CENTRE FOR DISTANCE & ONLINE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF JAMMU
JAMMU

SELF LEARNING MATERIAL
B.A. SEMESTER – Ist
TITLE: INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY

SUBJECT : SOCIOLOGY	**Unit: I-V**
COURSE NO. : SO-101	**Lesson No: 1-19**
	Credits: 4

Course Co-ordinator
Dr. Jaspal Singh
Associate Professor
Centre for Distance and Online Education
University of Jammu
 Jammu

http:/www.distanceeducationju.in

SO-101 INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY

Course Contributors

Prof. J.R Panda
Retd. Professor,
Dept. of Sociology
University of Jammu

Prof. Abha Chauhan
Retd. Professor,
Dept. of Sociology
University of Jammu

Prof. Ashish Saxena
Professor and Head
Dept. of Sociology
University of Allahabad

Prof. Vishav Raksha
Professor and Head
Dept. of Sociology
University of Jammu

Content Editing& Proof Reading :

Dr. Neha Vij
Lecturer in Sociology
Centre for Distance and Online
University of Jammu

B.A SEMESTER-I

SOCIOLOGY

FOR THE EXAMINATION TO BE HELD IN THE YEAR 2025

Course No.: SO-101   **Title: Introduction to Sociology**

Duration of Exam: 3 Hours   **Total Marks: 100**

Credits: 4   **Theory Examination: 80**

                                                            Internal Assessment: 20

Objectives:

- To introduce the students to the discipline of Sociology-its origin, growth, perspectives and relationship with other social sciences.

- To acquaint the students with the basic concepts and institutions in Sociology.

- To make the students understand the relationship between individual and society, culture and social change.

SYALLBUS

Unit I: Nature of Sociology

1.1 Origin and Growth of Sociology

1.2 Meaning, Nature and Scope of Sociology

1.3 Sociological Perspectives : Functional, Conflict and Interactionist

1.4 Sociology and Social Sciences: Anthropology, Economics, History and Political Science

Unit II: Basic Concepts

2.1 Community, Association and Institution

2.2 Group: Meaning and Types

2.3 Social Structure: Status and Role

Unit III: Institutions: Meaning, Characteristics and Types

3.1 Marriage and Family

3.2 Religion

3.3 Economy

3.4 Polity

Unit IV: Individual and Society

4.1 Relationship between individual and society

4.2 Culture, Norms and Values

4.3 Socialization: Meaning, Characteristics and Agencies

4.4 Social Control: Meaning, Characteristics and Types

Unit V: Social Change and Social Stratification

5.1 Social Change: Meaning and Types

5.2 Factors of Social Change

5.3 Social Stratification: Meaning and Characteristics

Note for paper setting:

A. Theory Examination

The question paper of each course will consist of two sections A and B.

- **Section A** will consist of 10 long answer type questions, two from each unit with internal choice. Each question will be of 10 marks. The candidate will be required to answer 5 questions, one from each unit. Total weightage will be of 10×5 = 50. The length of each answer should be of 500 words approximately.

- **Section A** will consist of 10 short answer type questions, two from each unit with internal choice. Each question will be of 10 marks. The candidate will be required to answer 5 questions, one from each unit. Total weightage will be of 6×5 = 30. The length of each answer should be of 500 words approximately.

B. Internal Assessment (Total Marks: 20)

Two long answer questions shall be given and the learner has to attempt both the questions in 950-1000 words. **(10X2=20 marks).**

Suggested Readings:

1. Berger, P.L., & Berger, B., Sociology: A Biographical Approach, Penguin Books.

2. Mills, C. Wright, The Sociological Imagination, New York: Oxford University Press.

3. Rao, C.N. Shanker, Sociology: Primary Principles, S. Chand & Company Ltd.

4. Schaffer, R.T., & Lamm, R.P., Sociology: A Brief Introduction, New York: McGraw Hill.

5. Worsely, Peter, Introducing Sociology, Penguin Books.

6. Berger, Peter L., Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective, Doubleday Publishers.

7. Bottomore, T.B., Sociology: A Guide to Problems and Literature, New York: Pantheon Books.

8. Davis, Kingsley, Human Society, London & New York: MacMillan & Co.

9. Giddens, Anthony, Sociology, Cambridge Polity Press.

10. Kar, Parimal B., Society: A Study of Social Interaction, Jaipur: Jawahar Publishers & Distributors.

11. Kuppuswamy, B., & Page, C.H., Society: An Introductory Analysis, MacMillan Publishers.

12. Majumdar, D.N., & Madan, T.N., An Introduction to Social Anthropology, Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

CONTENTS

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF SOCIOLOGY

Structure

1.0   Objectives

1.1   Introduction

1.2   Factors contributing to the Emergence of Sociology

1.3   Contributions of Comte and Spencer to the development of Sociology

1.4   Contributions of Marx, Durkheim and Weber

1.5   Development of Sociology in 20th Century

1.6   Sociology in India

1.7   Let us sum up

1.8   Self-Assessment Questions

1.9   Suggested Readings

1.0   Objectives:

After going through this chapter you will be able to understand:

- The beginnings of Sociology.

- The early characteristics of Sociology which helped in the development of sociology.

- The factors like industrialization and industrial revolution that contributed towards emergence of Sociology as a discipline.

- The contribution of founding fathers like Comte, Spencer, Marx, Durkheim and Weber towards growth and development of Sociology.

- The development of Sociology that took place in the 20ᵗʰ century.

- The sociologists who contributed towards the growth of Sociology in India.

1.1 Introduction

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 civilisation, 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 organised, and held views on man and his destiny, the rise and fall of peoples and civilisations. Though they were thinking in sociological terms they were called philosophers, historians, thinkers, law-givers or seekers. 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 August 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, 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

remains 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 now received new impetus. The literary works of some prominent intellectuals of this period clearly reveals this urge to understand and interpret man's socio-political system.

Machiavelli's *"The Prince",* Thomas Hobbes' *"Leviathan",* Rosseau'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. Thinkers like Sir Thomas More in his *"Utopia",* Thomasso Campanella in his *"City of the Sun",* Sir Francis Bacon in his *"New Atlantis",* James Harrington in his *"Common Wealth of Oceana",* and H.G. Wells in his *"A Modern Utopia"* - had made attempts to project a picture of an ideal society free from all shortcomings.

However, it was only in the 19th century that systematic attempts were made by August 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 encyclopaedic 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 modelled upon biology"*. This fact could be ascertained from the widely used conceptions of society as

an organisation and from the attempts to formulate general laws of social evolution.

(iv)   Sociology was virtually recognised above all, "a 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.

1.2   Factors Contributing to the Emergence 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 three factors which hastened the process of the establishment of sociology as a separate science. They may be briefed here.

1.   Industrial Revolution and Industrialisation

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.

1.1 Factory system of production and the consequent mechanisation and industrialisation brought turmoil in society:

New industries and technologies changed 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. Industrialisation changed the direction of civilisation. It destroyed, or radically altered, the medieval customs, beliefs and ideals.

1.2 Industrialisation led to urbanisation:

> 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.

2. 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.

3. **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.

1.3   Contributions of Comte and Spencer

The credit for having established sociology into an independent and a separate science and to obtain for sociology a respectable position in the family of social sciences goes to Comte and Spencer. Both of them championed the cause of sociology. In addition to Comte and Spencer, other thinkers such as Durkheim, Marx and Weber also took a leading role in making sociology a science. Hence these five thinkers are often called the *"pioneers"* or *"founding fathers of sociology"*.

Contributions of August Comte to the Development of Sociology as a Science

1. Comte gave to *'sociology'* its name and laid its foundation so that it could develop into an independent and a separate science.

2. Comte's insistence on *positive approach, objectivity* and *scientific attitude* contributed to the progress of social sciences in general.

3. Comte, through his *"Law of Three Stages"* clearly established the close association between *intellectual evolution and social progress.*

4. Comte's *classification of sciences* drives home the fact that *sociology depends heavily on the achievements of other sciences.* The

'interdisciplinary approach' of the modern times is in tune with the Comtean view.

5.   Comte gave maximum *importance to the scientific method.* He criticised the attitude of the armchair social philosophers and stressed the need to follow the method of science.

6.   Comte divided the study of sociology into two broad areas: *"social statics"* and *"social dynamics"*. Present day sociologists have retained them in the form of *'social structure and function'* and *'social change and progress'*.

7.   Comte had argued that sociology was not just a *"pure"* science, but an *"applied"* science also. He believed that sociology should help to solve the problems of society. This insistence on the practical aspect of sociology led to

The development of various applied fields of sociology such as *"social work"*, *"social welfare"*, etc.

8.   Comte also contributed to the *development of theoretical sociology.*

9.   Comte upheld the *'moral order'* in the society. The importance which he attached to morality highly impressed the later writers such as *Arnold Toynbee* and *Pitrim A. Sorokin.*

10.   Comte's famous books (i) *'Positive Philosophy'* and, (ii) *"Positive Polity"* [in 4 volumes] are a memorable contribution to the development of sociological literature.

<u>Contributions of Herbert Spencer to the Development of Sociology:</u>

1.   Spencer very strongly supported the views of Comte who insisted on *the need to establish a separate science of society.*

2.   Spencer stressed upon the *interdependence of different parts of society.* Spencer argued, the various parts of society, such as the state and the economy, are also interdependent and work to ensure the stability and survival of the entire system.

3. Spencer through his *"theory of Organic Analogy"* contributed to the *development of the tradition of comparative studies* in sociology. Though this theory has its own limitations it influenced **Ward, Sumner, Giddings** and other later writers.

4. Spencer emphasised the *"laws of evolution"* and tried to universalise them. According to **L.A. Coser,** the laws of evolution popularised by Spencer could be taken as *his contribution to the philosophy of sociology rather than to the science of sociology.*

5. Spencer's theories had a special appeal for two reasons: (i) they satisfied the desire for unifying knowledge; and *(ii) they stressed the need for the "principle of free enterprise"* [or *"laissez faire principle"]*. Spencer was a supporter of the principle of *"individualism"'.* The policy of *free thinking advocated by him supported the cause of the development of the new science of sociology.*

6. Spencer's works such as - *"Social Statics", "First Principle", "The Study of Sociology", "Principles of Ethics", "Principles of Sociology", "The Man Versus The State"* have been a great contribution to the enrichment of sociological literature.

1.4 Contributions of Marx, Durkheim and Weber

It is relevant here to make a brief mention of the contributions of other founding fathers such as Marx, Durkheim and Weber to the development of sociology.

These "four founding fathers" - Comte, Spencer, Durkheim and Weber-it seems, agreed upon the proper subject-matter of Sociology.

(1) Firstly, all of them urged the sociologists to study a wide range of institutions from the family to the state.

(2) Secondly, they agreed that a unique subject-matter for sociology is found in the interrelations among different institutions.

(3) Thirdly, they came to the common consensus on the opinion that society as a whole can be taken as a distinctive unit of sociological analysis. They assigned sociology the task of explaining wherein and why societies are alike or different.

(4) Finally, they insisted that sociology should focus on *'social acts'* or *'social relationships'* regardless of their institutional setting. This view was most clearly expressed by Weber.

1.5   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 Vierkandt 1867-1953, GabrialTarde 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.K. Merton, R.M. Maclver, 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 sciences as physics, astronomy and biology".

1.6   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, KM, 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 many 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.

1.7   Let us sum up

The immediate goal of sociology is to acquire knowledge about society like all the sciences. However, sociology is not content with descriptions, exhibitions and analysis. It has a more remote and ultimate purpose. *Robert Bierstedt's* views are meaningful in this regard. He says: "The final questions to which sociology addresses itself are those that have to do with the nature of human experience and this earth and the succession of societies over the long centuries of human existence. What are the factors responsible for the disintegration of one social structure, like that of the medieval world, and the coming into being of another? Do human societies like the individuals who comprise them, grow old after finally disappear from the face of the earth? Are there ebb and a flow in the affairs of men, a systole and diastole of human history? These too are problems of sociology ... But some day, if sociology, through its intimate analysis of the dynamics of society, can achieve some understanding of problems of this kind, and contribute to their resolution, it will fulfill its initial promise and its ultimate destiny. In brief, as *Samuel Koenig* has pointed out the ultimate aim of sociology is *"to improve man's adjustment to life*

by developing objective knowledge concerning social phenomena which can be used to deal effectively with social problems."

1.8 Self-Assessment Questions

1. Enumerate the characteristics of early Sociology.

   _____

   _____

2. What were the factors that contributed to the emergence of Sociology.

   _____

   _____

3. What has been the contribution of Auguste Comte to the development of Sociology.

   _____

   _____

4. Explain briefly the contribution of Herbert Spencer to the development of Sociology.

   _____

   _____

5. Who were the main contributors in the development of Sociology in 20th century.

   _____

   _____

6. Name some of the Indian sociologists who pioneered sociology in India.

   _____

   _____

1.9 Suggested Readings

1. Abraham, M. Francis, *Sociological Thought.* Delhi: Macmillan India Limited, 1985.

2. Berger, Peter, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective,* New York: Doubleday, 1963.

3. Coser, A. Lewis, *Masters of Sociological Thought,* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.

4. Durkheim, Emile, *Suicide,* New York: Free Press, 1951.

5. Fromm, Eric, *Marx's Concept of Man,* New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961.

6. Harris, Marvin, *Culture, People and Nature,* New York: Crowell, 1975.

7. Weber, Max, *Theory of Social and Economic Organisation,* New York: Free Press, 1964.

MEANING, NATURE AND SCOPE OF SOCIOLOGY

Structure

2.0   Objectives

2.1   Introduction

2.2   Meaning and Definitions

2.3   Nature of Sociology

2.5   Approaches

2.6   Scope of Sociology

2.7   Uses of Sociology

2.8   Let us sum up

2.9   Self-Assessment Questions

2.10   Suggested Readings

2.0   Objectives

After going through this lesson you will be able to understand

- Meaning of Sociology
- basic nature of Sociology
- Scope of Sociology

2.1 Introduction

Sociology is the youngest discipline among the social sciences. The credit for having established sociology as a independent science is given to August Comte— a 19th century French Philosopher. Like all other social sciences, sociology also studies the life and activities of man. It studies the nature and character of human society; its origin and development; structures and functions. Sociology also discovers the conditions of social stability and social change. In short, the areas of concern within sociology as a scientific discipline are:

(i) Study of origin and growth of society known as **evolution of society;**

(ii) Study of social order and social stability known as **continuity aspect of society.**

(iii) Study of inevitability and desirability, and the causes and consequences of change known as **change aspect of society.**

As such, sociologists are engaged in studying the evolution, continuity and changes in society. This block of study material is meant to understand the meaning and uses of sociology. In order to understand, as to what Sociology is (meaning), it is important to understand as to how the subject originated and what was the status of understanding the society before this systematic discipline (Sociology) came into being.

Sociology (the science of society), was taking its shape to emerge as a distinct science in the second half of 19th century and in the earlier part of 20th century, but before that sociology in the form of social thought, political philosophy and in other forms was there in the philosophical traditions. Prior to the middle of 18th century, it is rightly said, the study of society was dominated by social philosophers rather by social scientists. These philosophers were less concerned about what society actually is like, but what they thought it ought to be like. Sociology as a social science reversed this emphasis and became more scientific than philosophical. Broadly, therefore, it is being said that sociology had

four-fold origins in political philosophy, philosophy of history, the biological theory of evolution and the movements for social and political reforms.

The story of the origin of the subject is a fascinating one and is of a century old (1752-1850) proceeding the time when August Comte gave the name to the subject. During the second half of the 19th century when industrial revolution had occurred it also brought about some far reaching social changes. All of a sudden, people were brought face to face with problems which their fore-fathers had never experienced before. The other revolution during this period occurred in France and both these revolutions led to the emergence of new philosophies. The cumulative effect of these revolutions stirred the minds of men and the expressions like liberty, equality and fraternity were the concepts which came into being during the period. There was thus a radical transformation in the attitude of the people to the problems which happened around them.

However, the characteristics of earlier sociology were of the following:

1. It was encyclopaedic thereby concerned with whole of human history, languages. As such, Sociology is known to be the science or study of society.

2. It was evolutionary in nature due to influence of philosophy of history and biological theory of evolution.

3. It was positivist in character similar to natural science being influenced by Charles Darwin and laws of physics. Comte, Spencer and Durkheim were champions of positivist tradition.

Sociology at this stage was rooted in social survey which itself had two sources:

(a) The conviction that the methods of natural sciences should and could be extended to the behaviour.

(b) The concern with poverty as a social problem and as a result of check of human kinds and exploitation.

Being born out of twin revolutions it claimed itself as a science of new industrial society and finally early sociological thoughts included more of controversies and conflicting theories.

2.2 Meaning and Definitions

Sociology is the discipline which attempts at the scientific study of the society. No other social science endeavours to study society in its entirety. For example Economics studies the wealth and welfare aspect of the society. History deals with the human past; Psychology studies men as a behaving individual. Political Science studies man as a citizen, as a ruler and as being ruled by it. Sociology which alone studies entire social relationships is it social, cultural, economic, political and so on.

Thus the focus of the other social science is identical with that of Sociology. Sociology is interested in social relationships not because they are economic or political or religious or legal or educational but because at the same time they are social.

Alex Inkless identified three different paths to define Sociology:-

A. Historical—The views of founding fathers

B. Empirical—On the basis of the work of contemporary Sociologists

C. Analytical—On the basis of reason

Historical (the views of founding fathers): At least five thinkers are included in the list of founders of this subject. Of them, it is August Comte who introduced the word Sociology in his famous work, 'Positive Philosophy' at about 1839. The etymological meaning of sociology on the basis of Latin word 'Socious' and Greek word 'Logous' is the study or science of society. Comte therefore defined Sociology as the science of social phenomena "subject to natural and invariable laws the discovery of which is the object of investigation." Social Phenomena like physical phenomena for Comte can be studied by making use of positive or scientific method.

Let us also recall another classical sociologist, Emile Durkheim, who also claimed that study of society can be done scientifically. Durkheim favoured the idea that Sociology should concern itself with institutions and social processes.

Both Comte and Durkheim and even Herbert Spencer spoke of Sociology as science of society and considered society as unit of analysis.

- **DEFINITIONS 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 Frenchman, 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.

The question *'what is sociology'* is, indeed, a question pertaining to the definition of sociology. No student can rightfully be expected to enter in a field of study which is totally undefined or unbounded. At the same time, it is not an easy task to set some fixed limits to a field of study. It is true in the case of sociology. Hence it is difficult to give a brief and a comprehensive definition of sociology.

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 our purpose of study a few definitions may be cited here.

1. *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".

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

3. *Harry M. Johnson* opines that "sociology is the science that deals with social groups".

4. *Emile Durkheim* defines sociology as the "science of social institutions".

5. *Park* regards sociology as "the science of collective behaviour".

6. *Small* defines sociology as "the science of social relations".

7. *Marshal Jones* defines sociology as "the study of man-in-relationship-to-men".

8. *Ogburn and Nimkoff* define sociology as "the scientific study of social life".

9. *Franklin Henry Giddings* defines sociology as "the science of social phenomena".

10. *Henry Fairchild* defines sociology as "the study of man and his human environment and their relations to each other".

11. *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 cause and effects".

12. *Alex Inkless* says, "Sociology is the study of systems of social action and of their inter relations".

13. *Kimball Young and Raymond W. Mack* define sociology as "the scientific study of the social aspects of human life".

14. *Morris Ginsberg*: Of the various definitions of sociology the one given by Morris Ginsberg seems to be more satisfactory and comprehensive. He defines sociology in the following way: *"In the broadest sense, sociology is the study of human interactions and inter-relations, their conditions and consequences"*.

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.

2.4   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 enlisted by Robert Bierstadt in his book *"The Social Order"*.

1.   Sociology is an Independent Science

Sociology has now emerged as 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 behaviour, 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-judgments. 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, and 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 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.

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.

6. **Sociology is a Generalising and not a Particularising or Individualising 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 generalisations on the basis of the study of some selected events. For example, a sociologist makes generalisations about the nature of secondary groups. He may conclude that secondary groups are comparatively bigger in size, less stable, not necessarily spatially limited, more specialised, and so on. This, he does, not by examining all the secondary groups but by observing and studying a few.

7. **Sociology is a General Science and not a Special Social Science**

The area of inquiry of sociology is general and not specialised. 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 specialise themselves in those fields. Accordingly, economics specialises 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. Anthropology and social psychology often claim themselves to be *general social sciences.*

8. **Finally, 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 emphasises 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.

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

2.5   Different Approaches of Study

Sociologists have developed different approaches from time to time in their attempts to enrich its study. Still it is possible to identify some topics which constitute the subject-matter of sociology on which there is little disagreement among the sociologists. Such topics and areas broadly constitute the field of sociology. A general outline of the fields of sociology on which there is considerable agreement among sociologists could be given here.

Firstly, 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.

Secondly, 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, organisations and populations.

Thirdly, sociology has been concerned with the *development, structure and function of a 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.

Fourthly, no sociologist can afford to ignore 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, socialisation and indoctrination, social control and deviance including crime, suicide, social integration and social change assume prominence in sociological studies.

Fifthly, 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 generalisations.

Sixthly, 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.

Finally, in the present era of explosion of knowledge *sociologists have ventured to make specialisations* also. Thus, today good numbers of specialised 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 specialised 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.

2.6   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. Unfortunately, there is no consensus on the part of sociologist with regard to the scope of sociology. *V.F. Calberton* comments, "since sociology is so elastic a science, it is difficult to determine just where its boundaries begin and end, where sociology becomes social psychology and where social psychology becomes sociology, or where economic theory becomes sociological doctrine or biological theory becomes sociological theory something, which is impossible to decide".

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 the 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, sub-ordination, 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 behaviour. But social behaviour 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 criticised. 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 cannot 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 Views of Morris Ginsberg

Ginsberg, another advocate of the synthetic school, says that the main task of sociology can be categorised 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. *Ginsberg* has summed up the chief functions of sociology as follows:

(i) Sociology seeks to provide a classification of types and forms of social relationships.

(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, because, it would be, as *Sprott* puts it, *"A brave attempt to confine an enormous mass of slippery material into a relatively simple system of pigeonholes"*.

2.7 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 recognised widely today. In modern times, there is a growing realisation of the importance of the scientific study of social phenomena and the means of promoting what *Prof. Giddings* calls *human adequacy* (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.

35

(iv) The study of sociology helps us to know not only our society and men but also others, their motives, aspirations, status, occupations, traditions, customs, institutions, culture etc. In a huge industrialised 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 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, race relations, 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 practised 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 realised the importance of sociological knowledge in analysing 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 disorganisation, community disorganisation, 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 re-formed social reorganisation. 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 civilised 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 tribal on par with the rest of the civilised 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 broad-minded in spirit. It has made people to become tolerant and patient towards others. It has minimised 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.

2.8 Let us sum up

Sociology has come a long way from the days of the founding fathers. Earlier emphasis on social evolution has given way to social change first and development later. Sociology is no longer confined to the stud; of culture and various social institutions and processes. The field of sociology has now grown to incorporate numerous subfields such as complex organizations, demography, ecology, environmental sociology, feminist sociology, military sociology, peace studies, medical sociology, criminology, social stratification, sociology religion, sociology of the Third World, industrial sociology, sociology of occupations, and

many more. In recent years sociology has also become more interdisciplinary and global in outlook.

2.9 Self-Assessment Questions

1. What do you understand by the term 'Sociology'? Explain with the help of different definitions.

_____

_____

2.   Explain the main characteristics of Sociology.

_____

_____

3.   What are the different approaches to understand sociology.

_____

_____

4. Differentiate the Synthetic school of thought from the Specialistic school of thought.

_____

_____

2.10 Suggested Readings

1. Abraham, M. Francis, *Sociological Thought.* Delhi: Macmillan India Limited, 1985.
2. Berger, Peter, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective,* New York: Doubleday, 1963.
3. Coser, A. Lewis, *Masters of Sociological Thought,* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.
4. Durkheim, Emile, *Suicide,* New York: Free Press, 1951.
5. Fromm, Eric, *Marx's Concept of Man,* New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961.

6. Harris, Marvin, *Culture, People and Nature,* New York: Crowell, 1975.
7. Weber, Max, *Theory of Social and Economic Organisation,* New York: Free Press, 1964.

SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES: FUNCTIONAL, CONFLICT AND INTERACTIONIST

Structure

3.0   Objectives

3.1   Introduction

3.2   Functional Perspective

3.3   Conflict Perspective

3.4   Interactionist Perspective

3.5   Let us Sum up

3.6   Self-assessment questions

3.7   Suggested Readings

3.0   Objectives

In this lesson you will be able to understand:

- the point of view to identify certain facts
- the Orientation towards Sociology

3.1   Introduction

When we are confronted with some human events and happenings we generally ask the basic question what makes people do the things they do. There are of course many ways to look at human events. The perspective is point of view that is needed, identifies certain facts of most important and suggests how these facts can be woven together into meaning.

The term perspective literally means a point of view and also an orientation. We are here to discuss perspective in relation to the contribution made by different thinkers in Sociology in their attempt to study man and society. Thus we can easily say that in the Sociological theoretical perspective the thinkers explain their orientation about man and society. Perspectives are sometimes not considered of theories at all. It may be used to differentiate theory from a loose set of ideas or point of views. But in some writings theories and perspectives are used interchangeably and without entering more into this debate we'll use the term as an orientation or point of view.

A distinctive perspective is central to the discipline of Sociology which is defined of scientific study of human and social activity. As an academic discipline sociology is continuously learning about how human beings and social creatures think and act. Though there are various approaches or perspectives to guide their work, but all Sociologists used basic point of view in their quest to understand the social world.

As said earlier, one can list number of Sociological perspective based upon the thinking of different Sociological thinkers. Here in the following sections we will discuss some of the dominant perspectives. For your convenience it has been discussed in two blocks with two distinct headings. The first block includes the two major perspectives i.e., to say functional and conflict and they have been termed as positivist perspective belonging to macro traditions. The other section i.e., block two, look into micro tradition and the perspective that will be discussed under that heading is away from positivism.

3.2 FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Imagine your various parts of body such as brain, lungs, heart and liver and so on and its working as an organism. Biology and biologists when try to understand the working of body as an organism have to examine parts in relation to each other since they work together to maintain the organism. If we simply analyze the parts in isolation from each other we would not be able to explain how life was maintained. Therefore, we have to analyze the relationship between the heart, lungs, liver and soon to understand how they operate and appreciate

their importance. As such any part of organism must be seen as organism as whole.

The understanding of above example helps us to understand the functional perspective because the positivist sociologists compared society to an organism. Functionalism was a dominant functional perspective in sociology during 1940's and 1950's. On the basis of organic analogy let us now try to understand the functioning of a society as a system. The various parts of a society are seen to be interrelated.

To understand any part of society such as the family or religion, the part must be seen in relation to society as a whole. Thus when a biologist will examine the part of the body such as the heart in terms of its contribution to the maintenance of the human organism, the functionalist will examine a part of the society, such as family, in terms of its contribution to the maintenance of social system.

In simple terms function means effect. Thus the function of the family is the effect it has on other parts of the social structure and on society as a whole. In practice the term function generally used to indicate the contribution that institution makes to the maintenance and survival of the social system and for example, the major function of the family is the socialization of new member of the society which helps the order stability and cooperation on the basis of learned, shared norms and values. Further, in determining the function of various parts of social structure, the functionalists are guided by following ideas. Society has certain basic needs which must be met if they have to survive. These needs are, for the functionalists, functional pre-requisites. For example, production of food and shelter is a functional prerequisite since without them member of society could not survive. Socialization is another functional pre-requisite. Socialization helps in cultivating cultural values among the members of the society and without cultural social life.

Society could not be possible. These functional pre-requisites are to be satisfied for the survival of the society and there are specific parts of the social structure help in doing this. For example, economic system as a part of the social

structure is responsible for production of food and shelter needs. Similarly, the function of the family is the socialization of new member of the society.

Functionalists regard society as a system. A system is an anti-team made up of inter-dependent, inter-related and interacting parts, this way, this follows that each part in some way affect every other part and system as a whole. It also follows that if system is to survive, its various parts must have some degree of solidarity. Thus a functional pre-requisite of society involves a minimal degree of integration between the part.

Many functionalists argue that this integration is based largely on value consensus. The above two points i.e., integration and value consensus is the basic plank of functional perspective because the functionalist assume that certain degree of order and stability are essential for the survival of social system. Functionalism is therefore concerned with explaining the order and maintaining the system of society. They see shared value of the key to this explanation. Thus value consensus integrates the various parts of the society. It provides the foundation for cooperation, since common values produce common goals. Members of society will tend to cooperate in pursuit of goals which they share.

A	G
I	L

M. Harlambos in his book, "Sociology; Themes and Perspectives" talks about functional perspective in a following way.

Functionalism was the dominant theoretical perspective in sociology during the 1940s and 1950s. From the mid-1960s onwards, its popularity steadily declined due partly to damaging criticism, partly to competing perspectives which appeared to provide superior explanations, and partly to changes in fashion. The key points of the functionalist perspective may be summarized by a comparison drawn from biology. If a biologist wanted to know how an organism such as the human body worked, he might begin by examining the various parts such as the brain, lungs, heart and liver. However, if he simply analysed the parts in isolation

from each other, he would be unable to explain how life was maintained. To do this, he would have to examine the parts in relation to each other since they work together to maintain the organism. Thus he would analyse the relationship between the heart, lungs, brain and so on to understand how they operated and appreciate their importance. From this viewpoint, any part of the organism must be seen in terms of the organism as a whole. Functionalism adopts a similar perspective. The various parts of society are seen to be interrelated and taken together, they form a complete system. To understand any part of society, such as the family or religion, the part must be seen in relation to society as a whole. Thus where a biologist will examine a part of society, such as the family, in terms of its contribution to the maintenance of the social system.

Functionalism begins with the observation that behaviour in society is structured. This means that relationships between members of society are organised in terms of rules. Social relationships are therefore patterned and recurrent. 'Values' provide general guidelines for behaviour and they are translated into more specific directives in terms of roles and norms. The structure of society can be seen as the sum total of normative behaviour – the sum total of social relationships which are governed by norms. The main parts of society, its institutions, such as the family, the economy, the educational and political systems are major aspects of the social structure. Thus an institution can be seen as a structure made up of interconnected roles or interrelated norms. For example, the family is made up of the interconnected roles of husband, father, wife, mother, son and daughter. Social relationships within the family are structured in terms of a set of related norms.

Having established the existence of a social structure, functionalist analysis turns to a consideration of how that structure functions. This involves an examination of the relationship between the different parts of the structure and their relationship to society as a whole. From this examination, the functions of institutions are discovered. At its simplest, function means effect. Thus the function of the family is the effect it has on the term function is usually used to indicate the contribution an institution makes to the maintenance and survival of the social system. Thus a major function of the family is the socialization of new

members of society. This represents an important contribution to the maintenance of society since order, stability and cooperation largely depend on learned, shared norms and values.

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

From a functionalist perspective, society is regarded as a system. A system is an entity made up of interconnected and interrelated parts. From this viewpoint, it follows that each part will in some way affect every other part and the system as a whole. It also follows that if the system is to survive, its various parts must have some degree of fit or compatibility. Thus a functional prerequisite of society involves a minimal degree of integration between the parts. Many functionalists argue that this integration is based largely on 'value consensus', which is on agreement about values by members of society. Thus if the major values of society are expressed in the various parts of the social structure, those parts will be integrated. For example, it can be argued that the value of materialism integrates many parts of the social structure in Western industrial society. The economic system produces a large range of goods and ever increasing productivity is regarded as an important goal. The educational system is partly concerned with producing the skills and expertise to expand production and increase its efficiency. The family is an important unit of consumption with its steadily increasing demand for consumer durables such as washing machines,

televisions and three piece suites. The political system is partly concerned with improving material living standards and raising productivity. To the extent that these parts of the social structure are based on the same values, they may be said to be integrated.

One of the main concerns of functionalist theory is to explain how social life is possible. The theory assumes that a certain degree of order and stability are essential for the survival of social systems. Functionalism is therefore concerned with explaining the origin and maintenance of order and stability in society. Many functionalists see shared values as the key to this explanation. Thus value consensus integrates the various parts of society. It forms the basis of social unity or social solidarity since individuals will tend to identify and feel kinship with those who share the same values as themselves. Value consensus provides the foundation for cooperation since common values produce common goals. Members of society will tend to cooperate in pursuit of goals which they share. Having attributed such importance to value consensus, many functionalists then focus on the question of how this consensus is maintained. Indeed the American sociologist Talcott Parsons has stated that the main task of sociology is to examine 'the institutionalization of patterns of value orientation in the social system'. Emphasis is therefore placed on the process of socialization whereby values are internalized and transmitted from one generation to the next. In this respect, the family is regarded as a vital part of the social structure. Once learned, values must be brought back into line. Thus the mechanisms of social control discussed earlier in the chapter are seen as essential to the maintenance of social order.

In summary, society, from a functionalist perspective, is a system made up of interrelated parts. The social system has certain basic needs which must be met if it is to survive. These needs are known as functional prerequisites. The function of any part of society is its contribution to the maintenance of society. The major functions of social institutions are those which help to meet the functional prerequisites of society. Since society is a system, there must be some degree of integration between its parts. A minimal degree of integration is therefore a functional prerequisite of society. Many functionalists maintain that the order and stability they see as essential for the maintenance of the social system are largely

provided by value consensus. An investigation of the source of value consensus is therefore a major concern of functionalist analysis.

3.3 CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE

In the unit on functionalism which you just have read human behaviour is read as determined by the system. Functionalism tends to ignore coercion and conflict, social system is to be considered highly integrated and equilibrium oriented. The theory is conservative and does not provide empirical and demonstrative and explanation. It is an organic approach and represents a mechanical application of biological make of society. This biological analysis is subjected to critical analysis even through evolutionary process, it is static and less developmental and facts to explain the dynamic nature of the society.

On the contrary, the conflict theory use social phenomenon of the past, present and future of a result of conflict. Here the emphasis is placed on conflict as a creative or atleast an innovative effect of social life rather than of merely a destructive and available deviation.

There have been many conflict theories throughout the history including Thomas Hobbles, David Hume, Karl Marx and others.

This conflict theoretical perspective of radical alternatives to functionalism becomes increasingly influential in 1970's. For the conflict theorists society is a system of competing groups in a struggle to achieve basic material needs. It is naturalistic and evolutionary indicating the relation of human needs to social change. The main exponents of this theory Karl Marx who saw the struggle between the social classes of the major fact of history in contrast to the functionalist emphasis on stability and consensus, the conflict Sociologists see the social world in continual struggle.

For convenience, we will discuss in the following pages.

