FOREWORD

This introductory course seeks to familarize the students with sociology as a Social Science and the basic concepts evolved in understanding the social and cultural processes. It is organised in such a way that even students without previous exposure to sociology could acquire an interest in the subject and follow it.

The study material have been written in a Self Learning Material (S.L.M) format besides that the learner is advised to attend the P.C.P. to clarify the doubts which may be imminent in the case. To do a little better in terms of examination a learner may consider the library sources for further enrichment of their knowledge.

I wish you all success in your endeavour to grasp the subject and also to secure a respectable score in the examination.

Co-ordinator

SYLLABUS OF SOCIOLOGY M.A. IST SEMESTER FOR THE EXAMINATION TO BE HELD IN THE YEAR DEC. 2019, 2020, 2021 (NON CBCS)

Course No. SOC-C-101 **Title : Basic Concepts in Sociology**

Credits : 6 **Maximum Marks : 100**

Duration of examination 2½ hrs. **a) Semester examination (External) : 80**

b) Sessional assessment (Internal) : 20

Objective : This introductory course seeks to familiarize the students with Sociology as a social science and the basic concepts evolved in understanding the social and cultural process. It is organized in such a way that even students without previous exposure to sociology could acquire an interest in the subject and follow it.

Unit -I **Emergence of Sociology**

Meaning, Origin and Nature of Sociology.

Basic Concepts: Community, Institution, Association, Culture, Norms & Values.

Unit -II **Sociological Perspective s and Social Group**

Sociological Perspectives : Evolutionary, Positivist, Functional, Conflict.

Social Group : Meaning, Types; Primary-Secondary, Ingroup–Outgroup, Reference Group.

Unit -III **Social Institutions**

Education, Economy, Polity and Religion

Unit -IV **Social Structure and Social Straftification**

Social Structure Status and Role, Multiple Roles, Role Set, Status set, Role Conflict.

Socialization, Social Stratification & Social Mobility.

NOTE FOR PAPER SETTING :

The question paper will consist of three sections A,B and C. Section A will consist of eight long answer type questions two from each unit with internal choice. The candidates is required to answer any four questions selecting one from each unit. Each question carries 12 marks. (12×4=48)

Section B consist of eight short answer type questions-two from each unit with internal choice. The candidate required to answer any four questions selecting one from each unit. Each question carries 6 marks. 6x4=24 marks.

Section C consist of eight objective questions-one mark each. The candidate required to answer the entire eight questions. Total weightage will be of 1x8 = 8 marks.

Prescribed Reading :

1. MacIver & Page, Society, Introductory Analysis, MacMillan, Delhi, 2001
2. Giddens. A, Sociology: A Textbook for the Nineties, Polity press, 1990.
3. Davis, Kingsley, Human society, Surjit Pub., Delhi, 2004
4. Madan & Majumdar, An Introduction to Social anthropology, Mayur, 1999
5. Bottomore, T.B.: Sociology : A Guide to Problems and Literature, Blackie and Sons, Bombay, 1986.
6. Berger, P, Invitation to Sociology
7. Mills, C.W, 'Sociological Imagination'.
8. Worsley, P, Introducing Sociology, Penguin, 1987.
9. Burger & Burger, Sociology : An introduction.
10. Inkeles, Alex, What is Sociology? New Delhi, Prentice Hall, 1987.
11. Schaeffar, R.T.&R.P.Lamm, Sociology, New Delhi, Tata McGraw Hill, 1999.
12. Johnson, Harry M, Sociology: A Systematic Introduction, Allied publication, 1995.
13. Abrahim Francis, Contemporary Sociology, Oxford University Press, 2006.

CONTENTS

Unit -I	**EMERGENCE OF SOCIOLOGY**	**PAGE NO.**
Lesson-1	Meaning, Origin, Nature of Sociology	5-33
Lesson-2	Community	34-46
Lesson-3	Institution & Association	47-63
Lesson-4	Culture	64-73
Lesson-5	Norms and Values	74-90
Unit - II	**SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES AND SOCIAL GROUP**	
Lesson-6	Sociological Perspectives : Evolutionary, Positivist, Functional, Conflict.	91-106
Lesson-7	Social Group : Meaning, Types, Primary - Secondary, Ingroup - Outgroup, Reference Group	107-129
Unit - III	**SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS**	
Lesson-8	Education	130-145
Lesson-9	Economy	146-167
Lesson-10	Polity	168-193
Lesson-11	Religion	194-211
Unit - IV	**SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION**	
Lesson-12	Social Structure	212-217
Lesson-13	Status and Role, Multiple Roles, Role set, Status set, Role Conflict.	218-239
Lesson-14	Socialization	240-262
Lesson-15	Social Stratification and Social Mobility	263-286

COURSE: SOC-C-101 **LESSON NO. 1**

MEANING, ORIGIN AND NATURE OF SOCIOLOGY

UNIT - I **SEMESTER - I**

STRUCTURE

1.0 Objective :

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Meaning and Definitions

1.3 Origin of Sociology

1.4 Subject matter of Sociology

1.5 Contributions of founding fathers

1.6 Nature of Sociology

1.7 Uses of Sociology

1.8 Sociology and other social sciences

1.9 Check your progress

1.10 Key words

1.11 References

1.0 OBJECTIVE :

The objective of this chapter is to

– Familiarize the learners with sociology as a social science.

– Basic concepts involved in understanding

– Origin of the subject sociology

1.1 INTRODUCTION:

Sociology is the youngest discipline among the social sciences. The credit for having established sociology as an independent science goes to Auguste 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 aspect 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) preceding 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 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.

1.2 MEANING AND DEFINITION

Sociology is the discipline which attempts at the scientific study of the society. No other social science endeavors to study society as a whole . 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 alone studies entire social relationships be 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 Inkeles 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 Auguste 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.

Max Weber-contrary to the views of Comte, Spencer, and Durkheim considered individual as basic unit of the study and thus differed from the former who consider societies as the units of analysis. Max Weber (1864-1920) defined Sociology as "a science which attempts the interpretative understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at causal explanation of its cause and effect." You can easily guess that Weber regarded the social act or social relationship as particular subject matter of sociology. The above discussion on the basis of the various classical Sociologists may help us to propose a workable definition. In general, however, all the sociologists agree that Sociology is a general science of society. Some of them may have their different views on defining Sociology, be it on the basis of it to be social institution or social relationship or social behaviour, social action and so on. These divergent views about the definition of Sociology is about the distinct approaches used by different thinkers to the study of society. However, the common thread of all the definitions given by all the Sociologists is that sociology is concerned with man, his social relation and his society.

The classical sociologists, thus, had a common thread of agreement as the subject-matter of sociology:

A. Study of wide range of institutions from family to State,

B. Interrelations among different institutions,

C. Society as a distinctive unit of analysis,

D. But also focus on social facts or social relationships regardless of their institutional setting. This view was clearly expressed by Weber.

Secondly if we take what sociologists do as our guide of what Sociology is about, we have to depend upon the current sociology text books which of course may help us to identify the topic which constitute the subject matter of Sociology. Alex Inkeles has constructed the general outline of the subject matter of Sociology which would help you to understand about the basics which are part of the sociological curriculum and are found in all introductory text books of sociology.

1.3 ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Sociology is the newest of the social sciences to establish itself in the western universities of the English-speaking world (in 1876 Yale University, United States, in 1889 France and in 1907 England). In Asia, the formal teaching of sociology began in 1893 in Tokyo University and in India in 1919 in Bombay University. Men have always reflected upon the societies in which they lived, yet sociology as a modem science developed only in 19th century, largely out of concern about the changes wrought by the industrial revolution. Historically, the word sociology was invented by Auguste Comte/although a concern with the nature of society can be fomy throughout the Western (Plato and Aristotle's Greek philosophy and the works of European and Scottish inlightemnent thinkers) and Eastern (Hindu societal writings of Manu and Kautilya and Islamic jurisprudence of Ibn Khaldun) thought. However, it was not until the middle of the 19th century, in the aftermath of industrial revolution and the consequent upheavals, that we find a concern with society and thus the need for a "science of society" was recognised. These conditions gave impetus to French philosopher Saint Simon and his secretary-colleague Comte to think about human society on scientific lines. They believed that positivism can provide a scientific basis for the study of society. The new science—sociology—would discover the laws of the social world equivalent to our knowledge of the law; of nature. We could then determine the general laws of social change similar to those found in Newtonian physics or Darwinian biology. These optimistic beliefs of these early thinkers were overly ambitions.

In his most celebrated work. The Structure of Social Action (1937), Talcott Parsons has written that in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, sociology broke free of its earlier ideological shackles and establish itself a science proper, especially in the works of Max Weber & Emile Durkheim. Although these thinkers have much influence over modern sociology.

1.4 SUBJECT MATTER OF SOCIOLOGY

How subjects of study changed from time to time and what is the contemporary concern of sociology is well exemplified in a recent textbook Introductory Sociology, written by Tony Bilton, Adrew Webster and others (1996), as under:

Some key concerns of classical sociology

- The growth and impact of industrialisation.

- The development of capitalism and class conflict.
- The emergence and legitimacy of the nation-state.
- The growing complexity and differentiation of social institutions.
- The congruence between 'society' and 'nation'.
- The importance of class-based sources of protest and change.

Some key concerns of contemporary sociology

- The emergence of global industrialisation.
- Capitalism as a world economy.
- The growth of transnational economic and political structures.
- The compression of time and space.
- The legitimacy and role of nation-bound political institutions.
- The origins and impact of (non-class) social movements.

1.5 CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOUNDING FATHERS.

Auguste Comte (1798-1857)

Comte was a student of Saint-Simon and he was deeply influenced by the thinking of his master. He coined the term "Sociology" and prepared the ground for the growth and development of Sociology as a independent discipline. He pleaded against studying social phenomena in terms of abstract principles and speculative theories. He placed emphasis on applying scientific methods in studying social phenomena. He divided sociology into two major groupings.

