an object of love, particularly of sexual love. A doctor with such ambivalent attitude may inflict sexual crime on young and beautiful female patients. Policemen, teachers, parents, business superiors, all may have such complex personalities with unconscious deviant tendencies. These tendencies may lead them unconsciously to encourage certain kinds of deviation rather than to counteract it.
7. Subcultural Support of Deviance. Different groups have different ideas of permissible behaviour. The range of acts that would be approved by the working class people differs from that which would be approved by the middle class people. What is non-

conforming in the outside world becomes conforming in the group. For example, the frustrated children of the working class flock together in little gangs. The subculture of this gang may emphasize malice and negativism. The gang may even reward delinquent behaviour for it represents an attack on the values of the respectable middle class.

8. Sentiments of Loyalty to Deviant Groups. When once a person is involved in a deviant group he is obliged to co-operate with other members. He will find it difficult to 'betray' his co-members and suffer their disapproval and rejection. He is forced to approve of the behaviour even if he no longer believes in their activities. As parsons has remarked, deviant groups deal harshly with disloyal members. Because, such members not only pose a threat of exposure to enforcement agencies but also a threat to the stability of the group.
9. Indefinite Range of Norms. Some norms relating to some values are not probably specified. For example, the scope of patriotism and freedom (political values) is not clearly defined. Hence, some even defend their deviant behaviour in the name of patriotism and freedom. Thus, one may use harsh language against another in the name of freedom.
10. Secrecy of Violations. Some susceptible persons are more prone to commit deviant acts if they are assured that such acts are not going to be made public. For example, sex crimes and illegal abortions very often take place because of the confidence on the part of the actors that their behaviour would remain secret.

CONCEPT OF SOCIAL CONTROL

The Survival and smooth functioning of the society is possible only when there exist in it social harmony, social solidarity and social order. Social harmony or solidarity is not an automatic development. Individual members of the society must strive and struggle to bring it out. Members of the society are able to bring about social harmony or order only when they conform to certain accepted standards of behaviour or norms. Conformity to norms must prevail over the self-seeking impulses of the people. Group welfare or societal welfare must take precedence over individual pleasures. Individual by himself cannot do this. Hence society exercises its force or control over the individual members. Thus social control refers to the control of society over the individual. Social control implies a system of device through which society controls the activities of individual members.

Definition of Social Control

1. E.A. Ross. “Social Control refers to the “system of devices whereby society brings its members into conformity with the accepted standards of behaviour”.
2. Manheim. “Social Control is the sum of those methods by which a society tries to influence human behaviour to maintain a given order.”
3. Ogburn and Nimkoff have said that social control refers to “the patterns of pressure which a society exerts to maintain order and established rules.”

PURPOSES OF SOCIAL CONTROL

The purpose of ‘social control’ as the very term indicates, is to exercise control over people in an effective manner. Why the control is needed? According to Kimball Young, it is necessary “to bring about conformity, solidarity, and continuity of a particular group or society.” The three purposes of social control mentioned by Kimball Young – conformity, solidarity and continuity of the group- may be described below.

1. Social Control brings about social conformity. This is the main purpose of social control. Since the modern complex society is a multigroup society differential norms will have to co-exist. As a result, behavioural patterns of different groups differ significantly. But these differences should not be allowed to exceed the limits of tolerance. People must be made to feel the need for security. For the sake of security they are obliged, to accept conformity. Social Control thus provides for conformity.
2. Social Control brings about solidarity. The second main purpose of social control is to create in the minds of people the feeling of identity and of solidarity. For the proper and smooth functioning of the society the different organizations and institutions of the social system must be properly integrated. Otherwise, in this competitive world the weaker group may be completely exploited by the stronger one, or equally powerful groups may clash among themselves and spoil peace and order. Some groups may even develop anti-societal attitudes and pose permanent danger to the organization of the society. It becomes necessary for the society to establish a reasonable balance or equilibrium between different groups and institutions. This would repose confidence among people. Society does this through various means of social control.
3. Social Control assures the continuity of social group or society. Societies not only struggle for stability and solidarity but also for their own survival or continuity. Community is the bed-rock on which the future of the society depends. Society maintains its continuity by controlling effectively its people and their groups. Due to this continuity the means of social control become in course of time a part of culture. As a part of culture they are transmitted from one generation to another. Thus, various means of social control function endlessly to maintain the continuity of the society.

TYPES OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Society makes use of various means of social control depending upon the time and social situation for the realization of its purposes. It is left to the discretion of the group to decide what means must be used at what time and in what social situation. In some primitive communities magic and superstitious beliefs are enough to exercise control. In a rural society means such as folkways, mores, customs, traditions, beliefs are enough to act as social pressures on individual behaviour. But in the modern urban society, radio, television, newspapers, schools and colleges, police force, etc., may be used for enforcing conformity. In fact, societies have developed consciously or unconsciously various devices for the purpose of controlling the behaviour of their members. Formal and informal control represents two kinds of devices.

Formal and Informal Social Control:

Social Control can be classified into two major types on the basis of the means of social control that are employed.

They are: (i) Formal control, and (ii) Informal control.

1. **Formal Control.** The state makes use of law, legislation, military force, police force, administrative devices, etc., for the purpose of social control. Similarly, different political, religious, economic, cultural and other associations and institutions also institute formal control over the behaviour of the members. Formal control is deliberately created. Various rules are laid down to make it specific. The necessity of following formal control or rules is clearly stated by associations and institutions. Violators of formal control are given punishments depending upon the nature and type of violation. The organization that makes use of formal control may even create a body of officials vested with power to enforce control as we find it in the case of state which has established the police, military force, etc. In brief, an association, whether it is a state or a bank, or an army, or a factory or anything has its own norms through which it controls the behaviour of the members. All these come under

formal control. Formal control has become a necessity in the modern complex societies in which interaction is mostly impersonal in nature.

2. **Informal Control.** Informal Control includes gossip, slander, resentment, public opinion, sympathy, sense of justice, folkways, mores, customs, religion, morality and such other agents. These are not purposefully created. Nothing could be said with certainty regarding their origin. They arise on their own way and in course of time again currency and popularity. They become deep-rooted with people in their practices. No specific punishment would be given to the violators of informal control. Still they are more effective than the formal control. Faith in religion, moral convictions, public opinion artistic standard, and the general state of enlightenment are found to be more important in formal control.

Informal control is more effective in primary social groups such as family, neighbourhood, tribe, rural community where interaction takes place on a personal basis. Whenever the group or the society becomes larger (in terms of population) and more complex, the informal devices of control become less effective. Simple gossip and slander and censure can correct an erring ruralite but not an urban citizen. The anonymity of city life which has added to the confidence of the individual that he could commit an offence without being noticed or caught by others who are mostly engaged in their own business, contributes to the non-effectiveness of informal control. Hence informal methods have given place to the formal ones such as law, education, coercion and codes, though less effective informal control also functions along with formal control in urban areas in regulating people's activities.

AGENCIES OF SOCIAL CONTROL:

Society or group maintains social control by creating its own agencies which may enforce formal or informal control. Agencies such as law, education, physical coercion and codes on the one hand, folkways, mores, customs, convention, tradition, religion, etc., on the other, have

been used by the society for this purpose. The number and variety of devices and agencies employed depend on the degree of complexity of life in a society. The role of some of these agencies may be briefly discussed here.

1. Control by Law:

Law is the most powerful formal means of social control in the modern society. Laws appear only in societies with a political organization, that is a government. The term 'Law' has been defined in various ways. J.S. Roucek opines that "Laws are a form of social rule emanating from political agencies".

Law is derived from various sources. It is true that "in all societies law is based upon moral notions". Laws are made and legislations are enacted on the basis of social doctrines, ideals and mores. It does not mean that the domains of law and morals are co-extensive Still it can be said that "the maintenance of legal order depends upon the moral climate of a society". The effectiveness of legal regulation never rests solely upon the threat of physical sanctions. It very much depends upon a general attitude of respect for law, and for a particular legal order. This attitude itself is determined by moral approval of law as containing social justice.

Law requires enforcing agencies. Laws are enforced with the help of the police, the court, and sometimes the armed forces. Administrative machinery of the state is the main law-enforcing agency. Increasing complexity of the modern industrial society has necessitated enormous growth of administrative agencies. Law is, in fact the control of administrative power which is vested in the government officials. Law as an instrument of control performs two functions: (i) It eliminates to suppresses the homicidal activities of individuals. (ii) Law persuades individuals to pay attention to the rights of others as well as to act in co-operation with others. In this way law tries to protect the individuals and society and promotes social welfare.

2. Control by Education.

Education may be defined as a process whereby the social heritage of a group is passed on from one generation to another. It is in this sense, Durkheim conceived of education as “the socialization of the younger generation”. He also stated, “it is actually a continuous effort to impose on the child ways of seeing, feeling and acting which he could not have arrived at spontaneously”.

Education is not just concerned with transmitting a way of life. In the modern times it is largely devoted to the communication of empirical knowledge. It is required today to prepare individuals for a changing rather than a static world. Formal education has been communicating ideas and values which play a part in regulating behaviour. In modern society science and technology are the basis of a general rational approach to nature and social life. The whole rationalization of the modern world is connected with the development of science. The chief instrument of this development is educational system. In this way, formal education can be viewed as a type of social control. Education has contributed to the regulation of conduct in the early socialization of the child.

Without proper education the harmony of the individual and society is not merely difficult but also impossible. Education makes social control quite normal. It converts social control into self-control. In the absence of a well organized educational system, social control would remain merely as an arbitrary pressure which may not last long. Hence, education is a necessary condition for the proper exercise of social control.

3. Control by the Public Opinion

Public Opinion is an important agency of social control. As K. Young has said, “Public Opinion consists of the opinion held by a public at a certain time”. According to V.V. Akolkar, “Public opinion simply refers to that mass of ideas which people have to express on a given

issue” Public opinion may be said to be the collective opinion of majority of members of a group.

Public opinion is of great significance especially in democratic societies. Through public opinion the knowledge of the needs, ideas, beliefs, and values of people can be ascertained. It influences the social behaviour of people. Behaviour of the people is influenced by ideas, attitudes and desires which are reflected by public opinion. People get recognition and respectability when they behave according to accepted social expectations. Public opinion helps us to know what type of behaviour is acceptable and what is not.

There are various agencies for the formulation and expression of public opinion. The press, radio, movies and legislatures are the main controlling agencies of public opinion.

4. Control by Propaganda

“Propaganda is an organized or systematic attempt made by a person or a group to influence public opinion and attitudes in any sphere”. It refers to the techniques of influencing human action by the manipulation of representations. It is a means of influencing others, often towards a desirable end.

Propaganda can affect people’s faith, ideology, attitude and behaviour. It can also be used to replace old beliefs and practices with the new ones. Propaganda may bring about positive as well as negative results. Governmental departments such as medical department, planning department, cooperative department, customs department, income tax department, etc. make propaganda to help people to mend their ways and also to develop right habits, practices and approaches.

Propaganda plays a vital role in both democratic and dictatorial countries. In democratic countries propaganda is mainly used to persuade people to accept some opinions or reject some others. Mass

media of communication are used for this purpose. Propaganda by itself is neither good nor bad. It depends on the purpose for which it is used and how it is used.

5. Control by Coercion

Coercion, that is, the use of physical force is one of the forms of social control. Coercion refers to the use of physical force to stop or control a work or an action. Wherever people are refrained from doing a particular work or wherever some limits are put deliberately on the range of their choice through the use of force, or through the threat of its consequences, they may be said to be under coercion.

Coercion is an extreme form of violence. States is the only association which is empowered to use coercion in social control. No other association is vested with this power. It becomes necessary for the state to resort to coercion to suppress anti-social trends and activities. Otherwise there would be no security for social life.

6. Control by Customs

‘Customs’ represent a kind of informal social control. “The socially accredited ways of acting are the customs of society”. Many of our daily activities are regulated by customs. Our ways of dressing, speaking, eating, working, worshipping, training the young, celebrating festivals, etc., are all controlled by customs. They are self-accepted rules of social life. Individuals can hardly escape their hold.

Customers are conformed mostly unconsciously. Man learns them from his very childhood and goes on obeying them. Customs are very rarely opposed. Even the harmful customs are also obeyed by most of the people because they do not consider them harmful. While those who consider them harmful lack the courage to oppose them, only some exceptional individuals have the courage of going against them or carrying on protest against them.

7. Control by Folkways and Mores

Folkways and mores represent two important types of informal control. 'Folkways' refer to the ways of the people. They are "the repetitive petty acts of the people". Folkways are the norms to which people conform because it is expected of them. Conformity to the folkways is neither required by law nor enforced by any special agency of society.

Folkways are not as compulsive and obligatory as laws or morals. Those who violate folkways are not punished by formal means. But the violators are put to gossip, slander and ridicule. One can ignore a few of the folkways but no one can neglect or violate all of them. They constitute an important part of the social structure. They contribute to the order and stability of social relations.

'Mores' or 'Morals' represent another category of norms. When 'folkways' act as regulators of behaviour then they become 'mores'. Mores are considered to be essential for group welfare. The positive mores prescribe behaviour patterns while the negative mores or taboos prescribe or prohibit behaviour patterns. Mores for example, instruct people to love their country, to look after their wives and children, to tell the truth, to be helpful to others, etc. They also insist on people not to become unpatriotic, not to show disrespect to the god, not to steal, cheat, etc.