1. Karl Marx and his class conflict.

2. Some of the modern conflict theorists like Ralph Dahrendorf, (class and class conflict in Industrial society) and Lewis Coser, (The functions of social conflict).

1. **<u>Karl Marx and Class Conflict:</u>**

Marx used struggle between social classes as inevitable because of exploitation of one class by the other in different historical epochs. He therefore maintained that the history of existing societies is the history of classes and class struggle.

For example, in feudal society the conflict is between the lord (exploiters and their self), in capitalist society the conflict is between the capitalist and the workers. This creates the fundamental conflict of interest between social groups – lords and serfs, capitalist and workers. Since one goes at the expense of other. Further, Marx is of opinion that this conflict of interest must ultimately be resolved since the social system containing such contradictions cannot survive unchanged.

2. **<u>Ralph Dahrendorf and Conflict :</u>**

The conflict perspective of sociology has recently been most extensively advanced by Ralph Dahrendorf, Lewis Coser, C. Wright Mills, and Collins and Coser they are not in full agreement with Marx's conflict. Let us discuss briefly the contributions of some of them to understand the departure they have made from the Marxian analysis of conflict.

Ralph Dahrendorf criticized the functional analysis in general and of Parsonian theory in particular. He is, however, not considered to be radical Marxist and seems to be closer to century classical liberalist.

He was critical of functional analysis and premised on the idea that all human societies can best be understood as arenas perpetual struggles for power and outlawry that sees only in death. Dahrendorf's point of departure is the assertion that all social organizations are in fact bests an hierarchies of power. The powerful and able to extract conformity to their expectations from the less powerful through various means.

Power and Authority are scarce resources in society and people are perpetually engaged in struggle over distribution of these resources. Society is always in a state of conflict and the interest of some persons is always opposed to those of others. Dahrendorf saw these interests not in economic terms, of Marxist do, but rather in terms of contention over the distribution of power. Conflicts can never be eradicated because every solution to the conflict of power creates a new constitution of interests that give rise to new conflict.

3.4 Interactionist

The interactions perspective in sociology was initially influenced by Max Weber. He emphasized the importance of understanding the social life from the view point of individuals who act within it. Contrary to Durkheim, from Weber, the individual is basic unit of society. He therefore, expounded a special method called the method of understanding (Verstehen) for the study of social phenomenon.

The German word for understanding is Verstehen. Verstehen means that we can understand human action by penetrating to the subjective meanings that actors attach to their own behaviour and to the behaviour of others. Hence, Weber definition of Sociology as "the Science which aims at the interpretative understanding (Verstehen) of social behaviour in order of gain an explanation of its causes, and its effects."

The latter developments in this perspective have been strongly influenced by social psychology and by the work of early leaders in the Chicago School of Sociology, particularly G.H. Mead. Under this perspective a number of loosely linked approaches may be included which further can be arranged in two different blocks. The block (1) for your conventions will include the contributions of Mead and Herbert Blumer under the heading of symbolic interactionism in the block (2) M the contributions of Alfred Schutz and Harold Garfinkel shall be included under the heading of Phenomenology and Ethnomethodology.

2

Block -1

Symbolic Interactionism :

The interactionist perspective, in general, focuses on social behaviour in everyday life. It tries to understand how people create and interpret the situations they experience and it emphasis how countless instances of social interaction produce the larger structure of society. This perspective presumes that it is only through their social behaviour of the people that society can come into being. Societies ultimately created, maintained and changed by the social interaction of its members.

George Herbert Mead (Symbolic interaction) in his book,' The Mind Self and Society', discuss the self as basically the ability to take one self as object, the self has peculiar ability to all both subject and object. But for Mead the self develops through social process with communication among humans. Lower animals do not have self, nor do human infants at birth, the self-arises with development in through social activity and social relationships. To Mead, it is impossible images a self-arising in the absence of social experiences, but once a self has developed it is possible for it to continue to exist without social contact. The self, however is dialectically related to mind. Mead argues that body is not a self and becomes a self only when a mind has developed. At the same time the self and its reflexiveness is essential for the development of the mind. Further, it is impossible to separate mind and self because the self is a mental process. Even though we think of self as a mental process, like all other mental processes in Meads theoretical system, self is a social process.

The general mechanism for development of self is reflexivity or the ability to put ourselves unconsciously to others places and to act as they act.

Mead also have discussed the genesis of self, he sees the conversation of gestures or one background for the self but it does not involve the self since in such a conversation the people are not taking themselves of objects. The genesis of self can be traced through two stages in childhood development.

The first is the play stage and it is during this stage that children learn to take the attitude of particular other to themselves. However, children in this stage may play of Mummy and Daddy and in the process develop the ability to evaluate themselves of their parents and other specific individual do but they lack a more general an organized fence of themselves.

The next stage is game stage which is required if the person is to develop a self in the full sense of the term.

While in the play stage child use to take the role of discrete others. In the game stage the child must take the role of everyone else involved in the game or community. This is known as a generalized others. In other words, to have a self-one must be a member of a community and be directed by the attitudes to the community. While play requires only pieces of selves the game requires coherent selves.

Mead and Blumer, among others, are the champions of symbolic interactionsim. To understand symbolic interactionsim let me reproduce for your convenience George Ritzer's Summarization of the basic principles.

1. The symbolic interaction theory Human beings are endored with the capacity with thought.

2. This capacity of thought is shaped by social interaction.

3. In social interaction people learn meanings and the symbols.

4. The meaning and symbols, in turn, allow people to carry human action and interaction.

5. On the basis of their interpretation of the situation people are able to modify the meanings and symbols which are used in action and interaction.

6. People are able to make these modifications because of their ability to interact with themselves.

7. The inter-wined patterns of action and interaction make makes up groups and societies.

Further human interaction is essence of social action. This interaction is symbolic in the sense, human beings do not merely react to other's action in mechanical way, they interpret or define others action & respond to the same in a meaningful manner. You can ask what we mean by symbolic interaction. It is when we attach meaning to something it become a symbol for example, if you streak out your hand, it may symbolize either a greeting or a place for help or a threat of doing harm. Only when we attach meaning to this gesture we can respond in appropriate manner. If the meaning of this gesture symbolizes a greeting then again a respond it through handshake.

Communication plays a very important role in interaction. Mead and Blumer look upon all Human action as social behaviour based upon communication. This view of social interaction is known of symbolic interactionism. According to this theory, there are two kinds of action: - non-significant gestures or Automatic reflexes and significant gestures or actions based on interpretation of stimuli. Interpretation of stimuli connects as stimulus with a symbol or meaning or responds to it, in the light of that symbol or meaning conveyed through gestures. Gestures can be verbal or non-verbal. Thus communication is possible when people assign the same meaning to a given symbol. Here it is important to note that G.H. Mead's concept of generalized other, which we discussed above, may be considered for understanding the full import and meaning of symbolic interactionism.

Phenomenology and Ethno-methodology

In the origin of Phenomenological Philosophy, the credit goes to Edmund Husserl who was critical of positivism or naturalistic empiricism which assumes that scientist through five senses can investigate the world and build a body of knowledge that adequately reflects the objective reality of the world.

According to Husserl, the objective world can be known only through subjective human consciousness and it is a socially constructed reality when it is

interpreted. Thus this socially constructed reality has both objective and subjective characteristics.

Alfred Schutz of Husserl contributed to the foundation of phenomenological Sociology.

According to this theory, reality is not what is there but what is thought to be there. Phenomenological and Sociology questions the empirical foundations of Sociology.

Since, you have been told about Symbolic interactionsim just before, sometimes you may consider this phenomenological Sociology has an improvement upon the former. According to Schutz the phenomenological Sociologist, the meaning that the individual imports to situations to everyday life is of central importance. He focuses on individual own definitions of the situations, further he says that the meaning that the individual imports to the interaction situation may be said by the person with when he is interacting. This is known of reciprocity or perspective.

Ethnomethodology

Ethnomethodology means the study of members employed by the society. Harold Garfinkel, a student of Alferd Schutz, is the founder of Ethnomethodology. Garfinkel was deeply influenced by Schutz Phenomenological Sociology.

Sometimes Ethnomethodology is considered a branch of Phenomenological Sociology. The Ethnomethodologist argues that the study of researcher and theories that look upon society from outside is analytically inadequate. It is difficult for researcher to match the sayings and doings which they observe with the sociological theories. They further argue that society is experienced by its members as the world of everyday life.

The Professional Sociologist refrain from the studying the world of everyday life. They are more interested in social structural arrangements which are behind the appearances of everyday life.

The Ethnomethodologist are therefore concerned with the process by which people invoke certain taken for granted rules about behaviour with which they interpret an interaction situation and make it meaningful. That is, the interpretive process itself is a phenomenon for investigation in Ethnomethodology. Ethnomethodologists are interested in the interpretations people use to make sense of social setting. By making sense of event in terms of pre-conceived order of society, people create a world that is indeed ordered. According to Garfinkel, the proper subject for social science is the way in which ordinary people establish rational behaviour patterns. They use various methods to determine what is happening in society. This methodology is 'ethno' because like 'ethnobotany' it is derived from folk knowledge rather than from professional scientific procedures. Hence ethnomethodology is the study of the methods used by members of a group for understanding their community.

Ethnomethodology has not as yet refined or identified its most effective analytical tool. Some of the methods which are employed by most of the Ethnomethodologist may be noted. First the method of participant observation which is very much in use in cultural anthropology and symbolic interactionsim. Second, documentary interpretation which consists of taking behaviour statements and other external appearances of any other person or group as a 'document' interpret appearances. Third, interpretation in terms of language which serves as a communication of meaning. In this kind of social analysis, the term accounting is often used. Accounting implies the ability of the people to announce to themselves and to other the meaning they are getting out of a situation. Account involves both language and meaning. People usually give linguistic or verbal description when they explain their observations and actions.

3.5 Let us sum up

The functional and Marxian perspective provides different point views in many respects but have many common factors important for general explanation of unhole.

3.6 Self-Assessment Questions

Q1.   What is functional perspective.

_____

_____

Q2. Give a detailed account of interactionist perspective.

_____

_____

Q3.   Define Symbolic Interactionism.

_____

_____

3.7 Suggested Readings

1. Abraham, M. Francis, *Sociological Thought.* Delhi: Macmillan India Limited, 1985.
2. Berger, Peter, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective,* New York: Doubleday, 1963.
3. Coser, A. Lewis, *Masters of Sociological Thought,* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.
4. Durkheim, Emile, *Suicide,* New York: Free Press, 1951.
5. Fromm, Eric, *Marx's Concept of Man,* New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961.
6. Harris, Marvin, *Culture, People and Nature,* New York: Crowell, 1975.
7. Weber, Max, *Theory of Social and Economic Organisation,* New York: Free Press, 1964.

_____

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: ANTHROPLOGY, ECONOMICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY

Structure

4.1   Introduction

4.2   Objectives

4.3   Sociology and Anthropology

4.4   Sociology and Economics

4.5   Sociology and Political Science

4.6   Sociology and History

4.7   Let us sum up

4.8   Self-Assessment Questions

4.9   Suggested Readings

4.1   Introduction

The nature and scope of Sociology will be better understood in the light of its relationship with other social sciences. It is no more claimed as an all-inclusive science of society as some of the sociologists like Comte, Spencer, Hobhouse viewed in the past. For them, Sociology is the basic or the sole social science and all others are its sub-divisions. The field of social sciences today is more interdisciplinary in nature; understanding of one social science required some of the understanding of other. Further Sociology as a young science, has borrowed many things from other sciences and in return it has enriched them by its highly useful sociological knowledge.

Using Bottomore's format, let us first discuss the relation of sociology with two other general sciences—social anthropology and psychology, than its

relations two of the special social sciences—economics and political science, and finally its relation with history and philosophy.

Before we start discussing the relation with other disciplines let us first be clear about as to what we mean by relationship. The 'relation' may involve convergence and also divergence. It may also be overlapping. Sociology is not only dependent on social sciences but it derives its knowledge from certain physical and other sciences like biology, geography, statistics even it takes knowledge from some of non-empirical sciences like philosophy, logic, religion, ethic etc. We shall first deal with interdependent relationship.

As said earlier let us first discuss the relation of sociology with Anthropology and then Psychology.

4.2 Sociology and Anthropology

Convergence

Anthropology is primarily concerned with man—physical as well as social aspect. Etymonologically, Anthropology means science of Man and sociology means science of society. Anthropology draws knowledge from sociology regarding social organization of society, while sociology is to recognize the advantages to be gained through the study of anthropological investigation of primitive type of social organizations. Cultural anthropology as a branch of anthropology has much in common with sociology and is a connecting link between the two. Anthropology in the past though was engaged in studying primitive people and using inductive method is no more same today. Now there is a lot of commonness between socio-cultural anthropology and sociology and it is now difficult to make a distinction between two. If you happen to have a look at the syllabus of the civil service competitive examination, the syllabus of sociology includes the thinkers like Malinowski and Rad-cliffe Brown who are essentially anthropologists. So much so the structural functional perspective in sociology has its root in anthropological thought of Malinawski, Rad-cliffe Brown, Levistrauss, Evans Prichard, Edmund Leach who are anthropologists. In a number of universities social anthropology and sociology are administratively organized into one department.

Divergence

Though practically both these subjects are indistinguishable now, Bottomore believes that if one examines the concepts, methods of analysis, direction of interests of the two disciplines, it soon becomes apparent that they are still widely separated. There was a period of extreme divergence when anthropology adapted functional approach while sociology continued to be historically oriented and concerned with problems of social development. Further, anthropology used inductive method while sociology adapted deductive. Social anthropologists were involved in studying small societal units and emphasized on field work tradition, but sociology studied large societies and their institutions and used survey method.

In spite of the above mentioned divergences, the distinction between social anthropology and sociology in Indian context and also in studying contemporary societies has little meaning. Sociological research in India, Bottomore believes, whether it is concerned with the caste system, village communities, or on the process of industrialization and its effects is and should be carried out by sociologists and social anthropologists alike. There is therefore a real opportunity to do away with the traditional division between these disciplines which was true when the scholars of developing countries were usually trained in one of the western countries in which the division persists.

4.3 Sociology and Economics

Economics is primarily concerned with the production and distribution of goods and commodities; it is also concerned with larger questions of economic growth and distributive justice. For a long period, the economics attempted to develop the subject as an autonomous discipline. This is evident from the fact that most of the economic laws were subject to the proviso "other things remaining the same". This thinking thus gave rise to the concept of economic man, economic rationality and so on.

In the works of preclassical and classical economists like Physio crats and Adam Smith, there was close relation between sociology and economics but divergence between the two discipline was more visible in the work of German

historical economists. But in recent years the situation has changed in the days of modern economics. Economics has now realized the importance of interdisciplinary research and have accepted that the non-economic (socio-cultural) factors also have to be taken in understanding the economic behaviour. With the result, Economic Sociology or the Sociology of Economic Life which is a new branch of sociology is acceptable to the economists and thus starts the convergence between the two subjects.

Economic sociology, Smelser defines as the application of general frame of reference, variables, and explanatory models of sociology to that complex of activities concerned with the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services. Thinkers like Max Weber, Emile Durkheim and Talcott Parsons emphasized sociological approach to the study of economic activity. On the other hand thinkers like Karl Marx and Veblen emphasized that social reality is determined by economic and technical causes.

Recent literature in both the disciplines shows clearly that both economics and sociology are coming closer together. To mention a few of recent writings by economists on the relationship of interdependence are:

1. E.E. Hagen: On the theory of social change: How Economic Growth Begins.

2. Gunar Mandal: Asian Drama.

3. B.F. Hosetiez; The Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth.

4. J.K. Galbraith; The Affulent Society.

Further to mention some of the sociological writings like Max Weber: Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.

Talcott Parsons and Smelser: Economy and Society.

Neil. J. Smelser; Sociological aspect of Economic life.

4.4 Sociology and Political Science

Political Science studies state and government and all the issues associated with matters such as nature of Authority and Power, forms of

government and other institutions for political obligation etc. Political science confines its studies to the political activities of man. Sociology on the other hand has a much wider view and embraces the totality of life of man is society.

The study of political science led us to understand a radical change after the end of recent world war. It was argued that political institution and its method of study by the political scientists was inadequate as the changes in the structure of behaviour which affects the political institutions are neglected by them. The development of behaviouralism in political science has been largely an outcome to sociological influence.

The influence of sociology in field of political studies begin to be felt at an early stage in development of sociology largely through the works of the Marxists, the Political Sociology of Michels, Max Weber and Pareto. The outcome of these thus led to the modern study of Political Parties, elites, voting behaviour, bureaucracy. Political Scientists also made a borrowing of explanatory schemes and models e.g., of Sociological functionalism, which is manifest in the writings of Almond and Coleman, The Politics of Developing Areas (1960), and David Easton's Work, A system Analysis of Political life" (1965).

The orientation of theory and research in political science though made difficult to distinguish the subject from political sociology, the behaviour of approach which was responsible for it came under severe criticism but the other general scheme although which was taken from Sociology-including those derived from Marxism are yet argued in favour of conversion between these two subjects. For Giddens the co-relation between Political Sciences and Sociology is such that to teach the theory of the state to men who have not learned the first principle of sociology, is like teaching of astronomy or thermodynamics to men who have not learned the Newton's law of Motion.

4.5 Sociology and History

G.E. Howard rightly remarked that "History is past Sociology and Sociology is present History." Peter Worsley says that the best history is infact Sociology; the Sociology of the past, T.B. Bottomore is of opinion "it is of the greatest importance for the development of Social Sciences that History and

Sociology should be closely related and should borrow extensively from each other" he believes that they are inclined to do so.

All the above statements speak of convergent relationships of the disciplines. **Divergence** (Differences)—The fact states that History and Sociology are different disciplines. While History is a particularizing science, Sociology claims to be analytical. History is mostly interested in events but the interest of Sociology is interested in the patterns the events exists.

The histories are interested, of said colour, in the unique, the particular and the individual. The Sociologist on the other hand in the regular, the recurrent and the universal. *e.g.* a historian may be interested in eventful work war and even revolutions be it in American, Russian or French revolution and record them. But for Sociologists the words revolutions and Social Phenomenon and also of another kind of conflict between social groups.

Despite these differences and emphasis there are important basis for concordance of the history and sociology. Some great historian have written social history—that is history that seal with social relations, social patterns, means and customs and important institutions other than Monarchy and army and some of the that outstanding Sociological analysis as in the work of Max Weber has been applied to historical problems. Sociologists like Robert Bellha and Norman Bushman acknowledged historical sociology as one of the standard special field of their discipline.

4.6 Let us sum up

Thus to conclude there are both similarities and differences among different social sciences. Besides the differences they are helpful in understanding the society as a whole.

4.7 Self Assessment Questions

Q1. Give a relationship between sociology and history.

_____

_____

Q2.   Write convergence of Anthropology and Sociology.

_____

_____

4.8 Suggested Readings

1. Abraham, M. Francis, *Sociological Thought.* Delhi: Macmillan India Limited, 1985.
2. Berger, Peter, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective,* New York: Doubleday, 1963.
3. Coser, A. Lewis, *Masters of Sociological Thought,* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.
4. Durkheim, Emile, *Suicide,* New York: Free Press, 1951.
5. Fromm, Eric, *Marx's Concept of Man,* New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961.
6. Harris, Marvin, *Culture, People and Nature,* New York: Crowell, 1975.
7. Weber, Max, *Theory of Social and Economic Organisation,* New York: Free Press, 1964.

COMMUNITY AND ASSOCIATION

Structure

5.1   Objectives

5.2   Introduction

5.3   Meaning of Community

5.4   Definitions of Community

5.5   Elements of Community

5.6   Meaning of Association

5.7   Definitions of Association

5.8   Elements of Association

5.9   Difference between Community and Association

5.10 Let us sum up

5.10 Self-Assessment Questions

5.11 Suggested Readings

5.1 Objectives

After going through this topic the students should be able:

(i)   To know the meaning, indicated by various views given by different sociologists pertaining to community and association.

(ii)   To understand the elements of community and association.

(iii) To have knowledge about difference between community and association.

5.2 Introduction

The present chapter deals with community and association and their relevant aspects, the explanation includes the level of attachment and interaction. There are different groupings which may exist among the members of a society these groupings have been studied by sociologists from different point of view. The concepts of 'Gemeinschaft' and 'Gesellschaft' were developed by Tonnies usually translated as 'community' and 'association' respectively. Gemeinschaft or community is defined as intimate, private, and exclusive living together in a localized group and have a feeling of 'belonging' to one another. It is a group of people who occupy a defined territory within which the group is assured of a selfsufficing life. As communities develop or expand and get larger and more complex, they loss person to person contact marked by intimacy and mutual dependence. The size of community is an important determinant of its characteristics.

As Gesellschaft usually translated as 'association' represents relationships that are specific and utilitarian, it may be distinguished from the community on its specific objectives and aims. Its life is temporary and remains upto the attainment of objectives. This chapter includes meaning, definitions, characteristics of community and association and also difference between community and association.

5.3 Meaning of Community

The word community has been derived from two Latin words: 'Com' and 'Munis' in English 'Com' means together and 'Munis' to serve. The community is an organization of human beings framed for the purpose of serving together. MacIver has given the concept of community "as area of social living marked by some degree of social coherence." A man is linked in many ways to his fellows who form a group. It is not possible for a man to become the member of all the groups existing in the world. He can establish his relation only with the people who reside near him in a definite part of a territory. It is inevitable that the people who over any length of time reside in a particular locality should develop social likeness, should have common social ideas, common tradition and the sense of

belonging together. This fact of social living and common specific area given birth to community.

5.4 Definitions of Community

The following are the definitions of community.

(1) **According to MacIver,** "community is a group of people who live together, who belong together, so that they share, not this or that particular interest, but as a whole set of interests wide enough and complete enough to include their lives" He included in "community" small aggregations, such as villages and large ones, such as cities and tribes and nations.

(2) **According to Bogardus,** "A social group with some degree of 'we feeling and living in a given area" where a certain number of individual live a common life in a locality, we call those persons a community.

(3) **According to kingsley Davis,** "Community is the smallest territorial group that can embrace all aspects of social life."

(4) **According to Mannheim,** "Any circle of people who live together in such a way that they do not share this or that particular interest only, but a whole set of interests."

(5) **According to Parsons,** "A community may be defined as a group or collection of groups that inhabit a delimited geographical area and whose members live together in such a way that they share the basic conditions of a common life."

(6) **According to Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgers,** "Community is a local area over which people are using the same language, conforming to the same mores, feeling more or less the same sentiments, and acting upon the same attitudes."

The definitions mentioned above, emphasize the structural and sociological aspects of the community. Some writers have given the concept of community emphasizing its ecological aspects, other have adopted psychological emphasis in their thinking about community.

5.5 Element of Community

(1) **Territorial Character.** A community is always considered in relation to physical environment of a territory, when we say that community has definite territory. As MacIver and page has given the concept community indicating the territorial aspect, "The community possesses a distinctively territorial character. The characteristic is most marked in the case of primitive communities which consisted of small clearly defined group of individuals relatively independent of the other communities for the goods required by the prevailing standards of life and also territorial distinction of such communities was very marked even in this era of rapid migration, locality as a factor in the settlement of a community still holds its importance. The habitation of human beings in cities and villages the relatively thin and dense distribution of population over geographical regions and the characteristics modes of their life in their respective settlements strike to us when we think of community."

(2) **Home Instinct of Special Attachment.** Home instinct is found not only in mankind but also in many animals. It is very powerful instinct which lays foundation of our attachment to a particular house, community or nation itself. Whenever people live together for some time uniformity in the modes of their living takes place by their daily interaction. Thus instinct of attachment compels the individuals to live in community environment.

(3) **Common Life.** Prof. Elwood maintains that if the people in a community are almost same, there are no epochal differences between the ways of life of the individuals. Due to their inhabitation on a common territory, they develop a kind of emotional and cultural

67

uniformity. This is also because of the fact that community is never formed with a particular aim or objectives.

(4) **Community Feeling.** The psychological feelings of a community are more important than they appear. The life of a man is mostly lived in a community. MacIver says, "Whenever human beings are thrown together, separated in whole or in part from world outside so that they must live their lives in one an other's company, we can observe the effects of these social impulses which bring men into communities we observe in other words, the formation of "community sentiment".

(5) **Community has Particular Name.** Society is nameless but community has certain name, because community is the group of people living at a particular place with common culture. Community is always known by a particular name. Their immediate bases of origin give such a community a particular name.

(6) **Permanence.** Communities cannot be formed with any particular aims and objectives which are to be attained by their existence like association. But community prevails permanently. It is durable, because it has developed itself. The proof this assertion lives in the existence of age old communities in the modern era.

(7) **Wider ends.** In communities the people associate not for the fulfilment of a particular end. The ends of a community are wider there are natural and not artificial.

(8) **No legal status.** A community is not a legal body, neither it can sue nor it can be sued. In eyes of law it has no rights and duties which are to be performed in accordance of law.

5.6 Meaning of Association

In the primitive society needs and requirements of the individual were limited with the result that every individual was self-sufficient. But today we are

living in modern and complex societies were we are dependent on others for meeting our needs. Therefore we can meet our demands by three ways :

Firstly, we may act independently following our own way without thought of other's action. The unusual way has narrow limitation, where ever man live together. Secondly we may seek them through conflict with one another, if this method is not channelled strictly by regulate is precarious and is opposed to the very existence of society.

Finally, we may seek our ends in company on some cooperative basis. The cooperative pursuits may be determined by the customs of a community. On the other hand, a group may organize itself expressly for the purpose of pursuing of its interests together, when this happens, an association is born. MacIver says, that cooperative pursuit may be spontaneous, such as the offering of helping hand to a stranger. It may be casual. It may be determined by the customs of a community, as in the case of farmers assisting their neighbours at harvest time. But when there is group organization for the common purpose we may say association. Association is required to meet collective needs and necessities of the people, for which collective efforts are required. **5.7 Definitions of Association**

(1) **According to G. D. H. Cole,** "By an association we mean any group of persons pursuing a common purpose by of course co-operative action extending beyond a social act and for this purpose agreeing together upon certain methods of procedure and lying down, in however a rudimentary form, rules of common action."

(2) **According to Bogardus,** "An association is usually working together of people who wish to achieve certain purposes."

(3) **According to MacIver,** "An association is an organization deliberately formed for the collective pursuit of same interests or set of interest, which its members share."

(4) **According to Ginsberg,** "An association is a group of social beings related to on another by the fact that the possess or have instituted in common an organization with a view to securing a specific end."

(5) **According to Gillin and Gillin,** "An association is a group of individuals united for a specific purpose or purposes or held together by recognised or sanctioned modes of procedure or behaviour."

From the above definitions it can thus be said that an association is a group of people organised for a particular purpose. To constitute an association there must be firstly, a group of people; secondly these people must be "an organised one' *i.e.* there must be certain rules for their conduct in the groups; and thirdly, they must have a common purpose of specific nature to pursue. Thus family, church, trade union all are the instances of association.

5.8 Elements of Association

(1) **It is Concrete form of Organization.** An association is a group of person collected for some specific aims and objectives. It is thus a concrete group which can be seen, while at work. Thus it is a concrete form of organization of human beings.

(2) **It is established.** Like community association does not grow spontaneously. It has no natural growth and does not grow itself. Associations are formed when there are certain aims and objectives to be fulfilled. They are created by men to satisfy some motive or cause. Certain rules and regulations are formed to run a particular type of association and the members of the association run it on the basis of these rules and regulation.

(3) **Its aim is determined.** Aim is the soul base of association. No association is formed without aim. First there is the problem and the solution of which becomes the aim of the association formed to solve such problems. For example, if there is a dramatic association, then its aim will naturally to be stage drama and plays. No association can maintain its identity unless or until it has certain aim and objects.

(4) **Rules and regulations for members.** Every association has certain set of rules and regulation which are to be followed by its members.

2

It also contains 'code of conduct' for the members. Those who follow the rules and regulation provided for and participate in the pursuit of the aim of the association are only called the members of a particular association. Any one acting contrary or disowning the obligations as members may be expelled from the membership as per procedure framed for the purpose. It is also obligatory for the members to cooperate each other in achieving goals of the association.

(5) **Its membership is voluntary.** An association is not an essential organization like state or society. Neither it is natural organization in which contribution of every one is asked, nor there any common instinct among the persons based on common and unified ideology to become the member. Simply he is the member of a particular association because he wants it and he likes it and if he has the feeling of dislike he is absolutely free to disown the association voluntarily.

(6) **An association exists for its aim and objectives.** The life of the association is up to the achievement of the aims and objects for which it has been created. The existence of the association after the achievement becomes immaterial and irrelevant. It becomes lifeless body of formalities only. The aim is the soul of the association.

5.9 Difference between Community and Association

One of the most important divisions of social groups is that which we say community and association. An association is a group of people united for a specific purpose or a limited number of purposes, such as an army or a school, the aim of which is to define education or to import knowledge. There may be trade unions and other groups which have their aims and objectives which are to be achieved by them. A community on the other hand, is a permanent social group embracing a totality of ends or purposes. In contrast with an association the life of the members of a community is wholly lived in it; here they find all the social relations, while outside it there is a little what they need. MacIver defined it as any area of common life, village or town or district or country, or an even wider

area. To deserve the name of the community the area must be somewhat distinguished from farther areas; the common life may have some characteristics of its own so that the frontiers of the area have some meanings. Thus community is a self-contained group, where as an association is used as means to ends to be achieved mostly outside it. e.g. The victory of the army is not exclusively theirs; it has been attained for the nation. The following are the major differences between community and association:–

(1) **Membership.** It is up to the will of the members to become a member of a particular association or leave that to suit his convenience; whereas the membership of a community cannot be said to be absolutely voluntary. It is more or less compulsory.

(2) **Interests.** For participation in the activities of an association some personal interests are involved. In other words the people join an association for serving personal ends, on the other hand an individual lives, functions and dies in the same community, no matter whether his personal interests are involved in that or not.

(3) **Stability.** As regards stability associations are less stable. Only those associations have stability which wishes to achieve long standing objectives, more or less permanent. Whereas, communities are more stable than association.

(4) **Rules and regulations.** In every association code of behaviour is required to be observed by the members. Without their observance an association must disintegrate. On the other hand, in community, there are no such rules and regulations and gap is filled by customs, and conventions, which cannot be easily violated.

(5) **Importance of law.** Associations, when acquire some legal status, their action can even be challenged in the court of law; whereas the communities can have no legal status and as such the questions of challenging any action in any court of law does not arise.

(6) Existence. It requires specific efforts on the part of interested persons to bring an association into existence, whereas, it requires no specific efforts for the members to bring community into existence.

(7) Fulfilment of demands. It is impossible to think of an association to meet all the demands of the members, where as a community is required to meet all the demands of the people and as such community has multifarious activities as compared with an association.

(8) Difference of nature. An association is a manmade organization, whereas, a community is the natural development of those social forces which inspire men to come together with in a common bond of shared way of life and cause of settlements over some distinct locality.

(9) Settlements. Associations are generally transitory and serve a means; whereas, community is a permanent settlement and is a means as well as end, at the same time. Due to its manmade origin, associations have some fixed sets of rules, but in case of community, no definite rules are prescribed. Thus communities and associations are differing from each other on the basic of above mentioned factors.

5.10 Self-Assessment Questions

(i) Define community and discuss its various elements.

_____

_____

_____

(ii) Define association and discuss its elements.

_____

_____

_____

(iii) Describe meaning of community and association.

_____

_____

_____

(iv) What is community and discuss relationship between community and association.

_____

_____

_____

(v) Code of behaviour is required to be observed by the members in a group 'comment'.

_____

_____

_____

INSTITUTIONS

Structure

6.1   Objectives

6.2   Introduction

6.3   Institution: Meanings

6.4   Definitions of Institutions

6.5   Characteristics of Institutions

6.6   Difference between Institution and Association

6.7   Importance of Institutions

6.8   Let us sum up

6.9   Self-Assessment Questions

6.10   Suggested Readings

6.1 Objectives

After going through this topic the students should be able:

(i)   to understand the meaning of Institution.

(ii)   to know the various views about Institution given by different sociologists.

(iii)   to understand various characteristics of Institution.

(iv)   to know the difference between Institution and Associations.

6.2 Introduction

The present chapter deals with the illustration of social institution and its relevant aspects. Institutions are generally interpreted as certain enduring and accepted forms of procedure having influence over relation between individual and groups. Institutional norms differ from society to society. The institution in order to perform certain function has a division of labour among its participants. The major social institutions are, Economic Institutions, Political Institutions, Stratification Institutions, Kinship Institutions and cultural institutions. This chapter includes the discussion as meanings, definitions, characteristics of social institutions. The last part of the chapter includes the difference between institution and association and importance of Institution.

6.3 INSTITUTIONS

Meaning : In ordinary speech or writing the word 'institutions' is used to mean an organisation with some specific purposes, usually a public or charitable one. Sometime a building in which an organization is housed is also called an institution. But in social science it is not precise interpretation of the term institution. Some sociologists are of the view that we say 'institution' when we find any set of people in organized interaction. With this interpretation, any individual family or club or departmental store or prison or government is an institution. Thus we prefer the term institutions to mean a set of norms integrated around a major societal function.

Institutions are usually defined as 'certain enduring and accepted forms of procedure governing the relation between individuals and groups' while supporting this view Ellwood says that institutions are habitual ways of living together which have been sanctioned, systematized and established by the authority of communities'. These institutions functions like a wheel on which human society marches on; the Machinery through which society carries on its activities', Barnes H. E. called them; the strong holds of social life as well as the meeting points of accidents and design, or reason and un-reason, of necessity and dispensability. When we say an institution is a mode of procedure, or a constant way or system of doing things, it obviously follows that it cannot be identified

with any type of association or social group as is frequently done in common parlance. In associations the object and objects are distinguished, for which it exists, the ways of attaining them are the institutions. When we say as, the family the social group is some sort of propagation of mankind; while the marriage, the system of property and inheritance, are its main institutions. In religious association the forms of worship and the administration of the sacraments are its institutions. Its object is the fulfilment of religious needs. It is also seen in the political and economic orders, whose institutions are the party system, the elections, the industrial and monetary systems etc. Such important associations as these do not merely have their corresponding institutions but also are embody in themselves a system of institutions called institutional complex. As the activities proper to and are performed in special places, these and their respective associations are given the name of institutions, *e.g.* Hospital or college.

Prof. Rose has narrated the variation of the institutions and their structures as "Institutions vary in degree of specialisation expected of persons and this is, often related to the degree of control the institution have over the life of its members. The more specialized and segmentalized the relation of a given member, an institution, the less is its control over him. The teacher is associated with the school only in his occupational life, whereas the nun is associated with church in most aspects of her life. Even with in the same institution this holds true, the religious leader (Rabbi, priest, minister) has a less specialized relation to his church than does the accurate member, and his life much more controlled by the institutions. To the extent that the individual's life is controlled by one institution, he must have fewer relationships to other institutions. A priest for example must even withdraw from family life.