1. Social Statics : Study of social structure, function, system, relationships etc.
2. Social Dynamics : Study of Social Changes, development, transformation

In order to establish Sociology as a true science, he developed social laws to be applied to society so that society's past can be best understood and future be predicted (positivism). He developed law of three stages, according to his this theory each branch of our knowledge passes through three different theoretical conditions-the theological, the metaphysical and the positive. As an evolutionist, he traced the progressive developments of intellectual orientations of the people through these stages.

The theological stage is dominated by priests who seek to explain natural phenomena with reference to supernatural phases of fetishism, polytheism and monotheism.

The metaphysical stage is dominated by churchmen and lawyers. During this stage mind presupposes abstract forces capable of producing and explaining all phenomena.

The dawn of the 19th century marked the beginning of the positive stage in which observation predominates over imagination and all theoretical concepts become positive. Human mind seeks to establish scientific principles governing all phenomena. This stage is dominated by industrial administrators and scientists.

According to Comte the new industrial society will become the society of future of all mankind. This is the ultimate stage in the series of transformation that human society had gone through over time, each succeeding stage being superior to the one which replaces. Comte argues that human history is the history of a single people because the progress of the human mind gives unity to the entire history of society.

Another important contribution of Comte to the development of the sociological thinking was his enunciation of the concepts of social statics and social dynamics. In his view, order is the static aspect and progress is the dynamic aspect of society.

A review of his work clearly establishes him as the father of modern sociology.

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903)

Herbert Spencer, born on 1820, published his first book, "Social Statics", a study in political philosophy in 1850 and in 1852 published an article entitled "The Development Of Hypothesis" in which he openly rejected the thesis of special creation and spoke of organic evolution. This he did some seven years after Darwin's Origin of Species appeared.

Deeply influenced by the scientific advances in biological researches, Spencer sought to establish parallelisms between organic and social evolution. In his view, all phenomena-inorganic and social evolution (social) are subject to the natural law of evolution.

In the earlier phases of the growth of sociology there were attempts to apply Darwin's theory of evolution to social phenomena as an explanatory model of social interaction. Herbert Spencer was the most outspoken advocate of this approach.

Spencer's Social Darwinism centered around the following two principles.

1. The Principle of the survival of the fittest.
2. The Principle of Non-interference.

Like Comte, Spencer was also an ardent advocate of scientific method for the study of society. He was aware of the importance of objectivity in analyzing social phenomena.

Spencer spoke in functionalist terms, long before structural-functional theory came to dominate the thinking of sociologists. He clearly enunciated the thesis that "there can be no true conception of a structure without a true conception of its function".

Unlike Comte who was radically 'social' in his approach to sociology, Spencer was equally radical in his individualistic approach to sociology.

Whereas Comte subordinated the individual to society, Spencer looked upon society as a vehicle for the enhancement of individual goals and purposes.

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917)

Another French Sociologist, Emile Durkheim grouped the subject matter of Sociology as under :

1. Social Morphology : Study of Social forms & Structure
2. Social Physiology : Study of Social Process
3. General Sociology : Study of Social Problems

Durkheim wrote four great books which marked his intellectual itinerary and which represent variations on the fundamental theme of consensus.

The first, The Division of Labour, is concerned with the following theme. Modern society exhibits an extreme differentiation of jobs and professions. How are we to ensure that a society divided among innumerable specialists will retain the necessary intellectual and moral coherence? How can individuals

achieve a consensus which, incidentally, is the condition of social existence? Durkheim's answer to this central question is to set up a distinction between two forms of solidarity, viz, Mechanical Solidarity and Organic Solidarity.

In his book, The Rules of the Sociological Method, his first rule is: “Consider social facts as things”. He emphasizes that “far from being a product of the will, social facts determine it from without; they are like moulds in which our actions are inevitably shaped”. The conceptions of time, space, numerals and even religion are derived, according to him, from social experience. Thus, “time is the collective representation of the rhythm of social life”. In other words, ”the categories of thought are not a priori but derived from the structure of social existence; once implanted in men's minds the categories do indeed appear as if they were immanent”.

Social facts, as defined by Durkheim, have two objective criteria: (i) the criterion of exteriority and (ii) the criterion of constraint. Durkheim says that if individuals are constrained by external social facts which are not so clearly perceived and identified, and here Durkheim argues that the sociology must discover statistical rates which reflect these social facts.

His third great book, Le Suicide, is an analysis of a phenomenon regarded as pathological, intended to shed light on the evil which threatens modern or industrial societies: anomie.

According to Durkheim, “the force which determines the suicide is not psychological but social.”

His fourth great book, The Elementary Forms of Religious Life, is concerned with the essential characteristics of religious order at the dawn of human history. He undertook this study “not out of curiosity about what might have happened thousands of years ago, but in order to rediscover in the simplest societies the essential secret of all human societies-in order to understand what the reform of modern societies requires in the light of primitive experience”. In this book Durkheim tried to derive a general sociological theory of religion from what he believed to be its simplest form: Totemism.

Max Weber (1864-1920)

Weber initiated studies on various aspects of society. Sociology has been considerably enriched by these studies. His views on subjects are of abiding value and interest to sociologists even today.

Weber's belief that scientific method was relevant to social studies encouraged him to offer a set of operational definitions and to construct concepts which could be used. He classified and described types of social phenomena. He argued that if the types were rigorously defined and the elements of each type were consistent with each other, then it should be possible to compare existing cases to the type. He called the latter an ideal type. "An ideal-type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct. In its conceptual purity, this mental construct cannot be found empirically anywhere in reality. It is a utopia.

His classification of four types of social action is an example of ideal-type construct. His contribution to political sociology can be referred through the concept of legitimacy and authority.

The bases of this legitimacy may, however, differ from one instance to another. He said that there were three ideal-types of authority which derived legitimacy from three distinct sources:

(i) Rational legitimacy reflects belief in the legality of patterns of normative rules and the right of those people designated by the rules to exercise authority to command.

(ii) Traditional legitimacy depends on belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the right of those established on the strength of tradition in position of authority to exercise it.

(iii) Charismatic legitimacy depends on the devotion of followers to an individual who, according to their perception, is endowed with exceptional sanctity,

heroism or other personal qualities.

In this typology, Weber's emphasis is on rational legitimacy. The corresponding type of authority which emerges from this typology is as follows : rational-legal authority, traditional authority and charismatic authority.

1.6 NATURE OF SOCIOLOGY

Since the time of Auguste Comte (1842), the founder of sociology, it is debated that can there be a "natural science or society?" In what ways and to what extent sociology is a science? It is a long-standing controversy in sociology. It is the basic issue over which sociologists even today find themselves in disagreement. Many early sociologists were quite optimistic about this new discipline as science. They believed that sociology seeks to apply the methods of science to the study of man and society. Sociology modelled itself after the natural sciences since its inception in the nineteenth century, collecting data through observation and experiment (wherever possible) and devising and testing hypothesis. This procedure is known as scientific method. Many sociologists, often called positivists, believe that since sociology uses this method/procedure for arriving at the empirical truth, it has every right to be called a science. Even Comte believed that "a science of sociology should be based on systematic observation and classification, not on authority and speculation".

Modem sociologists are of the view that sociology is a science (as claimed by positivists) and art (as believed by interpretative sociologists) both. Science and art are two major forms of knowledge. Science deals in facts, while art in precepts. As science, its language is "This is" or "This is not", "This does or does not happen". The language of art is "Do this" or "Avoid this". If we apply, these canons of science and art on sociology, then sociology is a science and not an art. Sociology, like all other sciences, chiefly deals with the questions: what it is? how it is? and why it is? The questions like what should be? or what should exist? do not come under the purview of -sociology. Any knowledge which does not pertain to observable events or empirical world, such knowledge is either religious or ideological or a formal system of logic such as mathematics. To peep into the factual knowledge, we require understanding which is a form of art. The distinction between knowledge and understanding is a major difference between sociology as a science and sociology as an art.

A sociologist, as an artist, tries to understand things by "taking the role of other", i.e., by perceiving the world from the point of view of the subject of investigation. 'Understanding' refers to what might be called 'deep level acquaintance'. Early sociologists Max Weber and C.H. Cooley used and laid emphasis on the method of understanding in the study of social relationships. Their methods are known as Verstehen and sympathetic introspection respectively. For full comprehension of the social world, perspectives of art (taking the role of other) and science (a natural observer) both are required. This viewpoint is emphasised by great humanist C.W. Mills and eminent sociologist Robert A. Nisbet. Nisbet observes that we must never forget that sociology is both an art as well as a science, otherwise we run the risk of losing the science findings ourselves with a sandheap of empiricism or methodological narrdsm. Mills argues that sociology is better practised with imagination and flexibility than with rigid adherence to the models of natural science. Most of the sociologists who see sociology as an art are staunch humanists.

What is Science?

In the popular imagination, science is sometimes associated with a particular content, such as protons, neutrons, cells, skeletons, skulls or stars. For a common student, it is only physics, biology or chemistry are sciences, which have big laboratories fitted with jars, balances, test tubes and many other instruments and equipments. This identification of science with particular kinds of content or with laboratorial experiments is not correct. Today, it is generally agreed that science is not a body of content but a method of approach to any content. Long back, philosopher of science, Karl Pearson Grammar of Science) said that "the unity of all sciences lies only in their method and not in the material they study. The classification of facts, the recognition of their sequence and relative significance is the function of science".

Science has been denned in many ways. For our purpose two definitions will suffice. According to Churchman and Akoff (1950), "science is a systematic method of getting knowledge". A.W. Green (1952) wrote, "science is a way of investigation'. In modem times, science is seen chiefly in two distinct th ough related ways as systematic knowledge and as method of study.

1. Science as systematic knowledge

As systematic knowledge, science is an accumulation of organised and verified knowledge, based on reliable observation and organised into a system of general propositions and laws.