Mores represent the living character of the group. They are always considered as 'right' by the people who share them. They are morally right and their violation morally wrong. Hence they are more compulsive in nature. Mores contribute to the solidarity and harmony of the group.

8. Control by Religion

Religion refers to man's faith or belief in some supernatural power or force. Religious concept is thus linked with man's relationship with God. The behaviour which is in conformity with this relationship is religious behaviour. The norms concerned with religious behaviour

constitute the religious code. The main purpose of religious code is to instant on religious conformity. Religious conformity in most of the cases will be in consonance with social conformity. Because, the main intention of the religious code is to make man basically good, obedient and helpful to others.

Religious regulates the activities of people in its own way. It regulates human conduct, through religious code. The conceptions of spirits, ghosts, taboos, soul, divine commandments, sermon, etc., control human actions and enforce discipline. Ideas of hell and heaven too have great effects on the behaviour of people. It has a great disciplinary value.

9. Control by Morality

Morality is an institution that is closely related to religion. Morality is concerned with the conceptions of goodness and evil. It refers to “that body of rules and principles concerned with good and evil as manifested to us by conscience”. These rules are admitted at large by the community. Honesty, faithfulness, fairness, service-mindedness, truthfulness, conscientiousness, kindness, sacrifice, incorruptibility, etc., represent some of the moral concepts. People who are morally good are also socially good.

Morality always helps to make a distinction between right and wrong or good and bad. Hence morality acts as a guide of human behaviour. Moral rules are obeyed because of internal pressure. This pressure refers to the pressure of conscience. But in the case of religion, man obeys religious rule because of his fear towards God. In morality, man is not very much afraid of God, but he is afraid of society. Morality is based on national judgment or rationality whereas religion is based on faith and emotions.

Religion and morality are mutually complementary and supportive. What is morally good is in most of the cases good spiritually also. Both are concerned with the ‘higher law’ which stands over and above

the sphere of the state and outside state control. Though not always morality supports religious beliefs and considers religiosity as a moral virtue. In the same way, religion reinforces morality with its supernatural sanctions. Both jointly command and control human conduct.

10. Control by Sanctions

Sanctions are the supporters of norms. 'Sanctions' refer to "the rewards or punishment used to establish social control, that is, to enforce the norms in a society". The basic purpose of sanction is to bring about conformity. They are used to force or persuade an individual or group to conform to social expectations.

Sanctions may be applied in various ways, ranging from the use of physical force to symbolic means, such as flattery. Negatively, they may be anything from a raised eyebrow to the death sentence. Positively, they range from a smile to an honorary degree.

Chapter-19

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

Differentiation is the law of nature. True, it is in the case of human society. Human society is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. No two individuals are exactly alike. Diversity and inequality are inherent in society. Hence, human society is everywhere stratified.

All societies arrange their members in terms of superiority, inferiority, and equality. The vertical scale of evaluation, this placing of people in strata, or layers, is called stratification. Those in the top stratum have more power, privilege and prestige than those below.

Definition

1. Ogburn and Nimkoff: “The process by which individuals and groups are ranked in a more or less enduring hierarchy of status is known as stratification.”
2. Gisbert: “Social stratification is the division of society into permanent groups of categories linked with each other by the relationship of superiority and subordination.”
3. Melvin M. Tumin: Social stratification refers to “arrangement of any social group or society into a hierarchy of position that are unequal with regard to power, property, social evaluation, and or psychic gratification.”

Therefore, Social stratification is ubiquitous. In all societies there is social differentiation of the population by age, sex, and personal characteristics. Strictly speaking, there are no purely equalitarian societies, only societies differing in degree of stratification. P.A. Sorokin wrote in his 'Social Mobility' that 'Unstratified society with real equality of its members, is a myth which has never been realized in the history of mankind.'

Characteristics of social stratification

According to M.M. Tumin the main attributes of stratification are as follows:

1. **It is Social:** Stratification is social in the sense, it does not represent biologically caused inequalities. It is true that such factors as strength, intelligence, age and sex can often serve as the basis on which statuses or strata are distinguished. But such differences by themselves are not sufficient to explain why some statuses receive more power, property, and prestige than others. Biological traits do not determine social superiority and inferiority until they are socially recognized and given importance. For example, the manager of an industry attains a dominant position not by his physical strength, nor by his age, but by having the socially defined traits. His education, training skills, experience, personality, character, etc. are found to be more important than his biological equalities.

Further, as Tumin has pointed out, the stratification system is – (i) governed by social norms and sanctions, (ii) is likely to be unstable because it may be disturbed by different factors, and (iii) is intimately connected with the other systems of society such as the political, family, religious, economic, educational and other institutions.

2. **It is Ancient:** The stratification system is quite old. According to historical to historical and archaeological records, stratification was present even in the small wandering bands. Ever since the time of Plato and Kautilya social philosophers have been deeply concerned with economic, social and political inequalities.
3. **It is Universal:** The stratification system is a worldwide phenomenon. Difference between the rich and the poor or the 'haves' and the 'have nots' is evident everywhere. Even in the 'nonliterate', society's stratification is very much present.
4. **It is in Diverse Forms:** The stratification system has never been uniform in all the societies. The ancient Roman society was stratified into two strata: the patricians and the plebians, the ancient Aryan society into four Varnas: the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and the Shudras, the ancient Greek Society into freemen and slaves; the ancient Chinese society into the mandarins, merchants, farmers and the soliders and so on. Class, caste and estate seem to be the general forms of stratification to be found in the modern world. Gbut stratification system seems to be much more complex in the civilized societies.
5. **It is Consequential:** The stratification system has its own consequences. The most important, most desired, and the often the scarcest things in human life are distributed unequally because of stratification. The system leads to two main kinds of consequences: (i) 'life chances' and (ii) 'life-stles'. 'life chances' and (ii) 'life-stles'. 'Life-chances' refer to such things as infant morality, longevity, physical and material illness, childlessness, marital conflict, separation and divorce. 'Lifestyles' include such matters as – the mode of housing, residential area, one's education, means of recreation, relationships between the parents and children, the kind of books, magazines and TV shows to which one is exposed, one's mode of conveyance and so on. Life-chances are more

involuntary, while life styles reflect differences in preferences, tastes and values.

Forms of Social Stratification

The important forms of social stratification are-

- (i) Caste system (ii) Class system (iii) Estate System.**

Caste System:

The term 'caste' is derived from the Spanish (also Portuguese) word 'casta' meaning 'breed' or 'lineage'. The Portuguese used the term 'caste' first to denote the divisions in the Indian caste system. The word 'caste' also signifies 'race' or 'kind'. The Sanskrit word for caste is 'Varna' which means 'colour'. Races and color seem to be the bases of Indian caste in addition to the division of labour and occupation. The popular equivalent of caste is 'Jati'.

The Origin of the Caste System:

The caste stratification of the Indian Society has had its origin in the 'Chaturvarna' system. According to the Chaturvarna doctrine, the Hindu society was divided into four main varnas namely: the Brahmins, the Kashtriyas, the Vaishyas, and the Shudras. The Varna system which was prevalent during the Vedic period was mainly based on the division of labour and occupation. The Caste system owes its origin to the Varna system. The present caste system can be said to be the degenerated form of the original Varna system. Varnas which were four in number and castes which are found in hundreds and thousands are not one and the same.

DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CASTE

Definition: 'Caste' is a complex phenomenon which is difficult to define. Writers and thinkers are not unanimous in their opinion regarding caste, its definition and characteristics. Hence caste has been defined variously.

- (i) According to Sir Herbert Risely, Caste is a "collection of families, bearing a common name, claiming a common descent, from a mythical

ancestor, human and divine, professing to follow the same hereditary calling and regarded by those who are competent to give an opinion as forming a single homogeneous community.”

- (ii) According to MacIver and Page: “When status is wholly predetermined so that men are born to their lot without any hope of changing it, then the class takes the extreme form of caste.”
- (iii) According to C.H. Cooley: “When a class is somewhat strictly hereditary, we may call it a caste.”
- (iv) According to A.W. Green: “Caste is a system of stratification in which mobility up and down the status ladder, at least ideally may not occur”.
- (v) According to Ketkar: “A caste is a group having two characteristics; (i) membership is confined to those who are born of members and includes all persons so born, (ii) the members are forbidden by an inexorable social law to marry outside the group.”

Characteristics of Caste

The caste system is highly complex in nature. As Dr. G.S. Ghurye has, described the characteristics of caste in his book ‘Caste and Class in India’. The following have been the main traditional features of the caste system.

1. Caste-As a Hierarchical Division of Society. The Hindu Society is gradational one. It is divided into several small groups called castes and sub castes. A sense of ‘highness’ and ‘lowness’ or ‘superiority’ and ‘inferiority’ is associated with this gradation or ranking. The Brahmins are placed at the top of the hierarchy and are regarded as ‘pure’, supreme or superior. The degraded caste or the so called ‘untouchables’ have occupied the other end of the hierarchy.
2. Caste-As a Segmental Division of Society. The Hindu society is a caste-ridden society. It is divided into a number of segments called ‘castes’. It is not a homogeneous society. Castes are groups with defined boundary of

their own. The status of an individual is determined by his birth and not by selection nor by accomplishments. No amount of power, prestige and self can change the position of man. The membership of the caste is hence unchangeable, unacquirable, inalienable, unattainable and nontransferable. Further, each caste in a way, has its own way of life. Each caste has its own customs, traditions, practices and rituals. It has its own informal rules, regulations and procedures. There were caste councils or 'caste panchayats' to regulate the conduct of members also. The caste used to help its members when they were found in distress. Indeed, 'the caste was its own ruler'.

3. Caste Panchayat. During the early days in every village caste used to have its own caste Panchayat. It consisted of five chosen members who enjoyed much social privilege and respect. The caste panchayat used to perform a number of functions. It used to make the members comply with caste rules and regulations. Settling caste disputes and giving its final verdict on the issues referred to it, were also its other functions. It was giving punishments to those who violated caste rules and obligations. Matters such as-breaking the marriage promise, refusal on the part of the husband to take the wife to his house, cruelty to wife, adultery on the part of wife, killing the cows, insulting the Brahmins, having illicit sex relations with other caste people, etc., were dealt with by the panchayat. It was giving punishments such as Caste imposing fine, purification, out casting etc., for the offenders. The caste panchayat was also striving to promote the welfare of the caste members. Safeguarding the interests of the caste members was yet another function of the panchayat. These caste panchayats have become weak and ineffective nowadays.
4. Restrictions on Food Habits. The caste system has imposed certain restrictions on the food habits of the members, they differ from caste to caste. Who should accept what kind of food and from whom?-is often decided by the caste. Generally, any kind of food that is prepared by the Brahmins is acceptable to all the caste people. Further, restrictions are also there still on the use of certain vegetables for certain castes. Even today,

some traditional Brahmins do not consume onions, garlic, cabbage, carrot beatroot etc.

5. Restrictions on social Relations. The caste system puts restrictions on the range of social relations also. The idea of 'pollution' makes this point clear. It means a touch of a lower caste man would pollute or defile a man of higher caste. Even his shadow is considered enough to pollute a higher caste man. In kerala for a long time, a Nayar could approach a Nambudari Brahmin but would not touch him. Further, a Tiyan was expected to keep himself at a distance of 36 steps from the Brahmin and a pulayan at a distance of 96 paces. In Tamilnadu the Shanar toddy tapper was expected to keep a distance of 24 paces while approaching a Brahmin. This has resulted in the practice of untouchability. This practice has made the lower caste people to be segregated completely from the higher caste.
6. Social and Religious Disabilities of Certain Castes. In the traditional caste society some lower caste people [particularly, the Dalits] suffered from certain civil or social and religious disabilities. Generally, the impure castes are made to live on the outskirts of the city or the village. In south India, certain parts of the towns or the villages are not accessible to the Dalits.

Socially, Dalits are separated from other members. Even today, in many places they are not allowed to draw water from the public wells. During the early days, public places like hotels, hostels, public lecture halls, schools, temples, theatres were not kept open for the lower caste people. Entrance to temples and other places of religious importance was forbidden for them. Educational facilities, legal rights and political representation were denied to them for a long time. In south India, restrictions were placed on the mode of constructing houses of the lower caste people, and their types of dresses and patterns of ornamentation. The toddy-tappers of Malabar were not allowed to carry umbrellas, to wear shoes or golden ornaments and to milk cows. They were forbidden to cover the upper part of their body.

7. The Civil and Religious Privileges of Certain Castes. If the lower caste people suffer from certain disabilities, some higher caste people like the Brahmins enjoy certain privileges. Nowhere the Brahmins suffered from the disabilities cited above. They are given more liberty, because they are believed to be born 'pure' and 'superior'. Education and teaching were almost the monopoly of the higher caste people. Chanting the Vedic Mantras was great privilege of the Brahmins. The upper caste people in general, enjoyed social, political, legal and religious privileges.
8. Restrictions on Occupational Choice. In the caste-ridden society there is a gradation of occupations also. Some occupations are considered to be superior and sacred while certain others degrading and inferior. For a long time, occupations were very much associated with the caste system. Each caste had its own specific occupation. The caste members were expected to continue the same occupations. Occupations were almost hereditary.
9. Restrictions of Marriage. The caste system imposes restrictions on marriage also. Caste is an endogamous group. Endogamy is a rule of marriage according to which an individual has to marry within his or her group. Each caste is subdivided into several subcastes, which are again endogamous. Intercaste marriages were strictly forbidden then. Even at present, intercaste marriages have not become popular. Violation of the rule of endogamy was strictly dealt with during the early days.