Mack and Young have stated the functional aspects of the institutions as "every institution, in order for its functions to be performed, has a division of labour among its participants. Among the many norms linked together to make up the institutions are those defining the various roles necessary to the performance of the institutional function. The familial institution, for instance, is responsible for the reproduction of new members for the society; it will therefore, specify role behaviour appropriate to the statuses of father, mother, son, daughter, sister,

husband, wife and any other status such as obstetrician, or midwife, which are related to the reproductive function in the society."

Five major units of institution are conventionally identifies as :

(i) Economic institutions: server to produce and distribute goods and service.

(ii) Political institutions: Regulate the use of, access to, power.

(iii) Stratification institutions: determine the distribution of position and resources.

(iv) Kinship institutions: Deal with marriage, the family and the socialization of young.

(v) Cultural institutions: These are concerned with religious, scientific and artistic activities. The concept of institution is widely used in sociology without precise specification.

6.4 Definitions of Institution

Institution has been defined by different sociologists in different ways. Some of the definitions of institution are as under:-

(1) **According to MacIver,** "The established forms or conditions of procedure characterstic of group activity."

(2) **According to Bogardus,** "An institution is a structure of society that is organised to meet the needs of people chiefly through will establish procedures."

(3) **According to Sumner,** "An institution consists of a concept (idea, nation, doctrine or interests) and a structure."

(4) **According to Green,** "An institution is the organization of several folks and mores into a unit which serves a number of social functions."

(5) According to Cooley, "An institution is a complete organization of collective behaviour established in the social heritage and meeting some persisting need or want."

(6) According to Barnes, H. E., "Social institutions are the social structure and machinery through which human society organises, directs and executes the multifarious activities required to society for human need."

(7) According to Functionalist School of Sociology, "Institutions as fulfilling the 'needs' of individuals or societies."

From the above definitions it can thus be said that institution is a procedure characteristic of group activity, society organized for meeting the needs through this procedure, a concept and a structure, an organization constituted by folk ways and mores, a machinery through which society organises multifarious activities and ultimately institutions are fulfilling the needs of individuals in particular and societies in general.

6.5 Characteristics of Institutions

(1) Institutions provide lines. Institution provides guide lines to the ways of individuals. It teaches them various good precedents which they are expected to know, in accordance with these precedents the individual leads life smoothly and satisfactory.

(2) Institution keeps control over the individuals. Institutions help a moral check on various scrupulous motivations of individuals for the absence of institutional restrictions and provide information of various unaccepted norms which are condemned in the society and prevents from what is wrong in a particular set up. Through the institution an individual is able to understand what is to be done for acceptance of the society in which he is living.

(3) Institutions determine place and duties. An institution determines the place and duties of individuals in the society. It is only through the institutions that the individual comes to know his status and role in a

particular set up. The parents learn their place and children learn their duties towards their parents or elders in the society through institution. These statuses and roles are fixed by the institutional pattern of a particular society. And the individual members of that society have to work accordingly.

(4) Institution brings a Cultural Harmony. Institutions bring a cultural harmony in the society. It is only through the institution an individual comes to know the utilization of righteous stream of the society. The society seems to be unified structure due to the institutions. The unification and harmony are brought and maintain through the social institutions. And the process of unification leads to the social solidarity in a particular social set up man looks for various norms which are to be followed by for the existence at ever set up in the society.

(5) Objectives of the institutions. Every institution has certain aims and objective which are to be achieved. Every individual that belongs to a particular organisation is bound to contribute in achievement of the aims and objectives of that set up. Without aim, institutions cannot be existed, and there is not an institution in the world which has no aim and objective of its own.

(6) **Institution has symbol.** There is a symbol of an institution which can be either material or non-material. These symbols are the recognition of those particular institutions.

(7) **The Institution has procedure.** The institution has a definite procedures, which are formulated on the basis of customs, and dogmas that differ from society to society, because every society has it own customs and dogmas which are followed by its member, for the functioning of society and to maintain the existence of society these procedures played a great role.

(8) **Institution depends upon collective behaviour.** Institution depends upon the collective and group activities of man. An institution cannot be run by an individual because structure of institution is for the group

2

activities and the group may base on division of labour. Every section of the group has to perform its own task which is assigned by the institution. Thus the institution depends upon collective and group activities of the man.

(9) **Institution has some rules.** Every institution has certain rules and regulations. And these rules and regulations are to be obeyed by the individual of a particular society.

(10) **Fulfilment of needs.** Institutions are formed to fulfil the primary needs of the individuals. For these the individuals are fully depending upon that particular institution.

(11) It simplifies the group or social arts of an individual. It is a unified pattern of diverse human behaviour and action.

(12) Institutions provides definite role and status to the individual, institutional like political parties and the government limit and liberate the human energies contained in individuals to play suitable and respective roles.

Certain institutions are as old as the history of civilization, for example, the institution of marriage. The institution has social recognition, behind it. It is the product of social behaviour of man. It is relatively enduring.

6.6 Difference between Institution and Associations

The following are the difference between institutions and associations:—

(1) **Associations represent human aspect.** If institutions are the rules of procedure due to which they cannot associated with associations for their identification. Association is a group of people organised for the pursuit of a specific purpose. Family is an association which is organised for the purpose of various functions which are propagated by it in the life of an individual, while marriage is its main institution. In political sphere party system is an institution and state is an association. It can thus be said that association represents human aspects while an institution is a social condition of conduct and behaviour. The institutions are the way of

attaining object or objects for which the associations exists. When we regard college as a body of Teachers and students, we are selecting its associational aspect, but when we regard it as educational system we are selecting its institutional feature. We do not belong to marriage or property system but we do belong to families, to state and sometime prison. An individual is connected with group on associational basis not on the system basis.

(2) Associations have form and are concrete, whereas institutions have no form and are abstract.

(3) Associations are things and institutions are modes, the distinction between association and institution is of great importance in sociology because it is majorly concerned with institutions rather than association. Basically institution gives life to the association, communities or any other types of society. Because these are the social unit and connected and maintained on certain procedural basis. Thus it can thus be said that associations are things and institutions are modes and ways. We born and live in association. Ultimately we can say that both the terms 'associations and 'institution' are interdependent. Both are for each other and cannot function without each other. Such as when we see an organised group, it is an association, when we consider how it is organised and we see form of procedure it is an institution. And association denotes membership and institution denotes a mode or means of service.

6.7 Importance of Institutions

The institution has great importance in every society. 'Malinowski' has described the importance of institution in these words as "Every institution centres on a fundamental need, permanently unites a group of people in a cooperational task and has its particular body of doctrines and its technique or craft. Institutions are not correlated simply and directly to new functions, one need does not receive one's satisfaction in one institution." Society must reproduce new members, socialize them, give them a sense of purpose and provide for the maintenance of order and the distribution of good and services.

Each of these functions is performed through some social structure like family, school, state, church and business enterprises. And institution is thus to control the activities of social structures. MacIver has stated that importance of institution in these words, "It transfers cultural element from one generation to another introduces unity in human behaviour. Controls their conduct and guides man according to circumstances." Thus institutions simply are organized group which act according to procedural mode in the society.

6.8 Self-assessment Questions

(i)   What are social institutions ? Illustrate with suitable examples.

_____

_____

(ii)   Define social institution and discuss its characteristics.

_____

_____

(iii)   Define social institution and discuss difference between institution and association.

_____

_____

(iv)   The social institution has symbols and procedures, "comment".

_____

_____

_____

GROUPS: MEANING &TYPES

Structure

7.1   Objectives

7.2   Introduction

7.3   Meaning of Groups

7.4   Definitions of Groups

7.5   Characteristics of Group Life

7.6   Classification of Groups

    7.6.1   C.H. Cooley's Classifications

    7.6.2   Sumner's Classifications

    7.6.3   Ferdinand Tonnies Classification

    7.6.4   Other classification

7.7 Self-Assessment Question

7.1   Objectives

After going through this topic student should be able:

- to understand the meaning of groups
- to know the various definitions of social groups
- to have knowledge of various characteristics of the groups
- to know the various classifications given by different sociologists.

2

7.2 Introduction

This chapter deals with the interpretation of the term 'Groups' and various aspects connected with it. An individual's life is a group of life. It is said that, a group is a collection of individuals who are brought into social relationship with one another. The groups are constructed on the basis of some common interests; shared by all the members, the individuals, have mutual awareness to fulfil the common interests. The chapter includes discussion on the meaning of the group indicating the views of different sociologists and definitions propounded by various thinkers to make the concept clear for the students. The remaining part of the chapter includes the characteristics of social group and various classifications of the groups.

7.3 Meaning of the Group

The life of man to a great extent is a group life and every sort of interaction takes place in groups. There is an independence member in the group and the influence of the individuals is reciprocal. Basically, the distribution of the population in social groups and the size, number and characteristics of such groups, are important features of social structure. The description and classification of the principal types of social groups and institutions in Ginnberg's view make up the study of social structure. Man not only lives in the groups and continuously creates with his fellows new groups but he also develops a variety of symbol in order to indent them. In our society we often use the word 'Group' to refer to such diverse collectivises as the family, crowds or the social class or vast communities or some sort of division of sex or age or intelligence or temperament. In short the population of the society is organised in the form of social group and these constitute important feature of the structure of the society. Slightly different are the institutions or enduring pattern of social groups is helpful in studying in the structure of the society.

Simply we can say that 'group' is any collection of human beings who are brought into social relationships with one another. Social relationship involve some degree of reciprocity between these related, some measure of mutual awareness as reflected in the attitudes of the members of the group. On the basis

of this criterion, many of those discussions of a population are sometimes named social groups.

Every group is characterised by some common interest shared by all the members which give rise 'to a consciousness of kind' as pointed out by Giddings. Common ends are an important characteristic of group life and the interaction among members has to be associated. Max Weber also indicated while considering mean of group that social relations are established among individuals when they act on the basis of mutual awareness or mutual recognition. The system of social relationships serves as means to fulfil the common interests. Indicating concept of axial group Talcott Parson as pointed out that culture is the basic element in any system of axial relationship. Every group has certain pattern of behaviour which is shared by all its members. These norms defines serve also to differentiate between members and non-members. Cattal has given much stress to the functional aspects of social groups. A group has reference to two or more organisms interacting with reference to common goals in such a manner that the existence of many is utilized for the satisfaction of some needs of each. We can also say that groups are units of thus or more people meeting in the same environment or abolishing distance of some means of communication. Who are influencing each other psychologically. The example regarding the reciprocal psychological interaction are friends in conversation, a committee in action, and +become distortionary human.

7.4 Definitions of Group

Though group is one of the most important concepts of sociology but there is disagreement upon its definition. There is certain confusion because some terms continuous to be used with more than one meaning. Similarly, there are several meaning of "group" in sociological literature—(i) In one usage the term denotes 'any physical collection of the people'. (ii) In second usage it denotes, 'a number of people who share some common characteristics'. Thus males, college students, physicians and old people would each be a group. For this, "category" is more satisfactory term but sociologists often use "group". Where 'c32 -`category' would be more precise. (iii) Third usage denotes the 'group' as 'a number of people who share some organised patterns of recurrent interaction'. This

2

definition would include family. The friendship elique, organisation any kind of collective contact between people who repeatedly interact according to some pattern of action and relationships. (iv) Another usage is 'any number of people who share consciousness, of members together and of interaction. This usage indicates that if two persons are walking on the road would not be a group but would become group only when they start a conversation or interaction. The above usages indicate that the essence of social group is not physical closeness but a consciousness of interaction.

Some other definitions of social group are as follows:

- **According to MacIver,** "By group, we mean any collection of human beings who are brought into social relationship with one another."

- **According to Bogardus,** "A social group may be thought as a number of persons, who have some common object of attention who are stimulating each other."

- **According to Sheriff and Sheriff,** "A group is a social unit which consists of number of individuals who stand in (more or less) definite status and role relationship to one another, and which possess a set of values and norms of its own regulating the behaviour of individual members at best in matters of consequences to the group."

- **According to Bottomore,** "A social group is an aggregate of individuals in which (i) definite relations exist between the individual comprising it, and (ii) each individual is conscious of the group itself and its symbols."

- **According to Arnold Green,** "A group is an aggregate of individuals which persists in time, which has one or more interests or activities his common and which is organised."

From the above definition it can thus be concluded that the social group is an aggregate of individuals in which a definite relations exist between them and each individual in conscious of the group itself and its symbols. Social groups are

87

different from that of social classes, status groups or crowds, which not only lack structure but whose members are less aware or even unaware of the existence to the group these have been called quasi groups as grouping. Social groups are similar to social categories in this members are aware that they share something in common a consciousness of kind. Thus members of a social group are interacted with one another. There is a mutual and reciprocal influencing by two or more people of each other feelings attitude and actions.

7.5 Characteristics of Group

The followings are the characteristics of social groups:—

(1) **Interrelation of members.** All the group members must have social relation simply coming of people together cannot constitute a group. But is necessary for the formulation of the group, that people must have interaction and interrelationships with one another.

(2) **We feeling.** Members of the group assume themselves one, this sense the leads to the 'we feeling' of the people and they threat as they are one and others are out siders, they feel that harmful power should be collectively defended. They have a sense of collectivity.

(3) **Feeling of unity.** It is essential for members of social groups that they have a feeling of unity. It is this feeling which in actual practice develops a sense of sympathy among all the members of a group and brings them nearer to each other and attracts each other by emotions.

(4) **Common purposes.** In a social group it is an essential feature that all the member must have common purposes. It is essential for the stability of group life. It means that people must also have common ends or common needs without common goal group cannot come into existence.

(5) **Common behaviour.** It is also essential that there should be common behaviour of the members. In fact with common ends and needs behaviour would also become common.

(6) **Basis of social group.** For determination of social group there are certain bases. There are consanguine groups based on blood relation, affinal based

2

a marital relations. In social life there are various objectives, e.g. economic, political, social, religious, cultural etc. on these basis groups are formed.

(7) Structure of social groups. Prof. Futcher pointed out that like other social organisations group has a definite structure. In group organisation every member has specific status and role. There are certain rules and regulation which regulate the behaviour of the individuals (members). Every group has a set of norms, rules of conduct and every member has to conform to them. In some groups stratification of different status is quite obvious as in family. There is hierarchical order in the status of grandfather, father and son.

(8) Control over members. A group must have control over its members each member is required to line in discipline and under control. Those who neglect group discipline are punished and great punishment is public criticism. In other words it can be said that this control is exercised by informal agencies, such as customs, traditions, folk ways, mores etc. as in family, sometime it can be exercised through formal agencies such as law, police, army etc.

(9) Duration of the group. Certain groups are short terms groups and they are dissolved after some specific objective is achieved. But there are some permanent groups and during his life time man cannot leave them *e.g.* family. So on the basis of duration there are two types of groups, permanent, *e.g.* Nation, caste and temporary *e.g.* crowd, audience etc.

7.6 Types of Group

Different sociologists have given different classification of social groups indicating various basis. The followings are the classifications:—

7.6.1 C.H. Cooley's classification: (Primary) and (Secondary)

Charles Horton Cooley in 1909 was the first sociologist who has used the term primary groups to describe such groups as family, neighbourhood, and children's play groups. Such groups were in Cooley's phrase "The nursery of

human nature" where the essential sentiments of group loyalty and concern for other could be learned Cooley was not creating an entirely new concept, but he contributed the word primary, along with a sensitive description of the meaning of primary group relationships. The primary group is the nucleus of all social organisations. It is a small group in which a small number of persons come into direct contact with one another. They meet "face to face" for mutual help, companionship and discussion of common questions. They live in the presence and thought of each other. Charles H. Cooley describes the primary group in the following words:—

1. Primary Group

"By primary groups I mean those characterised by intimate face to face association and cooperation. They are primary, in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in framing the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association psychologically is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for man purposes, at least, is the common life and purpose of the group. Perhaps the simplest way of describing the wholeness is by saying that it is 'We'; it involves the sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which 'We' is the natural expression. One lives in the feeling of the whole and finds the chief aim of his will in that feeling."

- **Characteristics of primary groups**

  The primary group is based on cooperation and basic relationships and these relationships depend upon the following factors:—

  (i) **Physical Proximity.** To maintain the closeness of the members, it is necessary that their contacts should be close. This emphases the exchange of ideas, opinions easy. Physical proximity provides an opportunity for the development of the primary group.

(ii) **Small Size.** It is another feature of primary group is that it often has smallness in size. The relationship can be intimate and personal only in a small group. There is always an indication at which further expansion of membership means "dispersion instead of concentration, dilution instead of re-enforcement of the common interest." It is not possible to have intimate contact with many people at one and the same time.

(iii) **Stability:** To promote intimacy of relationship, the primary group should be stable.

(iv) **Similarity of background** is another feature of primary group. The members must not only close to each other but also approximately equally experienced and intelligent. In this regard MacIver says, "a level on which every group must dwell and the person who is too far above or below it, disturbs the process of group participation." Each member must have something to give as well as to take. There also some other characteristics, such as limited self-interest and intercity of shared interest, it means that in primary group the common interest is shared by every member and by being shared by all, the interest acquires the new importance. Each member intensively thinks that his existence depends upon the devotion of other members of the group.

2. Secondary Groups

Secondary group is of special significance in modern society and of which the large scale organisation is the most outstanding example. A secondary group is one which is large in size such as a city, nation, political party, corporation, intermation cartel and labour union. Here human contracts become superficial and undefined. The members of the group have indirect influence one the other. One member know very few about the others.

Though Cooley has never used the term 'secondary group' he lays stress on primary group and until or unless it is compared with secondary group, it meaning cannot be completed. Some of the definitions of secondary group are as follows:

1. **According to P.H. Landis,** "Secondary groups are those that are relatively casual and impersonal in their relationships. Relationships in them are usually competitive rather than mutually helpful."

2. **According to Ogburn,** "The groups which provide experience lacking in intimacy are called secondary groups."

3. **According to Davis,** "Secondary groups can be roughly defined as the opposite of everything already said about primary groups."

4. **According to Mazumdar,** "When face to face contacts are not present in the relations of members we have secondary groups."

- **Characteristics of Secondary Groups**

1. Formal and impersonal relations are often seen in secondary groups.

It is not necessary that the member have face to face contact with each other. They perform their jobs, carry out the orders, pay their dues and still may never see each other.

2. So far as the structure or size in concerned, the secondary groups has large size, even they might be spread all over the world, e.g. The Red Cross Society consists of thousands of members scattered all over the world. (iii) Membership of the group is not compulsory, formal rules are also followed by the member. Station of the individual depends on the role which is being played by him.

7.6.2 Sumner's classification (in groups and out groups)

Summer used the terms 'in group' and 'out group' to describe similar types of group feelings. But his terms have wider applicability. The groups which we belong are 'in group' and the groups to which we do not belong are 'out groups' especially if we look upon them with a certain amount of antagonism. The concept of in group versus out group is applicable to friendly rivalries between schools, clubs and associations, but it is also applicable to much more hostile groups on the small scale it is descriptive of intolerant neighbourhood gang on a

larger scale it is descriptive of violent neighbourhood gang on a larger scale it is descriptive of wars between nations. Sumner considered it virtually a law of human interaction that in-groups solidarity and hostility toward out groups are directly related. Several researchers have found that hostility toward out-groups tends to increase loyalty toward an in group. Kenneth Dion has found, similarly, that membership to highly cohesive in groups tends to increase prejudice against out-groups. The concept of in-group and out group is intimately linked to ethnocentrism, which means, literally, "being centred in the culture" and can be characterized by the idea that own group is best and others are to be judged on its terms.

7.6.3 Ferdinand Tonnies views about group classifications: (Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft)

The terms Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft have been translated as community and association were introduced by Tonnies. According to him community and association are two kinds of human relationships. Human, relationships are relationships between wills of human beings, their desires, intentions, purposes etc. community or Gemeinschaft is defined as intimate, private and exclusive living together' and Tonnies gave example of family and kin groups or friends groups. Association or Gesellschaft is defined as public life as something which is consciously and deliberately entered upon and Tonnies mentions as example principally those groups which are concerned with economic interests.

7.6.4 Other Classification

1. Disjunctive and Overlapping Groups

A disjunctive group is one which does not allow a person to join similar other group at one and the same time for example; college. An overlapping group is one in which members can join groups, as many as they like.

2.Voluntary and Involuntary Groups

A group whose membership depends on the members to join or come out at members own discretion, is called voluntary group. On the other hand where there is no option for the members but to join a group is called involuntary group.

3. Genetic and Congregate Groups

A genetic group is one in which a person is born and required to join involuntarily whereas a congregate group may be said as one in which he moves voluntarily and joins or withdrawn of his own.

4. Vertical and Horizontal Groups

Large inclusive groups are called Horizontal group, whereas small divisions are called vertical groups nation is the best example for Horizontal groups and economic and political organization are the example of vertical groups.

5. Conflict Groups

George Simmel, a German sociologist, wrote, "The unity of groups frequently disappears if they have no enemies." In this phrase he described the 'conflict groups', groups living with in a society but in a state of normative conflict with it. Throughout many centuries of Western history, religious dissenters have been good example of conflict groups. In India the casteism, communalism and regionalism may the best examples of it. Simmel was of the view that opposition is compulsory for competitions set up.

6. Reference Groups

The concept of reference group was first developed by Hayman. After that Turner and Sheriff elaborated it further. There are groups which are important to us models, even though we may not be the part of the group. Merton says that reference groups are in principle, almost innumerable. Any of the groups of which one is not a member can become points of reference for shaping one's attitudes, evaluation and behaviour. A reference group can be, but is not necessarily, one of a person's primary groups. People are often influenced by groups, to which they do not belong, but to which they aspire, (positive reference groups) occupational

groups, athletic teams, theatrical circles and upper classes are the example. The popularity of Alex Haley's Novel Roots, which traces the history of his family back to its origins in Africa, indicates that Ancestors can become a reference group especially for those seeking an identity. The reference groups have both the phases as positive which is mentioned above and negative reference groups, which are groups whose ways are generally wished to avoid. White society can constitute a negative reference group for black militant society. In older societies positive reference groups were often strictly rural and country people thought of city life in term of negative reference groups. Basically the reference depends upon the values of particular groups. Such as Brahmans are the reference group in Indian caste structure. There is often conflict of thinking between positive reference group and negative reference of group. In some societies straight people become the reference group and income societies as in criminal societies the habitual criminals have taken professional criminals as their reference groups. According to Felon, "I was not equipped to handle the outside world. I always felt uncomfortable with straight people." For him, criminals constituted a positive reference group, and straight people a negative reference. But there are certain reason for the members of a particular group take another group for reference if in the other grouping of the following circumstances prevail : (i) When members of the first group aspire to membership in the second group serves as the reference group of the first. (ii) When members of the first group strive to be like the members of the second group. (iii) When members of the first group desire some satisfaction from being unlike the members of the second group in some respect and even strive to maintain the difference between themselves and the members of the second group. (iv) When without necessarily striving to be like or while or to belong to the second group, the members of the first group appraise their own

95

group or themselves by using the second group or its members as a standard for comparison.

7.7 Self-Assessment Questions

    (i)   Define Social groups and discuss its characteristics.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    (ii)   Define group and discuss its various classifications.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    (iii)   Describe the types of groups with special reference to the Cooley's classification of the group.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

(iv) Define primary group and discuss difference between primary group and secondary group.

_____

_____

_____

_____

(v)   Write short note on

(i)   Conflict group
(ii)   In group and out group
(iii)   Reference group.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SOCIAL STRUCTURE: STATUS AND ROLE

Structure

8.1 Objectives

After going through this topic students should be able to:

(i)   to know the concept of social structure.

(ii)   to know the origin of the study of social structure.

(iii)   to have knowledge of various elements of social structure.

(iv)   to understand the types of social structure.

8.2 Introduction

The present chapter deals with social structure and its relevant aspects. Social structure had been the process of the study of Anthropologists and sociologists before the World War-II. Sociology has borrowed the use of the term from Anatomy, and then Spencer has given another turn to the term 'Social structure'. Some sociologists have viewed that social structure is concerned with the structural aspects of the society. The social structure is an arrangement of the position or status as variously created and maintained and of network of relationships among persons or actors. The chapter covers concepts, definitions, elements and types of social structure.

8.3   Concept of Social Structure

Different sociologists and Anthropologists have given varying interpretation to the concept of "social structure". After World War II the concept became much popular before which it had been referred to in things like building construction work etc. However Anatomy has made use of the concept to refer to the "wholeness" of the phenomena for example the "splitting up of a total whole" into component parts for the purpose of detailed analysis as a science of human system, sociology borrowed the use of the term "structure" from Anatomy on a slow progressive scale. Spencer's evaluation of structure as the maintenance of the component parts as independent units was indeed a positive step in the development of the studies of 'structure'. He indicated that the units were considered independent structures and the proper functioning of these units was a basic requirement for the maintenance of the total whole. Social structure has its

origin in anatomical studies of Biology, but also has mathematical reference. In mathematics, the transformability of the structure is of great significant. An event, though undergoing "professional transformation over period" has a common structure through which it is basic to all varying forms. This commonness is a mathematical notion, and unlike biological bases, it is generally abstract.

The structure of anything consists of the relatively stable interrelationships among its parts; moreover, the term "part" itself implies a certain degree of stability. Since a social system is composed of the interrelated acts of people, its structure must be sought in some degree of regularity recurrence in these acts. The participants in the social system can be thought of as occupants of roles. It is often seen that in 'permanent' groups roles beyond the occupancy of any particular person; that is roles are more 'stable' than the role occupants themselves. Moreover, role occupants are organised in sub groups within the larger system and some of these subgroups persist longer than any particular members. Many other sub-groups persist as types longer than any particular example of the type. This is true for example of families obligations of role occupants are of two types and these are divided as well. There are institutionalized in every society but one thing should be noted that in big societies these norms are not uniform. In fact the whole social structure has its own characteristics weather that is good or bad is something relative and not absolute. Every social structure, if it is to get going and serve the purpose of the society, it is essential that it should change with the changing circumstances. If that does not happen that will make time and society static and non-progressive. When a structure comes under heavy pressures and social institutions do not change the whole structure gets complicated and comes under heavy strains.

Some sociologists are of the social that simple social structure is concerned with the structural aspects of society. It is more stable as compared to system which is concerned with the functional aspect of the society structure exhibits a specific pattern on the basis of which one structure can be differentiated from the other. Even in organism the structural pattern of every organism is different from that of other.

2

8.4 Definitions of Social Structure

Social structure is a term which yet awaits precise definition. Since long many efforts have been made to define 'social structure' but, still there is no unanimity of the opinion of its definition. Herbert Spencer was the first sociologist to define social structure, he was much fascinated by his biological analogies (organic structure and evolution) to make clear, what he meant by the structure of the society. Durkheim also left the term vague. Many sociologists and anthropologists have tried to give it a more precise meaning, but their conception of social structure diverse widely. The following views have been given by different sociologist and anthropologists.

(1) **According to Formal sociologists,** "Sociologists like Forth believe that social structure is "an arrangement of positions of statuses, variously created and maintained, and of a network of relationships among persons or actors."

(2) **According to Malinowski,** "He has defined the concept of structure is the term of culture." His study of Trobriand Islanders was conducted chiefly from the standpoint of the Anthropologists. His conception of culture as the structural basis of society has been however criticised by Radcliff Brown.

(3) **Levis Strauss viewed,** in the evolution of the concept of structure that the creation of "models" was essential for the purposes of comparison in "actual" studies. Like Max Weber he felt the necessity of creating models and ideal types. Levis Strauss was of the view that it is "attribute of human social organisation as such, we can came to recognise the nature of this structure only when he built up a generalised model from radically exhausted empirical reference."

According to Radcliff Brown, "a great social anthropologists of England belongs to structural functional school of sociology. He was of the view "the components of social structure are human beings, the structure itself being an arrangement of persons in relationship institutionally defined and regulated. To clarify his definition he has given example of Australian and African tribal societies, he indicated that

kinship system among them is the description of institutionalized relationship. These relationships bind the individuals together in a specialized way and ascribe to them particular positions. The kin occupying a set of positions creates a pattern which is termed as 'kinship structure'. He has also given example of the Thonga and Bantu tribes of South Africa; there is a custom of cabula, under this custom a price of bride is paid to the parents of the bride at the time of marriage. This custom binds the individuals together. For the 'labola' not only the family members but also all Kith and Kin join their hands. It is treated as an economic aid which is to be spent at the marriage of bride's brother or any other close relative thus the whole process in institutionally defined and regulated marital relation become a link between two families in the socio-economic filled and their determined positions create a pattern of marriage and kinship structure. Later on Radcliff Brown has given another definition of social structure in these words, "human beings are connected by a complex network of social relations. I use the term 'social structure' to denote this network of actually existing relations." He indicated that the components of social structure are persons. And a person is a human being considered not as organism but as occupying position in a social structure. He considers social structure as real as are individual organism.

(4) **According to S.F. Nadel,** "Structure refers to a definable articulation, an ordered arrangement of parts. It is related to the outer aspect or the framework of society and is totally unconcerned with the functional aspect of society." He interpreted social structure as the network of social relationship which is created among the human beings when they interact with each other according to the position in accordance with the pattern of society.

(5) **According to Ginsberg,** "The study of social structure is concerned with the principal forms of social organisation, that is, types of groups, associations and institutions and the complex of these which constitute societies."

(6) **According to Karl Mannheim,** "Social structure refers to the web of interacting social forces from which have arisen the various modes of observing and thinking.

2

(7) According to Talcott Parsons, "The term social structure applies to the particular arrangement of the interrelated institutions, agencies and social patterns as well as the statuses and roles which each person assumes in the group." He has tried to explain the social structure in an abstract form. All the units of social structure, that is institutions, agencies, social patterns, statuses and roles are invisible and intangible and so we say it as an abstract form.

(8) According to MacIver and Page, "The various modes of grouping together comprise the complex pattern of the social structure." He also regarded social structure is abstract which is composed of several groups like family, church, class, caste, state and community etc.

(9) According to Johnson, "The structure of anything consists of the relatively stable inter-relationships among its parts; moreover, the term part itself implies a certain degree of stability. Since a social system is composed of the interrelated acts of people, its structure must be sought in some degree of regularity or recurrence in these acts."

(10) According to Girth and Mills. He defined social structure in terms of institutional orders and sphere. Although institutions are the basic building blocks, social structure is more than more interrelations of institutions. The unit and compositions of social structure are determined by the precise weight which each institutional order and the ways in which they are related to one another. Girth and Mills distinguish two fundamental traditions character structure and social structure and assert that the two are united by 'role' which links the persons in character structure and links the institution in social structure.

From above views and interpretation it can thus be said that social structure is an abstract and intangible phenomena. Individuals are the units of associations and institutions are the units of social structure, these institutions and association are interrelated in a particular arrangement and thus create the pattern of social structure.

8.5 Elements of social structure

In a social structure human beings are united and organised into associations for the pursuits of some objects the objectives can be fulfilled only if the social structure is based on the following elements:

(1) Normative system. In this system the ideals and values are presented with great importance. And people attach emotional importance to these norms. The institutions and associations are interrelated according to those norms. The individuals perform their roles in accordance with the accepted norms and values of the society.

(2) Position system. It refers to the statuses and roles of the individuals. The individuals have different types of desires, expectations and aspirations which are multiple and unlimited and these are fulfilled only if the members of the society are assigned different roles according to their capacities and capabilities. It can be said that proper functioning of social structure depends upon the effectiveness of the assignment of roles and statuses.

(3) Sanction system. For the proper enforcement of norms every society has sanction system. The integration and co-ordination of different parts of social structure depend upon the conformity of social norms. The non-conformists are punished by the society according to the nature and level of nonconformity. The stability of social structure depends upon the effectiveness and proper sanction system.

(4) System of anticipated responses. This system calls upon the individuals to participate in social system. His preparation sets the social structure in motion. The successful working of social structure depends upon the realization of his duties by the individuals and his efforts to fulfill these duties.

(5) Action system. It is the object, aim, of goal which is to be achieved by the social structure and the whole social structure revolves around this object.

The action is the root cause which weaves the web of social relationships and sets the social structure in motion.

It may be emphasised that social structure is an abstract entity its parts are constantly changing, they are spatially wide spread and therefore difficult to see as whole. Social structure denotes patterns which change more slowly than the particular personnel who constitute them. They are produced and reproduced by the inter weaving of numerous individual people acting in accordance with their own plans and strategies, yet social structure is rarely planned and intended by them, it results from the unintended consequences of action.

8.6 Types of Social structure

Talcott Parsons has categorised social structure into four types and types are based on the four social values:—

i) **Universalistic values** are those which are found almost in every society and are applicable to everybody, e.g. efficient individuals are respected universally.

(ii) **Particularistic social values** are those which are applicable to a particular situation, e.g. when selection of individuals are made on certain bases, they can be caste, religion, race.

(iii) **Achieved social values** are those values which are associated with one achieved status are termed as achieved social values.

(iv) **Ascribed social values** are those values which are associated with one's ascribed status are termed as ascribed social values. When these classification being assumed as base and different social pattern can be interpreted. The four major types of social structure are as under :—

    (1)   **Universalistic achieved Pattern.** Under this type of social structure. Sometime the values, which are opposed to the values of social structure come. And it is the combination of these value patterns. Universalism by its favour status determination on the

105

basis of generalized rules independently of one's achievement. When universalism is combined with achievement values. It produces a social structure of universalistic achievement pattern. Under this type of social structure, the choice of goal by the individual must be in accordance with the universalistic values. His pursuits are defined by universalistic moral norms. Talcott Parson has given example of capitalist society for this pattern.

(2) **The universalistic ascription pattern.** Under this type of social structure all resources are mobilized in the interest of the collective ideal. In this universalistic pattern plays the same role as his universalistic achieved pattern. In this pattern the norms of past and even future are incorporated. According to situation the norms change. In such social structure emphasis in laid on the status of an individual rather than on his specific achievement. The emphasis is on what an individual rather than what he has done it may be said that the universalistic achievement type of social structure is "individualistic" whereas ascription type is "collectivistic."

(3) **The particularistic achievement pattern.** This type combines achievement values with particularism. The basic criterion of valued achievement is found not in universalistic term such as conformity to a generalized ideal or efficiency but these are focussed on certain points of reference with in the relational system itself are inherent in the situation. The emphasis on achievement leads to the conception of a proper pattern of adaptation which is the product of human achievement and which can be maintained only by continuous efforts. This type is more traditionalistic and emphasis in on it stability.