2. Science as method of study

Science is a method of approach to the entire empirical world. It is an approach by which systematic, accurate and verified knowledge is acquired. This method of getting knowledge is opposed to the intuition, speculation, revelations, traditions or authorities. 'Method of approach' is a mode of analysis that permits the scientists to state proposition in the form of 'if and then'. Science, both as knowledge (goal) and as method (means), incorporates two essential elements—rationality and empiricism. As substantive knowledge, science is made up of logical related propositions that must also be supported by empirical evidence. As method, it places emphasis on reliable and objective observation and logical analysis. Neither of these elements alone constitutes science.

Characteristics of Science/Scientific Method

The following are the main characteristics of science and scientific method:

1. Objectivity

Scientific knowledge is objective. Objectivity simple means the ability to see and accept facts as they are, not as one might wish them to be. To be objective, one has to guard against his own biases, beliefs, wishes, values and preferences. Objectivity demands that one must set aside all sorts of the subjective considerations and prejudices.

2. Verifiability

Science rests upon sense data, i.e., data gathered through our senses—eye, ear, nose, tongue and touch. Scientific knowledge is based on verifiable evidence (concrete factual observations) so that other observers can observe, weigh or measure the same phenomena
and check out observation for accuracy.

Is there a God? Is 'vama' system ethical or questions pertaining to the existence of soul, heaven or hell are not scientific questions because they cannot be treated factually. The evidence regarding their existence cannot be gathered through our senses. Science does not have answers for everything. It deals with only those questions about which verifiable evidence can be found.

3. Ethical neutrality

Science is ethically neutral. It only seeks knowledge. How this knowledge is to be used, is determined by societal values. Knowledge can be put to differing uses. Knowledge about atomic energy can be used to cure diseases or to wage atomic warfare. Ethical neutrality does not mean that the scientist has no values. It here only means that he must not allow his values to distort: the design and conduct of his research. Thus, scientific knowledge is value-neutral or value free.

4. Systematic exploration

A scientific research adopts a certain sequential procedure, an organised plan or design of research for collecting and analysis of facts about the problem under study. Generally, this plan includes a few scientific steps—formulation of hypothesis, collection of facts, analysis of facts (classification, coding and tabulation) and scientific generalisation and predication.

5. Reliability

Scientific knowledge must occur under the prescribed circumstances not once but repeatedly. It is reproducible under the circumstances stated anywhere and anytime. Conclusions based on casual recollections are not very reliable.

6. Precision

Scientific knowledge is precise. It is not vague like some literary writing. Tennyson wrote, "every moment dies a man; every moment one is born", is good literature but not science. To be a good science, it should be written as: "In India, according to the 2001 census, every 10th second, on the average, dies a man; every 4th second, on the average, an infant is born." Precision requires giving exact number or measurement. Instead of saying "most of the people are against love marriages," a scientific researcher says, "Ninety per cent people are against love marriages".

7. Accuracy

Scientific knowledge is accurate. A physician; like a common man, will not say that the patient has slight temperature or having very high temperature but after measuring with the help of thermometer, he will pronounce that the patient is having 101.2 F temperature.

Accuracy simply means truth or correctness of a statement or describing things in exact words as they are without jumping to unwarranted conclusions.

8. Abstractness

Science proceeds on a plane of abstraction. A general scientific principle is highly abstract. It is not interested in giving a realistic picture.

9. Predictability

Scientists do not merely describe the phenomena being studied, but also attempt to explain and predict as well. It is typical of social sciences that they have a far lower predictability compared to natural sciences. The most obvious reasons are the complexity of the subject matter and inadequacy at control etc.

Basic Principles (Phases) of Scientific Procedure

There is a little bit disagreement among social scientists about the number of steps in a scientific research. Some scientists, like Roy G. Fransis (1954), have enumerated as many as twelve steps while others have condensed them into four or five steps. The important phases of research process are as follows:

1. Formulation of working hypothesis

A working hypothesis is a penetrating hunch, guess or the provisional explanation of the problem under study. This is found on the basis of preliminary observations of the facts related to the problem. In brief, the problem is stated in the form of a proposition, i.e., 'if and 'then'. Hypothesis serves as tentative explanation which can be rested empirically. It guides the researcher in the selection of pertinent facts needed to explain the problem at hand. Here, one thing is to be noted that hypothesis is not needed in all researches. Some researches develop hypotheses as the end results of a preliminary inquiry for further testing.

2. Preparation of research design

A research design is a detailed plan or a strategy of conducting research. It answers the questions—what, how, when/where, and why about the facts to be collected for the study. It is a process of making decisions with respect to: (a) types of data required; (b) sources of data and field of study; (c) method of data collection and preparation of tools

(Questionnaire, Interview Schedule etc); and (d) sample design. Designing the research ensures against its failure.

3. Collection of data

Actual gathering of data and information begins in accordance with the research design. By collecting the data, the researcher tests the hypotheses which he may ultimately accept, change, or abandon.

4. Analysis of data

After the data are collected, they must be assembled, organised and classified in such a way that the hypothesis can be tested. It is said that mere collection of facts is no science. Facts become meaningful when they are logically connected with other facts and sorted according to their nature. Broadly, this step of scientific research includes coding, classification and tabulation of gathered data. These days, much of this work is done by computers. The computer gives the desired computations and comparisons including data for statistical tests.

5. Drawing conclusions in the form of theoretical formulations and generalisations

Scientists are not concerned with isolated phenomena or events. They aim to discover under the surface layer of diversity of these events, a thread of uniformity. On the basis of this uniformity they try to formulate generalisations or a scientific theory. A generalisation is a statement about a number of events rather than about a unique event. Thus, the original hypothesis, if formulated in the beginning of the research, is either confirmed or rejected.

The basic procedure, as outlined above, is the same for all scientific researches or inquiries. Only the tools and techniques may vary according to the problem under study. Researchers may make changes and adjust to unforeseen difficulties once the study is under way.

Is Sociology a Science?

The term 'science' refers to the body of knowledge obtained by methods based upon systematic observation. As a systematic observation, sociology fulfils all the requirements of a science. It is objective, empirical, logical, value-neutral, and parsimonious. It has other characteristics of science also such as verifiability, reliability, precision, accuracy,

predictability and the power of generalisation. All allegations levelled against its scientific nature are partially true.

According to Anthony Giddens (2000), "Science is the use of systematic methods of empirical investigation the analyses of data, theoretical thinking and the logical assessment of arguments to develop a body of knowledge about a particular subject matter. According to this definition, sociology is a scientific endeavour". Robert Bierstedt (.The Social Order, 1957) has discussed the following distinguishing features of sociology as a science:

Sociology is	Sociology is not
Social	natural
Generalising	Particularising
Abstract	Concrete
Categorical	Normative
Pure	Applied
General	Special

1. Sociology is a social science

Sciences are commonly divided into natural and social sciences. Natural science studies natural phenomena (animate and inanimate both). Astronomy, biology, chemistry, physics and geology are all natural sciences. Social science is the study of various aspects of human society. The social sciences include sociology, anthropology, economics, political science etc. Sociology broadly studies human behaviour, man in society, social life of human beings and the structure of society. It is neither philosophy nor socialism as is sometimes thought but a social science.

2. Sociology is generalising science

This is an important feature of sociology which distinguishes it from history which is particularising (idiographic). For instance, sociology is not interested in a particular war (e.g., war of Mahabharat) but in war or revolution as a recurrent social phenomenon. Sociology seeks general laws or principles about human behaviour and association. It is interested in formulating generalisations of general validity.

3. Sociology is an abstract science

The concerns of sociology are relatively abstract not concrete. As a science, it proceeds on a plane of abstraction. For example, sociology is interested not in particular families but it the family as a social institution that exists in all societies—modem or preliterate.

4. Sociology is categorical science

Sociology is concerned with the questions of what, when, how or why and where about man and society and not what ought to be. It gives categorical judgements rather than normative ones. It is this feature of sociology that distinguishes it from ethics or moral and political philosophy.

5. Sociology is a pure science

Sociology is engaged in the acquisition of knowledge and not in its application. This distinction is like chemistry and pharmacy, physics and engineering or biology and science of medicine.

6. Sociology is both rational and empirical science

As an empiricist, a sociologist collects facts and as a rationalist, he coordinates and arranges them.

7. Sociology is a generalistic science

The nature of sociology is synthesising and generalising. It is not a specialistic science like economics or political science. The focus of sociology may be special one, as is the focus of every other science, but its area of study is general. PA. Sorokin has given the following paradigm and explanation about its synthesising character:

Subject	Subject Matter of Study					
Economics	a	b	c	d	e	f
Political Science	a	b	c	g	h	f
Psychology	a	b	c	j	k	l
Ethics	a	b	c	m	n	o

In all above phenomena, whether economics or political science or ethics, a, b, c occur. These are the social factors that they all have in common. It is on this level that

sociology operates and it does not, of course, investigate the special factors like d, e, f, g, h, i, etc., which are the subject matter of study of specialised sciences like economics, ethics or political science etc. The focus of sociology may be special one, as is the focus of every other discipline but its area of inquiry (subject matter) is general!")

1.7 USES OF SOCIOLOGY :

Sociology seems to be youngest amongst the social sciences. It has made remarkable progress and its uses are recognized widely. In modern times there is a growing realization of scientific knowledge of social phenomena and means of promoting human welfare. The subject of sociology has great value in modern complex society. In fact it is born out of the complexities of modern industrial societies due to industrial revolutions and the need for social-political reform due to French revolution. Some of the uses of sociology can be stated in the following way.

Joel. M. Charon in an interesting book "Meaning of Sociology", (1996) has noted the following considerations to understand the uses of Sociology.

(1) Some students are attracted to Sociology as it is interesting, challenging and applicable to kinds of questions that are concerned to them. Sometimes sociology becomes a bridge to an appealing occupation as it prepares the individual for many diverse occupations through teaching, social research, skills.