CHANGES IN THE TRADITIONAL FEATURES OF CASTE

Caste has assumed a different form in the modern times. Some of the traditional features [described earlier] have been radically altered. Here is a brief survey of the changes that have taken place in caste system after Independence.

1. The religious basis of the caste has been attacked. Caste is no more believed to be divinely ordained. It is being given more a social and secular meaning than a religious interpretation.

2. Restrictions on food habits have been relaxed. Distinction between 'Pakka' food and 'kachcha' food has almost vanished. Food habits have become more a matter of personal choice than a caste rule. Still commensal taboos are not completely ignored especially in the rural areas. Inter caste dining has not become the order of the day.
3. Caste is not very much associated with hereditary occupations. Caste no longer determines the occupational career of an individual. Occupations are becoming more and more "caste-free".
4. Endogamy, which is often called the very essence of the caste system, still prevails. Inter-caste marriages though legally permitted, have not become the order of the day.
5. The special civil and religious privileges which the Brahmins enjoyed are no more being enjoyed by them. The Constitution of India has removed all such privileges and made all castes equal.

Most of the legal, political, educational, economic and other disabilities from which the lowest caste people had suffered, have been removed by the constitutional provisions. They are given special protection also. Adult franchise and "reservation" have given them a strong weapon to protect their interests.

6. Caste continues to be a segmental division of Hindu society. Caste with its hierarchical system continues to ascribe statuses to the individuals. But the twin processes of Sanskritisation and Westernization have made possible mobility both within and outside the framework of caste.
7. Caste panchayats, which used to control the behaviour of caste-members, have either become very weak or disappeared. Though they are often found here and there in the rural areas, they are almost non-existent in the urban areas.

8. Restrictions imposed by the caste on social intercourse are very much relaxed. Distinction between 'touchable' and 'untouchable' is not much felt especially in the community of literate people. However, instances of untouchability are heard in the rural areas.
9. Though the dominate of caste is still found in villages it no longer depends upon its ritual status.
10. Casteism which is associated with caste, instead of disappearing in the wake of modernism, has become still stronger.
11. The 'jajmani' system which is used to govern the inter-caste relations especially in the villages has become very weak. In many places it has vanished. In place of intercaste dependence, intercaste strifes are found.
12. Caste has lost much of its hold over the social usages and customs practiced by its members.
13. Caste today does not dictate individual's life nor does it restrict newly valued individual freedom. Hence it no longer acts as a barrier to the progress of an individual.

CAUSES FOR THE CHANGES IN CASTE SYSTEM

The caste system has undergone vast changes in modern times. Factors that contributed to the changes in the caste system are briefly examined here:

1. **Uniform Legal System:** The Uniform legal system introduced by the British made the Indians feel that "all men are equal before the law" A number of legislations which the British introduced also struck at the root of the caste system. Independent India followed the same legal system. The Constitution of India has not only assured equality to all but also declared the practice of untouchability unlawful [Articles 15 and 16]. Articles 16, 164, 225, 330, 332, 334,

335, 338 and the 5th and 6th Schedules of the Constitution provide for some special privileges to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes to enable them to come up to the level of other upper castes.

2. **Impact of Modern Education:** The British introduced the modern secular education in a uniform way throughout India. In independent India educational facilities are extended to all the caste people. The lowest caste people are also entitled to avail themselves of these facilities. Modern education has given a blow to the intellectual monopoly of a few upper castes. It has created an awareness among people and weakened the hold of caste over the members. It does not, however, mean that the modern educated people are completely free from the hold of the caste.
3. **Industrialization, urbanization and Westernization:** Due to the process of industrialization, number of non-agricultural job opportunities were created. This new economic opportunity weakened the hold of the upper castes people who owned vast lands. People of different castes, classes, and religious started working together in factories, offices, workshops, etc. This was unthinkable two centuries ago. Growth of cities has drawn people of all castes together and made them to stay together ignoring many of their caste restrictions. The upper caste people started looking to the west for modifying their life-style on the model of the West. Thus they became more and more westernized without bothering much about caste inhibitions.
4. **Influence of Modern Transport and Communication System:** Modern means transport such as train, bus, ship, aeroplane, trucks etc, have been of great help for the movement of men and materials. Caste rules relating to the practice of purity and pollution and untouchability could no longer be observed. Modern means of communication, such as, newspapers, post, telegraph, telephone, radio, television etc., have helped people to come out of the narrow world of caste.

5. **Freedom Struggle and the Establishment of Democracy:** The freedom struggle waged against the British brought all the caste people together to fight for a common cause. Establishment of democratic type of government soon after Independence gave yet another blow to the caste by extending equal socio-economic opportunities to all without any discrimination.
6. **Rise of Non-Brahmin Movement:** A movement against the Brahmin supremacy was launched by Jyothirao Phule in 1873. This movement became popular in course of time particularly in the south. It created an awareness among the lower castes and instilled in them the feeling of “self-respect”. This movement which became a great political force, brought pressure upon the government to establish Backward classes commissions at Central and State levels. The recommendations made by these commissions and their implementation provided vast scope for the lower castes to achieve progress.
7. **Social Legislations:** A series of social legislations introduced by the British as well as by the Indian governments [such as the Caste Disabilities Removal Act of 1872, The Hindu Marriage Act of 1955, The Untouchability Offences Act of 1956 etc.] directly and indirectly altered the nature of the caste system.
8. **Social Reform Movements:** Various social reform movements [such as Satyashodhak Samaj, Brahma Samaj, Arya Samaj, Sri Ramakrishna Mission etc.] launched during the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries have been able to remove the rigidity and some of the evil practices associated with the caste system.
9. **Impact of the West:** Influence of the western thought and particularly the ideas of rationalism, liberalism, humanitarianism,

egalitarianism etc., made the educated Indians to come out of the clutches of the caste.

10.Threat of Conversion: Social disabilities imposed on the lower castes made some of them to get themselves converted to either Christianity or Islam. Pressure tactics and temptations further added to this conversion process. The threat of conversion compelled the upper castes to relax many of the caste rigidities so that they could hold back the lower caste people who were getting ready for conversion.

11.Improvement in the Status of Women, Evolution of New Social Classes [Working class, middle class and capitalist class] and radical changes in the system of division of labour especially in the rural areas have further loosened the roots of caste system.

Social Class

‘Social Class’ is a principal type of social stratification found especially in the modern civilized countries. If the caste system is found to be unique to India, the class system is universal in nature ‘class’ is used to represent groups of professors, artists, engineers, doctors, students, etc. The word ‘class’ is also used to refer the quality of the things whether good, better, best and so on. But the concept of ‘Social class’ is more used in sociology representing a kind of social stratification than anything else. From the Sociological point of view ‘Class’ denotes a group of people with similar social and economic status.

Definition

1. P. Gisbert: A social class is ‘a category or group of persons having a definite status in society which permanently determines their relation to other groups’.

2. Ogburn and Nimkoff: 'A social class is the aggregate of persons having essentially the same social status in a given society'
3. Max Weber: social classes are aggregates of individuals 'who have the same opportunities of acquiring goods, the same exhibited standard of living.'

Nature and Characteristics of Social Class

1. **Class-A Status Group:** A social class is essentially a status group. Class is related to status. Different statuses arise in a society as people do different things, engage in different activities and pursue different vocations. The consideration of the class as a status group make it possible to apply it to any society which has many strata. The idea of social status separates the individuals not only physically sometimes even mentally.
2. **Achieved Status and Not Ascribed status:** Status in the case of class system is achieved and not ascribed. Birth is not the criterion of status. Achievements of an individual mostly decide his status. Class system provides scope for changing or improving one's status. Factors like income, occupation, wealth, education, 'life-styles', etc. decide the status of an individual.
3. **The class System is Universal:** Class is almost a universal phenomenon. The class system appears in all the modern complex societies of the world. It is a phenomenon that is absent only in the smallest, the simplest, and the most primitive of societies. All other societies of any size have a class structure.
4. **Mode of Feeling:** In a class system we may observe three modes of feelings. (i) There is a feeling of equality in relation to the members of one's own class (ii) There is a feeling of inferiority in relation to those who occupy the higher status in the socio-economic hierarchy. (iii) There is a feelings of superiority in relation to those who occupy the lower status in

the hierarchy. This kind of feelings develops into class-consciousness and finally results in class solidarity.

5. **Element of Prestige:** Each social class has its own status in society, status is associated with prestige. The relative position of the class in the social set up arises from the degree of prestige attached to the status. Thus, the status and the prestige enjoyed by the ruling classes or rich classes in every society is superior to that of the class of commoners or the poor people. The prestige which a class enjoys depends upon our evaluations. In many societies knowledge, purity of race or descent, religion, wealth, heroism, bravery and similar other qualities confer a high degree of prestige on the persons possessing them. These qualities on which our evaluations are based vary considerably in different societies, and in the course of time, within the same society.
6. **Element of Stability:** A social class is relatively a stable group. It is not transitory no runstable like a crowd or a mob. Though status in the case of class is subject to change, it is to some extent stable. Status in the case of class may undergo radical changes in extraordinary circumstances i.e., in times of wars, revolutions, economic, political and social crisis and so on.
7. **Mode of Living:** A Social class is distinguished from other classes by its customary modes of behaviour or mode of behaving. This is often referred to as the 'life-styles' of a particular class. 'Life-styles' or the modes of living include such matters as the mode of dress, the kind of house and neighborhood one lives in, the means of recreation one resorts to, the cultural products one is able to enjoy, the relationship between parents and children, the kinds of books, magazines and TV shows to which one is exposed, one's friends, one's mode of conveyance and communication, one's way of spending money and so on. 'Life-styles' reflect the specialty in preferences, tastes, and values of a class.
8. **Social Class-an Open Group:** Social classes are 'Open groups'. They represent an 'open' social system. An open class system is one in which vertical social mobility is possible. This means there are no restrictions, or

at the most only very mild restrictions are imposed on the upward and downward movement of individuals in the social hierarchy. However, a completely open class system and a completely closed class system are only hypothetical.

9. **Social class-an Economic Group:** The basis of social classes is mostly economic, but they are not mere economic groups or divisions. Subjective criteria such as class-consciousness, class solidarity and class identification on the one hand, and the objective criteria such as wealth, property, income, education, occupation, etc., on the other, are equally important in the class system. classes, thus, are not merely economic groups, they are something more than these.
10. **Classification of Social Classes:** Sociologists have given three-fold classification of classes which consists of (i) upper class (ii) Middle Class, and (iii) Lower class. Warner and Lunt in their study of a New England town have divided each of the traditional classes into two sub-classes. They have given a six-fold classification consisting of (i) The Upper-Upper class (ii) The Lower-Upper class, (iii) The Upper-Middle class, (iv) The Lower-Middle Class, (v) The Upper-Lower class, and (vi) The Lower-Lower Class. Karl Marx, the champion of the theory of social class and class conflicts, has spoken of only two major social classes, the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’ or the rich and the poor, or the capitalists and the workers, or the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat. Sorokin has spoken of three major types of class stratification. They are economic, political, and occupational classes.
11. **Class Consciousness:** Class system is associated with class consciousness. Class consciousness is “the sentiment that characterizes the relations of men towards the members of their own and other classes”. It “consists in the realization of a similarity of attitude and behaviour with members of other classes”. Class consciousness is the means by which the integration of persons possessing a similarity of social position and of life-chances is transformed into a common group activity.