(4) **Particularistic Ascriptive Pattern.** The social structure is organised around the rational reference points notable those of kinship and local community but it differs from the particularistic achievement in as much as the rational values are taken as given and passively "adopted to" rather than made for an active organised

system. The structure tends to be traditionalistic and emphasis is laid on it stability. According to Parson The Spanish social structure is the example of such a type.

8.7 Status: Meaning

The concept of status and role has a significant place in the analysis of social structure, when MacIver defined society as network of social relationships. In order to maintain this network different members are placed in different positions in the society. In social organisation different role expectation are attached with every position or status and fulfilment of these role expectations ensures not only the satisfaction of one's own social needs but also the maintenance of social order. Basically, status is a position which is occupied by all the members of society. In every society, an individual will have an occupational status such as bus driver, clerk or an officer; family statuses such as son or daughter, father or mother; and Gender status as male or female. Statuses are culturally defined, despite the fact they may be based on biological factors such as sex or race, e.g. skin colour assigns individuals to status as Black and White, but these may be indications based on the conventions of particular societies. Generally other biological factors have not any connection with the status of an individual, such as colour of the hair has nothing to do with statuses.

Some status are fixed, there is little change may be "brought by the individual but some status are fixed and these cannot be changed example of such statuses are gender and aristocratic titles. It has been mentioned already that some time change in fixed statuses is possible but rarely, class system in industrialized sector is the best example. And so far as the rigidity in the fixing of status is concerned, the Indian caste system in best example, in which a son automatically entered the occupation of his father. Thus it can be said in some societies individual's material status and occupational status are achieved but the condition is not admissible in Indian social system. Where material status of an individual can be achieved or changed but change in occupational statuses is not possible particularly in Indian traditional society. Thus it can be said that status is a term often used in social structure to designate the "comparative amounts of prestige, difference, or respect accorded to persons who have been assigned different roles

107

in a group or community." Recognition of the position of an individual in the social system and the authority he hold is consequently a basis of status system. It is historical in all the ages, men inherited or acquired statuses and it is universal because status inheritance and acquisition is recognised commonly in all societies. It has been apparent to social scientists that members of all the societies are stratified to some extent that sometimes the basis of this order is very simple, such as sex and age and sometimes the divisions are many and complex. The status is a defined position in the social structure of a group or society that is distinguished from and at the same time related to other positions through its designated rights and obligations. Because each status position in a social structure can be viewed in terms of its superiority and inferiority, people tend to equate status with rank and prestige or hierarchical position. However, status in the usual sociological sense does not necessarily imply a rank in a hierarchy.

8.8 Definitions of Status

Until 1920, the term 'status' was mostly used to refer to either the legally enforceable capacities or limitations of the people or their relative superiority. More recently the rights and duties fixed by law have seemed less significant than those fixed by custom.

1. **Max Weber,** pointed out that status, class or income are the three major dimensions of social stratification. It is unclear which had priority, but Weber implies that if an individual has high status, wealth would follow, although they usually overlap. In saying that status is an effective claim to social esteem in terms of positive or negative privileges' Weber emphasized its rational base and that a status claimant must have an audience from which to receive or to demand differential response.

2. **Ralph Linton,** "status is primarily position in a social structure involving rights, duties and reciprocal expectations of behaviour, none of which depends on the personal characteristics of the status occupant".

3. **Davis and Merton,** Davis has developed this idea for sociology; and Merton (1957) went on to postulate that individuals have an array of social positions, forming a composite or status set. Since what is known

as status is related to other statuses is very crucial one. Stable interacted systems depend on the emergence of normative expectations i.e. every actor is to the attitudes other will take towards him.

4. **According to Ogburn and Nimkoff,** "The simplest definitions of status are that it represents the position of individual in the group."

5. **According to Elliott and Merril,** "Status is the position, which the individual occupies in the group by virtue of age, sex, family, class occupation, marriage and achievement."

6. **According to Ginsberg,** "A status is a position in a social group or grouping in relation to other individuals in the group or grouping."

7. **According to H. T. Mazumdar,** "Status means the location of the individual within the group, his place, his place in the social network of reciprocal obligation and privileges, rights and duty."

8. **According to MacIver,** "Status is a social position that determines for its possessor, apart from his personal attribute or social services, a degree of respect prestige and influence."

9. **According to Lundberg,** "Status is the comparative amount of prestige, difference or respect accorded to persons who have been assigned different roles in a group or community."

8.9 Characteristics of Status

The followings are the various characteristics of status:

1. **External symbol for identification of status:** Kingsley Davis has mentioned that a person is identified in a social situation through that social situation status is revealed. Though not always certain external symbols help in the identification of one's statuses in a society. And these external symbols include the style of dress, soldiers and army officers, nurses, doctors, advocates, police men religious missionaries, priest wear. These sections wear a particular dress from which their status can be understood. Sex status of man and woman can be identified by the dress they wear, sometime married and unmarried status of man and woman is also identified by certain symbols.

2. **Every status has its own, Right, Duties and obligations.** The nature of these rights and duties is fixed by normative system of society. A right is assumed on legitimate expectations which rest with an occupant of a status in relation to the behaviour of a person in another position. From the view point of another person their claim represents only an obligation. For example: The right of an employer to expect a particular behaviour from his employee and it is the obligation of employee to behave in the desired manner. In another example we can say that 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.

3. **Certain norms govern social status.** The norms which govern social status always vary with person, situations and statuses, even these norms are assumed to be common to all statuses. When we talk of situational difference in the norms, e.g. a doctor cannot always tell the truth to the patient regarding the condition of his disease and a merchant cannot practise honesty always in his trade. Thus more depends upon situation, and nature of interaction between to individuals determines the situations.

4. **One individual can have several statuses.** Society is a network of social statuses, it is often seen in every society, there is large number of groups which have many statuses, when an individual occupies many statuses. His status will differ with the type of the group. Example— A college student may be a student to his teacher, a customer to the bookseller, a member of the students union, a depositor to his banker, a passenger to the taxi, 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 the females, a patient to doctor, etc. These statuses indicate the complexity of the society, where various statuses are associated with one individual. Some time it become impossible to account the various status. But in simple societies an individual can have only a fewer statuses.

5. **Statuses have influence over careers of individuals.** The behaviour of the individual can be understood only understanding the statuses they assume in their respect group or societies. It means that the individual aspire to the status

which is familiar of him and he knows the evaluational standard statuses in that particular social order.

6. **Statuses have different degree of importance.** Some statuses are much importance than other and they are much preferred in the society. But criteria of preference are different from society to society. The status which is the most important E.T. Hill calls 'Key Status': has made the concept as 'key status' to identify a position of man in a particular society. In modern industrial societies 'occupational statuses are the key status, and in some societies, kinship statuses, religions statuses and political status is may be more important and hence become 'key statuses'. In India caste statuses and occupational statuses are important. In Russian societies political statuses are considered much important. In simple, primitive society's age, sex and kinship statuses are considered to be important.

7. **Social status has a hierarchical distribution.** Equal distribution of statuses in a society is not possible, and it is seen that some people occupy highest status or position while majority occupy ordinary statuses. The assumption behind the distribution is that the statuses are determined competitively by the possession of abilities relative to the demand for abilities in society. Thus it can be said that it depends upon the struggle of the individuals that some possess the abilities and qualities assume.

8.10 Types of Social Status

Generally, there are two types of status. Ascribed status and achieved status. Linton used the concepts of ascribed and achieved to refer to this distinction of statuses. Some statuses are 'ascribed' to the individuals while others are to be achieved by them. In some societies it is possible to fix more of ascribed statuses than achieved statuses and convers may be true in some other societies.

(i) **Ascribed status.** If a society is to function efficiently, people must perform a vast number of daily chores willingly. The simplest way to ensure their performance is to pare most of the routine work of the society into series of ascribed roles and to socialize people to accept and fill the ascribed

rules. Ascribed statuses are defined with reference to the status based on sex, age order of birth, biological relationship to other.

Ascription by sex: The infant's sex is a definite, highly visible physiological fact which appears at birth, sex difference is consequently a very convenient, not wholly for tuition basis for the ascription of life long statuses. Every society handles many task by making them part of a sex role. Most of the sex linked tasks can be performed equally will by either men or women provided they are socialized to accept the tasks as proper for them. The divisions of statuses into male and female is not mainly based on inherent traits of men and women. Because biological attributes cannot explain the behaviour difference of men and women. Social differences are not fixed but they change from time to time and society to society. For example 'The Tchambuli people, among these women are working for livelihood outside the house and men are looking after house hold work and spend time in their dressing and other beautification. Among Mundugumor people men and women are equally aggressive and among the Trobriand islanders, except for breast feeding; all the task of child nursing are done by the father. Among some tribe the father gives training to the son in the art of damning.

It seems that female's lesser physical strength and her bodily specialization for reproduction are reasons for the general prevalence of masculine dominance. The fact that women occupations are more frequently those that can be pursued in or near the home does not mean that women have a 'homemaking' instinct. It means that social efficiency is served by ascribing to women such occupation as will not interfere with child bearing. Many considerations which presume ably underlies our ascribed sex role are themselves changing today. The assumption of vast innate sex differences in intellect and aptitude has been discredited. Greater dependability on contraception's, declining family size and shift from human to machine power changed definitions of sex roles.

Ascription by age: In all societies there is recognition of differences in the statuses and roles related to age. Like sex, it is also a visible

physiological fact. In no society children, adults and aged are treated alike. Age role varies greatly among societies. Unlike sex, age is steadily changing conditions therefore cannot give rise to permanent life time status. The only way age can give permanent status is in terms of an age relationship between given persons e.g. between parents and children elder brother and younger brother, senior members and junior members etc. Age is not a dichotomy but a continuum which can provide a basis for several rather than this general status. It is a continuum with infinite small gradation, yet if too many distinctions are made with in this continuum, age loses its character of high visibility.

There are some various specialised series of positions which are assigned somewhat on the basis of age which involves the participation of only limited group. Generally a society recognises at least four age period, infancy, childhood, maturity and old age. Although age status ascription is universal, it is changing with the period of time.

(ii) **Achieved Status.** No society depends completely on ascribed status, but has some achieved status. A social position which is secured through an individual's choice and competition is known as 'achieved status.' In any society there is knowledge of individual accomplishment and individual failure. It enables the highly talented to move upward, but it also destroys the alibi of the factories. In civilized society, a tendency towards commerce and extreme division of labour, urban condition of life and rapid social change seem to be correlated with an emphasis on achieved status. In traditional societies the statuses are often ascribed, on the contrary, in the industrial societies it is the achieved status which becomes the rule. In modern civilized societies most of the occupational statuses are achieved. The existence of secondary groups indicates that our organizational membership is an achieved status. Marital status, parental status, educational status etc. are all achieved because one is not obliged to become a husband or a wife or a parent or an educated person.

Both ascriptive and achieved statuses are found in every society each though opposite in principle, is complementary in function and hence essential to society.

8.11 Self Assessment Questions

(i)   Define social status and discuss its characteristics.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

(ii)   What do you mean by social status and describe the determination of social status.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

(iii)   Every status has its own rights, duties and obligations. "Comment".

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

(iv)   Define status and discuss its types.

_____

_____

_____

_____

(v)   One individual can have several statuses in the society. "Comment".

_____

_____

_____

_____

8.12 Meanings of Role

Each status in a society is accompanied by an number of norms which define how an individual occupying a particular status is expected to act. Actions which are performed according to the norms of the society are called 'roles' they are performed according to the social expectations of the society as a whole or of a particular group. When individuals occupy social positions their behaviour is determined mainly by what is expected of that position rather than by their own individual characteristics. Roles are bundle of socially defined expectations associated with social positions. A Role is the expected behaviour associated with a specific social status. Ralph Linton indicated the role as dynamic aspects of status; it is the totality of all the cultural patterns associated with particular status. Any given role within a group tends to very according to the individual who occupies the status, as well as the general membership composition of the group. But if the performance of the role derivate very much from the expected ranges of behaviour the individual will be negatively sanctioned.

Each individual has various status positions with in a society and therefore he performs a variety of roles. When Linton developed the concept of 'role' indicated that individual occupy positions in different aspects of social life, he has

given example that a person may be father or mother on one hand and he may be teacher in the school on the other, he may be an office holder of any association, Linton calls these positions as statuses. In Linton words status are the polar positions, in patterns of reciprocal behaviour of polar position comprises a collection of rights and duties, thus he conceived the status as a group of rights and duties when a person is claiming these rights and enacting these duties, he is said to be performing a role, e.g.. When a teacher delivers lecture, he is performing his duty or performing his role of a teacher.

The Linton's formulation of the concept of role was further refined by Newcomb and Banton. Newcomb (1942) made distinction between expected behaviour related to a position and the actual behaviour. He pointed out that the way in which is person behaves may not always be what is expected of him. The expected behaviour conforms to the position that one occupies that is to say, one's role is directly associated with one's positions, and sometimes a person actual behaviour, may not confirm to his or her expected role. Michael Banton (1965) further refined the concept and pointed out that a role is a set of norms and expectation applied to the holder of any particular position. Banton distinguished between (i) Norms, whom are to be observed as a matter of course, these carry the massages that the holder of a role should behave in a particular kind of manner, and (ii) General expectations which indicate that the holder of a position will behave in a certain way in any specific situation.

Definitions of Role

The concept of role was first introduced by Pareto in 1916. Who was first to recognise the sociological significance of the labels such as lawyer, physicians, artists etc. Which indicate their roles some of the definitions of 'Role' are given below:

1. **According to Ogburn and Nimkoff.** "Role is a set of socially expected and approved behaviour pattern consisting of both duties and privileges associated with a particular position in a group."

2. **According to Lundberg,** "A social role is a pattern of behaviour expected of an individual in a certain group or situation."

3. **According Kingsley Dasus,** "Role is the manner in which a person actually carries out the requirement of his position."

4. **According to Linton,** "The term social role is used to designate the sum total of cultural pattern associated with a particular status. It thus includes attitudes, values and behaviour ascribed by the society to any and all persons occupying this status, in so far as it represents overt behaviour and a role has the dynamic aspect of the status; what the individual has to do in order to validate the occupation of the status."

5. **According to S.S. Sargent,** "A person's role is a pattern or type of social behaviour which means situationally appropriate to him in term of the demands and expectations of those in his group."

From the above definitions it has been cleared that every action has an attached role. This role has an aspect of action which is nothing but a cluster of inter-related structures around specific rights and duties and associated with a particular status position with a group of social situation. A person's role in any situation is defined by the set of expectations for his behaviour held by others and by the person himself.

8.13 Characteristics of Role

The followings are the major characteristics of social role:

(i) **Action Aspect of Status.** The role is infact the action aspect of status it involves various types of actions that a person has to perform inaccordance with the expectation of the society. The role is, as already stated is the sum-total or the pattern of the actions that are performed for the fulfilment of the expectations of other members of the society. These actions are dependent not on individual will but on

social sanction. That is why, it is said every social role has a cultural basis. Due to this fact the roles that are performed against the social values and ideals are not tolerated.

(ii) **Changing concept of role.** Social roles are inaccordance with the social values, ideals, patterns, etc. These ideals, values and objects change and so the concept of the role also changes. The role which is justified at a particular time may not be justified at some other time. e.g. Marriage by a young man to a woman of her choice may be appreciated today, but before twenty year it was not justified.

(iii) **Limited field of operation.** Every role is confined to particular area of operation. For example, an officer has a role to play in the office but when he reaches his family, that role ceases. If the officer continues to perform that role in his family also, he shall not be able to carryon his work outside the limited field.

(iv) **100% expectation are not fulfilled by roles performance.** It is not possible for any one to perform his role fully in accordance with

the expectation of the society is general and individual in particular. There is bound to be some distinction. For example, one may not be able to perform his role to the full satisfaction of the children, he is not a machine. Role is in fact the generalized form of action. Actual performance of the role may be slightly different from the generalized form.

(v) **Difference in the importance of Role.** From socio-cultural point of view all the roles are not equally important. Some roles are more important and they are called key role, the roles that are of general importance or less important in a particular social set up, they are called general roles. Key roles are important for the organisation of the society while general roles are helpful in the fulfilment of day today activities.

8.14 Approaches to Social Role

The first systematic use of the concept of social role was done by **G.H. Mead** (1934). In this usage the roles are depicted as the outcome of a process of interaction that is tentative and creature. Meadian social psychology was primary concerned with how children learn and develop their own social being by role ranking, i.e. imaginatively taking the roles of others. In adult social behaviour individuals were also thought to use role taking to work out their own roles. Every roles involves interaction with other roles. The interaction process means that people in roles are always testing their conceptions of other roles and the responses of the people in other roles reinforces or requestions such conceptions, this inturn leads people to maintain or change their own role behaviour. He used the term 'Role Making' in it he describes how expected behaviour is created and modified in interaction, a tentative process in which roles are identified and given content on shifting axes as interaction proceeds. Symbolic interactionists tend to avoid the extreme relative-ism implied by role making, namely that roles are fluid and interminate and that every interaction produces a different and unique role and asserts that role making produces constituent patterns of behaviour which can be identified with various types of social actors.

Linton approval to social Role

Second approach to role theory drives from R. Linton (1936) and was subsequently incorporated into functionalism. This moves away from role taking as the characteristic form of interaction with role making as its out come, and sees roles as essentially prescribed and status expectations of behaviour. These prescriptions drive from society's culture and they are expressed in social norms. Carried to extreme, this approach assumes a rigid determination of behaviour that effectively makes role synonymous with 'culture' and 'norms'.

8.15 Terminology of Role

The recent studies of role have produced several refinements, the following terms are included in that accounts :—

(i) **Role Distance.** The term coined by E. Goffman (1959) refers to detachment of the performer from the role he is performing. This man has an important distinction between the existence of expectations concerning role performance and individual's commitment to role.

(ii) **The Role-set.** As indicated by R.K. Merton, Roles do not exist by themselves in isolation from one another ; each role has its complimentary or associated role or roles. Any given social status involves an individual actor in a number of social relationships that are always or usually found to be necessary for persons in that particular status. The various social statuses in a society may require common associated roles which bring continuous functions of different status together. In such overlapping of associated roles people who occupied different statuses or positions in society may often meet and interact in a manner that promotes social integration. According to Goffman (1916), "Roles impinge on us as sets of norms that define our rights, the action which others can legitimately insist that we perform."

(iii) **Role Conflict.** The 'role conflict' refers to the controversial experience of the individuals at the time of role playing. They are experienced by the individuals at the levels (a) with in his own body of roles a (b) between his own roles and those of other actors. Some time the harmonious function of a group depends upon the proper classification and assignation of roles to proper members of the group and that the each members performs his role assigned to him satisfactory and without even slight degree of resentment. But in actual practice individuals resent the role as assigned to them and there arises the real conflict and it results into much group conflict as well as tension.

Individuals may be exposed to incompatible expectations – role conflict. This conflict arises either because of role partner have contradictory expectations or because those of one partner are unwelcome to other. The followings are the source of role conflict.

2

(i) Individuals may be confronted with the expectations of roles thatthey find incompatible with certain of their personality characteristic.

(ii) Individuals may be confronted with conflicting expectations drainingfrom their relationships with the people who are identified with other roles in their role set.

(iii) Individuals may be confronted with conflicting expectations stemming from their simultaneous, assumptions of two or more roles.

(iv) Individuals may be confronted with conflicting expectationsassociated with contradictory definitions of the appropriate responses demanded by a role.

(v) Individuals may be confronted with conflicting expectations stemmingfrom lack of inter-role consensus.

(iv) **Role Discontinuity.** It refers to a lack of congruity between the expectations associated with social roles taken on consecutively by an individual. The change from the courtship to the marriage role

and the occupational role to the retirement role are examples of situations involving a degree of role discontinuity

(v) **Role Insulation.** It is a state of relative isolation of the occupants of role that results from the tendency of a person occupying a given role (particularly an occupational role), to have more informal social interaction with each other than with persons occupying other roles. This tends to reinforce their own particular role perspective and decreases their understanding of other points of view.

(vi) **Role Model.** It refers to an individual whose behaviour in a particular role provides a pattern or model upon which another individual bases his behaviour in performing the same role. The

role model provides a standard used by other person in determining appropriate attitudes and actions of one occupant of the role. A role model need not be personally known to the individual, not living, nor necessarily real and may include public figures, historical figures and legendary Heros.

(vii) **Role Primary.** The precedence of one role over another is called role primacy. The primacy of the role is determined by the extent to which it is important or essential to the individual self conception or self image. Role primacy, however, is not simply an individual matter. The primacy of particular role varies with historical cultural and situational factors and the structures of a society or a social group is crucial in the determination of role primacy for its members.

(viii) **Reflexive Role Taking.** In accordance with the interpretation of G. H. naeed, it refers to a taking of the role of another by viewing oneself from the point of view of the other. Reflexive role taking allows a persons to become an object of himself to see himself as others see him. The concept is similar to cooley's concept of 'Looking Glass self'.

(ix) **Role Reversal and Role Change.** There may always be the possibility of role reversal. In a nuclear family, the father has to make decisions, while in joint family, he would have no occasion to make. So also the role of women is a nuclear family is now significantly different and changed. The subject of role reversal though of great interest has not yet been attended to in its fullness. Increasing urbanization and extending modernity of life have affected role reversals in many directions.

8.16 Classification of Roles

Ralph Linton has classified roles into the following :–

(i)   Ascribed Roles (ii) Achieved Roles

2

(i) **Ascribed Roles.** These have been defined as those, over which the individuals have absolutely no choice. It is established at birth that an individual is male or female, that one belongs to a certain family, or that he is a member of certain race. If the individual is a female, she must take on the feminines roles prescribed in her culture. Same is the case in family or social membership. Thus it can be said, that all that Roles which are played by the individuals in accordance with the birth or origin or any defined caste or class are the ascribed Roles.

(ii) **Achieved Roles.** These roles have been defined as the roles about which the person has some choice however much or little are achieved roles. In our society this includes all occupational roles. It includes the role of husband and wife and father and mother, for certain divisions are required before an individual achieves the position necessary to the playing of these toles. The degree of social pressure to play certain roles vary, of course.'

Relationship Between Status and Role

(1) **Both the terms are inter-related.** A 'status' is simply a position in a society or in a group. A role is the behaviourable aspect of the status. Statuses are occupied and Roles are played. A role is the manner in which a given individual fulfills the obligations of status and enjoys its privileges. Both the terms are often used interchangeably.

(2) **Composition.** Status is determined by the socio-cultural values and in relation to other members of the society. On the other hand role is also determined by socio-cultural values and it is also determined in relation to the roles of the other members of the society.

(3) **Expression of the Terms.** Status in almost all the societies is similar and same, where as: in respect of the similarity and sameness of the status, the roles are expressed in different forms.

8.17 Self Assessment Questions

(i) What is social role.

_____

_____

_____

(ii) Define social role and discuss its various characteristics.

_____

_____

_____

(iii)Give the concept of social role with special reference to the Linton's approach.

_____

_____

_____

(iv) Write short notes on (a) Role set (b) Role conflict (c) Role distance (d) Rolediscontinuity (e) Role-insulation.

_____

_____

_____

(v) Describe the classification of social role and discuss relationship betweenstatus and Role.

_____

2

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY

Structure

9.1.1   Introduction

9.2   Objectives

9.1.2   Definition

9.1.3   Perspectives of Family.

9.1.4   Composition and family patterns (types) including Descent Pattern, Family residence, Authority pattern.

9.1.5   Functions of Family.

9.2.1   Introduction.

9.2.2   Definition

9.2.3   Forms of Marriage.

9.2.4   Evolution of Marriage.

9.2.5   Rules of Mate Selection.

9.1 Family

Family is the most important primary group. Many sociologists have regarded the family as the cornerstone of society. It forms the basic unit of social organisation and it is difficult to imagine how human society could function without it. Although the composition of the family varies, for example in many societies two or more wives are regarded as the ideal arrangement, such differences can be seen as minor variations on a basic theme. In general, therefore, the family has been seen as a universal social institution, as an

inevitable part of human society. With the passage of time, family has undergone changes gaining and loosing various shapes and characteristics. The present stage of economic development and cultural changes have posed some new challenges to the institution of family leading to radical changes in the structures and functions of the family. In the western society, the existence of family appears to be threatened. However, the institution of family is still sneering in one form or the other.

9.1.2 Definition of Family

Family, basically, is made up of individuals who are related by blood, marriage (or some other agreed upon relationship) or adoption who share the primary responsibility for reproduction and caring for members of society. Some of the important definitions of the family as given by various sociologists are enlisted as under :

a) MacIver defines family as "a group defined by a sex relationship sufficientlyprecise and enduring to provide for the procreation and upbringing of children."

b) Burgess and Locke define family as "a group of persons united by the ties ofmarriage, bond or adoption consisting of a single household, interacting and inter communicating with each other in their respective social roles of husband and wife, mother and father, son and daughter, brother and sister, creating a common culture."

c) Davis argues that family is "a group of persons whose relations to oneanother are based upon consanguinity and who are, therefore, kin to another."

Some of the important features and characteristics of the family can be enlisted as under :-

a) **Universal phenomenon.** Family is a universal phenomenon as it has existed in every age and in every society and is found in all parts of the

127

world (in one form or another). Each one of us is a member of some or the other family.

b) **Emotional basis**. Family is based on the impulses of mating, parental care and procreation. It is a closely knit group which fortifies these emotions. There is not only economic cooperation and biological relation between the members of the family but there also exists emotional relationship among them. They share pleasures and pains with the another.

c) **Regulating feature.** The family regulates the behaviour of its members. It regulates sex relationship and defines legitimacy and illegitimacy, morals and manners. The persons in the family are assigned certain statuses who perform the roles expected of them. The persons in the family behave according to the status they occupy.

d) **Limited size.** The size of the family is limited as it is defined by biological conditions which it cannot transcend. Other groups may be smaller than a family but they are not so because of biological conditions.

e) **Socializational role.** The family exercises the most important control over its members. It socialises the individuals. The socialization involves the personality formation of the individual. The family's influence in infancy determines the personality structure of the individuals. Parents are considered to be the first agency of the socialization process.

9.1.3 Perspectives on Family

Two main perspectives which are important and need to be mentioned here are Functional perspective and Marxian perspective.

a) Functional Perspective

Functionalist writers, as the name implies, analyse social institutions such as the family in order to see what contributions they make to the existence of the society, in much the same way that we can say the heart contributes to our existence by pumping blood around the body. The analysis of the family from a

functionalist perspective involves three main questions. Firstly, 'What are the functions of family ?" Answers to this question deal with the contributions made by the family to the maintenance of the social system. The family is examined in terms of the degree to which it meets the functional prerequisites of the society. The second question asks, "What are the functional relationship between the family and other parts of the social system ?" It is assumed that there must be a certain degree of fit, integration and harmony between the parts of the social system if society is going to function efficiently. The third question is concerned with the functions performed by an institution or a part of society for the individual. In the case of the family, this question considers the functions of the family for its individual members.

George Peter Murdock argues that the family performs four basic functions in all societies. There universal functions he terms the sexual, reproductive economic and educational. They are essential for social life since without the sexual and reproductive functions there would be no members of society, without the economic function, life would cease, and without education, a term Murdock uses for socialization, there would be no culture. Talcott Parsons argues about two basic and irreducible functions of the family which are common to the family in all societies. These are the 'primary socialisation of children' and the 'stabilization of the adult personalities of the population of the society.'

The dysfunctional (critical) views about the family include Edmund Leach's study entitled— A Runaway world ? in which Leach presents a pessimistic view of the family in industrial society. He states that far from being the basis of the good society, the family, with its narrow privacy and tawdry secrets is the source of all our discontents. In their isolations, family members expect and demand too much from each other. The result is conflict.

R.D. Laing's work on the psychology of family life interprets the family as an agency which can promote constraint, unhappiness, frustration and even mental ill health. David Cooper, in his book, 'The Death of the family' sees the family as a stultifying institution which stunts the self and largely denies people the freedom to develop their own individuality. Cooper argues that individuals interiorize the family. In the process of internalization, 'one gives bits of other

people onto oneself and for most people, this results in 'the chronic murder of their selves.'

Leach, Laing and Cooper have provided a balance to the functionalist view which has dominated the sociological thinking on the family for many years.

b) Marxian Perspective

The Marxist perspective on the family concentrates on its dysfunctions and on the possibilities for change. The Marxist view begins with an historical account of the rise of monogamous marriage in the west. Engles suggested that is was the rise of private property which sowed the seeds of marriage to know who the legitimate heirs were.

For a Marxist, the family is first and foremost a 'unit of social control': it socialises young members to obey. The family absorbs and transmits some of the fundamental political norms promoted by the dominant class. Marxists also see family as a compensatory agency which offers comfort and esteem to the worker who returns from a factory or office where he was no control or satisfaction. Lastly, Marxists, see the family as a cheap unit which services the worker at no cost to the employer and keeps all alive on one wage packet. Because of the family, the employer, at no cost to himself, has his workforce fully serviced and therefore able to produce higher profits.

9.1.4 Composition and Family Patterns

Family has different forms and patterns and it has been classified into different types taking into consideration different factors as the basis.

a) **On the basis of marriage :-** The family has been classified into three major types on the basis of marriage.

    (1)   Polygynous family   (one husband and many wives)

    (2)   Polyandrous family   (one wife and many husbands)

    (3)   Monogamous family   (one wife and one husband)

b) **On the basis of nature of residence :–** On this basis the family can be divided into three main forms :

(1) Family of matrilocal residence.

(2) Family of patrilocal residence.

(3) Family of neolocal residence.

c) **On the basis of descent :–** Two main types are classified on the basis of descent or ancestry :-
(1) Matrilineal family   (mother's descent)
                                                                      (father's
(2) Patrilineal family   descent)

d) **On the nature of authority :–** The nature of authority that exists in the family, differentiates family in two main types :-

(1) Matriarchal family   (the authority of mother)

(2) Patriarchal family   (the authority of father)

e) **On the basis of size and structure :–**

(1) Nuclear family (single unit family)

(2) The joint family (the individual family)

f) **On the basis of relations :–** The family can be classified into two main types on the basis of the nature of relations that exist among family members :

(1) Conjugal family   (sex relationship)

(2) Consanguine family (blood relationship)

Some of the important types of families

(1) Nuclear Family. The nuclear family can be defined as "a small group composed of husband and wife and their immature children." Soon after

their marriage, the children leave their parental home and establish their separate household. Hence, a nuclear family is an autonomous unit free from the control of the elders. A nuclear family is mostly independent. The American family is an example of nuclear family.

The nuclear family has two kinds

(a) The family of orientation

(b) The family of procreation.

The family of orientation is in which the person is born and brought up which include his father, mother, brothers and sisters.

The family of procreation is the one in which a person establishes his marriage and which includes the husband or wife, the sons and daughters.

2. **Matriarchal Family.** In this family the mother is the head of the family and she exercises the authority. She is the owner of the property. Some of the examples of matriarchal families are the Malay islanders, Eskimos, the Khasis of North Eastern India, the Nayars of Kerala etc. In this type of family the descent is traced through mother. The residence is matrilocal.

3. **Patriarchal Family.** In this family the father is the head of the family and he exercises the authority. Thus it is father dominated family. He is the owner of property and the final decision in all matters lies with him. Most of the societies today have patriarchal families throughout the world although the form varies from one society to another. In a patriarchal family the descent and inheritance is traced through the male the father. The residence is patrilocal.

At present, both matriarchal and patriarchal families have diminished. In their place **egalitarian** or **equalitarian families** in which father and mother enjoy equal status and opportunities, have emerged. Most of the families in the industrial societies are equalitarian families. They are often called 'modern families' and they have taken the form of nuclear family.

9.1.5 Functions of the Family

A century ago, Friedrich Engles, a colleague of Karl Marx described the family as the ultimate source of social inequality because of its role in the transfer of power, property and privilege. Even today different theorists, some of them functionalists, enlist a number of functions performed by the family. The family fulfills a number of functions, such as providing religious training, education and recreational outlets. Yet there are six paramount functions performed by the family, they were first outlined by sociologist William F. Ogburn. These are :

1. **Reproduction.** For a society to maintain itself, it must replace its dying members. In this sense, the family contributes to human survival through its function of reproduction.

2. **Protection.** Unlike the young of animal species, human infants need constant care and economic security. They experience an extremely long period of dependency, which places special demands on elder family members. In all cultures, the family assumes ultimate responsibility for the protection and upbringing of children.

3. **Socialization.** Parents and other kin monitor a child's behaviour and transmit the norms, values and language of a culture to the child. Of course, as conflict theorists point out, the social class of couples and their children significantly influences the socialization experiences to which they are exposed and the protection they receive.

4. **Regulation of sexual behaviour.** Sexual norms are subject to change over time and across cultures. However, whatever the time period or cultural values in a society, standards of sexual behaviour are most clearly defined within the family circle. The structure of society influences these standards so that characteristically in male dominated societies, formal and informal norms permit men to express and enjoy their sexual desires more freely than women may.

5. **Affection and companionship.** Ideally, the family provides members with warm and intimate relationships and helps them feel satisfied and

133

secure. Of course, a family member may find such rewards outside the family– from peers, in school, at work - and may perceive the home as an unpleasant place. Nevertheless, unlike other institutions, the family is obligated to serve the emotional needs of its members. We expect our relatives to understand us, to care for us, and to be there for us when we need them.

6. **Providing of social status.** We inherit a social position because of the 'family background' and reputation of our parents and siblings. The family unit presents the newborn child with an ascribed status of race and ethnicity that helps to determine his or her place within a society's stratification system. Moreover, family resources affect children's ability to pursue certain opportunities such as higher education and specialized lessons.

Kingsley Davis speaks of four main functions of the family which again include the functions as given by Ogburn. They are 1. Reproduction 2. Maintenance 3. Placement 4. Socialization.

MacIver classifies the functions of the family into two types :

1. **Essential functions which include :**

(i)   the stable satisfaction of sex needs (ii) production   and   rearing   of

         children ; and (iii)   provision of a home.

2. **Non-essential functions which include :**

(i)   Religious

(ii)   Educational

(iii)   Economic

(iv)   health; and

(v)   recreation

These functions can also be classified as the primary and the secondary functions of the family.

Thus, one can sum up that family still enjoys importance as a biological group for procreation of children and it remains one of the most important social institutions for the human society. Although the family has been undergoing change as the modern family radically differs from that of the traditional one, the family has never been at rest. It has undergone change both in its structure and function. Despite these changes family still holds the same position even today as it did years ago.

9.2 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. Infact, family and marriage are complementary to each other. 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.

9.2.1 Definition of Marriage

Although there is no definition that covers all types of human marriage, but some of the important definitions and explanations attempted by various scholars are enlisted below :

Robert Lowie defines marriage as 'a relatively permanent bond between permissible mates'.

Edward Westemarck defines it as "the more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of offspring".