(2) Knowing sociology contributes to understanding of those who regard truth as an important value; who believe that there is nothing more exciting than understanding self, others, society and humanity, than sociology is important to study and know.

(3) Sociology can be applied to ones own life, it helps the individual to understand why people around him or her act the way they do. It adds to the understanding of ones own identity, thinking and action.

(4) Sociology is liberating as it is a step towards more control over ones life. Sociology should makes us more tolerant; it may foster commitment in us to better the human condition.

Further Sociology as a subject, its study and application has both individual and social advantage. Sociology, true to its definition (science of society) studies society in a scientific way. We all live in society and being part of the society we make a claim that we know society. This is inadequate. But the sociologists study society inductively and deductively and also inter-subjectively to make the study of society more value free and objective.

From the above discussion we can make a summary that Sociology is useful in following ways :

(1) **Scientific study of society.** Unlike other social science subject which studies specific institutional aspect of the society, for example, political science studies political institutions, Economics studies wealth and so on. Sociology studies the society as a whole. This point will become more clear, when you will study the next block unit on sociology and its relations to other social sciences.

(2) **Sociology as a profession**. In addition to sociology being helpful in making a career in teaching, there is an increasing demand for those students of sociology who are trained in research procedures.

There is an increasing demand for them in business, government, industries, city planning, social projects etc.

(3) Sociology is liberating. It makes us more tolerant of human differences and it will foster a commitment in us to better the human condition.

(4) Useful in solving problems. The problems of poverty, unemployment, over population family disorganization crime delinquency, youth unrest and untouchability are the social problems and it is necessary to solve them, sociology provides such an analysis.

(5) Social planning and social development. Sociology is often considered as a vehicle of social reform. It plays an important role in reconstruction of the society. Sociologists are now more engaged in social policy making and they are considered to be useful to enhance the social development aspect of society.

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

1.8 SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES

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.

Sociology and Anthropology:

Convergence

Anthropology is primarily concerned with man's-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 persisted.

Psychology and Sociology

Convergence

The problem of relation between psychology and sociology and of the social psychology and of the status of social psychology in relation to both, is difficult and

unsettled. Psychology as a science of behaviour occupies itself primarily with the individual. Sociology as a scientific study of human society studies the human interaction in social situations. It is a study of human social behaviour resulting from the interaction of human minds. All social relationships are basically psychological. Both are positive sciences dealing with human experiences and behaviour.

The bridge between psychology and sociology is through social psychology. In simple terms, psychology is the science of mind but mind is primarily the product of social process. Thus social psychology which maintains the primary interest in individual but then concerns itself with the socio-cultural influence upon the individual that helps us to understand the convergent relationship between sociology and psychology.

Divergence

According to Durkheim, "Sociology should study social facts not psychological facts. Social facts for him, are external to and coercive of the individual."

Red-Cliffe Brown argued that sociology and psychology study two entirely different systems, one social system, other mental system, and claimed that these two levels of explanations should not be combined.

The differences between these two disciplines are not difficult to determine. Psychology is interested mainly in individual, in its qualities of mind and temperament, in his nervous system, in his hopes and fear, in the order and disorder of mind. Sociology, on the other hand, is not primarily interested in the individual or his personality or his behaviour. The society in which the individual lives and persisting interaction that takes place within a group or with the group are the main areas of concern of sociology.

Though the focus of interest of psychology, social psychology and sociology remains distinct, it is not always easy to draw the line of separation. One discipline overlaps into the other, often making the boundary line indistinguishable.

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 provision "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 disciplines 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, 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. Gunnar Myrdal : Asian Drama.
3. B. F. Hosetiez : The Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth.
4. J .K. Galbraith : The Affluent 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.

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 in 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 of sociological influence.

The influence of sociology in field of political studies began to be felt at an early stage in development of sociology largely through the works of the Marxists, the Political Sociology of Michelss, 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 systematic 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 correlation 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.

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 are 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 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.

Sociology and Philosophy :

Sociology emerged largely in a Philosophical ambition to explain the social crises of European 19th Century and to provide a social doctrine which would guide social policy. Recently, however, Sociology has for the most part abandoned such aims and become divergent discipline. However this may be, for Bottomore

there remain connections between Sociology and Philosophy in at least three respects :-

1. In order to overcome the peculiar difficulties, experience, there is a need have a Philosophy and Sociology in the sense of Philosophy of Science that is to say an examination of methods, concepts and arguments used in Sociology.
2. There is a close relationship between Sociology and moral and social philosophy. Sociology is concerned with behaviour of man in society, since such behaviour is deeply influenced among others by the value orientation of the peaople, as Sociologists have to reckon with values while analyzing social behaviour. Sociology does not deal with values as Philosopher does. He treats values of social fact, of something given and analyse their impact

Divergence :

In course of time there was a conscious effort to develop Sociology as a positive science, free from kinds of ideological trappings. Apparently, the contact between Philosophy and Sociology was stopped. But this absence of loss of contact between two disciplines was more apparent than real and there are some areas where these discipline overlap.

1.9 Check your progress

Q. 1. Define Sociology and describe the contribution of founding father's in sociology?

Q. 2. Describe the uses of Sociology and its relation with other social sciences?

Q. 3. Give in detail nature and subject matter of sociology?

1.10 Key words

→ Science – Systematic method by which reliable, emphirical knowledge is obtained.

→ Scientific Law – A hypothesis that has been supported by empirical tests.

→ ValueScience – The position held by naturalists, that personal judgements and biases can and should be extended from social observations

→ Sociology – The description and explanation of social behaviour, social structure, social interaction in terms of people's perceptions of social environment.

1.11 References

Bottomore, T.B. (1962); Sociology : A Guide to Problems and Literature

Collins, R (1977); Theoretical Sociology

Giddens, A (2000); Sociology

MacIver and Page (1956) Society : An Introductory Analysis

Schaefer and Lamm (1992) Sociology

Rawal, H.K. (2007); Sociology : Basic Concepts

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 2
UNIT-I	COMMUNITY	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

2.1 Objectives

2.2 Meaning and Definitions of community

2.3 Bases of community

2.4 External structure of community

2.5 Community sentiment

2.6 Nation as a type of community

2.7 Sum up

2.8 Check your progress

2.1 OBJECTIVE

After going through this topic the learner should be able :

(a) to know the meaning of community.

(b) to understand the bases of community.

(c) to become familiar with the external structure of community.

(d) to understand nation as a type of community.

2.2 MEANING AND DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY

Groups are generally organized on the basis of some specific interest. However, there are certain types of groups which are formed not on the basis of a specific interest, but some general interest. Among such groups may be included communities residing in a particular territory. Thus we may apply term "community" to a pioneer settlement, a village, a city, a tribe or a nation. As defined by Machlver

and Page, "wherever the members of any group, small or large, live together in such a way that they share, not this or that particular interest, but the basic conditions of a common life, we call that group a community". The mark of a community is that one's life may be lived wholly within it. One cannot live wholly within a business organization or social club or a church, one can live wholly within a tribe or a city. The basic criterion of community, then, is that all of one's social relationship may be found within it.

Definition :

⇨According to Bogardus, "Community is a social group with some degree of we – feeling and living in a given area"

⇨According to Kingsley Davis, "Community is the smallest territorial group that can embrace all aspects of social life".

⇨According to MacIver, "Community is an area of social living marked by some degree of social coherence".

⇨According to Ogburn and Nimkoff, "Community is 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".

Thus, the concept of community concerns a particular constituted set of social relationships based on something which the participants have in common–usually a common sense of identity.

Communities need not be self sufficient :

Some communities are all inclusive and independent of others. Among primitive people we sometimes find communities of no more than a hundred persons, as for example, among the yurok tribes of California, which are almost or altogether isolated. But modern communities, even very large ones, are much less self-contained. Economic and, increasingly so, political interdependence is a major characteristic of our great modern communities.

We may live in a metropolis and yet be members of a very small community because our interests are circumscribed within a narrow area or we may live in a village and yet belong to a community as wide as the whole area of our civilization or even wider. No civilized community has wall around it to cut it

completely off from a larger one, whatever "Pron curtains" may be drawn by the rulers of this nation or that. Communities exist within greater communities : the town within a region, the region within a nation, and the nation within the world community which, perhaps, is in the process of development.

2.3 BASES OF COMMUNITY :

A community is an area of social living marked by some degree of social coherence. The bases of community are locality and community sentiment.

1. **Locality :** A community always occupies a territorial area. Even a nomad community, a band of gypsies, for example, has a local, though changing, habitation. At every moment its members occupy together a definite place on the earth's surface. Most communities are settled and derive from the conditions of their locality a strong bond of solidarity. To some extent this local bond has been weakened in the modern world by the extending facilities of communication ; this is especially apparent in the penetration into rural area of dominant urban patterns. But the extension of communication is itself the condition of a larger but still territorial community.

   The importance of the conception of community is in large measure that it underscores the relation between social coherence and the geographical area. This relation is easily revealed in such examples as a village or a frontier town or the semi-isolated communities of French Quebec. Whatever modifications in the relation of social bonds and territorial abode have been introduced by civilization, yet "the basic character of locality as a social classifier has never been transcended".

2. **Community Sentiment :** Today we find, what never existed in primitive societies, people occupying specific local areas which lack the social coherence necessary to give them a community character. For example, the residents of ward or district of a large city may lack sufficient contacts or common interests to instill conscious identification with the area. Such a "neighbourhood" is not a community because it dose not posses a feeling of belonging together–it lacks community sentiment. Here

it is sufficient to stress that locality, though a necessary condition, to repeat, is an area of common living. There must be a common living with its awareness of sharing a way of life as well as the common earth.

The spread of civilization and the world community :

The wholly self-contained community belongs to the primitive world. In the modern world the nearest approach to it is found in the huge nation. Community included within the frontiers of a single state. This has been especially the case when the state has sought to "co-ordinate" the whole national life as did National Socialist Germany, or when, as in Soviet Russia, it establishes a form of economy very different from that of most other nations.