Distinctions between Caste and Class:

Caste and class represent two main forms of social stratification. Their distinction between caste and class can be described as follows:

Caste	Class
1. Particular: The system with all its peculiarities is unique to India. It is peculiar to India and hence it is not universal.	1. Universal: The class system is universal in nature. It is found in almost all the modern complex societies.
2. Ascribed Status: Status is ascribed to the individuals by birth. Birth is the criterion of status and not achievement. Status can neither be changed nor be improved.	2. Achieved Status: Status is achieved by the individuals. There is scope for achievement. Hence, status can be changed or improved.
3. Closed system: Caste is a closed system. It restricts social mobility; i.e., the movement of people from one social status to that of the other.	3. Open system: Class is an open system. It provides for social mobility. Individuals can move from the lower class to the upper class.
4. Divine Origin: The caste system is believed to have had a divine origin. It is closely associated with Hindu tradition.	4. Secular: The class system is secular. It has nothing to do with religion. It has been given no religious explanation.
5. Purity and Impurity: The idea of purity and impurity is associated with the caste. Some castes are called	5. Feeling of Disparity: There is a feeling of disparity on the part of the members of a class. The

<p>‘pure’ while others are regarded as ‘impure’. ‘Impure’ castes are regarded as ‘untouchables’.</p> <p>6. Regulation of relations: The caste system controls the activities and regulates the relations of its members to a great extent. As MacIver says, it fixes the role of a man in society. it regulates even the routine activities of the members.</p> <p>7. Greater Social Distance: There is comparatively a greater distance being kept between different castes.</p> <p>8. Conservative: The caste ridden system tends to become conservative, orthodox and reactionary Castes become in course of time, water-tight compartments.</p> <p>9. Endogamous Group: Caste is an endogamous social unit. Accordingly, every caste member has to marry within the group selecting the life partner from his or her own caste. Intercaste marriages are not allowed.</p> <p>10. Complexity: The caste system is a complex system. The very fact that more than 2800 castes and subcastes are found in India, makes it evident</p>	<p>question of purity and impurity does not arise. Hence there is no practice of untouchability.</p> <p>6. Limits Relations: The class system, on the other hand, limits the range of contacts and communications of its members. Individuals are more free in a class. It does regulate the daily tasks of its members.</p> <p>7. Less Social Distance: There is less social distance between different classes. Members are more tolerant than others.</p> <p>8. Progressive: The class-laden system is regarded as more progressive. Classes give more freedom to the members. It permits greater social mobility.</p> <p>9. Not endogamous: A class is not an endogamous unit. The members are free to select his or her life partner from any of the classes. The class system never imposes restrictions on marriage.</p> <p>10. Simplicity: The class system is known for its simplicity. Broadly speaking, there are only three classes-the upper, middle,</p>
--	--

<p>how complex it is.</p> <p>11.Caste-Consciousness: Caste consciousness is more dangerous to democracy. Democracy and caste strictly speaking, cannot go together, because caste is based on inequality. Caste-feeling may also endanger the growth of national ‘sentiments and unity’. Caste restricts the amount of community feeling. Casteism has been a great hinderance to the national integration in India.</p>	<p>and the lower-and hence the network of relations is also simple.</p> <p>11.Class-consciousness: Class Consciousness is not inimical to democracy. Class and democracy go together. Class on the other hand, does not restrict the amount of community feeling. In spite of the communist influence to internationalize, the class system never disturbs the growth of national sentiments.</p>
--	---

Chapter-20

Theories of Social Stratification

I. Social Stratification- A Functionalist Perspective:

Functionalist theories of Stratification must be seen in the context of functionalist theories of society. They assume that society has certain basic needs or functional prerequisites that must be met if it is to survive. They therefore look to social stratification to see how far it meets these functional prerequisites. Functionalists assume that the parts of society form an integrated whole and thus they examine the ways in which the social stratification system is integrated with other parts of society. They maintain that a certain degree of order and stability is essential for the operation of social systems. They will therefore consider how stratification system help to maintain order and stability in society.

(i) Talcott Parsons- Theory of Stratification

Talcott Parsons believed that order, stability and cooperation in society are based on value consensus-a general agreement by members of society concerning what is good and worthwhile. Parsons argued that stratification systems derived from common values. If values exist, then it follows that individuals will be evaluated and placed in some form of rank order. In parson's words, 'stratification, in its valuational aspect, then, is the ranking of units in a social system in accordance with the common value system'.

In other words, those who perform successfully in terms of society's values will be ranked highly and they will be likely to receive a variety of rewards. At a minimum they will be accorded high prestige because they exemplify and personify common values.

For example, if a society places a high value on bravery and generosity, as was the case of the Sioux Indians in North America, those who excel in terms of these qualities will receive a high rank in the stratification system.

Because different societies have different value systems, the ways of attaining a high position will vary from society to society. Parsons argued that American society values individual achievement, efficiency and 'puts primary emphasis on productive activity within the economy'. Thus, successful business executives who have achieved their position through their own initiative, ability and ambition, and run efficient and productive business, will receive high rewards.

Parsons's argument suggests that stratification is an inevitable part of all human societies. If value consensus is an essential component of all societies, then it follows that some form of stratification will result from the ranking of individuals in terms of common values. It also follows from Parsons's argument that there is a general belief that stratification systems are just, right and proper, because they are basically an expression of shared values. Thus American business executives are seen to deserve their rewards because members of society place a high value on their skills and achievements.

This is not to say there is no conflict between the haves and have-nots, the highly rewarded and those with little reward. However, he believed that this conflict is kept in check by the common value system which justifies the unequal distribution of rewards.

Organization and Planning:

Functionalists tend to see the relationship between social groups in society as one of cooperation and interdependence. In complex industrial societies different groups specialize in particular activities. As no one group is self-sufficient, it alone cannot meet the needs of its members. It must, therefore, exchange goods and

services with other groups, and so the relationship between social groups is one of reciprocity (mutual give and take).

In societies with a highly specialized division of labour, such as industrial societies, some members will specialize in organization and planning while others will follow their directives. Parsons argued that this inevitably leads to inequality in terms of power and prestige.

Thus those with the power to organize and coordinate the activities of others will have a higher social status than those they direct.

Power:

As with prestige differentials, Parsons argued that inequalities of power are based on shared values. Power is legitimate authority in that it is generally accepted as just and proper by members of society as a whole. It is accepted as such because those in positions of authority use their power to pursue collective goals which derive from society's central values. This use of power therefore serves the interests of society as a whole.

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION:

Parsons saw social stratification as both inevitable and functional for society.

1. It is inevitable because it derives from shared values which are a necessary part of all social systems.
2. It is functional because it serves to integrate various groups in society.

Power and prestige differentials are essential for the coordination and integration of a specialized division of labour. Finally inequalities of power and prestige benefit all members of society since they serve to further collective goals which are based on shared values.

II. Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E-Moore's theory of Stratification:

Davis and Moore began with the observation that stratification exists in every known human society. They attempted to explain in functional terms, the universal necessity which calls forth stratification in any social system. They argued that all social systems share certain functional prerequisites which must be met if the system is to survive and operate efficiently. One such functional prerequisite is Effective Role allocation and performance. This means that:

1. All roles must be filled
2. They must be filled by those best able to perform them
3. The necessary training for them must be undertaken.
4. The roles must be performed conscientiously.

Davis and Moore argued that all societies need some mechanism' for ensuring effective role allocation and performance. This mechanism is social stratification, which they saw as a system that attaches unequal rewards and privileges to the different positions in society.

If the people and positions that make up society did not differ in important respects there would be no need for stratification. However, people differ in terms of their innate ability and talent, and positions differ in terms of their importance for the survival and maintenance of society. Certain positions are more functionally important than others. These require special skills for their effective performance and the number of individuals with the necessary ability to acquire such skills is limited.

A major function of stratification is to match the most able people with the functionally most important positions. It does this by attaching high rewards to those positions. The desire for such rewards motivates people to compete for them, and in theory the most talented will win through. Such positions usually require long periods of training that involve

certain sacrifices. The promise of high rewards is necessary to provide an incentive to encourage people to undergo this training and to compensate them for the sacrifice involved. It is essential for the well-being of society that those who hold the functionally most important positions perform their roles diligently and conscientiously. The high rewards built into those positions provide the necessary inducement and generate the required motivation for such performance. Davis and Moore therefore concluded that social stratification is a 'device by which societies ensure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons'.

To summarize, Davis and Moore regarded social stratification as a functional necessity for all societies. They saw it as a solution to a problem faced by all social systems, that of 'placing and motivating individuals in the social structure'. They offered no other means of solving this problem and implied that social inequality is an inevitable feature of human society. They concluded that differential rewards are functional for society, because they contribute to the maintenance and well-being of social systems.

III. Melvin M. Tumin- A critique of Davis and Moore

Melvin Tumin, produced a comprehensive criticism on Davis and Moore's theory of stratification. It can be explained as follows:

1. **Functional importance:** Tumin began by questioning the adequacy of their measurement of the functional importance of positions. Davis and Moore tended to assume that the most highly rewarded positions are indeed the most important. Many occupations, however, which afford little prestige or economic reward, can be seen as vital to society. Tumin therefore argued that 'some labour force of unskilled workmen is as important and as indispensable to the factory as some labour force of engineers'. Tumin argues that there is no objective way of measuring the functional importance of positions.

2. **Power and Rewards:** Tumin argued that Davis and Moore ignored the influence of power on the unequal distribution of rewards. Differences in pay and prestige between occupational groups may be due to differences in their power of Bargaining rather than their functional importance.
3. **The pool of talent:** Davis and Moore assumed that only a limited number of individuals have the talent to acquire the skills necessary for the functionally most important positions. Tumin regarded this as a very questionable assumption for three reasons:
 1. An effective method of measuring talent and ability has yet to be devised.
 2. There is no proof that exceptional talents are required for those positions which Davis and Moore considered important.
 3. The pool of talent in society may be considerably larger than Davis and Moore assumed. As a result, unequal rewards may not be necessary to harness it.
4. **Training:** Tumin also questioned the view that the training required for important positions should be regarded as a sacrifice and therefore in need of compensation.
5. **Motivation:** The major function of unequal rewards, according to Davis and Moore, is to motivate talented individuals and allocate them to the functionally most important positions. Tumin rejected this view. He argued that social stratification can, and often does, act as a barrier to the motivation and recruitment of talent.

This is readily apparent in closed systems such as caste and racial stratification.

Tumin suggested, however, that even relatively open systems of stratification erect barriers to the motivation and recruitment of talent.

Tumin argued that Davis and Moore failed to consider the possibility that those who occupy highly rewarded positions erect barriers to recruitment. Occupational groups often use their power to restrict access to their positions, so creating a high demand for their services and increasing the rewards they receive.

Tumin used the American Medical Association as an example. By controlling entry into the profession, it has maintained a shortage of doctors and so ensured high rewards for medical services. In this way the self-interested use of power can restrict the recruitment of talented individuals.

6. **Inequality of Opportunity:** Tumin argued that those born into the lower strata can never have the same opportunities for realizing their talents as those born into the higher strata.
7. **Social divisions:** Finally, Tumin questioned the view that social stratification functions to integrate the social system. He argued that differential rewards can 'encourage hostility, suspicion and distrust among the various segments of a society'. From this viewpoint, stratification is a divisive rather than an integrating force. Social Stratification can also weaken social integration by giving members of the lower strata a feeling of being excluded from participation in the larger society.

Tumin concluded that in their enthusiastic search for the positive functions of stratification, functionalists have tended to ignore many of its dysfunctions.

II. Social Stratification- A Marxist Perspective:

1. Marxist perspective provides a radical alternate to functionalist views of the nature of social stratification. They regard stratification as a divisive rather than an integrative structure. They see it as a mechanism whereby some exploit others, rather than as a means of furthering collective goals.

2. From a Marxist perspective, systems of stratification derive from the relationships of social groups to the means of production. Marx used the term 'class' to refer to the main strata in all stratification systems. From a Marxist viewpoint, a class is a social group whose members share the same relationship to the means of production. Marx believed that Western society had developed through four main epochs:
 1. Primitive communism
 2. Ancient society
 3. Feudal society
 4. Capitalist society
3. Primitive communism is represented by the societies of prehistory and provides the only example of a classless society. From then on, all societies are divided into two major classes: masters and slaves in ancient society, lords and serfs' in feudal society and capitalists and wage labourers in capitalist society.

During each historical epoch, the labour power required for production was supplied by the subject class that is by slaves, serfs and wage labourers respectively. The subject class is made up of the majority of the population whereas the ruling or dominant class forms a minority.

4. Classes did not exist during the era of primitive communism when societies were based on a socialist mode of production.
5. Classes emerge when the productive capacity of society expands beyond the level required for subsistence. This occurs when agriculture becomes the dominant mode of production.
6. Private property and the accumulation of surplus wealth, form the basis for the development of class societies, in particular, they provide the preconditions for the emergence of a class of producers and a class of non-producers. Some people are able to acquire the means of

production, and others are therefore obliged to work for them. The result is a class of non-producers which owns the means of production, and a class of producers which owns only its labour.

7. From a Marxist perspective, the relationship between the major social classes is one of mutual dependence and conflict. Thus, in capitalist society, the bourgeoisie and proletariat are dependent upon each other. Wage labourers must sell their labour power in order to survive, as they do not own a part of the means of production and lack the means to produce goods independently. They are, therefore, dependent for their livelihood on the capitalists and the wages they offer. The capitalists, as non-producers, are dependent on the labour power of wage labourers, since, without it, there would be no production.

However, the mutual dependency of the two classes is not a relationship of equal or symmetrical reciprocity. Instead, it is a relationship of exploiter and exploited, oppressor and oppressed. In particular, the ruling class gains at the expense of the subject class and there is therefore a conflict of interest between them.

8. Capitalism therefore involves the investment of capital in the production of commodities with the aim of maximizing profit in order to accumulate more capital. Money is converted into commodities by financing production, those commodities are then sold and converted back into money at such a price that the capitalists end up with more money than they started with.
9. Capital is privately owned by a minority, the capitalist class. In Marx's view, however, this capital is gained from the exploitation of the mass of the population, the working class. Marx argued that capital, as such, produces nothing. Only labour produces wealth. Yet the wages paid to the workers for their labour are well below the value of the goods they produce.

10. The difference between the value of wages and commodities is known as surplus value. This surplus value is appropriated in the form of profit by the capitalists. Because they are non-producers, the bourgeoisie are therefore exploiting the proletariat, the real producers of wealth.

Marx maintained that in all class societies, the ruling class exploits and oppresses the subject class.