Malinowski argues that marriage is a "contract for the production and maintenance of children."

The dictionary of sociology by **Duncan Mitchell** defines marriage 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."

9.2.2 Forms of Marriage

The main forms of marriage are Polygyny, Polyandry, Monogamy and Group Marriage.

(i) **Polygyny.** Polygyny is a form of marriage in which one man marries more than one woman at a given time.

Polygyny is of two types (a) Sororal Polygyny (b) Non-sororal Polygyny.

(a) **Sororal Polygyny :** It is a type of marriage in which the wives are the sisters. It is also called 'sororate'. It is usually observed among the tribes which pay a high bride price.

(b) **Non-Sororal Polygyny :** It is a type of marriage in which the wives are not related as sisters.

(ii) **Polyandry.** It is the marriage of one woman with several men. It is much less common than polygyny. Polyandry is of two types :

(a) Fraternal Polyandry (b) Non-Fraternal Polyandry.

(a) **Fraternal Polyandry —** When several brothers share the same wife, the practice is called fraternal polyandry. This practice of being mate, actual or potential, to one's husband's brothers is called 'levirate'. It is found among Todas.

(b) **Non-fraternal polyandry —** In this type of polyandrous marriage, the husbands need not have any close relationship to each other. 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.

(c) **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 civilised people. It has almost become a universal practice at present.

(d) **Group Marriage** — It has been revealed by many studies that the practice of group marriage is almost on the verge of extinction. Theoretically, group marriage means the marriage of two or more women with two or more men. Here the husbands are common husbands and wives are common wives. Some writers believe that group marriage is not in existence. If at all it is in practice, it is ceubbed with polyandry. For example, two Toda brothers marry two women as then common wives.

9.2.3 Rules of Marriage (Mate Selection)

All societies are governed by some rules regarding "who should marry whom". No society gives absolute and total freedom to its members, for selecting their life partners. Endogamy and Exogamy are the two main rules that condition marital choice.

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. For example we have caste endogamy, class endogamy, subcaste endogamy, race endogamy etc. In caste endogamy marriage has to take place within the caste. Endogamy prohibits marriage outside the group. Even today intercaste marriages are not encouraged.

Factors such as the policy of separation, virtual geographic separation of people, the desire to keep wealth within the group, religious, social and cultural differences between peoples, sense of superiority or superiority, etc. are said to be the causes of endogamy.

Exogamy :

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

The rule of exogamy insists that the so-called blood relatives shall neither have marital connections nor sexual relations among themselves. Near relatives are not supposed to marry among themselves. But the degree of nearness differs from community to community. In Australia among some people, a son may marry his father's wife if she is not his dueit mother. Similarly, marriage of cousins is allowed among Muslims.

It may be noted that endogamy and exogamy are not mutually exclusive. In some societies both the rules may coexist. For example, in India both are practised by the caste Hindus. Castes and subcastes are endogamous in nature. But 'Gotra' a small unit of subcaste is exogamous. Such rules differ from society to society.

9.2.4 Evolution of Marriage

Evolutionists have attempted to show the development of institution of marriage in sequences. Tylor, Morgan, Maine etc. have shown that the institutions of marriage has passed through the stages of sexual promiscuity, group marriage ployandrous marriage, polygynous marriage and monogamous marriage. According to Morgan, group marriage was the first stage of the institution of marriage, in which all males of a group marry all females of another groups. In Indian context, group marriage as an institution is not prevalent in present time. But among the tribes of Australia, group marriage is still existing.

The next stage is of polyandrous marriage which is between one female and more than one males. This type of marriage is found among Bantu and Wahuma of Africa.

Then another form of marriage called polygynous marriage cane in which one man marries more than one woman. This marriage is found among the tribes of Africa, Osceama and Malenesia. Though at present time, monogamy is a rule,

but polygyny is also found among all societies of India, i.e., tribal Hindu, Muslim etc.

Finally the monogamous marriage, which is the present form of marriage arrived in which one man marries one woman.

Important Terms

1. Monogamous Family

2. Polygynous Family

3. Polyandrous Family

4. Matrilineal Family

5. Patrilineal Family

6. Matrilocal Residence

7. Patrilocal Residence

8. Neolocal Residence

9. Matriarchal Family

10. Patriarchal Family

11. Nuclear Family

12. Joint Family

13. Conjugal Family

14. Consanguine Family

15. Polygyny, Sororal Polygyny, Non-sororal Polygyny

16. Polyandry, Fraternal Polyandry, Non-fraternal Polyadndry

17. Monogamy

18. Group Marriage

19. Endogamy

20. Exogamy

9.3 Self Assessment Questions

Q. 1. Define family and explain functional perspective of understanding family.

_____

_____

Q. 2. Enumerate the various functions of the family.

_____

_____

Q. 3. Explain the following :

(a) Nuclear Family

_____

_____

(b) Matriarchal Family

_____

_____

(c) Patriarchal Family.

_____

_____

Q. 4. Define Marriage and explain its various forms?

_____

_____

Q. 5. What are the different rules of mate selection.

2

RELIGION

Structure

10.1   Introduction

10.2   Objectives

10.2   Definition of Religion

10.3   Origin and Evolution of Religion

10.4   Functional Perspective of Religion

10.5   Marxian Perspective of Religion

10.6   Dysfunction of Religion

10.7   Basic Components of Religion

10.8   Religion and Magic

10.9   Secularisation

10.10   Self-Assessment Questions

10.1 Introduction

When we think of religion, a variety of diverse images come to mind. We may picture a solemn church service in a small New England town, a passionate revival meeting in the deep south or a Hare Krishna Group chanting on the streets of San Francisio. If we consider religions around the world, we may imagine Islamic travellers on a pilgrimage to Mecca, Orthodox jews praying at the western

wall of Jerusalem or an African tribe engaged in a ritual celebrating the birth of a child. Religion is found throughout the world because it offers answers to such ultimate questions as why we exist, why we succeed or fail, and why we die. It is difficult to determine with certainty when religious behaviour began, but anthropological evidence suggests that such behaviour was evident at least 1,00,000 years ago. The remains of early people in Europe reveal ceremonial burials with artifacts placed near the deceased, which implies that they believed in and after life. Apparently, the human species has long been preoccupied with spiritual concerns.

10.2 Definition of Religion

1. Supernatural beliefs are present in every known society. Their variety seems endless. Any definition of religion must encompass this variety. At its simplest, religion is the belief in the supernatural. This definition, however, fails to incorporate the idea that supernatural forces have some influence or control upon the world, a notion that always accompanies belief in the supernatural. Thus Roland Robertson states that religion, 'refers to the existence of supernatural beings which have a governing effect on life'. Melford E. Spiro adopts a similar definition when he states that religion is based on 'beliefs in superhuman beings and in their power to assist or harm man'.

10.3 The origin and evolution of religion

In the nineteenth century the sociology of religion was concerned with two main questions, 'How did religion begin?' and 'How did religion evolve?' This evolutionary approach was influenced by Darwin's, *"On the Origin of Species",* published in 1859. Just as Darwin attempted to explain the origin and evolution of species, so sociologists tried to explain the origin and evolution of social institutions and society. In terms of religion, two main theories, animism and naturism, were advanced to account for its origin.

Animism means the belief in spirits. Edward B. Tylor believes this to be the earliest form of religion. He argues that animism derives from man's attempts to answer two questions, 'What is it that makes the difference between a living

143

body and a dead one ? and, 'What are those human shapes which appear in dreams and visions ?' To make sense of these events, early philosophers invented the idea of the soul. The soul is a spirit being which leaves the body temporarily during dreams and visions, and permanently at death. Once invented, the idea of spirits was applied not simply to man, but also to many aspects of the natural and social environment. Thus animals were invested with a spirit, as were man-made objects such as the bull-roarer of the Australian aborigines. Tylor argues that religion, in the form of animism, originated to satisfy man's intellectual nature, to meet his need to make sense of death, dreams and visions.

Naturism means the belief that the forces of nature have supernatural power. F. Max Muller believes this to be the earliest form of religion. He argues that naturism arose from man's experience of nature, in particular the effect of nature upon man's emotions. Nature contains surprise, terror, marvels and miracles, such as volcanoes, thunder and lightning. Awed by the power and wonder of nature, early man transformed abstract forces into personal agents. Man personified nature. The force of the wind became the spirit of the wind, the power of the sun became the spirit of the sun. Where animism seeks the origin of religion in man's intellectual needs, naturism seeks it in his emotional needs. Naturism is man's response to the effect of the power and wonder of nature upon his emotions.

From the origin of religion, nineteenth-century sociologists turned to its evolution. Tylor believed that human society evolved through five major stages, beginning with the simple hunting and gathering band, and ending with the complex nation-state. In the same way, religion evolved through five stages, corresponding to the evolution of society. Animism, the belief in a multitude of spirits, formed the religion of the simplest societies, monotheism, the belief in one supreme god, formed the religion of the most complex. Tylor believed that each stage in the evolution of religion arose from preceding ones and that the religion of modern man, 'is in great measure only explicable as a developed product of an older and ruder system'.

10.4　Religion—A Functionalist Perspective

Functionalist analysis is primarily concerned with the contribution religion makes to meeting the functional prerequisites or basic needs of society. From this perspective, society requires a certain degree of social solidarity, value consensus, and harmony and integration between its parts. The function of religion is the contribution it makes to meeting such functional prerequisites, for example, its contribution to social solidarity.

4.　Emile Durkheim

In *"The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life",* first published in 1912, Emile Durkheim presented what is probably the most influential interpretation of religion from a functionalist perspective. Durkheim argues that all societies divide the world into two categories, 'the sacred' and 'the profane', or more simply, the sacred and the non-sacred. Religion is based upon this division. It is 'a unified system of beliefs and practices related to sacred things, that is to say things set apart and forbidden'. It is important to realize that, 'By sacred things one must not understand simply those personal things which are called gods or spirits; a rock, a tree, a spring, a pebble, a piece of wood, a house, in a word anything can be sacred'. There is nothing about the particular qualities of a pebble or a tree which makes them sacred. Therefore sacred things must be symbols, they must represent something. To understand the role of religion in society, the relationship between sacred symbols and that which they represent must be established.

Durkheim uses the religion of various groups of Australian aborigines to develop his argument. He sees their religion, which he calls totemism, as the simplest and most basic form of religion. Aborigine society is divided into several clans. A clan is like a large extended family with its members sharing certain duties and obligations. For example, clans have a rule of exogamy—members may not marry within the clan. Clan members have a duty to aid and assist each other; they join together to mourn the death of one of their number and to revenge a member who has been wronged by someone from another clan. Each clan has a totem, usually an animal or a plant. The totem is a symbol. It is the emblem of the clan, 'It is its flag; it is the sign by which each clan distinguishes itself from all

others'. However, the totem is more than this, it is a sacred symbol. It is carved on the bull-roarer, the most sacred object in aborigine ritual. The totem is 'The outward and visible form of the totemic principle or god'. Durkheim argues that if the totem, 'is at once the symbol of god and of the society, it is that not because the god and the society are only one ?' Thus he suggests that in worshipping god, men are in fact worshipping society. Society is the real object of religious veneration.

Durkheim argues that social life is impossible without the shared values and moral beliefs which form the 'collective conscience'. In their absence, there would be no social order, social control, soial solidarity or co-operation. In short, there would be no society. Religion reinforces the collective conscience. The worship of society strengthens the values and moral beliefs which form the basis of social life. By defining them as sacred, religion provides them with greater power to direct human action. The attitude of respect towards the sacred is the same attitude applied to social duties and obligations. In worshipping society, men are, in effect, recognizing the importance of the social group and their dependence upon it. In this way religion strengthens the unity of the group, it promotes social solidarity. Durkheim emphasizes the importance of collective worship. The social group comes together in religious rituals infused with drama and reverence. Together, its members express their faith in common values and beliefs. In this highly charged atmosphere of collective worship, the integration of society is strengthened. Members of society express, communicate and comprehend the moral bonds which unite them.

Bronislaw Malinowski

Like Durkheim, Malinowski sees religion as reinforcing social norms and values and promoting social solidarity.

Malinowski notes that in all societies life crises are surrounded with religious ritual. He sees death as the most disruptive of these events and argues that, "The existence of strong personal attachmens and the fact of death, which of all human events is the most upsetting and disorganizing to man's calculations, are perhaps the main sources of religious beliefs". Religion deals with the problem of death in

the following manner. A funeral ceremony expresses the belief in immortality, which denies the fact of death, and so comforts the bereaved. Other mourners support the bereaved by their presence at the ceremony. This comfort and support checks the emotions which death produces, and controls the stress and anxiety which might disrupt society. Death is 'socially destructive' since it removes a member from society. At a funeral ceremony the social group unites to support the bereaved. This expression of social solidarity re-integrates society.

Malinowski's distinctive contribution to the sociology of religion is his argument that religion promotes social solidarity by dealing with situations of emotional stress which threaten the stability of society.

Talcott Parsons

Talcott Parsons argues that human action is directed and controlled by norms provided by the social system. The cultural system provides more general guidelines for action in the form of beliefs, values and systems of meaning. Religion is part of the cultural system. As such, religious beliefs provide guidelines for human action and standards against which man's conduct can be evaluated. In a Christian society, the Ten Commandments operate in this way. Many of the norms of the social system are integrated by religious beliefs. For example, the commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill', integrates such diverse norms as the ways to drive a car, to settle an argument and to deal with the suffering of the aged. The norms which direct these areas of behaviour prohibit manslaughter, murder and euthanasia. They are all based on the same religious commandment. In this way religion provides general guidelines for conduct which are expressed in a variety of norms.

Parsons, like Malinowski, sees religion addressed to particular problems which occur in all societies. He argues that in everyday life, people 'go about their business without particular strain'. If life were always like this, 'religion would certainly not have the significance that it does'. However, life does not always follow this smooth pattern. The problems which disrupt it fall into two categories. The first 'consists in the fact that men are "hit" by events which they cannot foresee and prepare for, or control, or both'. Such an event is death, particularly premature death.

Like Malinowski, and for similar reasons, Parsons sees religion as a mechanism for adjustment to such events and as a means for restoring the normal pattern of life. The second problem area is that of 'uncertainty'. This refers to endeavours in which a great deal of effort and skill have been invested, but where unknown or uncontrollable factors can threaten a successful outcome. An example is man's inability to predict or control the effect of weather upon agriculture. Again, following Malinowski, Parsons argues that religion provides a means of adjusting and coming to terms with such situations through rituals which act as 'a tonic to self-confidence'. In this way religion maintains social stability by allaying the tension and frustration which could disrupt social order.

10.5 Religion—A Marxian perspective

To Marx, religion is an illusion which eases the pain produced by exploitation and oppression. It is a series of myths which justify and legitimate the subordination of the subject class and the domination and privilege of the ruling class. It is a distortion of reality which provides many of the deceptions which form the basis of ruling class ideology and false class consciousness.

In Marx's words, 'Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people'. Religion acts as an opiate to dull the pain produced by oppression. It does nothing to solve the problem, it is simply a misguided attempt to make life more bearable. As such, religion merely stupefies its adherents rather than bringing them true happiness and fulfilment.

From a Marxian viewpoint, religion does not simply cushion the effects of oppression, it is also an instrument of that oppression. It acts as a mechanism of social control, maintaining the existing system of exploitation and reinforcing class relationships. Put simply, it keeps people in their pace. By making unsatisfactory lives bearable, religion tends to discourage people from attempting to change their situation. By justifying the existing social structure, it dissuades ideas to alter it. By offering an illusion of hope in a hopeless situation, it prevents thoughts of overthrowing the system. By providing explanations and justifications for social situations, religion distorts reality. It helps to produce a false class

consciousness which blinds members of the subject class to their true situation and their real interests. In this way, it diverts attention from the real source of their oppression and so helps to maintain ruling class power.

Religion is not, however, solely the province of oppressed groups. From a Marxian perspective, ruling classes adopt religious beliefs to justify their position both to themselves and to others. The lines, 'God made them high and lowly and ordered their estate', show clearly how religion can be used to justify social inequality not simply to the poor, but also to the rich.

10.6 Dysfunctions of Religion

Religion as a basic social institution of human society has been fulfilling certain positive functions no doubt. Its role in promoting social solidarity, as Durkheim has pointed out, and its need in providing inner individual peace and solace as Edward Sapir has pointed out cannot be undermined. By looking at these manifest positive functions of religion one should not jump to the conclusion that religion brings man only advantages. Religion, on the contrary, has its own dysfunctional aspect also. It does certain disservices also.

The main dysfunctions of religion are as follows :

1.   **Religion inhibits protests and impedes social changes.** Religion provides man emotion consolation and helps him to reconciliate himself with situations. In doing so, *T.F.O.' Dea* remarks religion inhibits protests and impedes social changes which may even prove to be beneficial to the welfare of the society. All protests and conflicts are not always negative. Protests and conflicts often become necessary for bringing out changes. Some changes would certainly lead to positive reforms. By inhibiting protests and preventing changes religion may postpone reforms. This effect of religion can contribute to the build up of explosive resentments which eventually result in revolution and in most costly and destructive changes.

2.   **Hampers the adaptation of society to changed condition.** A religion can make norms of behaviour and can also sacralise the norms and values of society. Some of the norms which lose their appropriateness under changed

149

conditions may also be imposed by religion. This can "impede a more functionally appropriate adaptation of society to changing conditions". *Example* : During the Medieval Period in Europe, the "Church refused to grant the ethical legitimacy of money-lending at interest, despite the great functional need of this activity in a situation of developing capitalism". Even today, traditional Muslims face religio-ethical problems concerning interest-taking. Similar social conflict is evident in the case of birth control measures including abortion, in the Catholic world.

3. **Religion increases conflict and makes the evolution of realistic solutions more difficult.** By performing its prophetic function, religion may "provide standards of value in terms of which institutionalised norms may be critically examined and found seriously wanting". But this function can also have its dysfunctional consequences. Religious criticism of the existing norms and values may become so unrealistic that it beclouds genuine issues. The religious "demands for reform may become so utopian that they constitute an obstacle in the working out of more practical action".

4. **Impedes the development of new identities.** "In fulfilling its identity function religion may foster certain loyalties which may actually impede the development of new identities which are more appropriate to new situations." Religious identification may prove to be divisive to societies. Religion builds deeply into the personality structures of people a strong animosity that makes them to oppose their opponents tooth and nail.

5. **Religion may foster dependence and irresponsibility.** Religion often makes its followers to become dependents on religious institutions and leaders instead of developing in them an ability to assume individual responsibility and self-direction. It is quite common to observe in India that a good number of people prefer to take the advices of priests and religious leaders before starting some great ventures instead of taking the suggestion of those who are competent in the field. However, it is difficult to assess the exact role of religion in hampering the sense of responsibility and self-dependence of an individual, without an appeal to his own values. Still it could be said that religion's role with respect to individual development and maturation, is highly problematic.

2

10.7 Religion and Magic

Meaning and Definition of Magic

The phenomenon of magic is closely associated with religion. Magic is often regarded as a form of religion. Magic and religion are however different. They represent two aspects of the same non-empirical power. Of the two, religion is more widespread whereas magic is very much limited.

Definition of Magic

1. *Max Weber* used the term "magic" to refer to religious action believed to be automatically effective, whether the goal is empirical or non-empirical.

2. *B. Malinowski* defines 'magic' as "the use of supernatural means to try to obtain empirical ends." He, however, distinguished magic from religion.

Types of Magic

Sociologists have spoken of two types of magic. (*i*) *White magic,* and (ii) *Black magic*. The distinction between the two does not always correspond to the distinction between "*approved*" and "*disapproved*" or between "*legitimate*" and "illegitimte". White magic is normally approved of; but black magic is sometimes approved of, while some other times disapproved of.

1. **White Magic**

White magic is that kind of magic which is never used to do harm within the magician's own society. *Example :* Magic to restore health is "*white*". Similarly, magic to ensure victory in war is "white" even though it may harm the enemy.

2. **Black Magic**

Black magic consists of sorcery and witchcraft. *Sorcery* consists of rites and spells, the efficacy of which does not depend upon the supernatural power vested in the magician himself. Hence sorcery can be learnt and practised with efficacy by any one. It only requires that the ritual is correctly performed and that the victim or his protector does not use counter magic of greater power.

Witchcraft, on the other hand, is black magic that is thought to depend upon the supernatural power of the magician. Thus it cannot be transmitted, except possibly by heredity. Example : Among the *Dobuans* of the Western Pacific, black magic is used to protect property right and hence to punish theft.

10.8 Difference between Religion and Magic

Magic and religion are closely linked. According to some writers magic is also a kind of religion, while some others never consider it so. What they have in common is the reference to a supernatural realm. According to *Kingsley Davis*, magic and religion could be distinguished on the basis of the following : (*i*) *the kind of ends pursued,* (*ii*) *the types of attitudes involved,* (*iii*) *the particular kind of supernaturalism required,* and (*iv*) *the pattern of behaviour exhibited*. These may be explained in the following way.

Magic diverges most from religion when it is used to accomplish aims not sanctioned by the group. It may be employed to achieve vengeance to acquire property illegally, to steal another man's wife, to commit murder, etc. In such cases, it is carried out in secret. Hence members of the group fear black magic. For the same reason, "Magic is now, and for a long time has been regarded with some moral reprobation ....."

Magic and Science

Magic is often called a type of primitive science. This view is based on some analogies. *Example* : Magic, like science, pursues practical ends, conceives that certain effects follow certain causes, takes an impersonal attitude towards causation, and has little to do with morality. In spite of these analogies, magic is in many ways the opposite of science. Because, unlike science, magic relies on supernatural causation. Magic unscientifically believes that some effect is produced because of the mystical power associated with the spell, rite or object. In magic, the facts are not used to test the theory as in science. On the other hand, the theory that is, the magical procedure is always assumed to be right. Here the elements of faith and wishful thinking enter. A failure in magical performances is therefore attributed to a failure to carry out the procedure correctly, and *not to the*

procedure itself. The function of magic is to give confidence and a sense of security. For this reason, the individual must have a non-rational faith in its adequacy. Hence it can exist side by side with perfectly good scientific and technological practices. During the World War II the pilots used to carry in their planes some animals, articles of clothing, mystic numbers, etc., that were believed to give them luck. Magic deals in absolutes whereas science deals in probabilities. Science is tentative and partial and it cannot give the confidence in the way in which magic gives. As *K. Davis* says, magic may become less important, but it is not going to disappear as technology and science advance.

10.9 Secularisation

It is generally felt that the growth of modernism and modern civilisation has affected religion, its functions and the religiosity of the people. Developments in the fields of science, technology and education have also adversely affected religion and its traditional functions. There is a growing trend towards secularism and secularisation today.

Meaning of Secularism

- 'Secularism is a system of social or political philosophy that rejects all forms of religious faiths'.

- 'Secularism .... means liberation of politics from the hegemony of religion.'

- Secularism : 'Belief that morality, education, etc. should not be based on religion.'

Meaning of Secularisation

"The term 'secularisation' implies that what was previously regarded as religious is now ceasing to be such, and it also implies a process of differentiation which results in the various aspects of society, economic, political, legal and moral, becoming increasingly discrete in relation to each other."

The principal cause of secularisation is to be found in the complexity of modern urbanised industrialised society. In simple societies, religion extends to every aspect of experience. In a complex society many new specialised institutions arise. As a result, religion becomes a separate and a distinct insitution with a limited field of influence, and may find itself in competition with other institutions such as science or government. Religious belief is no longer self-evidently true. Religion loses its monopoly of faith and has to compete with alternative belief systems including even atheism. Religious commitment tends to become part time rather than full time.

Definitions and The Basic Components of Religion

Sociologists are yet to find a satisfactory explanation of religion. Writers have defined religion in various ways. A few definitions may be mentioned here.

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 of human life."

3. *Edward Sapir*, an American anthropologist, says that "the essence of religion consists in man's never-ceasing attempt to discover a road to spiritual serenity across the perplexities and dangers of daily life."

4. Maclver and Page have defined, "*Religion as we understand the term, implies a relationship not merely between man and man but also between man and some higher power.*"

Basic Components of Religion

(i) *Belief 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

2

God or the Almighty. He is formless and shapeless. They consider him omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent. They worship him in different ways. They are called *monotheists*.

(ii) *Man's Adjustment with the Supernatural Forces*. Man believes that he is at the mercy of the supernatural forces. He expresses his subordination to them by means of prayers, hymns and other acts. Worship 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 onesided.

(iii) *Acts, Defined as Righteous 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 believe d to bring man good results, while the sinful acts result in disaster. As *Durkheim* says, a distinction between the sacred 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 religions 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.

Functions of Religion

The universal existence of religion shows that religion has a great survival value. "The universality of religion is not based upon 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.

155

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 though prayers. He forgets the worldly 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. In a world full of uncertainties, indefiniteness, dangers, insecurities and unhappiness, the need for safety and security is really great. Religion here acts as the healer of the ills of life. It reduces one's grievances to some extent. It gives the individuals emotional support in the face of uncertainty. It consoles them when they are disappointed. It reconciles them when they are estranged from the goals and norms of society. In doing this, it supports established values and goals and reinforces the morale. It offers man inspiration, hope, faith, optimism and courage.

3.   *Religion Promotes Social Solidarity, Unity and Identity.* Religion upholds

and validates the traditional ways of the life. More than that it unites people. It is known that a common faith, common value-judgements, 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. Religion affects an individual's understanding of *who they are* (*people*) *and what they are.* As *Davis* points out, "Religion gives the individual a sense of identity with the distant past and the limitless future." As *Thomas F.O.'Dea* says, "*In periods of rapid social change and large-scale social mobility, the contribution of religion to identify may become greatly enhanced.*"

"As A.W. Green has pointed out religion is "the supremely integrating and unifying force in human society.""

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 behaviour. Through such agencies like the family and the Church, religion inculcates the values of life in the minds of the growing children. Further, as *Thomas F.O.'Dea* says, *"religion sacralises the norms and values of established society"*. It maintains the dominance of group goals over individual impulses."

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. Ides of *hell* and *heaven* have strong effect on the behaviour 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 prctices among many peoples.

6.   *Priestly Function of Religion.* By performing its 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 worship 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 cooperative. 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 art, culture and provides means for the development of character

on the right lines. Various religious organisations like the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. Hindu Seva Pratishthana, Ramakrishna Mission, Arya Samaj, Brahama Samaj, The Society of Jesus, etc., are engaged in various social, educational, aesthetic, cultural, civic, medical, and other activities.

8.   *Religion Provides Recreation.* Religion promotes recreation through religious lectures, *Kirtanas,* dramas, dance, music, *bhajanas, puranas, harikathas,* fairs, festivals, musical concerts, art exhibitions and so on. It tries to make men sorrowless and fearless. Various religious festivals and rituals can provide relief to the disturbed mind.

9.   *Religion Explains Individual Suffering and Helps to Integrte Personality.* Man has never lived by knowledge alone. Mn is a rational as well as an emotional creature. The things for which men strive in this world are in some measure denied to them. If the aim is to Propagate a faith, persecution may bring failure. If the aim is to achieve fame, a mediocre career may bring disheartenment. With a multiplicity of goals no individual can escape frustration. But the culture provides him with goals that anybody can reach. These are goals that *transcend* the world of actual experience, with the consequence that no evidence of failure to attain them can be conclusive. If the individual believes that he has gained them, that is sufficient. All he needs is sufficient faith. The greater his disappointment in this life, the greater his faith in the next. *Religion tries to give release from the very thing it instils, guilt.* Ritual means are freely provided for wiping away guilt, so that one can count on divine grace.

10.   *Religion Enhances Self-Importance.* Religion expands the *self* to infinite proportions. Religious belief 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.

10.10 Self-Assessment Questions

Q1.   What is meant by Secularisation.

Q2.   Give a detailed account of basic components of Religion.

Q3.   Explain Marxian perspective of religion.

ECONOMY

Structure

11.1   Introduction

11.2   Origin and Development of Economic Institutions

11.3   Types of Economy

        (i) Primitive Economies

        (ii) Modern Complex Economy

11.4   Division of Labour

        (i)   Marxian Perspective

        (ii)   Emile Durkheim's Functionalist Perspective

11.5   Property-A concept and its characteristics

11.6   Let us sum up

11.7   Self Assessment Questions

11.1 Introduction

The term economic system refers to the social institution through which goods & services are produced, distributed and consumed. As with social institutions such as the family, religion & government, the economic system shapes other aspects of social order and is, in turn, influenced by them. Man has been a creative animal since historical time and has improved upon his creation slowly. With the help of the labour he acts upon the nature and tries to alter it. The work provides the most important and vital means for man to fulfill has basic needs, his individuality and humanity.

2

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

Social life confronts with three fundamental imperatives.

(i)   Production

(ii) Distribution, and

(iii) Consumption of goods & services.

(i)   Production. It involves the assembling and applying of human and natural resources in the creation of goods & services. For analytical purposes, it involves.

    (a)   Primary Industry of Production :– The extracting or gathering of undeveloped natural resources from nature through agriculture, mining, fishing and forestry.

    (b)   Secondary Industry of Production :– The processing or converting of raw materials in a fashion that enhances their final consumption value.

    (c)   Tertiary Industry of Production :– Service activities of one sort or another e.g. marketing, banking, medicalcare etc.

(ii) Distribution. It involves channeling inputs i.e. natural resource and labour, to producing agencies and outputs (goods & services) to consuming agencies.The function derives from certain unavoidable conditions.

    Distribution requires social mechanisms by which goods & services are exchanged. 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 clane, communities or nation states.

161

(iii) Consumption. It involves the "using up" of goods & services. Production requires consumption while consumption necessitates production. The accumulation of possessions become the foundation for systems of social stratification.

11.2 Origin and Development of Economic Institutions

Economic activities have been the major activities of mankind throughout history. Even in the modern technological age, we spend a greater portion of our working house to economic pursuits. The concern of the sociologist with economic institutions arises from the fact that economic and other aspects of social life are closely inter-related. Sociology, therefore, studies economic institutions as a part of society.

The complex economic organization of ours had its humble beginning in the food gathering and hunting cultures of old. There was simple division of lobour between men & women. Men & not women were generally the hunters; women were the gatherers of fruits. The family was generally the producing consuming unit. The wife prepared the foods was brought in by the men and sometimes also by the women of the family. Occasionally, hunting was undertaken by the members of the entire community as is the case with hunting of big games like buffallo, walrus, etc. In cases like this, the entire community was the consuming unit.

These hunting communities were economically self-sufficient. Hence trade did not exist. There were, in addition, serious practical difficulties in the way of exchange. For instance, the distances between settlements were great, and the means of transportation undeveloped. In these circumstances exchange between settlements was not obviously possible. Another obstacle to trade was the absence of a common medium of exchange. Sometimes there existed barter between neighbouring tribal settlements.

With in a particular settlement: however, exchange was effected by hospitality or by gifts. Services were rendered or goods given without payment, but with the expectation of a return in kind at a later date. Hospitality and gifts,

therefore, rendered functions which money renders to us at present. Both private ownership and common use prevailed among these hunting tribes. All personal effects such as clothing, utensils etc.,including dwelling hute were privately owned. Land was used in common. And the reason is obvious. Since hunting was their main occupation and since animales moved from place to place private ownership of land was out of the question. A tribe used to extend its sphere of influence over particular areas of the forest.

Gradually, hunting as a means of making one's living was replaced by agriculture, and with it a number of changes were introduced. In the first place, land was assigned in plots to different families for use. In other words, private ownership of land was introduced. Secondly, food supply become more certain and substantial and an element of stability was introduced is the community. Thirdly,with stability come specialisation and development of skills in different lines, viz., weaving of cotton, wool etc, poltery making and similar other handicrafts.

Specialization in turn led to trade and other kinds of exchange against payment. Another off shoot of agriculture, that is particularly significant from the sociological point of view, is the development of social institutions that came in its wake. Private ownership of land that became the rule in an agricultural community meant individual family ownership. In course of time, land came to be identified with wealth. So large land holding came into being "by purchase, by marriage or by force where enough labour could be had to do the work." The community thus came to be divided into classless namely landed aristocracy and peasantry. Again, the family became an important economic unit with the advent of cultivation, domestication of animals and development of the various handicrafts. All these activities demanded leadership; and the role of the husband became quite important in the family economy.

11.3 Types of Economy

Features of Primitive Economies

In the context of the above resume of the growth and development of economic organisation over the years one may pinpoint certain prominent features of primitive economies.

(I)   **Shifting Cultivation.** Primitive economic organizations were of the subsistence type. That is, they fall into the broad category of production-consumption economies. One important reason for this is the absence of technological aids in their attempts to exploit nature. Shifting cultivation means that the same plots of land are not cultivated for long and that cultivators move from one plot to another. The primitive people were not aware of the various ways of conserving the fertility of soil through manuring. Shifting cultivation was thus the only alternative open to them. This was facilitated by the fact that the primitive people did not experience the problem of pressure of population on soil. They could, therefore, easily explore and exploit virgin lands. Obviously, such cultivation is wasteful, inefficient and uneconomic.

(II)   **Exchange.** In the absence of money as a store and measurement of value and a medium of exchange, economic transactions were always based on exchange. There were various forms of exchange prevalent in a primitive society. Some of these forms are noted below :-

(a) **Barter :** It is a direct form of exchange which involves bargaining and haggling unless it is regulated by customs or norms. Barter is an exchange of :

(1) Service for service (2) goods for service and (3) goods for goods.

Money does not figure in the barter transactions.

(b) **Silent trade/exchange :** This is another type of exchange in which goods are placed for exchange without the individual concerned being personally present. If the goods are found to be of unequal value, these are not picked up. The person who has placed them understands the problem and adds more to balance the bargain. Such a practice is known as silent trade or silent exchange.

(c) **Jajmani System :–** Jajmani system is another type of exchange. It is alsin to barter system. The unique character of Jajmani system lies in the fact that exchange of service for goods may occur in a deferred manner. The word: 'jajmani' is derived from the vedic term for a patron who employs a Brahmin to perform a sacrifice for the community. In its original meaning, therefore, jajmani economic relations involved the exchange of gifts for service rendered or to be rendered in future.

Jajmani has come to mean all the basic reciprocal relations of patronage. The system ensures the services of specialists like cobblers, washermen, barbers, potters, blacksmith etc, to the patrons on the one hand and on the other it also ensures subsistence of the specialists who render the service. In exchange for the services rendered the specialists receive annual gifts of products from the soil-a fixed portion of the crops-as well as cloth and sometimes related in any manner to the economic value of services rendered. The jajmani links are between families rather than between jatis.