But the forces which are partly technological, such as the improvement of the means of communication and transportation ; partly economic, such as the demand for markets and for wider areas of economic exchange necessitated by the newer processes of industrial production and partly cultural, since the thought and art and science of one country are, whatever the temporary barriers of "ideological" and political construction, inevitably carried on the wings of civilization to others. In the face of these forces, there are no national "secrets", atomic or otherwise, of permanent duration.

Now, we have been approaching a stage where no completely self contained community can be found on any scale unless we extend the limits of community to include the whole earth. Men's current efforts to develop political agencies of world scope are consistent with the trends of the spread of civilization. In our view, the counter efforts of some men ignore the realities of expanding community itself.

The Great and Small Communities :

We have noted the historical expansions of community to the dimensions of the nation and, perhaps, the world. The smaller communities, however, still remain, though only in degree. The nation or the world-state does not eliminate the village or neighborhood, though they may be changed in character. As civilized beings, we need the smaller as well as the larger circles of community. The great community brings us opportunity, stability, economy, the constant stimulus

of a richer. Mira varied culture. But living in the smaller community we find the nearer, more intimate satisfactions. The large community provides peace and protection, patriotism and sometimes war, automobiles and the ratio. The smaller provides friends and friendship, gossip and face-to-face rivalry, local pride and abode. Both the essential to the full life process.

2.4 EXTERNAL STRUCTURE OF THE COMMUNITY :

Every community reveals an external structural character. A country is not simply a number of towns and cities scattered over a delimited territory : it has its metropolis, its capital, its functionally specialized regions and cities, and the network of connections between them. The city is not simply an aggregate or households or families, but a system or pattern into which the units–families, occupations and specializations of all kinds–are fitted. So with the smallest and the largest of communities.

1. **Specialization and Changing types of community structure :** Even the smallest village has some rudimentary form of structural system, evidenced, for example, by the location of the store or church or some locally important home, and by the particular configuration centering at or near the intersection of main and secondary lines of transportation and communication. This variety of spatial patterns of small communities is almost endless. Perhaps the major significance during recent years in altering the character of the local village structure is the "conquest of space by automobiles" for it has broken the chief bond that held people together in communities, and this, together with economic conditions, has brought about a dispersal of institutions. "Lessening the orientation towards a specific village centre. With the growth of the city the single focus of the village becomes differentiated into a number of foci for different activities, centers of finance, administration, fashion, recreation, and so forth.
2. **Community Structure as a "Natural" Development :** The pattern of the community is usually unplanned. It is determined by forces generated wherever people in any numbers are thrown into close relationship–forces of competition, attraction, struggle for dominance, co-operation for the sake of economy, and so forth. Thus the city takes spatial form Here there is

financial center, perhaps over topping all the rest with the skyscrapers that rise from narrow, crowded thoroughfares ; here the political center, broadly architectural, here the fashionable shopping center, its location changing from time to time ; here the brightly lit center of midnight life, often save what tawdry by day ; here the drab industrial areas with their tall chimneys ; and filling the interstices and flowing out to the periphery are the myriad homes of human beings, where economic and cultural forces brings groups together in areas that range through all degrees of " highly desirable" locations down to the congested slums. The pattern changes somewhat as the city continues to expand or as the greater forces shopping man's civilization bear upon it. But always there is the physical configuration, the distinctive form of a community.

2.5 COMMUNITY SENTIMENT : ITS PSYCHOLOGICAL CONFIGURATION

The nature and bases of community sentiment :

Wherever human beings are thrown together, separated in whole or in part from the world outside so that their lives in one another's company, we can observe the effects of those social impulses which bring men all over the earth into communities. We observe, in other words, the formation of community sentiment.

In the more permanent communities the same influences work more profoundly, rooted in the historical conditions which have created the cultural values of every territorial group. The land the members occupy together is for them much more than a portion of the earth's surface–it is their "home", enriched by past association and present experience. The sense of what they have in common–memories and traditions, customs and institutions–shapes and define the general need of men to live together. The community becomes the permanent background of their lives, and, in a degree, the projection of their individualities.

Community sentiment is developed by the socialization process itself, by education in the largest sense, working through prescription and authority, social esteem or disfavor, until habits and conformities become the ground of loyalties and

convictions. No human being can grow up within a community without having this sense of community impressed in the depths of his personality.

Analysis of Community Sentiment :

1. **The elements of community sentiment :** Community sentiment combines various elements, various types of attitudes, which are subtly compounded. Three of these, though closely interrelated, are clearly distinguishable.

   One : We-feeling : This is the feeling that leads men to identify themselves with others so that when they say "we" there is no thought of distinction and when they say "ours" there is no thought of division. This "we–sentiment" is found wherever men have a common interest, and thus throughout group life, but is nowhere revealed more clearly than where the interest is the territorial community.

   Two : Role Feeling : Another ingredient in community sentiment is the sense of place or station, so that each person feels he has a role to pay, his own function to fulfill in the reciprocal exchanges of the social scene. This feeling, involving subordination to the whole on the part of the individual, is fostered by training and habituation in the daily disciple of life.

   Three : Dependency feeling : Closely associated with role feeling is the individual's sense of dependence upon the community as a necessary action condition of his own life. This involved both a physical dependence, since his material wants are satisfied within it and a psychological dependence, since the community is the greater "home" that sustains him, embodying all that is familiar at least, if not all that is congenial to his life.

2. **The Complexity of Community Sentiment :** Community sentiment stimulates a common interest among the members of a locality. The peculiarity of this common interest is its broad or inclusive character, for it is not attached to specific objects but to the whole background of daily life, to place and people together. It embraces both what belong to us, the heritage of tradition, the position we occupy in the community, the familiar features and our possessions, and what we belong to, the obligations and responsibilities that hold us within the accepted social

order. These strands are variously interwoven into the community sentiment. Common interest here as elsewhere combines with self-limited interest in various proportions, that is, with individual perception of private benefit and advantages, and with the sense of prestige or privilege or power that the particular community bestows upon its members. In so far as the common interest extends among them, however, it represents an attachment to the complex unity of place and group.

Indications of Community Sentiment :

Common living on a common soil engenders distinctive likenesses in the members of a group. The recognition of these in turn reinforces community sentiment.

1. **Community folkways :** The most clearly revealed evidence of attachment to the community is that of the folkways, the modes of behaviour that characterize to locality. Of these, perhaps none is a more subtle index of the distinctiveness of the group than the peculiarities of speech of different regions. Through terms of phrases, idioms, manners of pronunciation, special words, and the uses of words, we can identify localities, although the more extreme distinctions of speech are being diminished by the extension of communication between communities. But every community, village or city or larger region, has its own marks of some sort, its local customs, its local spots of interest, often its peculiar beliefs and superstitions, its own folk tales and myths.
2. **Interest in the local life :** The members of a community are likely to be, not only physically but psychically, nearer to one another than to those outside. One indication is the love of gossip–always a certain sign of communal sentiment in any group. We find it more interesting generally to talk about those who belong to our community. What they do excites a more intimate emotion than even the more intrinsically important acts of outsiders. Similar signs of community sentiment include the belief in the excellence of local products and pride in the success of prestige, particularly outside the community, of a local resident.

2.6 The Nation as a type of community :

The community bases of the nation : In our present day civilization the nation remains the largest effective community. By this we mean that the nation is the largest group which is permeated by a consciousness of comprehensive solidarity, like other communities, the nation rests upon locality and community sentiment. Every nation, whether it exists in legal fact or merely in the hopes and aspirations of a people, views some geographical area is its own.

The distinctive features of nationality : That the nation has all the earmarks of a community is borne out when we examine nationality as a type of community sentiment. It shares the characteristics of other community attachments, and it also has distinctive marks of it own.

1. **Democratic nature :** Like all communal sentiments-as contrasted, for example, with class consciousness or ethnic group attitudes-nationality feeling is essentially democratic. In other words, it admits no grades, no hierarchy of membership. It does not exclude the poor or the wealthy ; it does not distinguish between the intelligent and the stupid or between the learned and the ignorant. It claims alike the allegiance of reactionary and conservative and liberal and radical and these groups in turn, whatever the degree of special interest of control from outside the nation, promote their programs in patriotism's name. Hence the sentiment of nationality does not depend on peculiar interest or specific attributes of all the members of a nation.
2. **The basic criterion of Nationality :** There are nations, that do not rule themselves politically, but we call them nations if they seek political autonomy. This is the basic criterion enabling us to distinguish as a type of community sentiment, created by historical circumstances and sported by common psychological factors, of such an extent and so strong that those who feel it desire to have a common government peculiarly or exclusively their own. Here we are defining the nation in terms of the sentiment the members share, a non-objective criterion.

The ground of the sentiment of Nationality :

On the other scale of the nation, community sentiment must be reconciled with the

fact that millions of persons of different rank and ethnic status are equally entitled to share it, and together constitute the social reality to which the sentiment is devoted. On such a scale it is not easy to find like qualities characteristic of the group as a whole.

1. **National likeness and national stereotypes :** The feeling of the in-group permeating the nation involves, of course, a sense of its distinctive qualities, traditions, and achievements. But when we seek specific likeness that characterize the members of any nation in contrast to all others, we are faced on a larger scale with a difficulty inherent in the nature of all community feeling. Fundamentally, the sense of solidarity rests upon what the members have in common rather than upon what they have a like.
2. **Manipulating nationality symbols and "crowd mentality" :** The symbols of nationality sentiment become attached to the cultural, economic, and political achievements of the group taken as a whole. Therefore, for lack of a specific object the sentiment is apt to take a traditional or mystical form, as seen in the adoration of the flag, the national anthem, or similar symbols. It is difficult for most individuals to grasp the content of the nation–idea ; hence the importance of term like "fatherhood" and "mother country" and "homeland" for they suggest the recognized intimacy of the primary group. Attachment to these symbols is normally ingrained early in the socialization process.