11. Power and the superstructure:

Political power, in Marxist theory, comes from economic power. The power of the ruling class therefore stems from its ownership and control of the means of production. As the superstructure of society—the major institutions, values and belief systems—is seen to be largely shaped by the economic infrastructure, the relations of production will be reproduced in the superstructure. Therefore, the dominance of the ruling class in the relations of production will be reflected in the superstructure. In particular, the political and legal systems will reflect ruling-class interests since, in Marx's words, 'the existing relations of production between individuals must necessarily express themselves also as political and legal relations'.

12. Ruling-class ideology produces false class consciousness, a false picture of the nature of the relationship between social classes. Members of both classes tend to accept the status quo as normal and natural and are largely unaware of the true nature of exploitation and oppression, in this way, the conflict of interest between the classes is disguised and a degree of social stability produced, but the basic contradictions and conflicts of class societies remain unresolved.

13. Marx believed that the class struggle was the driving force of social change. He stated that 'the history of all societies up to the present is the history of the class struggle'.

14. A new historical epoch is created by the development of superior forces of production by a new social group. These developments take place within the framework of the previous era. The merchants and industrialists who spearheaded the rise of capitalism emerged during the feudal era. They accumulated capital, laid the foundations for industrial manufacture, factory production and the system of wage labour, all of which were essential components of capitalism.
15. The class struggles of history have been between minorities. Capitalism, for instance, developed from the struggle between the feudal aristocracy and the emerging capitalist class, both groups in numerical terms forming a minority of the population. Major changes in history have involved the replacement of one form of private property by another, and of one type of production technique by another: capitalism involved the replacement of privately owned land and an agricultural economy by. Privately owned capital and an industrial economy.
16. Marx believed that the basic contradictions contained in a capitalist economic system would lead to its eventual destruction. The proletariat. Would overthrow the bourgeoisie and seize the means of production, the source of power. Property would be communally owned and, since all members of society would now share the same relationship to the means of production, a classless society would result. Since history is the history of the class struggle, history would now end. The communist society which would replace capitalism would contain no contradictions, no conflicts of interest, and would therefore be unchanging.

17. Summary

1. In all stratified societies, there are two major social groups: a ruling class and a subject class.

2. The power of the ruling class comes from its ownership and control of the means of production land, capital, labour power, buildings and machinery.
3. The ruling class exploits and oppresses the subject class.
4. As a result, there is a basic conflict of interest between the two classes.
5. The various institutions of society, such as the legal and political systems, are instruments of ruling-class domination and serve to further its interests.
6. Only when the means of production are communally owned will classes disappear, thereby bringing an end to the exploitation and oppression of some by others.

III. Social Stratification-A Weberian Perspective:

1. Weber believed that social stratification results from a struggle for scarce resources in society. Although he saw this struggle as being primarily concerned with economic resources, also involve struggles of prestige and for political power.
2. Like Marx, Weber, saw class in economic terms. He argued that classes develop in market economies in which individuals compete for economic gain. He defined a class as a group of individuals who share a similar position in a market economy and by virtue of that fact receive similar economic rewards. Thus, in Weber's terminology, a person's 'class situation' is basically their 'market situation'. Those who share a similar class situation also share similar life chances. Their economic position will directly affect their chances of obtaining those things defined as desirable in their society, for example access to higher education and good quality housing.

3. Like Marx, Weber argued that the major class division is between those who own the forces of production and those who do not. Thus those who have substantial property holdings will receive the highest economic rewards and enjoy superior life chances. Weber saw important differences in the market situation of the property less groups in society. In particular, the various skills and services offered by different occupations have differing market values. For instance, in capitalist society, managers, administrators and professionals receive relatively high salaries because of the demand for their services. Weber distinguished the following class groupings in capitalist society:
 1. The Propertied upper class
 2. The propertyless white-collar workers
 3. The petty bourgeoisie
 4. The manual working class.
4. While class forms one possible basis for group formation, collective action and the acquisition of political power, Weber argued that there are other bases for these activities. In particular, groups form because their members share a similar status situation. Whereas class refers to the unequal distribution of economic rewards, status refers to the unequal distribution of 'social honour'.
5. Occupations, ethnic and religious groups, and most importantly, lifestyles, are accorded differing degrees of prestige or esteem by members of society. A status group is made up of individuals who are awarded a similar amount of social honour and therefore share the same status situation.
6. Castes also provide a good example of the process described by Weber as social closure. Social closure involves the exclusion of some people from membership of a status group. In the caste system social closure is achieved through prohibitions which prevent members of caste from marrying outside their caste. The

caste system is an extreme example of social closure since the exclusion of outsiders from the status group is so complete.

7. In many societies, class and status situations are closely linked. Weber noted that 'Property as such is not always recognized as a status qualification, but in the long run it is, and with extraordinary regularity'. However, those who share the same class situation will not necessarily belong to the same status group. Nouveaux riches (the newly rich) are sometimes excluded from the status groups of the privileged because their tastes, manners and dress are defined as Vulgar. Status groups may create divisions within classes.
8. Status groups can also cut across class divisions. For example, homosexuals from different class backgrounds are involved in Gay Rights organizations and events such as the annual Gay Pride celebration in Britain.
9. Weber's observations on status groups are important because they suggest that in certain situation status rather than class provides the basis for the formation of social groups. In addition, the presence of different status groups within a single class and of status groups which cut across class divisions can weaken class solidarity and reduce the potential for class consciousness.
- 10. Parties (Power):** Weber defined parties as groups which are specifically concerned with influencing policies and making decisions in the interests of their membership. In Weber's words, parties are concerned with 'the acquisition of social "power"'. Parties include a variety of associations, from the mass political Parties of Western democracies to the whole range of pressure or Interest groups.
11. In Weber's words, parties may represent interests determined through "class situation" or "status situation"... In most cases they

are partly class parties and partly status parties, but sometimes they are neither.

12. Weber's view of parties suggests that the relationship between political groups and class and status groups is far from clearcut. Just as status groups can both divide classes and cut across class boundaries. So parties can divide and cut across both classes and status groups. Weber's analysis of classes, status groups and parties suggests that no single theory can pinpoint and explain their relationship. The interplay of class, status and party in the formation of social groups is complex and variable and must be examined in particular societies during particular time periods.

13. In his analysis of class, Weber disagreed with Marx on a number of important issues:

- (i) Factors other than the ownership or non-ownership of property are significant in the formation of classes. In particular, the market value of the skills of the propertyless groups varies and the resulting differences in economic return are sufficient to produce different social classes.
- (ii) Weber saw no evidence to support the idea of the polarization of classes. Although he saw some decline in the numbers of the petty bourgeoisie due to competition from large companies, he argued that they enter white collar or skilled manual trades rather than being depressed into the ranks of unskilled manual workers. Weber argued that the white-collar 'middle class' expands rather than contracts as capitalism develops. He maintained that capitalist enterprises and the modern nation state require a 'rational' bureaucratic administration which involves large numbers of administrators and clerical staff. Thus Weber saw a diversification of classes and an expression of the white-collar middle class, rather than a polarization.

- (iii) Weber rejected the view, held by some Marxists, of the inevitability of the proletarian revolution. He saw no reason why those sharing a similar class situation should necessarily develop a common identity, recognize shared interests and take collective action to further those interests.
- (iv) Weber rejected the Marxist view that political power necessarily derives from economic power. He argued that class forms only one possible basis for power and that the distribution of power in society is not necessarily linked to the distribution of class inequalities.

Chapter- 21

Social Interaction and Social Processes

Meaning of Social Interaction

Social interaction is the foundation of society. It is the very essence of social life. Hence, the concept is crucial to any study of the dynamics of society and culture. Without interaction there would be no group life. Mere presence of individuals in a place does not weld them into a social unit or group. It is when persons or groups of persons do such things as work or play or talk together with common end, or when they compete or quarrel with each other that group life, properly speaking, exists. Thus, it can be said that interaction is the basic social process, the broadest term for describing dynamic social relationships. Social interaction is the dynamic element in society.

Definition

- (i) 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'.
- (ii) Drawson and Gettys: 'Social interaction is a process whereby men interpenetrate the minds of each other'.
- (iii) Gish, N.P.: 'Social interaction is the reciprocal influence human beings exert on each other through interstimulation and response'.

Two Conditions of Interaction

Park and Burgess are of the opinion that contact and communication are the two main conditions of social interaction.

Contact. Contact is the first stage of interaction. Contact means simply a coming together of independent social units [individuals]. It involves mutual response, an inner adjustment of behaviour to the actions of others. The two kinds of contact are: (i) contact in time and (ii) contact in space. The first one refers to contact of group with the earlier generations through customs,

traditions, folkways, morals, etc. The second one refers to the relationship between contemporary individual and groups within a particular area. The contacts may be primary and personal or secondary and impersonal in nature.

Communication. Communication is the medium of interaction. In communication one person infers from the behaviour of another the idea or feeling of the other person. It may take place at three levels-through the senses, the emotions and the sentiments and ideas.

The central nature of interaction is interstimulation and response. One stimulates the actions, thought or emotions of another persons and responds to the similar behaviour of the others. Interaction increases mental activity, fosters comparison of ideas sets new tasks, accelerates and discovers the potentialities of the individual.

SOCIAL PROCESSES

The Concept of Social Process. Society is a system of social relationships. The term social relationship refers to the relationship that exists among people. We may witness such relationships between father and son, employer and employee, teacher and student, merchant and customer, leader and follower, or between friends and enemies, between children, etc. such relationships are among the most obvious features of society. sociology must analyze and classify social relationships because they represent social facts and social data.

Social relationships represent the functional aspects of society. Analyzing the classifying social relationships is a difficult task. Social relationships involve reciprocal obligations, reciprocal statuses, and reciprocal ends and means as between two or more actors in mutual contact.

Thus social relationships may be studied by the kind or mode of interaction they exhibit. These kinds or modes of interaction are called social processes. Social processes are the fundamental ways in which men interact and establish relationships.

Definition

- (i) MacIver: “Social process is the manner in which the relations of the members of a group, once brought together, acquire a distinctive character”.
- (ii) A.W. Green: The “Social processes are merely the characteristic ways in which interaction occurs”.
- (iii) Ginsberg: “Social processes mean the various modes of interaction between individuals or groups including cooperation and conflict, social differentiation and integration, development, arrest and decay”.
- (iv) Horton and Hunt: The term social processes refer to the “repetitive forms of behaviour which are commonly found in social life”.

Forms of Social Processes

The society contains hundreds and perhaps thousands of socially defined relationships. These relationships are beyond measurement. It is humanly impossible for any individual to make a detailed study of each and every social relationship. Instead they must be classified and dealt with as ‘general types’. For this reason social relationships have been classified and discussed in terms of the ‘kinds of interaction’ they manifest. These kinds of interaction, or ‘patterns of interaction’ are called social processes. The kinds of interaction or social processes include-cooperation, competition, conflict, accommodation, assimilation, etc.

KINDS OF SOCIAL PROCESSES:

COOPERATION

Meaning of Cooperation

‘Cooperation’ is one of most basic, pervasive and continuous. Social processes. It is the very basis of social existence. Cooperation generally means working together for the pursuit of a common goal. The term ‘cooperation’ is derived from the two Latin words: ‘Co’ meaning together and ‘operari’ meaning to work. Literally, cooperation means joint work or working together for common rewards.

Definition

1. Merrill and Eldredge: ‘cooperation is a form of social interaction wherein two or more persons work together to gain a common end’.
2. A.W. Green: ‘Cooperation is the process by which the individuals or groups combine their effort, in a more or less organized way for the attainment of common objective.’
3. Fairchild: ‘Cooperation is the process by which the individuals or groups combine their effort, in a more or less organised way for the attainment of common objective’.

Thus, cooperation is mutual working together for the attainment of a common goal. It implies a regard for the wishes, needs and aspirations of other people. It is often considered to be unselfish,. But men may also find that their selfish goals are best served by working together with their fellows. Cooperation may be found in groups as small as the dyad [group of two persons-Ex: husband and wife] and as large as the modern countries. People may cooperate for self-centred gain or for self-protection, or to do good to others. Groups may cooperate for self-advancement as in the case of a monopoly, for mutual protection, or for the welfare of all groups.

Cooperation requires sympathy and identification. We cannot have cooperation without the development of sympathy. Sympathy depends upon the capacity of an individual to imagine himself in the place of another, particularly when the other person is in difficulties. Mutual aid is another name for cooperation. Cooperation is possible only when there is likemindedness, similarity of purpose, mutual awareness, mutual understanding, mutual helpfulness and selfless attitude.

Types of Cooperation

1. Direct Cooperation. Here, the individuals involved do the identical function. Ex.: Playing together, worshipping together, tilling the field together, taking out a cart from the mud, etc. People do work in company with other members. Performance of a common task with joint efforts brings them social satisfaction.
2. Indirect Cooperation. In this case, people work individually for the attainment of a common end. People here do unlike tasks towards a similar end. This is based on the principle of division of labour and specialization. For example, farmers, spinners, weavers, dyers, tailors are different people engaged in different activities. But their end remains the same, that of producing clothes. The modern technological age requires specialization of skills and functions. Hence it depends on cooperation.
3. Primary cooperation. Primary cooperation is found in primary groups such as family, neighborhood, friends' groups, children's play group and so on. Here there is an identity of ends. Every member works for the betterment of all. There is an interlocking identification of individuals, groups, and the task performed. The group contains all or nearly all, of each individual's life. The rewards for which everyone works are shared, or meant to be shared, with every other member in the group. Means and goals become one, for cooperation itself is a highly prized value.