(d) **Ceremonial Exchange :–** Yet another type of exchange is known as ceremonial exchange. It is a form of social exchange, as distinguished from an economic exchange. It implies giving of goods or money on an auspicious or a festive occasion to a relation, friend or a neighbour without expecting immediate reciprocity. The return is expected to

follow in course of time on an appropriate future occasion.
e.g. birthday gifts, gifts on the occasion of Marriage, Diwali
etc.

(III) **Absence of Profit motive.** The profit motive that is generally
associated with economic transactions is generally absent in a
primitive economy. A sense of mutual obligation, sharing and
solidarity provides the necessary incentives in all economic
pursuits.

(IV) **Virtual absence of innovation.** The rate of innovation in simple
societies is very low, giving the appearance of an unchanging
social structure over a period of time. Stability and Uniformity of
social structure are also the outcome of simple and uniform
techniques of production used in these societies.

(V) **Communal nature of economy.** Primitive societies show strongly
developed features of communal economies. All activities starting
from construction of shelters to production of primary
consumption goods are carried on through cooperative and
collective efforts of the members of the community.

(VI) **Absence of division of Labour.** There is virtually no division of
labour except specialisation based on sex. While men generally
participate in activities outside home, women take care of the
infants and of preparation of food. These activities naturally force
women to stay longer at home.

(VII) **Concept and nature of property rights.** It will be wrong to apply
to primitive society modern conceptions of property. Thus, in a
food gathering society: there can be no property or any type of an
economic surplus like cattle wealth. Among herdsmen. There is no
ownership of land. Pastures are held jointly. Similarly, cultivators
may own their lands jointly. Cases of individual ownership of land
also sometimes exist. A very interesting variation is that of

multiple possessor rights as reported from New Zealand & West Africa.

Features of Modern Complex Economic order

The economic life was radically changed within the development of power, specially the development of steam, later by electrical power and industrial chemistry and further in recent years by electronics and computer technology. The application of power to production brought into being a new economic order called capitalistic order. The following are some of the implications of the economic order:

(i)   Capitalistic order is based on the idea of profit. A manufacturer or a trader is expected to sell his products for more than costs the difference going to him as profit.

(ii)   The ideal of profit brings out clearly the anti-thesis between group interest and social function. The specific function of this economic order is to maximise production so as to lead to maximization of profit.

(iii)   It follows, therefore that, "there is no safeguard against a grose discrepancy betwen service and return except in so far as vigilant scrutiny and regulation are maintained by constituted authority."

(iv)   Capitalist order brings into being large joint stock business. More production requires large capital which can be collected through the sales of shares among innumerable shareholders.

(v)   Capitalist brought in factories which employed thousands of workers whom the employers do not know. Labour unions are natural offenoots of this system since these unions help them to wrest better terms

from their employers.

(vi) This brings to another aspect of capitaliest order. "It is always an arena of contending forces for it rests on two premises, competition and bargain."

(vii) Because of these tensions within the economic system, the state has to pass laws" to safeguard the life and health of workers, to prevent employment of childrezn and to provide a measure of security in case of accidents, unemployment, sickness and oldage."

(viii) Minute division of labour, which it both a cause & consequence of modern technological method of production, is an important feature of all modern economies. Its social of psychological consequences and implications have been examined by many scholars.

11.4 The Division of Labour :

One of the striking features of modern industrial economy is the complex division of labour. The complex nature of division of labour was brought by Adam Smith. The description of the complex nature of division of labour as given by Adam Smith does not, however, throw any light on the social and psychological implications of complex division of labour. Both Marx and Burkheim have examined these aspects from their respective points of view.

Marxian perspective : Alienated Labour

To Marx, work provides "the most important and vital means for man to fulfil his basic needs, his individuality and his humannity. Man gets satisfaction when he applies his creative powers in the production of certain commodity. It is his creation and, as such, he takes pride in and feels joy over the outcome of his effort. Another source of his happiness opens up when his product is appreciated by others. At this stage, his work becomes fully satisfying activity, encompassing both himself and the community of fellow human beings. Work though an individual activity, thus becomes a social activity as well. Marx meant by alienated labour the state of a man being cut off from his work. This means that he no longer finds work satisfying to him. He is no longer creative. He works simply

because he has to. Being thus unable to express his creative faculties, he actually alienates himself from his trueself. Further, since work is a social activity, alienation from work also involves alienation from others. Alienation is thus complete. He is alienated from his work from his true self and from his fellow workers. Marx solution to the problem of alienated labour is the communist society in which the force of production are communally owned.

Emile Durkheim : A Functionalist Perspective on the Division of Labour in Society

While Marx was pessimistic about the division of labour in society. Durkheim was cautiously optimistic. Marx saw the specialised division of labour trapping the worker in his occupational role and dividing society into antagonistic social classes, Durkheim saw a number of problems arising from specialisation in Industrial society, but believed the promise of the division of labour outweighed the problems.

The theme of Durkheimian thought, as expressed in his book, **The Division of Labour in society (1883),** is the relation between individuals and collectivity. He made the distinction between two forms of social solidarity, namely, **mechanical solidarity** and **organic solidarity.**

Mechanical solidarity is, to use Durkheim's language, a solidarity of resemblance. The chief characteristics of a society in which mechanical solidarity prevails is that the individual differ from one another as little as possible. They resemble each other because they feel the same emotions, cherish the same values and hold sacred the same things. The society is harmonious and coherent because there is little social differentiation and division of labour is unspecialised.

The other form of solidarity, namely, organic solidarity, is one in which consensus or the harmonious and coherent unity of the collectivity results from differentiation. The individuals, who are members of the came collectivity, are not similar, but different. In such a situation, the consensus is achieved precisely because the individual are different. Their interdependence brings them closer and social solidarity is established.

169

In Durkheim's thought, these two forms of solidarity correspond to two extreme forms of social organisation. The division of labour Durkheim speaks about concerns the structure of the society as a whole of with economic division of labour is merely an expresion.

11.5 Property :

Property is one of the basic institutions of society. In everyday speech one thinks of "property" as referring to an object or objects. Strictly speaking, however, property refers not to an object but to the rights than the owner of the object has in relation to others who are not owners of the object. Property rights are backed by the state and enforced through its legal institutions.

Nature/Characteristics of Property

(1) **Transferability.** Property can be transferred by its owner by way of sale, exchange or gift.

(2) **Ownership and possession of Property.** From the legal point of view a distinction can be made between the ownership of property and the possession of the same. Property rights do not guarantee the actual owner always enjoys his properties. Property rights and the actual use of the property do not always go together.

(3) **Property rights are not absolute but only relative.** Property not only confers rights on the owner it may impose duties as well. Further, no society permits unrestricted rights over property.

(4) **Property and Scarcity.** Property exists because resources are very scarce. If resources were to be as unlimited and in exhaustible as the air, nobody would want to claim ownership.

(5) **Property and the power.** The possession of property may mean possession

of power over others. The owership and possession of property help an individuals to exert influence or exercise control over these persons who do not have it.

(6) Tangible and intangible nature of property. The things in which an individual may hold property rights may be both tangible and intangible.

(7) Property and social norms. The institution of property like all other intitutions, is governed by the normative system that regulates the relations between individuals and/or groups. Thus property owners are under the obligation to use property according to social norms. In the same way, these who do not possess a particular property right are under the general right are under the general obligation not to infringe upon the right of the possessor.

11.6   Let us sum up

Thus, economy of the important institutions associated with men since primitive times. It is playing a vital role in the development of human and society.

11.7 Self Assessment Questions

Q1.   Write in detail about origin and development of economic institutions.

_____

_____

Q2.   Discuss the feature of Primitive Economies in detail.

_____

_____

POLITY

Structure

12.1 Introduction

12.2   Objectives

12.1   Power: A Concept

12.2   Perspectives on Power

12.3   i)   Max Weber's View on Power: A Constant-sum view

ii)   Talcott Parson's View or Power: A variable-sum approach to power

iii)   A Marxian perspective on Power

12.4 Authority and its types Traditional

> Authority

> Legal-rational Authority

> Charismatic Authority

12.5   State

12.6   Democracy

12.7   Pressure Groups

12.8   Political Socialization

> Political Parties of Voting Behaviour

> Types of Political Systems

> Polity

12.9   Self-Assessment Questions

12.1 Introduction

The struggle for power and authority inevitably involves politics, which political scientists **Harold Lasswell** (1936) defined as who gets what, when and how. In their study of politics and government sociologists are concerned with social interactions among individuals and groups and their impact on the larger political and economic order.

Politics concerns the means whereby power is used to affect the scope and content of governmental activities. The sphere of the political may range well beyond that of state institutions themselves.

12.2 Power

Power is at the heart of a political system. Power is the ability of individuals or groups to make their own interests or concerns count, even when others resist. According to **Max Weber** power is the ability to exercise one's will over others. To put it in another way, if one party in a relationship can control the behaviour of the other, that individual or group is exercising power. Power relations can involve large organizations, small groups or even people in an intimate association. An individual or group do not hold power in isolation, they hold it in relation to others. Power is therefore power over others.

There are three basic sources of power within any political system—**force, influence** and **authority.**

Force is the actual or threatened use of coercion to impose one's will on others. When leaders imprison or even execute political dissidents, they are applying force. Sociologists often distinguish between two forms of power, authority and coercion.

Authority is that form of power which is accepted as legitimate, that is right and just and therefore obeyed on that basis, whereas **Coercion** is that form of power which is not regarded as legitimate by those subject to it. However, the distinction between authority and coercion is not as clear-cut as the above definitions suggest. It has often been argued that both forms of power are been

ultimately on physical force and those who enforce the law are able to resort to physical force whether their power is regarded as legitimate or not.

Influence, on the other hand, refers to the exercise of power through a process of persuasion. A citizen may change his or her position regarding a supreme court nominee because of a newspaper editorial, the expert testimony of a law school dean before the Senate Judiciary Committee, or a stirring speech at a rally by a political activist. In each case, sociologists would view such efforts to persuade people as examples of influence.

12.3 Perspectives on Power

i) Max Weber's View On Power : A Constant-sum View

Max Weber defined power as "the chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will in a communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action."

Defined thus, power is, therefore power over others and, as such, power is an aspect of social relationships. Nobody can hold power in isolation." This is very broad definition of power since it enters into every aspect of social life. It extends from parents assigning domestic chores to their children to teachers enforcing discipline in the classroom, from a manager organising his work force to a political party enacting legislation. In each case, an individual or a group has power to the degree to which others comply with their will. Many sociologists argue that 'Political
Sociology' is the study of power in its broadest sense."

Weber's definition of power represents a view which is sometimes known as **'Constant-Sum'** concept of power. The reason is that according to Weber's definition, those who hold power do so at the expense of others. If some hold power, others do not. The underlying assumption is that the amount of power is constant.

Talcott Parsons View on Power : A variable-sum approach to power

Talcott Parsons, on the other hand, rejects the 'constant-sum' view of power. In his view, power does not belong to an individual or a group of individuals, but to the society as a whole. This social power is utilised or employed for the attainment of goals of the society, for the furtherance of collective interests. The power of the society is, thus, contingent upon the efficiency of the society in achieving its goals. The greater the efficiency, the greater in the power and vice-versa. This view is sometimes known as a 'variable-sum' concept of power is as much as power is not constant or fixed, but variable is the sense that it may increase or decrease.

A Marxian Perspective on Power

The view that power is a social resource held in trust and applied by those in authority is rejected by Marxist writers. They argue that power is held by a particular group to the exclusion of all others, and applied by this group in furtherance of their class or sectional interest which may conflict with the interest of those who are subject to power. Marxian concept of power is, thus a 'constantsum' concept of power in the sense that the net accretion of power in the hands of the dominant group means a net loss of power for the rest. "This is very different from the picture presented by Parsons' in which rulers of the ruled pull together for the benefit of society as a whole, undivided by any fundamental conflict in interest." From a Marxian point of view, the source of power lies in the economic infra-structure. Force of production determine the relations of production. Those who emerge as economically dominant are able to grab power which they use in furtherance of their interest. According to Marxist theory, power of the ruling class extends beyond specific economic relationships, and pervades the entire superstructure.

12.4 Authority and its types

The term **authority** refers to power that has been institutionalized and is recognized by the people over whom it is exercised. Sociologists commonly use the term in connection with those who hold legitimate power through elected or publicly acknowledged positions. It is important to stress that a person's authority

175

is limited by the constraints of a particular social position. Thus, a referee has the authority to decide whether a penalty should be called during a football game but has no authority over the price of tickets to the game.

Max Weber developed a classification system regarding authority that has become one of the most useful and frequent cited contributions of early sociology. He identified three ideal types of authority :

i) Traditional authority ii)

Legal-rational authority iii)

Charismatic authority

Weber did not insist that only one type of authority is accepted in a given society or particular organization. Rather, all can be present, but their relative importance will vary. Sociologists have found Weber's typology to be quite valuable in understanding different manifestations of legitimate power within a society.

Traditional Authority

In a political system based on Traditional authority, legitimate power is conferred by custom and accepted practice. The orders of one's superiors are felt to be legitimate because "this is how things have always been done." For example, a king or queen is accepted as ruler of a nation simply by virtue of inheriting the crown. The monarch may be loved or hated, competent or destructive ; in terms of legitimacy, that does not matter. For the traditional leader, authority rests in custom, not in personal characteristics, technical competence, or even written law. Traditional authority is absolute in many instances because the ruler has the ability to determine laws and policies.

Legal-Rational Authority

Power made legitimate by law is known as legal-rational authority. Leaders derive their legal-rational authority from the written rules and regulations of political systems. e.g. the authority of the president of the United States and the Congress is legitimate by the American Constitution. Generally, in societies that

are based on legal rational authority, leaders are conceived of as having specific areas of competence and authority. They are not viewed as having divine inspiration as are the heads of certain societies with traditional forms of authority.

Charismatic Authority

Weber also observed that power can be legitimized by the charisma of the individual. The term charismatic authority refers to power made legitimate by a leader's exceptional personal or emotional appeal to his or her followers. Charisma allows a person to lead or inspire without relying on set rules or traditions.

Unlike traditional rulers, charismatic leaders often become well-known by breaking with established institutions and advocating dramatic changes in the social structure and the economic system. The strong hold that such individuals have over their followers makes it easier to build protest movements which challenge the dominant norms and values of a society.

If the charismatic authority is to extend beyond the lifetime of the leader, it must undergo what Weber called the **routinization of charismatic authority**— the process by which the leadership qualities originally associated with an individual are incorporated into either traditional or legal-rational system. Once routinization takes place, authority evolves into a traditional or legal-rational form.

Weber used traditional, legal-rational and charismatic authority as ideal types.

12.5 State :

The state exists where there is political apparatus of government ruling over a given territory, where authority is backed by a legal system and by the capacity to use military force to implement its policies. All modern societies are **Nation-States.** That is, their system of government lays claim to specific territories, possesses formalized codes of law and is backed by the control of military force. **NationStates** have come into existence at various times in different parts of the world. Their main characteristics, however, contrast rather sharply with those of states in traditional civilizations. They are :

177

Sovereignty :

The territories ruled by traditional states were always poorly defined, the

level of control wielded by the central government being quite weak. The notion of **sovereignty**—that a government possesses authority over an area with clear-cut borders, within which it is the supreme power-had little relevance. All nation-states, by contract, are sovereign states.

Citizenship :

In traditional states, most of the population ruled by the king or emperor showed little awareness of, or interest in, those who governed them. Neither did they have any political rights or influence. Normally only the dominant classes or more affluent groups felt a sense of belonging to an overall political community. In modern societies, by contrast, most people living within the borders of the political systems are **citizens**, having common rights of duties and knowing themselves to be part of a nation. While there are some people who are political refugees or are 'stateless' almost everyone in the world today is a member of a definite national political order.

Nationalism :

Nation-States are associated with the rise of nationalism, which can be defined as a set of symbols and beliefs providing the sense of being part of a single political community. Thus, individuals feel a sense of pride and belonging in being British, American, Canadian or Russian. Probably people have always felt some kind of identity with social groups of one form or another—their family, village or religious community. Nationalism, however, made its appearance only with the development of the modern state. It is the main expression of feelings of identity with a distinct sovereign community.

The above mentioned are some of the important characteristics of modern states.

12.6 Democracy :

Democracy in its basic meaning is therefore a political system in which the people, not monarchs or aristocracies, rule. In some societies the officially accepted version of democracy is limited to the political sphere, whereas in others it is extended to other areas of social life.

In **participatory democracy** (or direct democracy), decisions are made communally by those affected by them. This was the original type of democracy practised in ancient Greece. Those who were citizens, a small minority of the society, regularly assembled to consider policies and make major decisions. Participatory democracy is of limited importance in modern societies, where the mass of the population have political rights and it would be impossible for everyone actively to participate in the making of all the decisions that affect them.

While some modern states (such as Britain and Belgium) still favour **monarchs**, these are few and far between. Where traditional rulers of this sort are still found, their real power is usually limited or non-existent. In a tiny number of countries monarchs continue to hold some degree of control over government, but in most cases they are symbols of national identity rather than personages having any direct power in political life. The queen of the United Kingdom, the King of Sweden and even the emperor of Japan are all **constitutional monarchs :** their real power is severely restricted by the constitution, which vests authority in the elected representatives of the people. The vast majority of modern states are republican— there is no king or queen ; almost everyone, including constitutional monarchies, professes adherence to democracy.

Countries in which voters can choose between two or more parties and in which the mass of the adult population has the right to vote are usually called **liberal democracies.** Britain, European countries (Western), US, Japan etc. all fall into this category. Some third world countries, such as India, also have liberal democratic systems.

12.7 Pressure Group or Interest Group:

In order to have an adequate appreciation of the working of governmental machinery in a democratic setup, one should take into account the role of political parties and pressure groups in the political process. Political parties carry on their

activities openly. They publicise their policies of programmes and solicit public support. But pressure groups do not carry on their activities so openly. All their activities are withheld from public view by a veil of secrecy. Naturally, the members of the public are not even aware of the existence of pressure groups. But the influence they exercise over the decision-making process is enormous.

One may identify three distinguishing features of a pressure group :—

i) In the first place, the members who comprise a particular pressure group share similar attitude, common objectives and ideals.

ii) Secondly, they share a common interest which binds the group together.

iii) Thirdly, they exercise indirect pressure upon the departments concerned to influence Government policy concerning their fields of activity to their advantage.

There are two basic differences between political parties and pressure groups :—

i) First, political parties, function in the "pitiless glare of publicity" while pressure groups function in a somewhat secretive manner.

ii) Secondly, political parties aim at capturing political power and at using political power to implement the policies of programmes of the particular party. On the contrary, pressure groups do not have any such political aim. Naturally, they do not join the electoral battle and solicit votes from the electorate.

The modus operandi of pressure groups may be described thus :

i) Pressure groups generally contribute to the election funds of political parties or of a particular candidate. The idea is that when the members or a member would win the election, they are expected to sponsor or support the cause of a particular pressure group. The interest of the pressure group would be represented on the floor of the

legislature by the member or members whose election expenses were met substantially by the pressure group.

ii) It is interesting to note that if a particular political party or a particular candidate on being elected does not assist the pressure group to the extend expected, the latter would contribute to the election fund of another political party or candidate at the next election. Pressure groups generally do not have particular fascination for a particular party or candidate. Their only motive is to further the interest of the group.

iii) Pressure groups also lobby the bureaucrats with a view to exerting indirect pressure at the policy formulation stage. This they do in a very subtle manner.

iv) Pressure groups also attempt at influencing public opinion by recourse to very persuasive media publicity.

It will, however, be wrong to assume that the activities of pressure groups are invariably unethical and contrary to the general well-being of the people. On the contrary, these groups play a positive role.

12.8 Political Socialization :

Political socialization is the process by which individuals acquire political attitudes and develop patterns of political behaviour. This involves not only learning the prevailing beliefs of a society but also coming to accept the surrounding political system despite its limitations and problems. In the United States, people are socialized to view representative democracy as the best form of government and to cherish such values as freedom, equality, patriotism and the right of dissent.

The principal institutions of political socialization are those which also socialize us to other cultural norms—including the family, schools of the media.

Many observers see the family as playing a particularly significant role in the process. "The family incubates political man", observed political scientist Robert Lane. In fact, parents pass on their political attitudes and evaluations to their sons of daughters through discussions at the dinner table and also through the example of their political involvement or apathy. Early socialization does not always determine a person's political orientation ; there are changes overtime and between generations.

The schools can be influential in political socialization, since they provide young people with information and analysis of the political world. Unlike the family and peer groups, schools are easily susceptible to centralized and uniform control ; consequently, totalitarian societies commonly use educational institutions for purposes of indoctrination. Yet, even in democracies, where local schools are not under the pervasive control of the national government, political education will generally reflect the norms and values of the prevailing political order.

In the view of conflict theorists, American students learn much more than factual information about our political and economic way of life. They are socialized to view capitalism and representative democracy as the "normal" and most desirable ways of organising a nation. At the same time, competing values and forms of government are often presented in a most negative fashion or are ignored. From a conflict perspective this type of political education serves the interests of the powerful and ignores the significance of the social divisions found within the United States.

Like the family and schools, the mass media can have obvious effects on people's thinking and political behaviour—this is one reason why the media were included among the agents of socialization. Today, many speeches given by our nation's leaders are designed not for immediate listeners but for the larger television audience. Therefore, television now plays an important role in identifying the leading candidates for each party and narrowing the field of contenders.

Political Parties And Voting In Western Countries :

2

A **political party** may be defined as an organization oriented towards achieving legitimate control of government through an electoral process. In some situations, there may be political organizations which seek to achieve power but are denied the opportunity to do so through orthodox means. Such organizations are best regarded as political sects or movements until they achieve recognition.

In late nineteenth century Germany, for example, the Social Democrats were outlawed by Bismarck. They were an organised political movement, operating outside orthodox channels, but later achieved recognition as a party and have held power for several periods in this century.

Party Systems :

There are many types of party system. Whether a two-party system or a system involving more parties flourishes depends in large part on the nature of electoral procedure in a given country. Two parties tend to dominate the political system where elections are based on the principle of winner-takes-all. The candidate who gains the most votes wins the election, no matter what proportion of the overall vote he or she gains. Where elections are based on different principles, such as proportional representation, two-party systems are less common.

In Western European countries various types of party organization are found, not all of which exist in British politics. Some parties are based on religious denomination, some are ethic parties, others are rural parties, yet others are environmental parties, concerned with ecological objectives.

Socialist or Labour parties have formed governments at some point since world war two in most West European societies. In some countries, the leader of the majority party, or of one of the parties in a coalition, automatically becomes Prime Minister, the highest public official in the land. In other cases (like the United States) a president is elected separately from party elections to the main representative bodies. Hardly any of the electoral systems in western countries are exactly the same as one another and most are more complicated than that of the United Kingdom. Germany can serve as an example.

Systems with two dominating parties, like that of Britain tend to lead to a concentration as the 'middle ground', where most votes are to be found, and exclude more radical views. The parties in these countries usually cultivate a moderate image, and sometimes, come to resemble one another so closely that the choice they offer is slight. A plurality of interests may be represented by each party. Multiparty systems allow divergent interests and points of view to be expressed more directly, and provide scope for the representation of radical alternatives ; on the other hand, no one party is likely to achieve an overall majority. This leads to coalitions which can suffer from an inability to make decisions because of major conflicts, or to a rapid succession of elections and new governments, none able to stay in power for long and thus very limited in their effects.

Voting Behaviour :

The pattern of voting behaviour found in UK before the 1970s—the committed loyalty to one or other of the two main parties—came to be known as **partisan alignment.** The idea of partisan alignment presumed that social class was the most important influence on voting behaviour and that the voters 'identified' with one party or the other. In other words, they thought of themselves as either 'Conservative' or 'Labour'.

The correlation between class and voting has become distinctly more fuzzy today. In addition, a much higher proportion of voters now claim to be influenced in their voting behaviour by the policies and outlook of the parties, rather than giving one or other their unswerving loyalty. This is a process, therefore, of partisan dealignment—a move away from consistent party identification. Voters, now tend to vote for whatever party they see as best supporting their interests.

Types of Political Systems :

The evolutionary sociologists all made a distinction between those societies which had, and those which had not, a political system, but they made it in different ways and they diverged in their accounts of how the state originated. Spencer distinguished in his category of **'Simple Societies'** some which had no

headship and others which had only occasional or unstable headship. It was only at the stage of 'doubly compound societies' that any elaborate political organization was to be found.

Hobhouse distinguished between three types of society characterized by different fundamental social bonds : kinship, authority and citizenship. In a later work, he studied more closely the institutions of primitive societies, and demonstrated a correlation between the level of economic development, increasing social differentiation and the emergence and consolidation of a regular political authority.

Thinkers distinguish between different kinds of political systems. Long back Aristotle introduced a sixfold classification of political system. Kingship (Monarchy) and Tyranny (rule by one); Aristocracy and Oligarchy (rule by a few) and Polity and Democracy (rule by many).

Max Weber was of opinion that the type of the political system depends upon the nature of its legitimacy. Legitimacy rests on three factors :

i)   Tradition

ii)   Exceptional Personal Qualities or Charismatic Personality and

      iii) Legality.

T. B. Bottomore makes a distinction b/w three kinds of political systems:

i)   Political system of tribal societies which are slowly getting modernised and industrialized. (e.g. African Societies)

ii)   Political systems in non-industrial countries of ancient civilizations which are being industrialised after emancipation from colonial and autocratic rule.

iii) Political systems of the industrial societies. Here two major types of political systems can be witnessed :

 a)   Democratic—Capitalist or Democratic—Socialist.

b) The Communist—Totalitarian including other kinds of totalitarianism.

i) **Political system of tribal societies which are slowly getting modernised and industrialised:** There are tribal societies, mainly in African countries which are being modernized under Western influence on the lines of Western Political institutions. It is difficult to say how far this kind of modernisation process would help to keep in check the tribal feuds and establish national unity and cohesion on a firm foundation. Africa was parcelled out among colonial powers according to their needs and convenience. As a consequence, particular tribe has been distributed among three or four neighbouring nation-states. Thus, these African societies faced, in addition to the challenge of bringing about rapid economic advance and ensuring economic well-being to the vast majority of the population, the uphill task "of consolidating a national community formed out of tribal groups whose existence within their frontiers is in some measure the result of the arbitrary division of Africa among the colonial powers."

ii) **Political systems in non-industrial countries of ancient civilizations which are being industrialized after emancipation from colonial and autocratic rule :** Another type of political situation obtains in those developing countries of ancient civilisation which are attempting to modernise their societies after emancipation from foreign rule. Apart from the newly independent states of Africa which have already been discussed above, the Asian states and the Latin American states fall under this category.

These are some political conditions and problems which are common to most, if not all, of there developing countries. Some of these problems are : (i) the problems of establishing altogether a new political system based principally on western political institutions, (ii) devising appropriate governmental machinery for the purpose of bringing about rapid economic growth and (iii) effecting, as rapidly

as possible, general improvement in the standard of living of the common people.

These developing countries face a number of difficulties in implementing the aforesaid programmes of work. In most of these countries, the political institutions which have been set up on the western model are not working as well as is expected because the people of these countries have not been able to develop the appropriate political culture. Social institutions in the form of kinship system, patterns of families, class divisions and above all, traditional outlook on life do not favour smooth functioning of a modern political system. These factors are also very conducive to the growth of work culture. As a consequence thereof, economic growth is halting.

iii) Political systems of the industrial societies :

In the third category are included industrially advanced countries of Europe, North America, Australia, Japan, etc. Here a distinction should be made b/w two types of political systems obtaining in countries under this category : the democratic—socialist countries on the one hand and communist countries on the other.

The general political characteristics of the modern industrial societies of the first type are :

i)   the existence of a nation-state as the political movement.

ii)   the election of the political executive by universal adult suffrage, and

iii) the administration of public affairs by a large bureaucracy.

The most important characteristic of the industrial societies of the second type is the existence of a single party which monopolises political power. "The situation is justified in terms of Marxist theory and the expression of social unity resulting from the elimination of antagonistic social classes. The dictatorship of

the party is equated with the dictatorship of the proletariat in a transitional period during which the foundations of the ultimate classless society are being laid." It is argued on the basis of Marxist theory that after the establishment of the classless society, the state will 'wither away'. On the contrary, the coercive power of the state in communist societies has vastly increased. The suppression of dissident opinion in the Soviet Union and countries of Eastern Europe is an evidence of this development. Voices are raised, not infrequently, against too much concentration of power, particularly in countries of Eastern Europe. A development of far-reaching importance in communist societies is the experiment launched in China in terms of giving private enterprise a pivotal role in the economic field, both in agriculture and is industry.

12.9 Self-Assessment Questions

Q. 1.   Define power and explain Variable-Sum Approach to Power.

_____

_____

Q. 2.   Explain authority and the types given by Weber.

_____

_____

Q. 3.   Explain the following :

i) Pressure Groups

_____

_____

ii) Political Socialization.

_____

_____

Q. 4.   Explain in detail the different types of Political Systems.

RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY

Structure

13.1   Objectives :

The main objectives of this lesson is to understand:

·   the relationship between individual and society

·   the various theories concerning about the origin of society

·   the nature of society

·   and finally the views of various thinkers on the nature and origin of society and its formation.

13.2   Introduction:

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. It is within us as well as around us.

There is a vast literature on the questions such as the nature or 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. Our essential theoretical understanding of individual and society, then, is the understanding of a relationship – a relationship involving those processes that operate between man and man and between man and group in the constantly changing pattern of social life. Society with all the traditions, the institutions, the equipment it provides is a great changeful order of social life, arising from the psychical as well as the physical needs of the individual, an order wherein human beings are born and fulfill themselves with whatever limitations and wherein they transmit to coming generations the requirements of living.

13.3   Sociality of Man:

Aristotle once said that man is a social animal. It is this proposition which 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 important 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 us 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, infect, 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 i.e. the person and the group, the individual and the collectivity.

18.4   Theories Concerning the Nature of Society :

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.

(ii) The Organismic Theory.

13.4.1 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 though 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 :

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 neighbors 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 prounce on the other with all its ferocity.

Since the conditions in the state of nature were intolerable of 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 agreement was of each with all and of all with each. This 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.

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, good will, 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". Hence 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 was known as "social contract" by Locke.

Locke made it clear that the social contract later on contributed to the governmental control. The governmental contract was made by the society when it established a government and selected a ruler to remove his inconveniences of "ill condition".

193

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) :

Rousseau, the French writer of the 18th century, in this 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 virtues. Man enjoyed a pure, innocent life of perfect freedom and equality in the state of nature. 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. Simplicity and idyllic happiness disappeared. Families were established, institutions of property emerged and human equality was ended. Difference between, stronger and weaker, rich and poorer, arose.
Man began to think in terms of 'mine' and 'thine'.

Criticism:

The theory of social contract has been widely criticized on the basis of following points:

1) The theory seems to be a mere fiction.

2) The theory is far away from facts.

3) The advocates of the theory hold that the early individuals entered into the contract for their individual safety and security. But history tells us the other way. Every Jaw was more communal than individual. Every man was born into his family and into his status in society.

4) Conception of natural rights and natural liberty as is said to have existed in the state of nature is illogical and fallacious.

13.4.2. The Organismic Theory of Society:

This theory can be dated back to Plato and Aristotle. Plato compared society and state to a magnified human being. He divided society into three classes of rulers, the warriors, and artisans based upon the three faculties of the human soul, that is wisdom, courage and desire. Aristotle drew a comparison between the symmetry of the state and symmetry of the body and firmly held that the individual is an intrinsic part of society. The parallelism between an individual organism and social organism has been worked out to the minutest possible extent by Bluntschli and Herbert Spencer during the recent times. The organic theory considers society as a unity similar to that which characterizes a biological organism. The union of individuals forming the society has been described as similar to the union between the several parts of an animal body, where in all parts are functionally related. Just as the body has a natural unity, so has a social group. The animal body is composed of cells, so is the society composed of individuals and as is the "relation of the hand to the body or the leaf to the tree, so is the relation of man to society. He exists in it and it in him."

The ancient and medieval writers had merely drawn an analogy between the society and an organism. They held that the society resembled an organism. But writers of the 19th century regarded the society as an organism. They tried to analyze the structure of function of society in comparison with those of an organism.

Views of Herbert Spencer:

Spencer is the chief exponent of this theory. He said that society is an organism of 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. 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 effects the health and proper functioning of other organs, similarly, individuals who form society are in separably connected with one another for the realization of their best self. There is so much dependence of one on the other than 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.

Spencer gives sticking structural analogies between society and organism. He says, society too, has three systems corresponding to the:

1) The sustaining system

2) The distributary system

3) The regulatory system.

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 all the alimentary organs of a society.

2) The distributary system in an organism consists of the blood vessels, hart, arteries and veins and they carry blood to all parts of the body. Means of communication and transport and along with them the wholesalers, retailers, bankers, railway and steam shipmen and others may correspond to thee 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.

2

3) Finally, the regulating system is the 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.

Marry 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 grows 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. 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 world. Limbs separated from body have no life, and similarly individuals separated from society have no life. The individuals exist in and within society.

- **Criticism**

The analogy used here to compare society with an organism, has its own limitations. Even Spencer was aware of these. He himself noted some of the defects of this analogy such as the following:

1) A society has no specific form comparable to the body of an individual.

2) The units of a society i.e. individuals are not fixed in their respective positions like those of an individual organism.

197

3) The units of a society are dispersed persons and are not physically continuous like cells of the individual.

4) Society has no 'common censoring', no central organ of perception and thought as an individual has.

5) The proposition that society is like an organism is acceptable with some reservations, but the assertion that society is an organism, is rather misleading.

6) The process of growth of society and that of an organism is also not similar.

13.5   Let us sum up

Therefore the question of the nature of society is closely connected with the question of the relationship of man and society. Human life and society almost go together. 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 exists.

13.6   Suggested Readings

1. Abraham Francis, *Contemporary Sociology: An Introduction to Concepts and Theories,* Oxford University Press, 2006.
2. MacIver and Page, *Society: An Introductory Analysis,* Macmillan India Limited, 1988.
3. Inkeles Alex, *What is Sociology?* Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, 1999.
4. Kar, Parmal.B, *Society: A study of Social Interaction,* Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1994

13.7   Self-Assessment Questions

1.   What is the relationship between individual and society.

_____

_____

2.   Discuss the various theories regarding the origin of society. Explain in detail any one.

_____

_____

3.   Explain in detail the views of Herbert Spencer regarding the nature of society.

_____

_____

NORMS AND VALUES, CULTURE

Structure

14.1   Objectives

After going through this topic, the students should be able:

1) Understand the meaning of Social Norms

2) Different types of Norms.