Form of National Sentiment and some broader implications :

We have seen that nationality, wherever found, rests upon the sense of sharing some common values usually expressed with relatively simple symbols. But the sentiment itself assumes many diverse forms.

1. **Patriotism :** In one from nationality coheres about the idea of the father-land or the homeland. When this thought inspires altruistic devotion it is properly named patriotism.
2. **Nationalism :** In another form the sentiment of nationality turns into nationalism, a group attitude of profound significance in the modern world. Nationalism as the "state of mind" that seeks not only to make the nation an effective unity, but to make it the object of man's supreme loyalty, has

developed remarkably in the western world since the 18th century and is growing today in the eastern world.

3. **Positive and Negative aspects of Nationality :** Nationality, it follows, may express a beneficial ideal of unity or it may be a cause of serious division between man and men. Consequently it has been as much denounced by some as it has been extolled by others. The prophets of nationality, like Mazzini, have regarded it as the very breath of life stirring in the people, while those of an opposite view have declared it an evil whose course "will be marked by material and moral rain, in order that a new invention may prevail over.... the interests of mankind".

Thus community is the most inclusive grouping of man, marked by the possibility for the individual member to live his life wholly within it. Community need not be self–sufficient, and in fact is decreasingly so as civilization becomes more interdependent. The two bases of all communities are the occupation of a territorial area and the shared possession of a community sentiment. There are many ranges and degree of modern society. Today none of us belongs to one inclusive community, but to nearer and wider communities at the same time. Moreover our sense of attachment to different communities varies from one to another and from time to time.

2.7 Sum up

The concept of community concerns a particularly constituted set of social relationship based on something which the participants have in common–usually a common sense of identity. According to Robert Nisbert (The sociological tradition, 1966), it was the most fundamental and far reaching of the core ideas incorporated in the discipline's foundations, principally because concern with loss of community was central to nineteenth–century sociology. The sociological content of community has, however, remained a matter for endless dispute.

These disputes flow from what Nisbert describes as the rediscovered symbolism of community in nineteenth–century thought, which identified this form as social association with the good society, and with all form of relationship which are characterized by a high degree of personal intimacy, emotional depth, moral

commitment, social cohesion, and continuity in time. It was feared that these were precisely the features which were disappearing in the transition from a rural based to an urban industrial society. This alleged loss of community was central to the work of Ferdinand Tonnies, who has been described as the founder of the theory of v. in the book Gemeinschaff and Gesellschaft ('Community and Society') Tonnies presented ideal typical pictures of these forms of social association, contrasting the solidaristic nature of social relations in the former, with the large–scale and impersonal relations thought to characterize industrializing societies.

One difficulty for the sociology of community ensuring from these intellectual origins is that it has frequently been used to identity and at the same time endorse a particular from of social association. A second is that there is no clear and widely accepted definition of just what characteristic features of social interaction constituted the solidaristic relations typical of so called communities. These value laden but imprecise circumstances go a long way to explaining a tried difficulty the empirical identification of communities. The term has been used in the sociological literature to refer directly to types of population settlements (such as villages or physically bounded urban neighborhoods) ; to supposedly ideal–typical ways of life in such places ; and to social network whose members shares some common characteristic apart from or in addition to common location (such as ethnicity or occupation). Frequently the term is used in ways which contain all these elements–as, for example, in traditional inner–city working class communities. "At one time the problem of defining the concept community provided the basis for a thriving sociological industry. In a classic contribution to this debate, George A. Hillery analyzed no fewer than ninety–four definitions of the concept, although his conclusions were hardly enlightening since he was able only to extract from these a classification which distinguished sixteen different and characteristic elements. These included geographical area, self–sufficiency, kinship, consciousness of kind, common life styles, and various intensive types of social interaction.

Family not only produces and rears cheap labour but also maintains it in good order at no cost to the employer. A women in her role as a housewife, attends to her husband's needs thus keeping him in good running order to perform his role as a wage

labourer. Fran Ansley translates persons' view in to Marxian framework by saying that the family functions to stabilize adult personalities. All the emotional support provided by the wife as a safety–value for the frustration produced in the husband by working in the capitalist system than being turned against the system. Which produces that frustration. In this way, the system is not threatened.

Kathy Mc Afee and Hyrana Wood claimed that "the poly dictatorship which most men exercise over their wives and family enables them to vent their anger and frustration in a way which poses no challenge to the system".

The social reproduction of labour power does not simply involve producing children and maintaining them in good health. It builds up the attitudes essential for an efficient workforce under to conform, to submit to authority and thus workforce required by capitalism.

Some of the criticism of previous views of the family also apply to Marxian approaches, both 'presuppose a traditional model of the nuclear family where there is a married couple with children, where the husband is a bread winner and where the wife says at home to deal with the housework' Marxian view of the family have developed to include families in which the wife is also a wage earner.

2.8 Check your progress

Q. 1. Define community and explain the bases of community in Indian Society ?

Q. 2. Describe Nation as a type of community ?

Q. 3. Explain community sentiment and give the external structure of community ?

2.9 Key words :

Community : Community is an area of social living marked by some degree of social coherence.

COURSE: SOC-C-101 **LESSON NO. 3**

UNIT-I **ASSOCIATION AND INSTITUTION** **SEMESTER-I**

STRUCTURE

3.1 Introduction

Objectives

3.2 Family as an association

3.3 The Great Association

3.4 Relation b/w Association and Community

3.5 Meaning and definition of Institution.

3.6 Types of Institution

3.7 Relation b/w Institution and Association

3.8 Sum up

3.9 Check your progress

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Associations as means of pursuing ends. There are three ways in which men seek the fulfilment of their ends. First, they act independently, each following his own

way without thought of his fellows or their actions. However seemingly desirable, this unsocial way has narrow conflict with one another, each shining to wrest from the others the objects that he prizes. But this method, if not channelled strictly by regulation, is precarious and wasteful and is opposed to the very existence of society. True, as we shall see later, conflict is an ever-present part of social life, but for the most part it is, like economic competition, socially limited and regulated. Finally, men may pursue their ends in company, on some co-operative basis, so that each is in some degree and manner contributing to the ends of his follows.

This last method, co-operative pursuit, may be spontaneous, such as the offering of a helping hand to a stranger. It may be determined by the customs of a community, as in the case of farmer assisting their neighbours at harvest time. On the other hand, a group may organize itself expressly for the purpose of pursuing certain of its interests together. When this happens, an association is born.

Thus an association is any public, formally constituted and non-commercial organization of which membership is optimal, within a particular society.

Examples include churches, political parties, pressure groups, leisure associations or clubs, neighbourhood groups, and (sometimes) trade unions and professional associations. In some theories of democracy, emphasis is placed on the important role such groups can play in fostering participation in the civil society and thus in maintaining social order.

Definitions :

The term describes either a process or an entity. The process has been of a number of individuals interacting for a specific ends or set of purposes. The entity has been an organization of individuals who are held together by a recognized set of rules governing their behaviour to one another for a specific and or set of purposes.

Some members of the society share some set of interests and in order to pursuit these common interests, an organization is deliberately formed which is called an association. Thus, an association is a group of people organized for the achievement of a particular interest or interests. Keeping this in mind, R. M. Maclver defined association as, “an organization deliberately formed for the collective pursuit of some

interests, or a set of interests, which its members share". Another thinker Morris Ginsberg defined it as a group of social beings related to one another by the fact that they posses or have instituted in common an organization with a view to securing a specific end or specific ends. Thus we can conclude that men have several interests an so they establish different associations to fulfill them.

They have a number of associations of different kinds such as political associations, religious associations, students associations, labourer's associations, professional associations, economic associations or business associations, international associations etc.

The associations may be found in different fields. No single association can satisfy all the interests of the individual or individuals. Since man has a bundle of interests, he organizes various associations for the purpose of fulfilling his varied interests. It follows then that a man may belong to more than one association. He may be member of a political association, religious association, an entertainment club, a sports club, a rotary club and so on.

Main characteristic of Association :

1. An association is formed or created by people. It is basically a social group. However, all groups are not associations, because, an association is basically an organized group like crowd or mob cannot be an association.
2. It is not merely a collection of individuals but consists of those individuals who have more or less the sense of interests. Accordingly, some join political associations and some join religious associations according to their interests.
3. An association is based on the co-operative spirit of its members. People work together to achieve some definite purpose. For example, a political party has to work together as a united group on the basis of co-operation in order to fulfill its objective of coming to power.
4. Association denoted kind of organization. An association is known essentially as an organized group. Organization gives stability and proper shape to an association. Organization refers to the way in which the statuses and roles are

distributed among the members.

5. Every association has its own ways and means of regulating the relations of its members. Organization depends on this element of regulation. The way assume written or unwritten forms.
6. Associations are means or agencies through which their members seek to realize their similar or shared interests. Such social organizations necessarily act not merely through leaders, but through officials or representatives as agencies. Associations normally act through agents who are responsible for and to the association. This fact gives association a distinctive character and its peculiar legal status. Further , association may have its own methods of operations.
7. An association may be permanent or temporary. There are some long-standing associations like the state, family, religious associations etc. Some associations may be purely temporary in nature.

It is clear from the above, that an association is not merely a group, it is something more than that. It is a group expressly organized around a particular interest. The qualification "expressly organized", helps us to distinguish between associations and other social groups. Social groups like class, crowd, mob, public etc. in this way, are not associations.

3.2 THE FAMILY AS AN ASSOCIATION :

In some of its forms, especially in some primitive and extremely rural societies, the family has many of the attributes of a community. In these cases, people toil, play and even worship almost wholly within the orbit of the family. It circumscribes largely or even wholly the lives of its members.

However, in modern, society as in all complex civilizations, the family becomes definitely an association, so far as its adult members are concerned. For the original contracting parties it is an association specifically established with certain ends in view. These interests are vastly important but nevertheless limited. The functions of the family are more and more limited and defined as the social division of labour increases.