4. **Secondary Cooperation.** Secondary cooperation is the characteristic feature of the modern civilized society and is found mainly in secondary groups. It is highly formalized and specialized. Cooperation is not itself a value; attitudes are more likely to be individualistic and calculating. Most members of the group feel some loyalty toward the group, but the welfare of the group is not their first consideration. Each performs his task, and thus helps others to perform their tasks, so that he can separately enjoy the fruits of his cooperation. Each may work in cooperation with others for his own wages, salaries, promotions, profits and in some cases power and prestige. Such kind of Co-operation may be witnessed in political, economic, religious, commercial, educational and other groups.
5. **Tertiary Cooperation.** Cooperation may be found between bigger groups also. It may be found between two or more political parties, castes, tribes, religious groups and so on. It is often called accommodation. The two groups may cooperate and work together for antagonistic goals. Two political parties may work together in an attempt to defeat a third party. Still, one party may intend to seize power while the other to get sufficient public support. Similarly, the labour and management may work together for different ends.

Role of Cooperation in Social Life

Cooperation as a form of social process is universal and continuous. It has made our social life possible and livable. It surrounds us on all sides. It is both a psychological and a biological necessity and a social condition of man's continued existence.

Cooperation takes place under some conditions. As Young and Mack have said, cooperation requires first of all a motivation to seek a goal. Secondly, people must have some knowledge of the benefit of cooperative activity. This requires some kind of education, for cooperation is not an inborn tendency. Thirdly, people must have a favourable attitude towards sharing both the work and the rewards involved. Finally, they need to equip themselves with the skills necessary to make the cooperative plan work.

COMPETITION

Meaning of Competition

Competition is the most fundamental form of social struggle. It is a natural result of the universal struggle for existence. It is based on the fact that all people can never satisfy all their desires. Competition takes place whenever there is an insufficient supply of things that human beings commonly desire. Whenever and wherever commodities which people want are available in a limited supply, there is competition.

Definition

1. Park and Burgess: “Competition is an interaction without social contact”.
2. Biesanz: “Competition is the striving of two or more persons for the same goal which is limited so that all cannot share.”
3. Horton and Hunt: “Competition is the struggle for possession of rewards which are limited in supply, goods, status, power, love-anything.”
4. Competition may also be defined as “the process of seeking to monopolise a reward by surpassing all rivals.”

Nature and Characteristics of Competition

1. Scarcity as a Condition of Competition. Wherever there are commonly desired goods and services, there is competition. In fact, economics starts with its fundamental proposition that while human wants are unlimited the resources that can satisfy these wants are strictly limited. Hence people compete for the possession of these limited resources.

2. **Competition and Affluence.** Competition may be found even in circumstances of abundance or affluence. In a time of full employment competition may take place for the status of the top class. There is competition not only for food, shelter and other basic needs, but also for luxuries, power, nature, fame, social position, mates and so on.
3. **Competition is Continuous.** Competition is continuous. It is found virtually in every area of social activity and social interaction. Particularly, competition for status, wealth and fame is always present in almost all societies.
4. **Competition is Universal.** Modern civilized society is marked by the phenomenon of competition. Competition is covering almost all the areas of our social living.
5. **Competition is Dynamic.** It stimulates achievement and contributes to social change. It lifts the level of aspiration from lower level to a higher level. A college student who competes with others to get selected to the college cricket-team, after becoming successful may later struggle to get selected to the university cricket team, to the state team, to the national team and so on.
6. **Competition- A Cause of social Change.** Competition is a cause of social change in that, it causes persons to adopt new forms of behaviour in order to attain desired ends. New forms of behaviour involve inventions and innovations which naturally bring about social change. It is an effect of social change also, because a changing society has more goals to open than a relatively static society.
7. **Competition may be Personal or Impersonal.** Competition is normally directed towards a goal and not against any individual. Sometimes, it takes place without the actual knowledge of other's existence. It is impersonal as in the case of civil service

examination in which the contestants are not even aware of one another's identity. Competition may also be personal as when two individuals contest for election to an office. As competition becomes more personal it leads to rivalry and shades into conflict. Competition in the social world is largely impersonal. The individual may be vaguely aware of, but has no personal contact with other competitors.

8. Competition may be Constructive Destructive. Competitions may be healthy or unhealthy. If one of the two or more competitors tries to win only at the expense of the others, it is destructive. Sometimes, big industrialists or capitalists resort to such a kind of competition and make the small petty businessmen to become virtually bankrupt. But constructive competition is mutually stimulating and helpful. It contributes to the welfare of all at large. For example, farmers may compete to raise the best crops, workers in a factory to maximize production, students in a college to get distinctions and so on.
9. Competition is Always Governed by Norms. Competition is not limitless nor is it unregulated. There is no such thing as 'unrestricted competition'. Such a phrase is contradiction in terms. Moral norms or legal rules always govern and control competition. Competitors are expected to use 'fair tactics' and not 'cut-throat devices'.
10. Competition may be Unconscious also. Competition may take place on an unconscious level. Many times individuals who are engaged in competition may become oblivious of the fact that they are in a competitive race. Rarely do they know about other competitions.

Role of Competition in Social Life

Competition plays an important role in our social life. Competition performs a number of useful functions in society. Some of them may be noted here.

Social Functions of Competition

1. Assigns Statuses to the Individuals. Competition assigns individuals their respective place in the social system. Social Status and competition are always associated. Some people compete with others to retain their status, others compete to enhance their status.
2. Source of Motivation. Competition is a source of motivation for the individuals. It makes the individual to show his ability and express the talents. It increases individual efficiency.
3. Provides for Social Mobility. As far as the individual is concerned competition implies mobility and freedom. The spirit of competition helps the individual to improve his social status.
4. Competition Contributes to Socio-Economic Progress. Fair competition is conducive to economics as well as social progress. It even contributes to general welfare because it spurs individuals and groups on to exert their best efforts. When the competition is directed to promote the general interests of the community as a whole, it can bring about miraculous results.
5. Provides for New Experience. As Ogburn and Nimkoff have pointed out, competition provides the individual better opportunities to satisfy their desire for new experiences and recognition. As far as the group is concerned, competition means experimental charge.

CONFLICT

Definition

Conflict is an ever-present process in human relations. It is one of the forms of struggle between individuals or groups. Conflict takes place whenever a person or group seeks to gain a reward not by surpassing other competitors but by preventing them from effectively competing.

- (i) Horton and Hunt: conflict may be defined as a process of seeking to monopolise rewards by eliminating or weakening the competitors.
- (ii) A.W. Green: “Conflict is the deliberate attempt to oppose, resist, or coerce the will of another or others.”
- (iii) Young and Mack: “Conflict takes the form of emotionalized and violent opposition, in which the major concern is to overcome the opponent as a means of securing a given goal or reward.”
- (iv) Gillin and Gillin: “Conflict is the social process in which individuals or groups seek their ends by directly challenging the antagonist by violence or threat of violence.”

Nature and Characteristics of Conflict:

1. Conflict is Universal. Conflict or clash of interests is universal in nature. It is present in almost all the societies. In some societies conflict may be very acute and vigorous while in some others it may be very mild. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Saint Simon, Gumpłowicz and others have emphasized the role of conflict as a fundamental factor in the social life of man. Karl Marx, the architect of communism, has said that the history of the hitherto existing human society is nothing but the history of the class struggle. He has mentioned the capitalists and the

labourers as belonging but the history of the class struggle. He has mentioned the capitalists and the labourers as belonging to two distinct social classes which have mutually opposite interests.

2. Conflict is a Conscious Action. Individuals and groups who are involved in conflict are aware of the fact that they are conflicting are aware of the fact that they are conflicting. As park and Burgess have pointed out conflict is always conscious and evokes the deepest emotions and strongest passions.
3. Conflict is Personal. When competition is personalized it leads to conflict. In the struggle to overcome the other person or group, the goal is temporarily relegated to a level of secondary importance.
4. Conflict is not Continuous but Intermittent. Conflict never takes place continuously. It takes place occasionally. No society can sustain itself in a state of continuous conflict.
5. Conflict Defines Issues about which individual differ a lot. A great part of human history consists of information about conflicts of one sort or the other. These conflicts may be between social classes, religious groups, social groups, political groups and nations. The pattern of struggle or conflict always changes as a result of changes in values, ideals, goals, religious notions, attitudes, ideologies, national interests, and so on.
6. Conflict is conditioned by Culture. Conflict is affected by the nature of the group and its particular culture. The objects of conflicts may be property. Power and status. Freedom of action and thought. Or any other highly desired value. When the stability of a political order is threatened, political conflict may be the result. If sectarianism is rife, we may expect conflict to

occur in region. The culturally determined values of a society will set stage for its struggles.

7. Conflicts and Norms. Not only culture modifies conflict and its forms but also controls and governs it. When conflict is infrequent and when no adequate techniques have been worked out, more violent and unpredictable sorts of conflict such as race riots arise.
8. Conflict may be Personal or Impersonal. Conflict may assume a variety of forms. We may observe conflicts between two individuals, families, classes, races, nations and groups of nations. It may take place between smaller or larger groups.
9. Frustration and Insecurity Promote Conflicts. Sometimes, factors like frustration and insecurity promote conflicts within the same society. Individuals feel frustrated if they are thoroughly disturbed in their attempts to reach their goals. These goals may be desire for power, position, prestige, status, wealth, money, etc. insecurities like economic crisis, unemployment, the fear of deprivation of love and affection may add to the frustration. In extreme cases of this sort one may even lose mental balance or even commit suicide. A society marked by widespread insecurity is one in which conflict is potential.

Forms or Types of Conflict

George Simmel has distinguished between four types of conflict: (i) war, (ii) feud or factional strife (iii) Litigation, and (iv) conflict of impersonal ideals.

- (i) War, according to Simmel, represent, a deep seated antagonistic impulse in man. But to bring out this impulse into action some definite objective is needed. The objective may be the desire to

gain material interests. (ii) Feud is an intra-group conflict. It may arise because of injustice alleged to have been done by one group to another (iii) Litigation is a judicial struggle by an individual or group to protect right to possessions. This kind of conflict is more objective in nature. (iv) Conflict of impersonal ideas is a conflict carried on by the individuals not for themselves but for an ideal. In such a conflict each party attempts to justify truthfulness of its own ideals. For example, the communists and the capitalists carry on conflict to prove that their own system can bring in a better world order.

Positive Effects of Conflict.

It is wrong to assume that conflict has only the negative side and does always disservice. Thinkers like Ratzenhofer and Gumpowicz have said that society overcomes its problems and registers progress through ceaseless conflicts and endless struggles.

1. A limited amount of internal conflict may indirectly contribute to group stability. An occasional conflict within the group may keep its leadership alert and its policies up-to-date. If there is no scope for occasional expression, of conflict, and if it is deliberately suppressed, the accumulated discontent may explode and cause irreparable loss.
2. External Conflict brings about social unity and oneness among the members. During the Indo-park War, all the political parties joined together forgetting their differences and supported the Government of India in facing the challenge.
3. Personal Conflicts also have their advantage. It is through constant struggling only that individuals can rise to a higher level. The opposition of one individual by the other is the only way in which the continued relationship can be made personally tolerable.

ACCOMMODATION

Definition of Accommodation

1. The famous psychologist J.M. Baldwin was the first to use the concept of accommodation. According to him, the term denotes acquired changes in the behaviour of individuals which help them to adjust to their environment.
2. MacIver says that “the term accommodation refers particularly to the process in which man attains a sense of harmony with his environment”.
3. Lundberg is of the opinion that “the word accommodation has been used to designate the adjustments which people in groups make to relieve the fatigue and tensions of competition and conflict”.
4. According to Ogburn and Nimkoff. “Accommodation is a term used by the sociologists to describe the adjustment of hostile individuals or groups.”

Characteristics of Accommodation

1. Accommodation is the natural result of Conflict. Since conflicts cannot take place continuously they make room for accommodation. When parties or individuals involved in conflict do not relish the scene of conflict they sit down for its settlement. Such settlements, temporary or permanent, may be called ‘accommodation’. In the absence of conflicts the question of arriving at accommodation does not arise.
2. Accommodation may be a conscious or an unconscious activity. Man’s adjustment with the social environment is mostly unconscious. From birth to burial man has to behave in conformity with the normative order. The new born individual learns to accommodate himself with the social order which is dictated by various norms such as customs, morals, traditions, etc. He would not become

a full-fledged member of the group if he failed to adjust himself to the social environment. Thus, unconsciously the new born individual accommodates himself with his family, caste or race, neighborhood, play-group, school, church, place of work, in brief, with the total environment. Life is full of such unconscious accommodative activities.