3) To understand various functions of Norms

4) To understand meaning of Values

5) To know various characteristics of Values

6) To five an understanding of types of values

14.2   Meaning of Norms

"A norm is a shared expectation of behavior that connotes what is considered culturally desirable and appropriate." According to Oxford Dictionary of sociology (1994). The term norm refers to that which is most common, or that which is 'normal'. For sociologists, norm means any shared standard of behavior which in turn entails certain expectations of behavior in a given situation. As such, that which is normal is not necessarily normative. Haralambos defines it as "a norm is a specific guide to action acceptable and appropriate behavior in particular situation."

The term 'social norm' is relatively a newcomer to the dictionary of sociology. M.sherif in 'The Psychology of Social Norms', 1936 used the term for the first time to describe the common standards or ideas which guide members' responses in all established groups." Social norms" refer to group-shared standards of behaviour. Norms represent "standardized generalizations" concerning expected modes of behaviour. They are based on social values. A norm is a pattern setting limits on individual behaviour. In simple terms, norms are guidelines which direct our conduct in particular situation. They are similar to rules and regulations in being prescriptive, although they lack the formal status of rules. These rules or norms specify how people should and should not behave in various situations. Laws, dress codes, rules of sports and games-all express social norms. For instance, norms of dress provide guidelines for what to wear on particular occasions.

Norms are established standard of behaviour maintained in a society. "Thou shall not kill" is a norm found almost in every culture. We typically expect that people will be quite in the theatre hall while the film is shown. Norms are relative. In different societies, there can be different norms for some particular behaviour. Even in one society, the norms may differ from community to community. They are not static, but change from time to time and society to society.

14.3   Types of Norms

Norms can be classified in many ways but the most important distinction is between prescriptive and proscriptive norms. A *prescriptive norm* is positive in form and spells out forms of behaviour which role-players are expected to follow. *A proscriptive norm* is one which directs a role-player to avoid or abstain from certain activity. The latter tend to be more inflexible in that behaviour is defined as either complaint or deviant, whereas prescriptive norms involve behavioural degrees of conformity. Some sociologists see norms as either formal or informal. *Formal norms* have generally been written down and involve strict rules for punishment of violators. Laws are an example of formal norm. *Informal norms* are generally understood but are not precisely recorded. Standard of proper dress is a common example of informal norm. Norms are also classified by their relative importance to society. When classified in this way, they are known as mores, folkways and customs. Some writers have also included law in the category of norms. This typology is distinguished by the intensity of feelings they arouse and the consequences that flow from violations of them. Kingsley Davis has given an exhaustive list of social norms as under:

· Folkways

· Mores

· Laws (customary and enacted laws)

· Institutions

    · Custom, morality and religion

    · Conventions and etiquette

2

· Fashion and fad.

Social norms, in the sense of shared standards have great power to motivate behaviour. Societies exist because through the internalization of norms, human agents monitor their behaviour in anticipation of sanctions, i.e. reward and punishment from other social actors.

14.4 Functions

Social norms perform the following main functions:

1. They direct, regulate and control human behaviour. The process by which norms and other behavioural regulators are transformed into personality elements is called socialisation.

2. They help in satisfying our social needs.

3. They help in establishing social order by mitigating tensions and conflicts in society.

4. They act as measuring scale to evaluate social behaviour.

5. They act as ideals and objectives in certain situations.

6. They help in predicting behaviour.

14.5 VALUES

More generally, all sociology is concerned with value issues, and many of the classical writers-most notably Emile Durkheim and Max Weber-discussed the role of values in social research at some length. At this more philosophical level, the issues for sociology would seem to be twofold. First, since society itself is partially constituted through values, the study of sociology is in part the study of values. Second, since sociologists are themselves members of a society and presumably hold values (religious, political, so forth), sociological work may become embroiled in matters of value-or even (as Marxists might put it) matters of ideology. Indeed, some have argued that, for this reason, sociologists may be incapable of the value-neutrality expected of scientists more generally. (Oxford dictionary of Sociology, 1998; pp. 689).

Generally, values has been taken to mean moral ideas, general conceptions or orientations towards the world or sometimes simply interests, attitudes, preferences, needs, sentiments and dispositions. But sociologists use this term in a more precise sense to mean "the generalized end which has the connotations of rightness, goodness or inherent desirability". These ends are regarded legitimate and binding by society. They define what is important worthwhile and worth striving for. Sometimes, values have been interpreted to mean "such standards by means of which the ends of action are selected". Thus, values are collective conceptions of what is considered good, desirable, and proper or bad, undesirable, and improper in a culture.

According to M. Haralambos (2000), "a value is a belief that something is good and desirable". For R.K. Mukerjee (1949) (a pioneer Indian sociologist who initiated the study of social values), "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. Familiar examples of values are wealth, loyalty, independence, equality, justice, fraternity and friendliness. These are generalized ends consciously pursued by or held up to individuals as being worthwhile in them. It is not easy to clarify the fundamental values of a given society because of their sheer breadth.

14.6   Characteristics

Values may be *specific,* such as honoring one's parents or owning a home or they may be more *general*, such as health, love and democracy. "Truth prevails", "love the neighbour as yourself', "learning is good as an end itself' are a few examples of general values. Individual achievement, individual happiness and materialism are major values of modern industrial society.

Value systems can be different from culture to culture. One may value aggressiveness and deplores passivity, another the reverse, and a third gives

2

little attention to this dimension altogether, emphasizing instead the virtue of sobriety over emotionally, which may be quite unimportant in either of the other cultures. This point has very aptly been explored and explained by Florence Kluchkhon (1949) in her studies of five small communities (tribes) of the American south-west. One society may value individual achievement (as in USA), another may emphasize 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. Often, this characteristic of values brings conflict between different communities or societies or sometimes between different persons.

Most of our basic values are learnt early in life from family, friends, neighbourhood, school, the mass print and visual 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.

14.7   Types of Values

Values can be classified into two broad categories:

1) Individual Values

These are the values which are related with the development of human personality or individual norms of reorganization 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 sociable ness are known as collective values.

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

Intrinsic Values

These are the values which are related with goals of life. They are sometimes known as ultimate and transcendent values. They determine the schemata of human rights and duties and of human virtues. In the hierarchy of values, they occupy the highest place and superior to all other values of life.

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.

14.8   Importance and Functions of Values

Values are general principles to regulate our day-to-day behaviour. They not only give direction to our behaviour but are also ideals and objectives in themselves. Values deal not so much with what is, but with what ought to be; 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. He also stressed that values enable individuals to feel that they are part of something bigger than themselves. Modern sociologist E. Shils (1972) also makes the same point and calls 'the central value system' (the main values of society) are seen as essential in creating conformity and order. Indian sociologist R.K. Mukerjee (1949) writes: "By their nature, all human relations and behaviour 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. The influence people's behaviour 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 behaviour.

14.9   Norms and Values

Both terms – norms and values – are at many times used interchangeably in our day-to-day discourse. But social scientists use them in a specific sense. Social norms are standards, rules, guides and expectations for actual behaviour, whereas values are abstract conceptions of what is important and worthwhile. Honesty is a general value; the expectation of what is important and worthwhile. Honesty is a general value; the expectation that students will not cheat or use such material forbidden by the codes in the examinations is a norm. Values are general guidelines, while norms are specific guidelines. Values are general standards, which decide what is good and what is bad. Norms are rules and expectations that specify how people should and should not behave in various social situations. To confirm to a particular value of a society, there can be many norms. Norms link values with actual norms. In brief, values are ends while norms are means to achieve these ends. Sometimes, the values and norms of a society conflict with each other. The change in one element of material culture (mechanization of

agriculture) may sometimes conflict with the associated aspect of non-material culture (system of joint family or collective living).

Though there is a difference between norms and values, still, there is often a direct relationship between values, and sanctions of a society. For example, if a society highly values the institution of marriage, it may have norms and strict sanctions which prohibit the act of adultery and allow divorce only in hard cases. If a society views private property as a basic value, it will probably have stern laws against theft and vandalism. The most cherished values (right of life) of a society will receive the heaviest sanctions (capital punishment), whereas matters regarded as less critical will carry light and informal sanctions.

14.10 Let us sum up

Each individual develops his or her own personal goals and ambitions, yet each culture provides a general set of objectives for its members. Values are these collective conceptions of what is considered good, desirable, and proper-or bad, undesirable, and improper-in a culture. They indicate what people in a given culture prefer as well as what they find important and morally right (or wrong). Values may be specific, such as honoring one's parents and owning a home, or they may be more general, such as health, love, and democracy. Values influence people's behaviour and serve as criteria for evaluating the actions of others. There is often a direct relationship between the values, norms, and sanctions of a culture. For example, if a culture highly values the institution of marriage, it may have norms (and strict sanctions) which prohibit the act of adultery. If a culture views private property as a basic value, it will probably have laws against theft and vandalism. The values of a culture may change, but most remain relatively stable during any one person's lifetime. Socially shared, intensely felt values are a fundamental part of our lives in the United States.

14.11 Suggested Readings

1. MacIver, R,M and C.H. Page (1950), 1974, **Society: An Introductory Analysis,** Macmillian India Limited, New Delhi.

2. Bottomore, TB, !962 '**Sociology: A Guide to Problems and Literature'** George Allen and Unwin Ltd. (Blackie and sons (India), Ltd. Bombay, 1986) Rawat, H.K 2007 **'Sociology'** Rawat Publications, New Delhi.

3. Rao, C.N.Shankar, **Sociology: Primary Principles,** S.Chand & Company Ltd., New Delhi (1990), 2001.

14.12 Self-Assessment Questions

Q1.   Give the meaning and definition of Norms.

_____
_____
_____
_____

_____

Q2. Give the functions of Values?

_____

_

_____

___

_____

___ Q3.   Give the relation between Norms and Values?

_____

_

_____

_____

_____

_____

SOCIALIZATION: MEANING & CHARACTERISTICS

Structure

15.1   Objectives:

The main objectives of this lesson are:

- the meaning of socialization
- the various agencies involved in the process of socialization
- the various stages of socialization

15.2   Introduction:

Culture is a key concept in both sociology and anthropology. What distinguishes man from non-man in his possession of culture which is the result of communal living? Culture shapes our values, beliefs, norms and to a great extent, our attitudes and the way one perceives the world around them. Every society has a unique culture which guides its members. How we dress, what language we speak, what and how we eat, how we greet one another, and what structures and institutions we build are determined by our culture. Culture is always transmitted from one generation to the other. The process by which it is done is known as socialization. A new born individual, an unsocialised organism, is moulded by the society into a socialized individual. What is transmission of culture from the point of view of society as a whole is socialization from the point of view of the individual.

15.2   Meaning of Socialization:

Socialization is the process by which individual learns the culture of their own society. Socialization is a life long process which enables the individual to learn the content of his culture and the many behavioural patterns of the group to which he belongs.

The process and effects of socialization are most pronounced in early childhood when the family consciously or unconsciously teaches the child certain types of behaviour as well as beliefs. Toilet training is often a deliberate process. Regardless of where we live, we all are products of socialization. Human beings are social animals and we need socialization to learn the cultural and behavioural patterns of the group to which we belong. Socialization makes us aware of who we are, what we believe and how we do things. Socialization is the only way by

211

which an individual can become a full member of the society. It is the only way we can transmit our social heritage from one generation to the next.

15.3   Agents of Socialization:

The process of culture transmission is a fascinating story. Individuals acquire the culture of their society through participation in a variety of groups and institutions. From his family the child learns the first words of his language, religion and several role definitions. But the family cannot teach everything. At every stage of life we learn new rules and behaviour patterns as we interact with others. The primary agents of socialization are the family, peer group, the school and mass media.

15.3.1 The Family :

The family is the most important institution of primary socialization. Since children spend their early years under the care and protection of the family. They acquire a large part of their values beliefs and knowledge from the parents. Indeed, it is membership in a family that gives the child his first social identity. Family is the source of the first set of values, beliefs and attitudes. This explains why children who grow up in different cultures think and behave differently. Families confirm and perpetuate caste identity, religious traditions and kinship obligations. Hence, the process of socialization begins in the family.

15.3.2 Peer Groups :

Peer groups consist of people of almost the same age who share similar interests. The first peer group is, of course, the neighbourhood play ground; children who hand out together, in the neighbourhood and play different games. They sometimes spend more time among themselves than with members of the family. They swim in the river, play cricket in the local school yard, or simply hang out together. Participation in such groups gives the child an important social identity.

Later in life peer groups become more influential in school and the work place. Unlike the neighbourhood play groups where peers were simply there, in the school the child gets to choose his own friends. The influence of the peer

group continues in the workplace. The office norm, or the unwritten rules of behaviour, is a product of peer socialization. For example, in an industry or in a government office, there is often this shared understanding that a honest day's work is not necessary, and the peers frown upon people who are eager to complete the task in a timely fashion. At the same time friends in the workplace can help individuals tide over many life crises such as domestic problems, divorce, accidents and death.

15.3.3 The School :

The school is the first formal agency which exposes the child to the rules of the larger society. Here the child learns to recognize and obey rules, practice skills and relate to people in positions of authority. Children learn to behave in group settings, sit quietly and listen to teachers, participate in social vents, and accept responsibilities. The school plays the most significant role in the development of social and intellectual skills and acquisition of society's cultural heritage. It is not only arithmetic but for the transmission of the accumulated social heritage of the community. Education refines social skills and frequent interaction with peers and teachers help in the formation of a healthy social identity. The school also teaches civic sense, patriotism and pride in the nation's shared heritage. Above all, education is supposed to foster critical thinking so that individuals can think for themselves and become creative and productive members of the society.

15.3.4 The Books:

In literate societies another important agency of socialization is the printed word in books and magazines. Our cultural world experiences and knowledge, values and beliefs, superstitions and prejudices – is expressed in words. The words are always written by someone and these people too-authors and editors and advertisers – join the teachers, the peers and the parents in the socialization process.

15.3.5 Mass Media:

In contemporary society, mass media play a significant, although subtle,

role in the socialization process. Mass media refers to all instruments of communication such as television, radio, newspapers, magazines, movies and records. Television has become by far the most influential medium in recent years. With the growth of the cable industry and numerous private television channels, people have a choice. The role of television is very significant as it communicates directly to both our ears and eyes and thus leaves a strong impression.

Studies in America show that pre-schoolers of young children spend almost one third of the day in front of the television studies have also shown that exposure to violence in the media can contribute to aggressive behaviour, insensitivity to violence, night mares and feelings of insecurity. Many of the movies and video games are full of violence. In India, parents are more likely to regulate children's viewing of television and violent movies.

15.4   Stages of Socialization:

Socialization is, in essence, nothing but learning to participate in social roles. The most important things to be internalized are the social roles themselves. At each stage of socialization, the child internalizes a system of roles, and not just one role.

We may discuss briefly four stages of socialization:

The First Stage or the Oral Stage:

In the womb the foetus is warm and comfortable. At birth, the baby faces his first crises: he must breathe, he must exert himself to be fed, and he is susceptible to cold, wet and other discomforts. During the first stage of socialization, he seeks to establish what is called oral dependency. By his cries he is able to build up fairly definite expectations about feeding time of also about his pressing needs for care. At this stage, the baby is not involved in the family as a whole. He is rather involved only in the sub-system consisting of him of his mother. At this stage, the baby does not seem to internalize any role at all. By the time oral dependency has been established, his own role and that of his mother are probably 'merged' together.

This is the stage, according to Freud, of "primary identification".

The second stage or the anal stage:

This stage probably begins soon after the first year and extends up to the third year. This period is called anal stage because toiler training is the main focus of attention of the socializing agent, particularly mother. During this stage, the child internalizes two roles his own and that of his mother. These two roles are now clearly separated. The child not only receives care, he also receives love and gives love in return. During this stage, the child is taught as to how to discriminate between correct and incorrect behaviour, first by advice and\or hints given by the mother and, secondly, by being rewarded or appreciated for correct performance and not rewarded or appreciated for incorrect behaviour.

The Third Stage:

This stage extends from the fourth year to puberty (i.e. age of 12 or 13). In the course of the third stage, the child becomes a members of the family as a whole. He identified himself with the social role ascribed to him on the basis of his biological sex. Identification means either of two closely related things:

(i)   One identified with a social role, i.e. one not only internalizes the role but adopts it as one's own.

(ii)   One identifies with a social group, i.e. one internalizes the role system of the group and considers oneself a member of it.

Identification in the first sense links a boy with his father and brothers, but not with his mother. A girl, on the other hand, identifies with her mother and sisters, but not with her father.

Identification in the second sense links a boy or a girl with the family, including both parents and all siblings. There are, thus three kinds of identification:

(i)   With the father or mother, as the case may be.

(ii)   With the siblings.

(iii)   With the family as a member.

The Fourth Stage: Adolescence:

Adolescence, which begins roughly at puberty, is the age during which the young boy or girl has a tendency to get away from parental control. The "crisis" of this age arises from the fact the adolescents hanker after greater freedom while there is parental control over many activities in which he loves to have his own way.

The strain involved in transition during the adolescent period depends upon the cultural definition of adult roles. In some societies, vital decisions concerning adolescents are taken by the parents or guardians. That makes transition easier. In India it is so. Thus, the choice of a marriage partner is made by elders within conventional rules. In some others, particularly in western societies, adolescents are required to take important decisions more or less on their own. Obviously in such cases, transition is somewhat different and puts strain on them.

15.5   Let us sum up

Therefore every society has a unique culture which guides its members. The process by which it is done is known as socialization. What is transmission of culture from the point of view of society as a whole is socialization from the point of view of the individual.

Socialization is a life long process which enables the individual to learn the content of his culture and the many behavioral patterns of the group to which he belongs. Human beings are social animals and we need socialization to learn the cultural and behavioral patterns of the group to which we belong. Socialization makes us aware of who we are, what we believe and how we do things. Socialization is the only way by which an individual can become a full member of the society. It is the only way we can transmit our social heritage from one generation to the next.

15.6   Suggested Readings

1. Abraham Francis, *Contemporary Sociology: An Introduction to Concepts*
2. *and Theories,* Oxford University Press, 2006.
3. MacIver and Page, *Society: An Introductory Analysis,* Macmillan India Limited, 1988.
4. Inkeles Alex, *What is Sociology?* Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, 1999.
5. Kar, Parmal.B, *Society: A study of Social Interaction,* Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1994.

15.7   Self-Assessment Questions

Q1.   Define Socialization. Discuss the various agencies of socialization.

_____

_____

Q2.   What are the various agencies of socialization? Discuss in detail any two.

_____

_____

217

SOCIAL CONTROL

Structure

16.1   Objectives

16.2   Introduction

16.3   Definitions

16.4   Functions

16.5   Forms of Social Control

16.6   Agencies of Social Control

16.7   Let us Sum up

16.8   Suggested Readings

16.9   Self-Assessment Questions

16.1   Objectives

The main objectives of social control may be stated as under:

- To regulate the individual behaviour and avoid clash in the society

- To maintain and re-establish the social order.

- To establish unity and solidarity among the members.
- To ensure the continuity of the group or the society.
- To secure members conformity to the group expectations.
- To bring society's recalcitrant and deviant members back into the line.
- To check cultural degeneration and social disintegration.

16.2 Introduction

In very simple terms, "the system or the organization by which the social relations or behaviour is controlled is called social control".

The words 'control' may refer to two types of acts:

(1) To an act of controlling or

(2) To the process ,technique, device by means of which changes in the behaviour is affected

As applied to human relationships, the terms may carry either of these meanings. Sociologist are generally interested in social controls (second meaning of control) rather than in act of controlling. Not all controls in human society is social; it is physical in so as the relation between persons is purely external. It is social to the extent that it involves communication. The control becomes social only when it brings modification in behaviour resulting from act of communication and not from arbitrary applications of physical force.

16.3   Definitions

According to Roucek (social control, 1947) "social control is a collective terms for those processes, planned or unplanned, by which individuals are tough, persuaded, or compelled to conform to the usages ,and life- values of groups".

Maclver (1946) observes, "social is control is the way in the which the entire social order coherers and maintains itself how it operates as a whole , as a changing equilibrium".

Parsons (1951) defined it as "the process by which, though the imposition of sanctions, deviant behaviour is counter acted and social stability is maintained".

Horton and Hunt (1964) state: "Sociologists use the term social control to describe all the means and process whereby a group or a society secures its members' conformity to its expectations".

In the words of Peter L. Berger (Invitation to Sociology, 1963), "social control refers to various means used by a society to bring its recalcitrant members back into line"

According to Roberts (1991) "the term social controls refers to the techniques and strategies for regulating human behaviour in society".

In Oxford Dictionary of Sociology (1994), "social control refers to the social process by which the behaviour of individuals or groups is regulated".

For Bottomore (1962), "the term social control refer to the social regulation of human behaviour". In the end , we conclude this with the definition of Gillin and GIllin (1948), which is quite exhaustive and easy to understand: "Social control is the system of measures, suggestions , persuasions , restraint and the coercion by whatever means including physical force – by which a society brings into conformity to the approved pattern of behaviour of a sub –group or by which a group moulds into conformity its members ."

All above definitions of social control emphasize on three things (1) it is a system of devices or process or means techniques through which (2) society brings its recalcitrant or deviant members back into the line and (3) forces them to conform to the accepted standard behaviors.

What there is the need of social control? Many explanations have been given for this question. Generally, it is said that to satisfy peacefully the basic drives of humans – sex, shelter (security) and hunger- some kind of regulation is needed. This regulation put check on the individual desires of persons so that they cannot fulfill them they way they wish (as we see in animals). Human being have to adhere to certain norms (folkways, mores, rules and regulation of the groups) to satisfy their wants (needs and desires) without any clash. Thus, for the mutual welfare and wellbeing, some kind of control (inner as well as external, i.e., social control) is an almost necessity. Through social control, personal, cultural, and social malarrangements are properly balanced and the struggle among the manageable extent. According to Gillin and Gillin (1948) the main among which is the social equilibrium necessary for the continued existence of society.

2

Functionalists contend the people must respect social norms of any group or society is to survive. They stress that order is necessary for effective social life. In their view, societies literally could not private conduct. To maintain unity, stability, continuity and the balance in the group of society, some kind of social control is needed. By contrast, conflict theories are concerned benefit the powerful and work to disadvantage of other groups. Marxists argue that not only does the law protect the powerful and perpetuate inequality but people have unequal access to the law.

16.4   Functions

The major functions of social control are:

(1)   It forces persons to get obeyed social decisions

(2)   It maintains the equilibrium and stability in the society

(3)   It helps in the choosing behaviour and fulfilling one's desire for social status.

(4)   It helps in proper socialisation of the individual

(5)   It helps in performing social roles.

(6)   It helps in mitigating and tensions and conflict among members

(7)   It breeds conformity in society.

Social control operates at three levels:

(i)   Group over group

(ii)   Group over its members

(iii)   Individuals over their fellow members.

Thus, social control takes place when a person is induced or forced to act according to the wishes of others, whether or not in accordance with his own individuals interests. It operates on the basis of the individual's desire for social status, induces him to conform to group standards of conduct whatever his

personal inclinations or situational temptations. Social control occurs on all levels of society – in his family, in the peer groups, in bureaucratic organization and in the government of every society.

16.5   Forms

Analyses of forms of social control differ. Different authors have used different terminology to refer different forms of social control as we see in the following table

Authors	Forms of Social Control
E.A.Ross	Formal and Informal
C. H. Cooley and Barnard	Conscious and Unconscious
Karl Manheim	Direct and Indirect
Kimball Young	Positive and Negative
Gurvich and Moore	Organiesd, Unorganised, and Autonomous
R. T. Lapiere	Authoritarian and Democratic
Horton and Hunt	Planned and Unplanned

The common distinction is between the formal (repressive or coercive) and the informal (persuasive or softer) forms of control. It has the universal sanction and liked by many sociologists. Social control may be positive or

negative, i.e. consisting in rewards or punishment and repressive measures respectively. Similarly, social control may be planned (deliberate) or unplanned (incidental). If it is planned it may be either formal (organized) or informal (unorganized)

Informal and unplanned (incidental) control

Informal social control as the term implies, is used by people casually .Norms are enforced through the informal sanctions. These norms include folkways, customs, mores, values, conventions, fashions and public opinion etc. Ritual and ceremony also act as instruments of informal control. But ceremony plays a less important role in modern society then in the traditional societies .Informal control often takes the form of a look, nudge or frown which says "behave you" or "get into line".

Methods and techniques of informal control are numerous .They vary the purpose and the character of the group in question .For example, in a homogeneous rural community ,the gossip may be a potent means of enforcing conformity but would be of little important in the personal life of a metropolis like Mumbai. They also vary greatly from one social situation to another .They are positive and negative both. Awards, prizes wealth and power over others are examples of positive control through physical medium. Gossip ,smile praise ,persuasion ,badges and   titles are example of positive control by symbolic means .Negative social control is represented by satire ,laughter, raining of an eyebrow, opprobrium, name calling, negative gossip and ridicule threats ,physical torture and ostracism etc. Words and phrases (epithet, watchwords and slogans) are other means of informal control .They serve as collective representations symbolizing the emotional attitudes of the group.

The above techniques of informal control are typically employed with in primary group such as families; Individuals learn such techniques early in their childhood socialisation to cultural norms –folkways, mores, values, etc. Other than the family, these methods and techniques are also exercised by personal friends, colleagues and co-workers at the workplace.

Informal social control is based on their popular belief that "the all –seeing eyes of gods are everywhere". It acts as mores (a controlling device). A belief in spiritual persons, who are omnipresent and omniscient, introduces an imagined presence which serves as a powerful controlling device.

Formal and planned (deliberate) control

Informal methods of social control are not adequate in enforcing and conforming of obedient behaviour in all cases and in every situation. It can serve as last resort when socialisation and informal sanctions do not bring about desired result. In secondary groups and mass society where relations between individuals are impersonal, the primary group controls are not so effective .Control is then exercised through, government, courts police, military, administrators, corporate managers and bureaucrats etc. There are formal controls of licensing boards ,professional organization and trade unions also .As against the informal social controls which grow out of necessities of the group or the society and which are the created and imposed by man themselves .But ,these are less powerful forms as they are not based on human instincts and basic necessities of life. Thus, they have not much importance in primary groups .Only one example will suffice to clarify this point .The law banning child marriage was passed as early as in 1929 in India but the thousands of child marriages are still performed on a single auspicious day of Akshay Tritiya .Thus, laws are not all powerful .Laws which go against widespread customs are unpopular, such as prohibition of gutka (mixture of tobacco and flavored betelnut) become difficult to enforce.

16.6   Agencies of Social Control

There are many means of social control. They work either severally or simultaneously to maintain social order. Bottomore (1962) has enlisted them as the agencies of social control. On the above analysis of forms of social control, the agencies of social control may be grouped into two classes:

a)institutional

b)   non-institutionalInstitutional Agencies:

Political institutions- state, law and government

Religion

Marriage, home and family

Education

Social Classes

Non-institutional Agencies:

Ideologies, legends and myths

Beliefs, ceremonies and rituals

Art and literature

Folkways, customs and mores

Leadership

Violence and terror

16.7   Let us Sum Up

In this lesson we discussed that a society have social order if it is to function smoothly. But no society succeeds in getting all its members to behave as expected all the time. When a person fails to conform to the social norms of society, social deviation arises. If societies are to survive, they must have ways of making people conform to social norms. This situation gives rise to different types of controlsplanned and unplanned or persuasive and coercive.

16.8 Suggested Readings

MacIver, R.M and C.H. Page (1950), 1974, **Society: An Introductory Analysis,** Macmillian India Limited, New Delhi.

Bottomore, T.B., !962 '**Sociology: A Guide to Problems and Literature'** George Allen and Unwin Ltd. (Blackie and sons (India), Ltd. Bombay, 1986) Rawat, H.K 2007 **'Sociology'** Rawat Publications, New Delhi.

Rao, C.N.Shankar, **Sociology: Primary Principles,** S.Chand & Company Ltd., New Delhi (1990), 2001.

16.9 Self Assessment Questions

Q1   Give the types of Social Control.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q2   Define Social Control and also the nature of social control.

_____

_____

_____

_____

SOCIAL CHANGE

Structure

17.0   Objectives

17.1   Introduction

17.2   Meaning of Social Change

17.3   Nature and characteristics of Social Change

17.4   Analysis of Social Change

17.5   Different perspectives on Social Change in Sociology

17.6   Types of Social Change

17.8   Let us Sum up

17.9   Self-Assessment Questions

17.10   Suggested Readings

17.0 Objectives

After going through this lesson, you should be able to:

- Know the meaning of social change.
- Understand the nature and characteristics of social change.
- Make an analysis of social change
- Understand different perspectives on social change.

17.1 Introduction

Social change is a necessary, inevitable and a continuous process as no society, however primitive or archaic stays the same way for very long. Therefore, the study of 'Social Change' constitutes an important subject matter of sociology.

In this lesson we begin by knowing the meaning of social change its nature and characteristics and then go on to have an understanding of how we can proceed with an analysis of social change and what are the different perspectives on social change in sociology.

17.2 Meaning of Social Change

'Social Change' broadly refers to an alteration in society or any social institution that acquires a new and different meaning in the given context. As society is a complex and dynamic entity, defining 'social change' becomes a difficult task. Morris Ginsberg (*Essays in Sociology and Social Philosophy, 1986*) defines social change as follows. "By social change, I understand a change in social structure for example, the size of a society, the composition or balance of its parts or the type of its organization. The term social change must also include changes in attitudes and beliefs in so far as they sustain institutions and change with them. In this definition, Ginsberg emphasizes two types of changes. One, changes in the structure of society and two, changes in the values and social norms which bind the people together and help to maintain social order. These two types of changes should not, however, be treated separately because a change in one induces change in the other. For example, a change in the attitude of the people may bring about change in the social structure.

Some sociologists lump together these two types of changes under the category of 'cultural change' : Kingsley Davis (**Human Society**, 1948) for instance, defines social change thus : "By social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organization, that is, the structure and functions of society. Social change and their forms only part of what is essentially a broader category called 'cultural change.' The latter embraces all changes occurring in any branch of culture, including art, science, technology, philosophy etc. as well as changes, in the forms and rules of social organization".

Thus, all social changes are cultural changes but all cultural changes need not necessarily be the social changes also. Cultural changes can be called social changes only when they affect human relations and social organizations causing variation in them. For example, changes in the musical styles, painting styles,

2

rules of writing poetry and drama etc., represent cultural changes. They are purely cultural changes and cannot be called social changes, because they do not in any way affect the existing pattern of human interactions, social system and social organisation. On the other hand, the rise of organized labour in the capitalist society and the introduction of communism in the place of democracy, represent social change. These two changes may cause a series of changes in human-relations and social organization. They represent a basic alteration in the relation of employer and employee, rulers and the ruled. They may contribute to the changes in the economic organization, methods of administration, legislations, economic policies and programmes and so on. These may in course of time affect the way of life of people and qualify to be called cultural change.

Cultural change is thus much broader than social change. No part of culture is totally unrelated to the social order, but it remain true that changes sometime occur in these branches without noticeably affecting the social system. Sociologically, therefore, we are interested in cultural change only to the extent that it arises from or has an effect on social organisation. Davis, despite maintaining the difference between the social and cultural change concedes that the two are related and a clear-cut distinction between them is difficult to maintain. Social change should therefore, be interpreted to mean both a change in social structure and a change in any branch of culture.

According to MacIver and Page (***Society: An introductory Analysis***, ed. in English, 1950) "social change refers to a process responsive to many types of changes; to changes in the man-made conditions of life, to change in the attitudes and belief of men, and to the changes that go beyond the human control to the biological and the physical nature of change." In this way MacIver and Page include wide spectrum of areas of social change.

From the meaning and definitions of social change, thus stated, we can delineate the characteristics of social change.

17.3 Nature and Characteristics of Social Change

1. Social Change is continuous: Society is not static but always in flux. The changes in society cannot be stopped and therefore, social change is a continuous on-going process.

2. Social Change is Temporal: Change occurs through time. Social change is temporal in the sense it denotes the time sequence. As MacIver and Page say, "It is a becoming, not a being; a process, not a product." Innovation of new change, modification and renovation of the existing behaviour and the discarding of the old behaviour patterns take time. But the mere passage of time does not cause change, as in the biological sense.

3. Social Change is Environmental: Social change must take place within a geographic or physical and cultural context. Both these context have impact on human behaviour and human beings in turn change or recreate them. Social changes never take place in vacuum.

4. Social Change is Human change: The sociological significance of change consists in the fact that it involves the human aspect. The composition of society is not constant but changing. The fact that people effect change and are affected by it makes change extremely important.

5. Social Change results from interaction of a number of factors: A single factor may trigger a particular change, but it is always associated with other factors. The physical, biological, technological, cultural and other factors may be together bring about social change. This is due to the mutual interdependence of social phenomenon.

6. Social Change may create chain reaction: Change in one aspect of life may lead to a series of changes in its other aspects. For example, change in the rights and privileges of women have brought about a series of changes in home, in society, at the workplace and in their overall development and empowerment.

7. Social Change involves rate and direction of change: In most discussions of social change, some direction is assumed. This direction is most necessary

inevitable. Sometimes, the direction is determined ideally. Change towards such a destination is more appropriately regarded as progress. In actual terms social change may tend towards any direction. The rate of change is not governed by any universal laws and varies considerably from time to time and society to society depending upon its nature and character.

8. Social Change may be planned or unplanned: The direction and rate of social change are often conditioned by human engineering. Plans, programmes and projects may be launched by people in order to determine and control the rate and direction of social change. Unplanned change refers to change resulting from natural calamities such as famines and floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruption etc.

9. Short versus long run change: Some social changes may bring about immediate results while some other may take years and decades to produce results. This distinction is significant because a change which appears to be very vital today may be nothing more than a temporary oscillation having nothing to do with the essential trends of life.

10. Social Change is an objective term: Social change is understood to be an objective term in the sense it has no value judgement attached to it. To the sociologist, social change as a phenomenon is neither moral nor immoral, it is a moral *i.e.* study of social change involves no value judgement. It is ethically neutral. One can study change even within the value system without being for or against the change.

17.4 Analysis of Social Change

A Sociological analysis of social change requires a model consisting of important questions more than general theories and perspective. The major questions to be outlived for this model have also done by Gerth and Mills ("*Character and Social Structure 1954*") are:

    (i)   What is that changes?

    (ii)   How does it change?

(iii) What is the direction of change?

(iv) What is the rate of change?

(v)   Why did change occur or why was it possible?

(vi) What are the principal factors in social change?

The analysis of these questions is extremely important in the study of social change to make possible the formulation of problems as well as the systematic presentation of results.