But even in the most complex society, the family, for the new lives that arise

within it, is more than an association. To the child the family is a preliminary community by imperceptible degree it is transformed for him also, as he grows up, into an association of, often intense, but limited interest. Eventually he will normally leave it to establish a new family.

The state as an association :

The state is frequently confused with the community. In reality the state is one form of social organization, not the whole community in all its aspects. We distinguish, for example, the state from the church, the political from the religious organization. The confusion of community and state is increased by the usage of the same term to indicate either. Thus "United States" refers either to our national state association with its governmental apparatus or the national community which it governs.

It is highly important, of the understanding of social structure and particularly of the evolution of that structure, that we should realize the associational character of the state. The state is an agency of peculiarity of wide range, but nevertheless an agency. The state may assume at times absolutist or "totalitarian" form, claiming to control every aspect of human life. Even if this claim were fully realized–which never could be the case–the state would not become the community, but an association controlling the community.

Human beings are, without choice to be sure, citizens or subjects of the state. But they are also members of families and churches and clubs, they are friends or lovers, scientists or labourers or artists associating with their kind. However significant the citizen role may be, it is only one of many roles that each man exercises as a social being.

The state, we must recognize, is different in important respects from all other associations.

3.3 THE GREAT ASSOCIATION :

The nature and significance of the great association : The general features of the large scale associations are mentioned below :

1. **The growth of large-scale organization :** Where life is relatively simple,

as in a primitive community or in a frontier settlement, or where for any reason the area of effective communication is small, the face to face group suffices for most purposes. But where society expands, another kind of association grows necessary, the large–scale organziation with its impersonal or secondary relationship and its specialization of functions. Interests become differentiated. The service of experts is required. Techniques are elaborated, and the average member has neither the time nor the energy nor the skill to attend to them. The new range of the interest demands a complex organization. It is no longer localized and no longer controllable by the local group. The members are too numerous and too scattered to conduct their business through face-to-face relationships. Specially selected persons must act on behalf of the whole, a hierarchy of official arises ("bureaucracy") and the executive or controlling groups become distinct from the mess of the members. These features mark the rise of the modern state, the great corporation, the international cartel, the large church, the nation-wide political party, and the labour union. There are, of course, significant difference between these groups, but there are equally significant similarities.

2. **The individuals roles in large scale organization :** Within these multicellular organizations, with their various departments, informal primary groups develop. Other face-to-face groups remain as part of the formal structure-directorates, communities and so forth but their character and function have changed. Their members have become agents, delegates, officials, or experts. The lay members are now reduced to a more passive role, and while their relationship to one another and to the whole may become more complicated, they are for the most part, less engrossing. In this way the great state tends to develop its spectator–worshippers, the large corporation its passive stock holders, the political party its exploitable "rank and file", the union its "paper" dues paying members.

The large–scale organization is marked by formality and mechanical regulation. There is concentration of direction as well as division of labour. The average member occupies both as active and a passive role, and the two are not easy to reconcile. As in the state he is both citisen and subject, so in degree he is in even great association. They passive role bulks are largely the greater the association grows,

and thus the members are apt to feel that its elaborate machinery lies wholly outside themselves, beyond the area of their control.

3. **Large–Scale organizations and the primary groups :** Some sociologists have taken the position that with the growth of complex society the primary group gradually loses its character and binding strength. The primary group is an expression of communal relations, involving a sense of collective participation, and these, it is held, are in a large measure superseded by more superficial relations. This view was stated a century ago by Tonnies and today is frequently expressed by the students of rural–urban and regional sociology. Certainly the increase and functional dominance of the less intimate and less personal relationship are characteristic of every more advanced civilization. But whether the communal life that flowed into primary group relations actually declines and degenerates is a more debatable question. Possibl, it is expressed in other ways and is attached to large unities like the nation or the large region. In any event the question itself suggests significant difference between the primary group and the large–scale associations.

3.4 ASSOCIATION AND COMMUNITY :

It follows from our definition that an association is not a community, but an organisation within a community. A community is more than any specific organization that rise within it contrast, for example, the business or the church or the club with the village or city or nation. With respect to the business or church or club, we can ask such questions as why they exist and what they stand for. And we can answer it in terms of the particular interests around which they are organized. But if we ask why communities exist, we can expect no such definite answer.

Another contrast between the community and the association is revealed by considering the interest aspect of associations. Because the association is organized for particular purposes, for the pursuit of specific interests, we belong only by virtue of these interests. We belong to an athletic club for the purposes of physical recreation or sport, to a business for livelihood or profits, to a social cult for fellowship. Membership is in an association has a limited significance. It is true that an association may engage our whole devotion. Or the interests of an association may be wider

The following table makes clear the difference between association and community :

ASSOCIATION	COMMUNITY
1. Membership of an association is voluntary. Individuals are at liberty to join them.	1. By birth itself individuals become members of a community. In this way membership is rather compulsory.
2. An association has some specific interests or interest.	2. A community has some general interests.
3. An association does not necessarily imply the spatial aspects.	3. A community is marked by a locality.
4. An associations may be stable and long lasting or it may not be so.	4. A community is relatively more stable and permanent.
5. Associations may have their legal status.	5. A community has no legal status.
6. Associations may have their own rules and regulations to regulate the relations of their members. They may have written or unwritten rules.	6. A community regulates the behaviour of its members by means of customs, traditions etc. It does not have written rules or laws.
7. Association is partial. It may be regarded as a part of the community.	7. Community is integral. It may have, within its boundary, several associations.

than or different from those officially professed. But we belong to associations only by virtue of some specific interest that we posses. Consequently, there can be a multitude of associations within the community. And the individual, of course, may belong to many. The late president Butler of Columbia University reported membership in twenty clubs in addition to dozens of other associations.

Associations may become communities, at least temporarily. There are the examples of seventeenth–century trading company outposts which becomes communities in every respect, or of military units compelled to create their own communities when isolated for a period of time. And there are borderline cases between community and association, such as the monasteries, convents, and prisons. The two major social organizations which may seem to lie on the borderline between associations and communities are the family and the state.

Thus, an association is established for the purpose of fulfilling some common but definite needs of the people. It is hence deliberately created. On the other hand, community is a natural organization. Its objectives are common but not specific. Man is born in a community but he enters into different associations to fulfill his specific interests or needs. An association is not a community, but a church or trade union or a political party. We can call a country a community but not the political parties of the country. They are associations.

3.5 MEANING AND DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION

The structure of most of the important groups in society is determined by shared definitions of the statuses and roles of their members. When such statuses and roles are designed to perform major social functions, they are termed institutions. In popular usage the word institution generally refers to a large bureaucratic organization like a university or hospital or prison. But although the word has this meaning in everyday language, the sociological use of the term should not be confused with the meaning.

In sociology, an institution is a more or less stable structure of statuses and roles devoted to meeting the basic needs of people in a society. The family is an institution that controls reproduction and the training of new generations. The market is an institution that regulates the production and exchange of goods and

services. The military is an institution that defends a society or expands its territory through conquest. Any particular family, corporation or military unit is a group or organization with in one of these institutions.

Within any given institution there are norms that specify how people of various statuses are to perform their roles. Norms may be institutionalized in a group of any size and complexity. So to carry out one's role in that status is to behave in accordance with a normative system of set of mores and folkways that distinguish a particular institution from others. Hence each institution has a specific set of norms to govern the behaviour of people within that institution.

Definitions

The term institution has been defined and used in a variety of ways. It is defined as a complex of norms or rules regulating activity or as a set of behavioral patterns, a code of behaviour or a set of standardized group reaction pattern. According to Pimasheff and Facey. "An institution is a closely knit set of rules which imposes a relatively permanent way of satisfying the specific needs prevalent in society. Social institutions are the groups in which the social interaction between the members is regulated by custom. Thirdly, institutions have been defined as system or complexes of roles. Fourthly, an institution incorporates several diverse kinds of referents in a single cultural configuration or system.

As J. O. Hertzler points out social institutions are purposive, regulatory and consequently primary cultural configurations, formed unconsciously and or deliberately to satisfy individual, wants and social needs bound up with the efficient operation of any plurality of persons. They consist of codes, rules and ideologies, unwritten and written and essential symbolic organizational and material implementation.

A social institution is thus a recognised normative pattern. As such, it applies to a particular category of relationships. Thus the institution of marriage is a complex normative pattern that applies to all marriages in a particular social system or a particular segment of a social system. These marriages (relationships) conform to the pattern in varying degrees, of course, but married partners all know the pattern itself, if it is truly institutional and they regard it as morally valid and binding.

Thus Social Institutions are the organizational system a society uses to add one or

more of its basic needs. Human socialization occurs with in social institutions such as family and school, as society shapes the ways in which people feel, think and act. The functional tradition from Herbert spencer to Talcott Parsons drew a basic distinction between the structures and the processes of a society–analogous to the physical and organic structures of an organism and the activities which these perform. Thus social institutions were seen as structural components of society through which essential social activities were organized and social 'needs' were met. They could take the form of organizations, groups or practices of an enduring kind to which there was a high level of social commitment which integrated, ordered and stabilized major areas of social life, providing approved procedures and forms for the articulation of relationship and interests. Institutions were always in the course of formation, negotiation and decline, and this process was itself of major significance as a focus of analysis. In this account, institutions are simply patterns of behaviour which persist and crystallize in the course of time and to which people become attached as a result of their role in the formation of identity or through investments of energy of social interests.

Characteristics of Institution

1. **Institution defined as established forms of procedure :**

It is sometimes the practice to refer to anything which is socially established as an institution. This broad usage is illustrated, e.g. by H. E. Barnes, comprehensive study in which he described social institutions as the social structure and machinery through human society organizes, directs and executes the multifarious activities required to satisfy human needs.

2. **Universality :**

Social Institutions are ubiquitous. They exist in all the societies and existed at all the stages of social development. The basic institutions like family, religion, property and some kind of political institutions are observed even in the tribal or primitive societies.