3. Accommodation is Universal. Accommodation as a 'condition' and as a 'process' is universal. Human society is composed of antagonistic elements and hence conflicts are inevitable. Since no society can function smoothly in a state of perpetual conflict, accommodation becomes necessary. Thus accommodation is found in all societies and in all fields of social life.
4. Accommodation is continuous. The process of accommodation is not confined to any particular stage in the life of an individual. It is not limited to any fixed social situation also. On the contrary, throughout the life one has to accommodate oneself with various situations. Further, as and when conflicts take place sooner or later accommodation would follow. Not only the individual but also the groups within the society are obliged to accommodate among themselves.
5. The effects of accommodation may vary with the circumstances. It may act to reduce the conflict between persons or groups as an initial step towards assimilation. It may serve to postpone outright conflict for a specific period of time, as in a treaty between nations or labour-management agreement. It may permit groups marked by sharp socio-psychological distance to get along together. It may prove to be beneficial for the parties involved in it. Sometimes it may help the superior or more powerful party to impose its will on the weaker party.

Forms or Methods of Accommodation

Accommodation arrangements between groups or individuals take a variety of forms. Gillin and Gillin have mentioned of seven methods of adjustment. They are: 1. Yielding to coercion, 2. Compromise, 3. Arbitration and conciliation,

4. Toleration, 5. Conversion, 6. Sublimation, and 7. Rationalization. But these are not mutually exclusive and are very often found in combination.

1. Yielding to Coercion. Coercion involves the use of force or the threat of force for making the weaker party to accept the conditions of agreement. This can take place when the parties are of unequal strength. It implies the existence of the weak and the strong in any conflict. For example, slavery is an arrangement in which the master dominates the servant. Similarly, in wars the victorious nation imposes its will on the vanquished. Various political dictatorships are also instances of coercive accommodation in which a strong minority group which seizes political power imposes its will on the masses.
2. Compromise. When the contending parties are almost equal in power they attain accommodation by means of compromise. In compromise each party to the dispute makes some concessions and yields to some demand of the other. The “all or nothing” attitude gives way to a willingness to give up certain points in order to gain others. Certain international agreements and management-labour agreements on wages, hours of work, are examples of compromise.
3. The Role of Third Party in Compromise. Arbitration, mediation and Conciliation.
 - (a) Arbitration. When the contending parties themselves are not able to resolve their differences they may resort to arbitration. Arbitration is a device for bringing about compromise in which a third party (who may be chosen by both the sides) tries to bring about an end to the conflict. Here the decision of the third party is binding on both the parties. Labour-management disputes, some political disputes are often resolved in this way.
 - (b) Mediation. Mediation is more akin to arbitration. This involves the introduction into the conflict of a neutral agent whose efforts are directed towards bringing about a peaceful settlement. But the mediator has no

power to settle the conflict as such for his decisions are not binding on the parties. His function is advisory only. In religious and industrial disputes mediators and arbitrators are commonly used.

- (c) Conciliation. Closely related to compromise is conciliation. This is an attempt to persuade the disputants to develop friendship and to come to an agreement. Conciliation has been used in industrial, racial and religious struggle. Conciliation implies a milder response to an opponent than coercion. In the end, conciliation, like toleration opens the door to assimilation.
- (d) Toleration. Toleration is another form of accommodation in which the conflicts are avoided rather than settled or resolved. Toleration or tolerant participation is an outgrowth of the “live-and-let-live” policy. It is a form of accommodation without formal agreement. Here there is no settlement of difference but there is only the avoidance of overt conflict. Each group tries to bear with the other. The groups realize that their differences are irreconcilable. Hence they decide to coexist with their differences. Racial groups, caste groups, political groups wedded to mutually opposite ideologies for example, resort to toleration.
- (e) Conversion. This form of accommodation involves a sudden rejection of one’s beliefs convictions and loyalties, and the adoption of others. This term is ordinarily used in the religious context to refer to one’s conversion into some other religious. The concept is now used in the literary, artistic, economic, political and other fields. In the political fields, in India now the change of party affiliation and ideological conviction has become very common.
- (f) Sublimation. Adjustment by means of sublimation involves the substitution of non-aggressive attitudes and activities suggested by Jesus Christ, Gandhiji and most of the religious prophets to conquer violence and hatred by love and compassion, is that of sublimation.

(g) Rationalization. This involves plausible excuses or explanations for one's behaviour. One is not prepared to acknowledge one's failures or defects for it may indicate guilt or the need for change. Hence one blames others for one's own fault. By ascribing one's failures to others instead of accepting one's own defects, one can retain self-respect. Thus a student who fails in the examination for his negligence of studies may put the blame on teachers or valuers of answer papers. Even groups also try to justify their action on purely imaginary grounds.

Needs for Accommodation

It is clear from the above that accommodation assumes various forms. Without accommodation social life could hardly go on.. since conflict disturbs social integration, disrupts social order and damages social stability, in all societies efforts are made to resolve them at the earliest. Accommodation checks conflicts and helps persons and groups to maintain cooperation. It enables persons and groups to adjust themselves to changed functions and status which are brought about by changed conditions. It helps them to carry on their life activities together even with conflicting interests. It is a means of resolving conflict without the complete destruction of the opponent. It makes possible cooperation between antagonistic or conflicting elements or parties. Hence it is often called "antagonistic cooperation". Thus two or more conflicting political parties may come together to forge a union to defend a third party. Accommodation may take place at personal or social level.

ASSIMILATION

Definition

1. According to Young and Mack. "Assimilation is the fusion or blending of two previously distinct groups into one".
2. Bogardus: Assimilation is the "Social process whereby attitudes of many persons are united, and thus develop into a united group".

3. Biesanz: Assimilation is the “social process whereby individuals or groups come to share the same sentiments and goals”.
4. Ogburn and Nimkoff. “Assimilation is the process whereby individuals or groups once dissimilar become similar and identified in their interest and outlook”.
5. Samuel Koenig writes: Assimilation is “the process whereby persons and groups acquire the culture of another group...”

Characteristics

1. Assimilation is not confined to single field only. The term assimilation is generally applied to explain the fusion of two distinct cultural groups. But this process is by no means limited to any single field. For example, children are gradually assimilated into adult society. husband and wife who start their marital life with their dissimilar family backgrounds normally develop a surprising unity of interest and purpose. In the religious field, assimilation may take place when an individual or a group of individuals of a particular religious background get converted into some other religious sect or group. As a group process assimilation encompasses life in general.
2. Assimilation is a slow and gradual process. Assimilation cannot take place all of a sudden. It takes time. Fusion of personalities and groups usually takes time. It occurs only when there is relatively continuous and direct contact. The speed of the process of assimilation depends on the nature of contacts. If the contacts are primary assimilation occurs naturally and rapidly. On the contrary, if the contacts are secondary and superficial, assimilation takes place very slowly. The assimilation of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman cultures has taken more than two centuries in Britain. The formation of American culture due to the assimilation of British, Scottish, German and other European cultures also has taken several decades and centuries.

3. Assimilation is an unconscious process. In the process of assimilation the individual or group is usually unconscious of what is taking place. Mostly in an unconscious manner individuals and groups discard their original cultural heritage and substitute it with the new one.
4. Assimilation is a two-way process. Assimilation involves the principle of give and take. It is normally preceded by another process called 'acculturation'. Acculturation is a preliminary and necessary step towards assimilation. It takes place when one cultural group which is in contact with another borrows from it certain cultural elements and incorporates them into its own culture. Contact between two groups essentially affects both. Usually, the culturally 'weaker' group borrows most of the traits from the culturally 'stronger' group.
5. The adoption of some traits of the 'dominant' culture by another 'weaker' cultural group paves the way for the total merger of the latter with the former.

Chapter-22

SOCIAL DISORGANISATION

The Concept of Social Disorganisation:

Like nature, the human society too has its own order. The orderliness of society depends on its internal strength to maintain its equilibrium. Society will be in a state of equilibrium as long as its various parts are properly adjusted and fulfill their functions. The orderliness or the equilibrium that is normally maintained in the natural world is often upset due to certain forces at work. In the same manner, the equilibrium in the social world is also often disturbed. Whenever the social equilibrium is severely disturbed 'social disorganization' sets in. Thus 'social disorganization' can be understood as nothing but the state of social disequilibrium, in which the smooth functioning of various parts of society gets disturbed.

DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL DISORGANISATION:

Definition of Social Disorganisation:

1. Emile Durkheim considers social disorganization as "a state of disequilibrium and a lack of social solidarity or consensus among the members of a society".
2. Ogburn and Nimkoff have said that "when the harmonious relationship between the various parts of culture is disturbed, social disorganization ensues".
3. According to Elliot and Merrill, "Social disorganization represents a breakdown in the equilibrium of forces, a decay in the social structure, so that old habits and forms of social control no longer function effectively".
Thus, social disorganization implies a breakdown in the bonds of relationship, co ordination teamwork and morale among groups of

interrelated persons so as to impair the functions of the society or smaller social organization.

Characteristics of Social Disorganisation

The nature of social disorganisations can be understood by means of its characteristics: They are as follows:

1. **Conflict of Moeres and Institutions:** Every society has its own moeres and institutions which regulate the social life of its members. With the passage of time some of these more and institutions may become obsolete. New ideals and new institutions may arise to suit new needs. The existing moeres and institutions instead of giving place for the new ones may come in conflict with them. This conflict between the old and new may destroy the social consensus. With the destruction of consensus, the organization is a disrupted. For example, in India, such conflicts may be found very often with regard to social practices, ideals, and institutions relating to divorce, female education, joint family, family control, widow remarriage, inter caste marriage, dowry system, untouchability family planning, etc.
2. **Transfer of functions from one group to another:** In an organized society the functions different groups are relatively well defined and almost predetermined. Due to the dynamic nature of society some of these functions either undergo radical change or get transferred to other groups or agencies. As a result of this, social disorganization may set in even if it is for a temporary period. For example, the joint family in India is no more performing some of its traditional functions for these have been transferred to some external agencies. Hence the joint family system is facing a crisis now. Similarly, the functions of caste and religious organizations have been transferred to other organizations or agencies leading to crisis.
3. **Individuation:** The modern age places a high premium on individualism or individualistic tendencies. Now everyone is more prone to think of himself

and in terms of his own pleasures and wishes and expectations. Important issues such as education, occupation, marriage, recreation morality, etc., have almost become matters of individual decisions. Individuals often fail to think in terms of the expectations and wishes of the groups or organizations of which they are a part. This tendency is, of course, caused by the changing social values. But it may shatter the social organization and may drive it towards a state of disorganisation.

4. **Inconsistency between expectations and achievements:** In a disorganized society considerable inconsistency is visible between the expectations embodied in the social role and the extent to which these expectations can be anti-social manner there is clear indication of the society being in a state of social disorganization. For instance, if a large number of students take part regularly in strikes and indulge in violence and resort to malpractices in examination, we have no hesitation to say that the college education system has become a disorganized one.
5. **Inconsistency between status and rule:** In an organized society the status and role of each individual are well defined and hence the possibility of a conflict taking place between the two is comparatively less. Changing social values and social conditions may bring about some conflicts between statuses of the individuals and their roles. Due to this disorganization may set in. Thus, a disorganized society is characterized by an extreme uncertainty and ambiguity of social roles.

Finally, it may be said that in any instance of social disorganization the following conditions may be present in one way or another either individually or collectively. In most of the cases, they are found in a combined form. Those conditions are: (1) diversity of opinions; (2) heterogeneity of population; (3) mutual distrust ; (4) uncertainty and insecurity ; (5) individually and variety in interests and attitudes; (6) emphasis on rights rather than on duties ;(7) contradiction between status and function;(8) lack of clarity in status and roles;(9)conflict of mores and conflict between institutions ; (10) absence of or decreased social control ; (11) conflict

between society and individual, and (120) disregard of values, norms and laws.

Types of Disorganisation.

Elliot and Merrill have spoken of three types of disorganization which are interrelated. They are as follows:

- (i) Personal or Individual disorganization which includes crime, insanity, or mental derangement, prostitution, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, drug addition, gambling and suicide.
- (ii) Family disorganization which consist of divorce, desertion, separation, broken home, illegitimate births and venereal disease.
- (iii) Community Disorganisation which comprises of poverty, beggary, unemployment, over- population, lawlessness, political corruption, crime and so on.

CAUSES OF SOCIAL DISORGANISATION:

A complex phenomenon such as social disorganization is caused by a number of factors. These factors are so intermingled that it becomes difficult to say which of these are predominate. Different writers have highlighted the importance of different factors. For example, Elliot and Merrill have given four causes: (1) the social processes under the three main heads: cultural, political and economic, (2) cultural lag, (3) conflicting attitudes and values, and (4) social crisis.

Sorokin is of the opinion that disorganisation is mainly due to cultural degeneration of values in various spheres such as art, science, philosophy, religion, law, politics, economics, family, etc. In brief, change from the “idealistic”, and “ideational” culture to “sensate culture” is the main cause of social disorganization.

G.R. Madan has listed a few factors that invite the problems of disorganization. They may be briefly explained below:

1. Psychological Factors. Sometimes, the cause of social disorganization is to be found in the human psychology itself. Psychological factors contribute to disorganization in two ways: (i) Failure to maintain proper communication among fellow beings, and (ii) Failure to modify or change one's attitudes in tune with the demands of time.