While dealing with the first question, according to Bottomore (**Sociology**, 1962), it is important to define social change as a change in social structure or in particular social institutions or in the relationship between institutions, *i.e.* what is that changes? The second question- how does it change? It focuses on the manner in which change takes place, for instance, is it slow and gradual in an evolutionary or reformative manner or it is sudden and fast as in the case of a revolution. Discussion on the direction of change, the third question suggests trend and state of any institution or group or any unit under study. For example, the diminishing size of family, increasing competition and the division of labour and increasing rate of divorce etc. On a more wider scale one can analyse the direction of change through the change taking place—for example in British Welfare State or in India after independence, or more recently, on the state of terrorism after September eleven incident in the USA.

The fourth question that of rate of change has always been of interest to the sociologists who focus on the acceleration of social and cultural change in modern times. W.F. Ogburn (**Social Change**, 1922) was one of the first to examine the phenomenon systematically and to undertake quantitative studies of the rate of change, especially in the sphere of technological innovations. Ogburn also focussed attention upon the discrepancies between the rates of change in different sector of life giving his hypothesis of 'cultural lag' which is concerned with disharmony between the rapid economic growth and slower transformation of social institutions. Such studies have acquired greater importance in the present context with increasing industrialization and urbanization and more currently globalization.

2

The problem of why change occurred, the fifth question is closely linked to the sixth question that deals with the general problem of the factors in social change. This also leads to complex issues concerning social causation. Causes of social change, single or in combination are also understood as factors of social change and would be discussed in detail in lesson IV.

Check Your Progress - I

Q. 1 What are the major questions that must be included in any model for studying social change.

_____

_____

_____

Q. 2 What is the relevance of focussing on these questions? Why and how are questions dealing with manner, direction and rate of change are important.

_____

_____

_____

17.6 Different Perspectives on Social Change in Sociology

The analysis and explanation of social change occupy an important place in the sociological tradition. Different sociologists gave their own perspectives to explain social change. Some of the important perspectives are evolutionary or lineal, cyclical, functionalist and materialistic.

Many things that are experienced as permanent features of social features (e.g. sustained existence of a nation) may in fact require ongoing change and may be called linear, or evolutionary. To give an extreme explanation of linear view, it can be said that social phenomena in a society continue to persistently move in a particular direction never faltering and without repeating themselves over or infinite period of time. These theories posited an evolution of society, but their

233

emphasis was on progress. Writers such as Spencer, Darwin, Comte, Karl Marx and Durkheim belonged to this school. They charted the course of human evolution through well-marked stages registering increasing progress (S.C. Dube, **Understanding Change**, 1992)

Auguste Comte (1798-1857) proposed a theory of evolutionary social change, dividing it into three stages of thought: the theological (religious) the metaphysical (philosophical focussing on abstract thinking) and positivist (scientific). According to Comte, societies in the supernatural or religious stage are more primitive than societies in the positivist stage.

Evolutionary theories in general focussed on the point that human societies evolve from simple, homogeneous, non-specialized cultures into complex, heterogeneous, specialized cultures (Herbert Spencer), from 'barbarism' to 'civilized' (Lewis Henry Morgan), from animistic to polytheistic to monotheistic (Edward Taylor); and from communities bound together by tradition and affection (Gemeinschaft) to those characterised by non-emotional objectivity (Gesellschaft) (Ferdinand Tonnies).

Karl Marx, (1818-1883) gave a different perspective on evolution. According to him, as societies develop, people can lose control over what they have produced through their own activities. In the capitalist societies of the west, alienation of a worker would be most unlike in the stage of primitive communism. Marx proposed an alternative evolutionary view which incorporated a cyclic view as well, He believed that society would evolve thorugh a series of cycles of revolution, equilibrium and new revolution- to a point at which all people would live together in peace based on equality of ownership in the means of production.

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) claimed that the increased specialization and individualism of modern life would result in growth, but not necessarily growth for the better. Instead, he foresaw an increasing breakdown in collectivism and solidarity as societies become more complex, more specialized and more fragmented resulting in the state of anomie, unless alternative systems and institutions are not build-up.

Another perspective is the cyclical perspective, which focuses on the point that social phenomenon of whatever form repeat again and again over a span of time in enactly the same way and shape as they were before. This view germinated from the disallusious that the stage of modernity, rationality and development brought in, (as shown by Durkheim) unlike what evolutionists thought was a better stage. Sorokin, Spencer and Toynbee were the main advocates of the cyclical perspectives of social change.

Sorokin (*Social and Cultural Dynamics* 1937-1941) presented a broad three-fold typology of cultures : Sensate culture (things readily accessible to senses) Ideational culture (things available to the spirit) and Idealistic culture (representing a combination of the two.) In the cyclical change, an alteration takes place between these three with the Sensate and the ideational extremes being inherently temporary, one giving way to the other with a brief intervening period of the Idealistic. Oswald Spengler (**Decline of the West**, 1918) and Arnold Toynbee (**Study of History**, 1934-39 and 1954) both developed a theory of growth and decline of civilizations that suggest cyclical motion. Toyanbee believed that a civilization grows when it responds creatively to the challenges of its minorities and declines when the leadership cannot respond. Spengler associated change in culture with that of seasons of the year and the aging of nature. Among many sociological perspectives for the explanation of social change, two conflicting options have risen to the forefront: the functionalist and the materialist. The functionalist perspective, as seen in the works of Durkheim, Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, Parsons and Merton, emphasizes that each social institution fulfils a function relative to other social entities. Societies undergo a gradual and adaptive changes by maintaining equilibrium. Many sociologists have criticized functionalists for their inability to explain change.

The materialistic interpretation, as envisaged by Marx in historical perspective, focusses on the point that the production and ownership of goods determine social relationships, contradiction and finally change. These views will be discussed in detail in lesson III and IV (see 'International Encyclopaedic of Sociology. Vol II, Ist. Indian ed., 2002)

Check Your Progress : 2

Q. 1 What are different perspectives of social change and who are their main proponents.

_____

_____

_____

Q. 2 What do you understand by linear and cyclical perspective of social change.

_____

_____

_____

17.7 Let Us Sum Up

In this lesson we discussed the meaning, nature and characteristics of social change. By this we came to know not only what social change is, but also how and in what way it is different from other changes. Through this lesson, we were able to understand the model or the framework of sociological analysis consisting of some important questions to be dealt with in the study of social change. This helps us not only to understand how change takes place, but also how we should study the process of social change. Views of different sociologists helped us to understand the different perspectives on social change and also why this is such an important topic in the field of sociology.

17.8 Suggested Readings

1. Bottomore, T.B., _Sociology_: **A Guide to Problems and Literature**, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1962.

2. Davis, Kingsley, _Human Society_. Macmillan International Edition, London 1970 (1948).

3. Dube, S.C., *Understanding Change : Authropological and Sociological Perspectives,* Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1992.

4. *International Encyclopedia of Sociology*, S. Chand & Company Ltd., New Delhi, 2000, Vol. II.

5. MacIver, R.M. and C.H. Page, *Society : An Introductory Analysis,* Macmillan India Limited, New Delhi, Ist Indian Ed. 1974 (1950).

FACTORS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Structure

18.0   Objectives

18.1   Introduction

18.2   Economic Factor of Social Change

18.3   Technological Factor of Social Change

18.4   Cultural Factor of Social Change

18.5   Demographic Factor of Social Change

18.6   Geographic Factor of Social Change

18.7   Let Us Sum Up

18.8   Self-Assessment Questions

18.9   Suggested Readings

18.0   Objectives

After going through this topic, the students should be able to.

1.   Know the different factors of social change.

2.   Understand how these factors affect social change.

3.   Develop an in-depth knowledge of how factors of change like economic, technological, cultural as biological, demographic and geographic operate in society.

18.1 Introduction

In this lesson we would study the factors of social change. So far, we have dealt with the meaning and definition of social change, types of social change as well as change in structure and structural change. We know that social change is the change in social structure, particularly in social institutions or in relationships between the institutions. In a way, we have already focussed on what is that changes as well as how it changes. An important question which remains to be answered in detail is—why did change occur or why was it possible? This question is closely linked to the question—what are the principal factors in social change?

This lesson aims to provide an in-depth understanding and analysis of these factors and their significance for the study of social change. These factors include economic, technological, cultural, biological, demographic and geographic. Each of them will be taken-up separately, though in reality they overlap and do not exist in isolation.

18.2 Economic Factor of Social Change

Economic factor of social change is an important determinant of social change in society. In this are included aspects such as income, property wages, capital, production, labour, *i.e.* all such aspects which determine the economic factor or the economy, well-being and standard of living of the people. Change in any one of these separately or in combination leads to change in society.

Karl Marx, among others has been the most important figure who focussed on the economic factor to explain social change. According to him, the prime mover of change is the economic infrastructure consisting of forces and relations of production. The change in infrastructure brings about corresponding change in the superstructure consisting of political, judicial and religious institutions. The super structure seeks to sustain the infra-structure, on which it is founded, but when contradictions are produced in the latter because of technological development and other factors—the system in general has also to change. Changes in the forces and relations of production, thus, are the motivating force for changes all around.

Marx's theory sought to explain significant change in the types of social systems through which human kind appears to move from slavery to feudalism, from feudalism to capitalism and from capitalism to socialism. Marx's interpretation is often criticised for being economic deterministic and also for considering infrastructure, economy as the base completely changing the super structure. However, the explanation is very much sociological as well, as it explains change in terms of the processes of social systems. For Marx, economic infrastructure or mode of production consists not only of ownership of means of production, but also of relations of production which is of great importance in determining any change in the economic infrastructure. It can however, be said that inner contradictions at the economic level give rise to ideologies and politics that bring about change. But it can also be argued that ideological commitment and revolutionary politics are preconditions of economic change. (S. C. Dube, *Understanding Change*, 1992, Ch. 3)

However change in the mode of production as the source of social change is only one aspect of economic factor. Changes in the land ownership for example, due to land reforms in India, granting share in parental property to women according to the Hindu succession Act, 1956, work participation and employment of women outside the house are, a few cases of change in the economic factor responsible for bringing about change in the society and its institutions like the caste system or the family.

18.3 Technological Factor of Social Change

Technology is a systematic knowledge which is put into practice, *i.e.* to use tools and run machines to serve human progress. Technology is a product of civilization, a result of an attempt by human beings to satisfy their wants and fulfil their needs through interaction with the environment.

There has been a tremendous change in technology since invention of locomotives in the beginning of the 19th century to the present age of globalization and spread of information technology. This rise and spread of new technologies have brought in considerable changes in society, especially in the new forms of social relations and cultural patterns. There are for instances technological changes, introduced in agricultural economy, which have influenced

agrarian class relations as well as gender relations within and outside the family. Technological advancement in the field of reproductive technologies has not only affected demographic transition but has also given women choice to control their fertility affecting power relations.

For some thinkers, like Karl Marx, Thorstein Veblen and Ogburn to an extent, technology is the sole explanation of social change. Marx's theory has been explained above in which be regarded change in mode of production as the main source of change in the entire society. This mode of production consists of forces of production, much of them including technology, machines, tools, raw material etc. It is these forces of change that change faster than relations of production, bringing about contradiction and later conflict and change in society. In every stage that Marx's talk about from ancient, to feudal or capitalist to socialist, the stage of technological development determines the mode of production and the relationships and institutions that constitute the economic system.

Thorstein Veblen (***The Theory of Leisure Class***, 1922) who is regarded as a technological determinist argues that in human life, the great agencies of habituation and mental discipline are those inherent in the kind of work by which men live and particularly in the kind of teaching which that work involves. Here, above all, must be sought the influences which shape men's thoughts, their relations with one another, their culture and institutions of control. Habituation is the great moulder of the minds as well as the bodies of men. 'The way of habit is the way of thought'.

According to Veblen, man has certain derives or instincts and these may be regarded as constants, but the habits to which they prompt vary according to the varying opportunity for expression according to the material environment. It is thus the difference in environment which explains the difference in the social structure. A genetic inquiry into institutions will address itself to the growth of habits and conventions as conditioned by material environment and by innate and persistent propensities of human nature. Thus, Veblen points out to the fact that the forces which have shaped the development of human life and of social structure are no doubt ultimately reducible to terms of living tissue and material

environment. In his own words, 'Any community may be viewed as an industrial or economic mechanism, the structure of which is made up of what is called its economic institutions. These institutions are habitual methods of carrying on the life process of the community in contact with the material environment in which it lives. (MacIver and Page, *Society*, 1950, Ch. 25)

Ogburn (*Social Change*, 1922) and his associates popularized the concept of 'Cultural Lag' which suggested that inventions are incorporated into a culture in two stages. In the first, behaviour is changed bit by bit to accommodate the invention and in the second, institutions and belief systems are changed to permit the fullest scope of the invention. The time between the first and the second stage is the cultural lag, which also accounts for general features of society such as tensions and conflicts (S. C. Dube, *Understanding Change*, 1992, Ch. 3) Ogburn thus tries to show the change in society brought in through gap between what can also be said material and non-material culture as a result of the introduction of some technological invention. It is technological progress which produces rapid changes in the material aspects of culture and non-material aspects are not able to keep pace them, hence the 'lag' and also the associated problems.

MacIver and Page prefer to use the term 'technological lag' in a situation where any one of the interdependent functions within a technological process fails to achieve or maintain the degree of efficiency for its harmonious co-operation with the rest, so that the productivity of the whole process is impaired, retarded or blocked at this point. An example is the industrial 'bottleneck', or the failure of the management to maintain overall efficiency when a corporation expands in scale. Another term 'technological restraint' is used where the introduction of more efficient instruments, methods, or agencies, or the utilization of more efficient products is impeded by controls designed to protect some established interest. The example can be seen in the restraint determined by bureaucratic interest where the inertia, tradition or prestige of an established order possesses the introduction of more efficient methods or techniques. (MacIver and Page, *Society*, 1950, Ch. 26)

Thus, we can say that change in technology and its various parts bring

about change in society. Not only does technology brings change for example in culture producing lag between its material and non-material aspects, but also within technology itself, whether in the form of 'lag' or 'restraint.'

Check Your Progress - I

1. Write in brief Veblen's contribution to the explanation of technological factor of social change.

    _____

    _____

    _____

2. Explain Ogburn's concept of 'Cultural Lag' in relation to change in technology.

    _____

    _____

    _____

3. Explain the concepts 'Technological Lag' and 'Technological Restraint' with examples.

    _____

    _____

    _____

18.4 Cultural Factor of Social Change

Culture is understood to be that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. We have already seen that culture and social factors are closely related. There is an intimate connection between our belief and our institutions, our valuations and social relations. Certainly, all cultural change involves social change.

243

Culture, besides material, consists of non-material aspects as well. It has already been shown that how with the change in material culture, which Ogburn terms, adaptive culture, change slowly producing a phenomenon of cultural lag. Culture also acts as 'restraint' to material culture, or more appropriately to technology. Besides cultural lag and cultural constraint, MacIver and Page also talk about 'culture clash' and cultural ambivalence. This term is used to denote the conflict of opposing value schemes, creeds, or ways of life when these are brought into contact inside the same community. The fear of an alien technology is not simply a fear that it will disturb the old values; it is also a fear that it will introduce alien values, different standards and different goals.

'Cultural ambivalence' refers to the phenomenon when the individual is subjected, especially in the formative stage of life, to the counter demands of clashing culture patterns and he may fail to achieve an adequate personal accommodation. He undergoes a process of cultural denudation and cannot reconcile in his behaviour the opposing demands. Such situation comes with people of a particular cultural background brought up in a totally different culture.

Max Weber has made an important contribution to the study of culture as determinant source of social change. The best known on sociology of religion is seen in his study *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, (1904-05). In this book be showed the relation between protestant ethic, mainly Calvinist, and the spirit of capitalism. Weber argued that the elective affinity between the two was responsible for the rise of capitalism in Western Europe, something which was missing in other parts of the world. Thus there was a close relationship between a type of religious form and economic system that set in the process of social change.

Weber's contribution is considered to be a significant one as it did not like many other showed that religious and cultural factors were impediments to economic development, but that they facilitated the process of transformation. In the context of the Indian society, one can see that despite the situations of cultural lag, restraint, clash on cultural ambivalence, culture in many ways has adapted itself to new kinds of economic and technological changes.

Check Your Progress - II

1. Explain the concept of 'culture clash' and 'cultural ambivalence' with examples.

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Briefly outline the contribution of Max Weber to the theory of cultural change.

   _____

   _____

   _____

18.5 Demographic Factor of Social Change

The study of demography includes the following. First to ascertain the total population within a prescribed geographical area; two, to find out as to whether the population in particular period or year has increased or declined as compared to a base period or year; third, to analyse the probable reasons for the increase or decline of population, and fourth, to indicate, in the context of the aforesaid data, the future trend of population. Changes in population composition and size, thus, result in change in society and are studied under the demographic factor of social change.

A change in population of any area depends upon factors such as birth, death and migration. Fertility which depends on the birth rate, mortality, which is based on the death rate and migration, or movement of people from one area to another are all to a great extent socially determined and socially determining (Kingsley Davis, **Human Society**, 1970). For instance, fertility, which means the actual number of children a woman has, is determined by the kind of society which allows freedom of choice to women, and which in turn affects the

upbringing and growth of children. Similarly, mortality is determined by social factors as provision of better health facilities and nutrition, which in turn determine the quality of life of women and children. Migration also results from various 'push' and 'pull' factors that operate in a given condition and have important social implications, both at the place of origin and at the place of migration. The change in size and composition of the population thus leads to change in society and on the economic and social life of the people. If affects the resources of society as such as the social attitudes and social relationships. With lesser population, one can meet better standard of living and more economic parity, can be ensured. The lower birth rate, (*i.e.* better utilization of birth control measures) along with lower death rate (which means better utilization of medical facilities) is the recent and more developed stage in the theory of demographic transition. This stage is reached after the two stages, first, characterized by high birth rate and death rate (balance in population mainly through natural selection) and second, by high birth-rate and low death-rate (which speaks of population explosion and various problems associated with a huge number). Equally important is the control on morality rates, both child and maternal, that speaks not only of better medical facilities, but also better standard of living and more freedom of choice in social life.

In this sense, demographic factors are important sources of bringing about change in society and their understanding helps us to understand various related issues and associated problems and what steps can be taken to resolve them.

18.6 Geographic or Physical Factor of Change

The geographic or physical factor consists of the surface of the earth, climate, rainfall, rains, mountains, natural vegetation, forests, animal life, minerals, etc. They have a profound influence upon the human society. Various cultures and civilizations have known to flourish or decline due to physical factors. The establishment of cities and villages are known to be dependent on geographic or physical factors. At the polar regions, and in the deserts, there can be no cities, or at least a very limited population, and changeless stabilities are maintained. Indo-Gangetic plain on the other hand is a fertile land wherein a population of significant size and density live.

The types of surface not only determine the size and density of population but also economic and social life of the people. Communities earlier live along the coast line have fishing as their main occupation, their entire social life is centred on its production and use. The people who live on mountainous region or in forest are several tribal groups whose economy depends upon forest and social life on patterns very different from caste society.

The slow geographic changes as well as the occasional convulsions in the form of storms, famines and floods, cyclones, hurricanes and earthquakes result in significant changes-sometimes very drastic. The great volcanic eruption of Yokohama in Japan in 1923 was responsible for the new kind of architecture in Japan. It is said that the ancient civilization of Egypt, Mesopotamia and Indus valley withered away due to devastating bad climate. However, certain changes in the environment may be attributed to human activity. For example, social impoverishment has taken place in south Italy, Greece, Palestine, Egypt and Morocco. The desert wastes of North Africa were once green and well-populated.

Man has disturbed the ecological balance by exhausting minerals, destroying the forests and devastating the land and by the mass killing of the child life. The modes of culture and the whole system of social institutions have undergone, modifications, consequently, the centres of population, the routes of trade, the seats of empire and the structures of societies have been vastly affected. (C.N.S. Shankar Rao, (1990), 2001, Ch. 36)

18.7 Let Us Sum Up

In this lesson we outlined several factors responsible for bringing about social change. To understand and analyse social change these factors were considered important as they not only suggested different realms in which social change took place, but helped in knowing as to why did the change occur in society. It dealt with the question of not only how but why also, providing a sufficient cause for the process of social change. This lesson provided the linkages between various factors of social change like economic, technological, cultural, demographic and physical. The lesson focussed on how they were responsible in bringing about change in society and how the process of social change in turn affected these factors.

18.8 Self-Assessment Questions

18.9 Suggested Readings

1. Kar, Primal, B., *Society: A Study of Social Interaction*, Jawahar Publisher and Distributors, New Delhi, 1994.
2. MacIver, R.M. and C. H. Page, *Society: An Introductory Analysis*, Macmillan India Limited, New Delhi, (1950), 2001.
3. Rao, C.N. Shankar, *Sociology: Primary Principles*, S. Chand & Company Ltd. New Delhi (1990), 2001.

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

Structure

19.0   Objectives

19.1   Introduction

19.2   Definitions of Stratification

19.3   Universality of Social Stratification

19.4   Characteristics of Social Stratification

19.5   Origin of Social Stratification

19.6   Social Stratification and mobility

19.7   Functions of Social Stratification

19.8   Let us sum up

19.9   Self -Assessment Questions

19.10   Suggested Readings

19.0   Objectives

After going through this lesson the learners will be able to understand:

- Concept of Stratification
- Characteristics of Social Stratification
- Social Stratification and Mobility

19.1 Introduction

Differentiation is the law of nature. True, it is in the case of human society. Human society is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. Men differ from one other, in many respects. Human beings are equal so far as their bodily structure is concerned. But the physical appearance of individuals, their intellectual, moral, philosophical, mental, economic, religious, political and other aspects are different. 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.

Society Compares and Ranks Individuals and Groups: Members of a group compare different individuals, as when selecting a mate, or employing a worker, or dealing with a neighbour; or developing friendship with an individual. They also compare groups such as castes, races, colleges, cities, athletic teams. These comparisons are valuations, and when members of a group agree, these judgements are social evaluations.

All societies differentiate members in terms of roles and all societies evaluate roles differently. Some roles are regarded as more important or socially more valuable than others. The persons who perform the more highly esteemed roles are rewarded more highly. Thus stratification is simply a process of interaction of differentiation whereby some people come to rank higher than others.

19.2 Definitions of Social Stratification

1.   *Ogburn and Nimkoff*: "The process by which individuals and groups are ranked in a more or 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 positions that are unequal with regard to power, property, social evaluation, and or psychic gratification."

4.   *Lundberg*: "A stratified society is one marked by inequality, by differences among people are evaluated by them as being lower and higher".

5.   *Raymond W. Murry*: "Social stratification is a horizontal division of society into high and lower social units".

19.3 The Universality of Social Stratification

Social stratification is ubiquitous. In all societies there is social differentiation of the population by age, sex, and personal characteristics. The roles and privileges of children differ from those of adults; and those of good hunters or warriors differ from those of the rank and file. It is not customary to speak of a society as stratified if every individual in it has an equal chance to succeed to whatever statuses are open. Strictly speaking, there are no purely equalitarian societies, only societies differing in degree of stratification. Even Russia which dreamt of a 'classless society' could not, any more than any other society, escape the necessity of ranking people according to their functions. The criterions of rank have changed along with values of society. ***P.A. Sorokin*** wrote in his '*Social Mobility*' that '*Un-stratified society with real equality of its members* is a myth which has *never realised in the history of mankind*.'

- **Social Differentiation and Stratification**

As it is clear from the above, all societies exhibit some system of hierarchy whereby its members are placed in positions that are higher or lower, superior or inferior, in relation to each other. The two concepts - '*social differentiation*' and '*social stratification*' - are made use of to refer to such classification or gradation and placement of people in society. In differentiation

society bases status on a certain kind of trait which may be (i) *physical or biological* such as skin-colour, physical appearance, age, sex, (ii) *social and cultural* such as differences in etiquettes, manners, values, ideals, ideologies, etc. Thus, differentiation serves as a sorting process according to which the people are graded on the basis of roles and status.

Stratification tends to *perpetuate* these differences in status. Hence, through this process people are fixed in the structure of the society. In some cases, [as it is in the case of caste] status may become hereditary. Differentiation may be considered the first stage preceding stratification in society, sorted and classified into groups. It does not, however, mean that all differentiation leads to stratification in society.

19.4 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 recognised 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) 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 and archaeological records, stratification was present even in the small wandering bands. Age and sex were the main criterion of stratification then. '*Women and children last*' was probably the dominant rule of order. Difference between the rich and poor, powerful and humble, freemen and slaves was there in almost all the ancient civilisations. 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 not's evident everywhere. Even in the 'non-literate' societies stratification is very much present. As Sorokin has said, all permanently organised groups are stratified.

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, merchant's farmers and the soldiers and so on. Class, caste and estate seem to be the general forms of stratification to be found in the modern world. But stratification system seems to be much more complex in the civilised societies.

5.   It is Consequential. The stratification system has its own consequences. The most important, most desired, and 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 styles'. 'Life-chances' refer to such things as infant mortality, longevity, physical and mental illness, childlessness, marital conflict, separation and divorce. 'Life-styles' 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.

253

19.5 ORIGIN OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

There are two no main theories, concerning the origin of "social stratification": (i) theory of economic determinism of Karl Marx, which is often referred to as the conflict theory, and (ii) the functionalist theory.

(i) Theory of economic Determinism or the Conflict Theory

According to Marx, economic factors are responsible for the emergence of different social strata or social classes. Therefore, social classes are defined by their relation to the means of production (i.e., by their ownership or non-ownership). Thus, there are, in every society two mutually conflicting classes- the class of the capitalists and the class of the workers or the rich and the poor. Since, these two classes have mutually opposite interests, conflicts between the two are inevitable Marx maintained.

Gumplowicz and Oppenheimer and others have argued that the origin of social stratification is to be found in the conquest of one group by another. The conquering group normally dominates the conquered. The conquered group is forced to accept the lower status and lower class life. C.C.North also has expressed more or less the same opinion.

(ii) Functionalist Theory

Kingsley Davis, P.A. Sorokin, MacIver and others have rejected the conflict theory of Marx Soronkin maintained that conflict may facilitate stratification but has never originated it. He attributed social stratification mainly to inherited individual differences in environmental conditions.

Kingsley Davis has stated that the stratification system is universal. According to him, it has come into being due to the functional necessity of the social system. The main functional necessity is "the requirement faced by any society of placing and motivating individuals in the social structure...." Social

stratification is an unconsciously evolved device by which societies ensure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons.

The Conflict Theory of Marx emphasises conflict between large and stable groups, with strong community sentiments, while the Functional Theory emphasises the integrating function of social stratification based upon individual merit and reward. Both have their own merits and demerits.

19.6 SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

- **Meaning of Social Mobility**

Individuals are normally recognised through the statuses they occupy and the roles they enact. Not only the society is dynamic but also the individuals are dynamic. Men are normally engaged in endless endeavour to enhance their statuses in society, move from lower position to higher position, secure superior job from an inferior one. For various reasons people of higher status and position may also be forced to come down to a lower status and position. Thus, people in society continue to move up and down the status scale. This movement is called 'social mobility'.

'Social mobility' may be understood as the movement of people or groups from one social status or position to another status or position. For example, the poor people may become rich, the bank peons may become bank officers, farmers may become ministers, a petty businessman may become an industrialist and so on. At the same time a big businessman may become a bankrupt and the ruling class may be turned out of office, and so on.

Kinds of Social Mobility

Social Mobility is of two types:

(i)   Vertical Social Mobility

(ii)   Horizontal Social Mobility

(i)   Vertical Mobility refers to the movement of people of groups from one status to another. It involves change in class, occupation or power. For example, the movement of people from the poor class to the middle class, from the occupation of the labourers to that of the bank clerks, from the power position of the opposition to that of the ruling class.

(ii)   Horizontal Mobility is a change in position without the change in status. It indicates a change in position, within the range of the status. For example, an engineer working in a factory may resign from his job and join another factory as an engineer and may work in more or less the same capacity. Similarly, a teacher may leave one school to join another as a teacher.

- **Social Mobility and Social Stratification**

The nature, form, intensity and magnitude of social mobility depend on the nature and the type of social stratification. Class and Caste are the two main types of stratification. In both the systems same kinds of opportunities are not provided for social mobility. Because, in both the societies the factors that determine the statuses of the individuals differ radically. There is a close link between the way in which individuals obtain their statuses and the nature of social mobility. In the caste system, the status is determined by birth. Since birth cannot be changed, the status which is determined on the basis of birth cannot be changed. For example, a Harijan cannot attain the status of a Vokkaliga, or Lingayat or Brahmin. Similarly, a Brahmin, born as a Brahmin, dies as a Brahmin. Caste statuses cannot be changed. Hence, the caste as a form of social stratification does not facilitate vertical social mobility. It is for this reason the caste system is called a 'closed system', and the caste-ridden society, the 'immobile' society.

In a class system opportunities are provided for social mobility. Here, the status is determined mainly by the talents, intelligence, wealth and achievements of the persons. The status is not ascribed by birth but 'achieved' by individual attempts. For example, by his endless efforts and struggles a labourer may become the owner of a factory, a salesman of a business house, the owner of a

business firm, and so on. There is scope for the improvement of the social status in the class system. Hence, the class system is called an 'open system', and the open-class society, the 'mobile' society.

As and when the society becomes more and more complex, and the life of its members improves, individuals may find better opportunities for the expression of their abilities and talents. But in no society all the deserving individuals can obtain statuses of their liking, desires and expectations. As Sorokin has pointed out in his "Social Mobility", only in an 'ideal' society all the individuals get employments and statuses in accordance with their capacities. At the same time, it is not possible to make people to confine to their status when once they occupy or assume a status without going away from it, or changing it in any manner. For example, even in the so called 'immobile' society like India, through a Harijan cannot change his caste-status, he can change his educational, economic, employment and political status. In this sense, there are no completely 'open' and mobile societies and completely 'closed' and 'immobile' societies.

- **Principal Types of Social Stratification: Caste-Estates and Social Class**

Sociologists have recognised three major types of social stratification: Caste estates and social class. Of these, caste system with all its peculiar features is to be found in India only. Estate system as a kind of stratification system existed in Europe during the medieval period. But social classes are almost universal in nature. They are found in all the civilised, industrialised and literate societies of the world. These stratification systems decide largely the position that a man occupies in society. The extent of social mobility is mostly conditioned by them. The range of one's social contacts is almost fixed by one's caste or estate or class. They influence and condition the way of life of people or their 'life-styles' to a very great extent.

19.7 FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

The glimpse of the cultures of the world reveals that no society is 'classless', that is un-stratified. All the known established societies of the world

are stratified in one way or the other. According to Wilbert Moore and Kingsley Davis, stratification system came to be evolved in all the societies due to the functional necessity. As they have pointed out the main functional necessity of the system is the requirement faced by any society of placing and motivating individuals in the social structure. Social inequality is thus an unconsciously evolved device by which societies ensure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons. As analysed by H.M.Johnson certain things here can be noted about the "functional necessity' of class stratification system.

1. **Encourages hard work:** One of the main functions of class stratification is to induce people to work hard to live up to values. Those who best fulfil the values of a particular society are normally rewarded with greater prestige and social acceptance by others. It is known that occupations are ranked high if their functions are highly important and the required personnel are very scarce. Hard work, prolonged training and heavy burden of responsibility are associated with such occupational positions. People undertaking such works are rewarded with money, prestige and comforts etc. Still we cannot say that all those positions which are regarded as important are adequately compensated for.

2. **Ensures circulation of elites:** To some extent class stratification helps to ensure what is often called "the circulation of the elite". When a high degree of prestige, comforts and other rewards are offered for certain positions, there will be some competition for them. This process of competition helps to ensure that the more efficient people are able to rise to the top, where their ability can best be used.

3. **Serves an economic function:** The competitive aspect has a kind of economic function in that it helps to ensure the rational use of available talent. It is

also functionally necessary to offer differential rewards if the positions at the top are largely ascribed as it is in the case of caste system. Even in caste system the people at the top can lose their prestige if they fail to maintain certain standards. Hence differential rewards provide the incentives for the upper classes to work at maintaining their positions.

4.   Prevents waste of resources: The stratification system prevents the waste of scarce resources. The men in the elite class actually possess scarce and socially valued abilities and qualities, whether these are inherited or acquired. Because of their possession of these qualities their enjoyment of the privileges such as extra comfort and immunity from doing menial work, are functionally justified. It becomes functionally beneficial for the society to make use of their talents without being wasted. For example, it would be a waste to pour the resources of society into the training of doctors and engineers, and then making them to work as peons and attendants. When once certain individuals are chosen and are trained for certain difficult positions it would be dysfunctional to waste their time and energy on tasks for which there is enough manpower.

5.   Stabilises and reinforces the attitudes and skills: Members of a class normally try to limit their relations to their own class. More intimate relationships are mostly found between fellow class members. Even this tendency has its own function. It tends to stabilise and reinforce the attitudes and skills that may be the basis of upper-class position. Those who have similar values and interests tend to associate comfortably with one another. Their frequent association itself confirms their common values and interests.

6.   Helps to pursue different professions or jobs: The values, attitudes and qualities of different classes do differ. This difference is also functional for

society to some extent. Because society needs manual as well as non-manual workers. Many jobs are not attractive to highly trained or 'refined' people for they are socialised to aspire for certain other jobs. Because of the early influence of family and socialisation the individuals imbibe in them certain values, attitudes and qualities relevant to the social class to which they belong. This will influence their selection of jobs.

7.   Social Control: Further, to the extent that 'lower class' cultural characteristics are essential to society, the classes are, of course, functional. In fact, certain amount of mutual antagonism between social classes is also functional. To some extent, upper-class and lower-class groups can act negative reference groups for each other. Thus they act as a means of social control also.

8.   Controlling effect on the 'shady' world: Class stratification has another social control function. Even in the 'shady' world of gamblers and in the underworld of lower criminals, black marketers, racketeers, smugglers, etc., the legitimate class structure has got respectability. They know that money is not a substitute for prestige but only a compensation for renouncing it. Hence instead of continuing in a profitable shady career, such people want to gain respectability for their money and for their children. They try to enter legitimate fields and become philanthropists and patrons of the arts. Thus the legitimate class structure continues to attract the shady classes and the underworld. This attraction exerts a social control function.

19.8   Let us sum up

Thus, stratification simply means division and social stratification is a division of society on the basis of age, sex, class, caste, race etc.

19.9 Self-Assessment Questions

Q1.   What is social stratification? Discuss its characteristic's in detail.

_____

_____

Q2. Discuss in detail the various functions of social stratification.

_____

_____

_____

19.10 Suggested Readings

1. Kar, Primal, B., Society: A Study of Social Interaction, Jawahar Publisher and Distributors, New Delhi, 1994.

2. MacIver, R.M. and C. H. Page, Society: An Introductory Analysis, Macmillan India Limited, New Delhi, (1950), 2001.

3. Rao, C.N. Shankar, Sociology: Primary Principles, S. Chand & Company Ltd. New Delhi (1990), 2001. 0 Suggested Readings