- (i) Communication is an essential psychological process among human beings. It is maintained through the social processes such as imitation, cooperation, competition, suggestion, conflict, accommodation, assimilation, etc., which are also psychological in character. Common

Understanding and common consciousness help the people to maintain communication. Due to lack of common consensus regarding values and due to divergent attitudes people may fail to maintain proper communication among themselves. Words, ideas, phrases and symbols that they use in their communication may sound different things to them. Thus, lack of appropriate communications or its total failure may create ill-will, prejudice and lot of psychological distance among people.

- (ii) The problem of attitudes. Human tendencies and attitudes are modified very slowly whereas culture is modified with comparative rapidity. The sociocultural environment may impose much requirement on individuals which they find it difficult to fulfill. For example, the modern industrialized and urbanized society is so competitive that some find it extremely difficult to cope with. Similarly, the cultural conflict between the order and the younger generation may result in disorganization of the adolescents, juvenile delinquency, and sometimes in family disorganization. Conflicts of attitudes between the old and new values are always pregnant with trends of disorganization.

- 2. **Cultural Lag:** 'Cultural lag' the concept used by W.E. Ogburn, refers to the imbalance in the rate and speed of change between the material cultural and non-material culture. Objects of material cultural such as mode of housing, means of transport and communication, type of dresses, patterns of ornaments, technical and mechanical devices, instruments, etc., change very quickly. But ideas, beliefs, attitudes, tastes, philosophies, habits, ideologies,

institutional structures and such other aspects of non- material culture change slowly and gradually. Hence a 'gp' or a 'lag' arises between the material and non- material culture .This lag, referred to as 'cultural lag' invites the process of disorganization to set in. For example, though a good number of Indians have adopted Western technology, they have not very much changed their traditional beliefs, attitudes and customs, etc. This quality has often led to some conflicts which have opened the doors for disorganisation.

3. **Physical or Geographic Factors:** The maladjustment of man and his culture to certain extra-ordinary physical or geographic conditions or situations may cause disorganisations in society. This is especially true in the case of nature calamities such as storms, cyclones, hurricanes, famines, floods, earthquakes, volcanoes, epidemics, etc., which upset the social balance and bring in social disorganization.
4. **Biological Factor:** Population explosion or extreme scarcity of population, the instances of racial intermixture, defective hereditary traits and such other biological factors may also cause disorganizing effects upon society. For example, if overpopulation has caused the problems of poverty and unemployment in some countries, the fact of under population has created has created a psychological crisis manifested in what is known as "race extinction".
5. **Ecological Factor:** Social disorganization is related to environment in terms of regions and neighborhoods. Professor Shaw and his associates at the institute of Juvenile Research in Chicago found that the delinquency was unevenly distributed in the city of Chicago. They observed that the delinquents mostly concentrated in the areas of poor housing, over crowding, and the areas in which cinema houses, hotels, night clubs, liquor shop, gambling centers were found in a large number. Some findings have relatively that per capita crime rate is relatively higher in large cities than in smaller ones.

6. **Social Problems Leading to Social Disorganisation:** Social problems and forces such as a revolution, a social upheaval, a class struggle, a financial or economic crisis, a war between nations, mental illness, political corruption, mounting unemployment and crime etc., threaten the smooth working of society, the social problems are the disease of the society and they threaten the welfare of the society. They may bring in disorganization.

7. **Degeneration of values:** Social values are often regarded as the sustaining forces of society. They contribute to the strength and stability of social order. But due to rapid social change new values come up and some of the old values decline. At the same time, people are not in a position to reject the old completely and accept the new altogether. Here conflict between the old and the new is the inevitable result of which leads to the social disorganization.

Changes in social values necessitate new social institutions and associations. These come into conflict with the older existing ones. This creates disorder in society. The statuses and role of people will have to change in accordance with the changes in social values. But they take time to adjust themselves to new situations. In this way, disorganization spreads. According to Sorokin, the cause of social disorganization is nothing but degeneration of values in various spheres such as art, science, philosophy, religion, law, politics, economics, family , etc, which has lead to more wars criminality , revolution, suicide, mental diseases, etc.

8. **Disintegration and Confusion of Roles:** Members of Society are expected to perform certain definite roles in accordance with their placements in society. Due to per found social changes these exceptions also undergo a change. Consequently, people are confused with regard to their new roles. Professor Fairs considers this as the most important cause of disorganization. According to him, IT is due to the transition from pre-industrial folk society to modern complex society. For example, children are to be cared for and essential cultural education be given to them by the family members. The economic order is assumed to provide for the production and distribution of goods and wealth .The religious institutions are expected to maintain the

religious heritage and to pass on the same to succeeding generation. When any of these functions are not properly fulfilled, disorganization may be the result.

9. **Political Subordination:** Political subordination of one country to another leads to social disorganization in the former. The vanquished country is not allowed to develop its economy and institution in its own ways. It is made a means to serve the interests of the dominant country. India suffered under the British rule in the same manner. The dominant country may not even care for the basic needs such as food, Clothing, shelter, basic education, medical facility, etc., of the people of slave country. As a result, the slave country may have to face a number of socio-economic problems.

Remedial Measures:

To face the challenges of social disorganization it is necessary first of all to study the nature and gravity of social disorganization. Depending on its nature steps should be taken to counteract its influence. In this connection we may suggest the following remedial measures:

1. Able and efficient administration to fight against the disruptive force.
2. Proper and comprehensive social and economic planning and policies.
3. Proper implementation of the plans and policies.
4. Organised social work and social welfare activities and social security measures.
5. Appropriate steps to rehabilitate and reform the beggars, criminals, juvenile delinquents prostitutes mentally and physically handicapped, the aged and the diseased persons,
6. Effective enforcement of land reforms and fixing a ceiling on urban property.

7. Making effective and attractive family planning and welfare programmes and projects.
8. Providing ample educational and employment opportunities especially for the spread of diseases.
9. To create a psychological atmosphere of security and confidence, assuring and providing social equality, justice, and liberty to all.
10. Taking steps to mobilize public opinion against the evil practices of bribery, corruption casteism, communalism, racism, exploitation, etc.
11. Instilling in the minds of people sentiments of unity, solidarity, patriotism and nationalism by making use of mass media of communication in the best possible manner.

Chapter-23

Major Perspectives in Sociology

There are three general perspectives in modern sociology. They are

(i) The functionalist perspective (ii) The conflict perspective and (iii) The interactionist perspective.

(i) The Functionalist Perspective

The functionalist perspective draws its original inspiration from the work of Herbert Spencer and Durkheim. In the view of functionalists, society is like living organism in which each part of the organism contributes to its survival. Therefore, the functionalist perspective emphasizes the way that parts of a society are structured to maintain its stability.

Spencer compared societies to living organisms. Any organisms has a structure, that is, it consists of number of interrelated parts, such as a head, limbs, hearts, blood veins, nervous system, and so on. Each of these parts has a function to play in the life of the total organisms. Spencer further argued that in the same way, a society has a structure –it also further argued that in the same way, a society has a structure, it also consists of interrelated parts, such as the family, religion, state, education, economy, and so on. Each of these components also has a function that contributes to the overall stability of the social system. Modern structural-functionalism [which is usually referred to as functionalism] does not insist much on the analogy between a society and an organism. However, the general idea of a society as a system of interrelated parts, persists even now.

Emile Durkheim's analysis of religion represented a critical contribution to the development of functionalism. Durkheim focused on the role of religion in reinforcing feelings of solidarity and unity within group life. For over four decades, parsons dominated American sociology with his advocacy of functionalism. He saw society as a network of connected parts, each of which contributes to the maintenance of the system as a whole. Under the functionalist approach, if an aspect of social life does not serve some identifiable useful function

or promote value consensus among members of a society – it will not be passed on from one generation to the next.

The functionalist theory assumes that society tends to be an organized, stable, well-integrated system, in which most members agree on basic values.

In the functionalist view, a society has an underlying tendency to be in equilibrium or balance. Social change is therefore, believed to be disruptive unless it takes place in a slow and gradual manner. Because changes in one part of the system normally brings about changes elsewhere in the system.

Functionalism presumes that a given element in the social system may have its own functions or dysfunctions. The proper ‘functions’ add to the stability of the order, whereas the dysfunctions may disrupt the social equilibrium.

Functionalism makes a distinction between ‘manifest functions’, that is, those that are recognised and intended, and “latent functions”, that is, those that are unrecognized and unintended.

An important criticism of the functional perspective is that it tends to be inherently conservative. This theory, fails to pay sufficient importance to the changes that take place in the system. Further, it is commented that this perspective ignores the element of conflict and its role in the social system.

(ii) The Conflict Perspective

The conflict perspective derives its strength and support from the work of Karl Marx, who saw the struggle between the social classes as the major fact of history. In contrast to functionalists’ emphasis on stability and consensus, conflict sociologists see the social world in continual struggle.

The conflict theorists assume that societies are in a constant state of change, in which conflict is a permanent feature. Conflict does not necessarily imply outright violence. It includes tension, hostility, severe competition, and disagreement over goals and values. Conflict is not deemed here as an occasional event that disturbs the smooth functioning of the system. It is regarded as a constant process and an inevitable part of social life.

Karl Marx viewed struggle between social classes as inevitable because of the exploitation of workers under capitalism. Expanding on Marx's work sociologists and other social scientists have come to see conflict not merely as a class phenomenon but as a part of everyday life in all societies. Thus in studying any culture, organization, or social group, sociologists want to know "who benefits, who suffers, and who dominates at the expense of others". They are concerned with conflicts between women and men, rich and the poor, upper castes and the lower castes and so on. In studying such questions conflict theorists are interested in how society's institutions – including the family, government, religion, education, and the media, may help to maintain the privileges of some groups and keep others in a subservient position. The conflict perspective dominated the Western European sociology and was largely neglected in American sociology until the sixties. Modern conflict theory, which is associated with such sociologists as C.Wright Mills (1956) and Lewis Coser (1956), does not focus, as Marx did on class conflict. It sees conflict between many other groups such as the Whites and Negroes Asians and the Europeans, and so on.

Conflict theorists are primarily concerned with the kinds of changes that conflict can bring about, whereas functionalists look for stability and consensus.

The conflict perspective is viewed as more "radical" and "activist". This is because of its emphasis on social change and redistribution of resources. The functionalist perspective, on the other hand, because of its focus on the stability of society, is generally seen as more "conservative". At present, the conflict perspective is accepted within the discipline of sociology as one valid way to gain insight into a society.

One important contribution of conflict theory is that it has encouraged sociologists to view society through the eyes of those people who rarely influence decision-making .Example, the Blacks in America and South Africa, the untouchables in India, and so on similarly, feminist scholarship in sociology has helped us to have a better understanding of social behavior. Thus a family's social standing is also now considered from the women's point of view and not solely from the husband's position or income. Feminist scholars have also argued for a gender-balanced study of society in which women's experiences and contributions are visible as those of men.

(iii) The Interactionist Perspective

The Functionalist and conflict perspectives both analyse society at the macro-level. These approaches attempt to explain society – wide patterns of behavior. However, many contemporary sociologists are more interested in understanding society as a whole through an examination of social interactions at the micro-level small groups, two friends casually talking with one another, a family, and so forth. This is the interactionist perspective. This perspective generalizes about fundamental or everyday forms of social interaction. From these generalizations, interactionists seek to explain both micro and macro- level behavior.

The interactionist perspective in sociology was initially influenced by Max Weber. He had emphasized the importance of understanding the social world from the viewpoint of the individuals who act within it. Later developments in this theory have been strongly influenced by social psychology and by the work of the Chicago School of Sociology, particularly George Herbert Mead.

The interactionist perspective focuses on social behavior in everyday life. It tries to understand how people create and interpret the situations they experience, and it emphasizes how countless instances of social interaction produce the larger structure of society such as government, the economy and other institutions. This perspective presumes that it is only through these social behaviour of the people that society can come into being. Society is ultimately created, maintained, and changed by the social interaction of its members.

Blumer preferred to stress on the symbolic interaction approach laid down by G.H.Mead. Symbolic interaction is the interaction that takes place between people through symbols-such as signs, gestures, shared rules, and most important, written and spoken language. Much of this interaction takes place on a face-to-face basis, but it can also occur in other forms. For example, symbolic interaction is taking place between the author of this book and the readers who read the sentences here.

The interactionist perspective provides a very interesting insight into the basic mechanics of everyday life. It has the advantage of revealing fundamental social processes that other perspectives normally ignore.

An Evaluation of the Three Perspectives:

These three perspectives-functionalism, conflict and the interactionist-represent three different ways of understanding the same reality, that is social phenomenon. Each of these perspectives starts from different assumptions, each leads the investigator to ask different kinds of questions, and each viewpoint is therefore likely to produce different types of conclusions. These perspectives seem to be contradictory also. But we cannot say that one is “better” than the other two, or even that they are always incompatible.

Each of these perspectives focuses on a different aspect of reality:

- (i) functionalism, primarily focuses on social order, and stability and Integration.
- (ii) Conflict theory, primarily focuses on tension and change Contradictions and Conflicts.
- (iii) Interactionism, primarily on ordinary experiences of everyday life Such as Social interaction, Socialization Social processes etc.

Each of the perspectives has a part to play in the analysis of society. Sociology makes use of all the three perspectives since each offers unique insights into the same problem being studied.