3. **Social in Nature : They make us Social being**

Institutions come into being due to the collective activities of the people. They are

essentially social in nature. After all, institutions are the products of the secular and repititive forms of social relationships of the individuals.

4. Institutions as standardised Norms :

An institution must be understood as standardised procedures and norms. They prescribe the way of doing things. They also prescribe the rules and regulations that are to be followed. Marriage, as an institution, for example governs the relations between the husband and wife.

5. Institution as means of satisfying needs :

Institutions are established by the people themselves and they cater to the satisfaction of some of the basic vital needs of the individuals of the society.

6. Institutions as the Controlling Mechanisms :

Institutions like religion, morality, state, government, law, legislation etc. control the behaviour of men. These mechanisms preserve the social order and give stability to it. It is a complex of norms and rules regulating the activity of human life.

7. Institutions are interrelated :

Institutions though diverse are interrelated. Understanding of one institution requires the understanding of the other related institutions. The religious, moral, educational, political, economic and other types of institutions are essentially interlinked.

Gillin and Gillin have mentioned five or six characteristics of institutions, which can be represented by a chart.

3.6 TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS :

Sumner has divided institutions into two broad categories. viz. crescive institutions and enacted institutions. The crescive institutions are those which grow up unconsciously out of the mores such as property, family, religion etc. Exacted institutions are those which are consciously organized for definite purposes such as educational institutions etc. The former he called “the most primary institutions”. The later which are the result of the relational invention and intention are transformed into positive institutions defined by law and sanctioned by the force of the state.

Ballard has divided them into two categories basic and subsidiary. The basic are

those which are regarded as being necessary for the maintenance of social order in a given society. Among these he included family, private property, the church, the school and the state. Among subsidiary which not regarded as quite necessary we included recreational ideals and activities. However, it may be pointed out that the character of an institution as basic or subsidiary depends upon the total configuration of a culture of which it is a part what is basic in one culture may be subsidiary in other. Institutions have also been described as socially sanctioned or unsanctioned institutions. For example, business is a socially sanctioned institution, while a racket is an unsanctioned one.

Interdependence of Institutions :

In a traditional society the various institutions form a fairly unified and harmonious whole and the individual life is ordered with a minimum of stress by the institutional structure. The family fits in nicely with the economic institutions. Religion and other institutions of that society are harmonious, they do not clash with each other, and the individual feels no stress and strains due to institutional inconsistencies. From the earliest day of his existence of his death, the pattern of behaviour is set for the individual and satisfied fairly well with basic needs. Hence only the radical individual deviate experiences distress.

Others are passed into conformity with the general order of life provided by the institutions of the society. In a changing society, whatever harmony has been established is marred by changes in one or more of the vs. Economic changes occur or new ideas arise which conflict with the old traditions or contact with other peoples introduces strange institutions which are more agreeable to some individuals. Thus institutional disharmony results. The gang develops its own institutions at variance with those of the major part of the society, becomes popular with a part of the population, or new economic ideals and practices are introduced because they are more efficient and they do not harmonize with other societal institutions. Thus disharmony is the result.

As the various institutions are dependent upon one other the whole cultural and social system tends to be bound together from the static point of view, rather like the stones in an each arch, although a socio cultural system is much more fluid and shifting than a masonry arch. For example a joint family system is connected

with agricultural economy and has been affected by industrial economy.

3.7 Institution and Association :

The difference between association and institution is so subtle that sometimes it becomes difficult to separate them when men create associations they must also create rules and procedures for the dispatch of the common business and for the regulation of the members to one another. Such forms are distinctively institutions. The church, for example, has its sacraments, its modes of worship its rituals.

Different meanings represented by institutions :

S. No.	Institutional Elements	Family	Staff	Church	Industry
1.	Stated objectives and purposes	Procreation, social status etc.	Protection of rights providing job security, etc.	Establi-shment relations with natural	Providing Income, etc.
2.	Behaviour patterns, including attitudes	Love, affection, devotion, loyalty, respect, obedience etc.	Devotion loyalty, respect, obedience etc.	Reverence, awe, fear etc.	Fairplay, thrift, workman ship etc.
3.	Symbolic traits	Wedding ring, crest, coat of arms, heirlooms etc.	Flag, seal, emblem, anthem, uniform etc.	Cross idd, shrine, altar hymn etc.	Trademark design, advertising, emblem etc.

4.	Utilitarian traits	House furnishings etc.	Public buildings, public works etc.	Temple baptistery	Stores, factories, ships, railroads, machinery etc.
5.	Oral or written tradition	Marriage, license, genealogy etc.	Constitution Treaties, Laws, history etc.	Bible, catechism etc.	Contracts, franchises, articles of incorporations etc.

The family has a marriage contract, is the institution of the marriage relationship, it has the home, the family name and so forth. The state has its own peculiar institutions such as representative government and legislative procedure.

One belongs to associations, but not to institutions. If one considers something as an organized group, it is an association ; it is a form of procedure, it is an institution. Association denotes membership ; institution denotes a mode or means of service. When college is regarded as a body of teachers and students it is an associational aspect, but when one regards it is an educational system, one is selecting its institutional features. One cannot belong to an institution. One do not belongs to marriage or property systems or solitary confinement, but one does belong to families, to states and sometimes to prisons.

The table below makes clear the difference between association and institution :

ASSOCIATION	INSTITUTION
1. An association is a group of people organized for the purpose of fulfilling a need or needs.	1. Institution refers to the organized way of doing things. It represents common procedure.
2. Association denotes membership. We belong to associations, to political parties, unions, to the family, to the community, to the home, the family name and so forth.	2. Institution denotes only a mode or means of service. We do not belong to institutions. We do not belong to institutions such as marriage, property, education or law.
3. Association consist of individuals.	3. Institutions consist of laws, rules and regulations.
4. Associations are concrete.	4. Institutions are abstract.
5. An association has a location ; it makes sense to ask where it is. Thus, a family can be located in space.	5. An institution does not have location. The question where it is makes no sense at all. Thus, we cannot locate examination, education, marriage etc.
6. Associations are mostly created or established.	6. Institutions are primarily evolved.
7. An association may have its own distinctive name.	7. Institutions does not possess specific names, but has a structure and may have a symbol.
8. Associations may be temporary or permanent.	8. Institutions are relatively more durable.

Institution and Community :

It should be observed that there are institutions established by communities as well as these that associations set up. Such are, e.g. festivals, ceremonies expressive of important occasions, modes of recreation and amusement. Consider in our own urbanized society the quit systematized procedures that have been established for "dating" or the everywhere recognized practices of movie going and radio listening. These forms of procedure, to be sure, are frequently part of the practices of associational groups–thus dating in the college fraternity or radio listening within the family–but they are neither establsihed by associations nor characteristically continued to them.

Communal institutions, unlike many associational institutions, do not result from a deliberate act of establishment. They are, to use Summer's well–known distinction, cresive rather than enacted. Communal institutions gradually attain social recognition, they grow into establishment. In the final analysis, it can be seen that all institutions, communal or associational, are crescive. "Even if it is deliberately establsihed, an institution has neither a definite beginning nor an uncompromised identity".

Functions of Social Institution :

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

1. **Institutions cater to the satisfaction of needs :**

Institutions contribute to the fulfilment of the fundamental human needs. Thus institutions are the organizational system a society uses to add one or more of its basic needs.

2. **Institutions control human behaviour :**

Institutions organize and regulate the system of social behaviour. Through, the institutions the unexpected, spontaneous and irregular behaviour of people is replaced by expected, patterned, systematic, regular and predictable behaviour. Thus the

interpersonal relationships of the individuals are regulated by institutions. They make clear for the members what is allowed and what is not ; what is desirable and what is undersirable. e.g. governmental institutions.

3. Institutions simplify Actions for the individuals :

Since the institutions prescribe a particular way of behaviour for the fulfilment of the basic needs, they save much of the energy and time. They avoid confusion and uncertainties and contribute to a system and order in society.

4. Institutions assign Roles and Statuses to the Individuals :

Institutions of the social behaviour consists of the establishment or definite norms. These norms assign statuses positions and role–functions in connection with such behaviour. Institutions such as family, marriage, education, property, division of labour, caste, religion etc. provide some social standing for the individuals concerned.

5. Institutions contribute to Unity and Uniformity :

Institutions which regulate the relations between individuals have largely been responsible for unity and uniformity that are found in a society.

3.8 Conclusion

Social institutions incorporate a body of formal or informal rules and regulations through which activities of a society or of an organization are carried out or regulated. Indeed, social institutions are the means of the social end. It can be exemplified that through the institution of marriage. The sexual life of the members of the society is regulated. Similarly, religious institutions promote knowledge, skill and socialization process of the society.

Hence social institutions are the established forms of procedure consisting of rules and regulations which regulate the human behaviour in the society.

3.9 Ask yourself

Q. 1. Define Association and Explain the relation between Association and Community ?

Q. 2. Explain Family as an Association ?

Q. 3. Give the meaning of Institution and its types ?

Q. 4. Give the relation and difference between Association, Community and Institution ?

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 4
UNIT-I	CULTURE	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

5.0 Objectives

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Meaning and definition

4.3 Complexes of Culture

4.4 Culture and Society Relation

4.5 Sum up

4.6 Ask yourself

4.7 Key words

4.1 INTRODUCTION

It is a observed fact that behaviour of human being shows regular and recurrent patterns. Certain types of human actions are repeated over time for example if you meet some body you will greet him first. The ways of greeting in different groups may be different, like in India such action may take the form of 'Namaste' and in western society it may be 'hello' etc. Every human group has its unique standard pattern of behaviour. This aspect of human behaviour i.e. the existence of a standardised pattern of behaviour is the basis for the study of sociology. Sociologist have developed the concept of culture in order to explain the regularities in human action and the fact of social life.

Culture is one of the most important concept in Social Science. It is a main concept in Anthropology and a fundamental one in Sociology. The study of society or any aspect of it becomes incomplete without the proper understanding of the culture of that society.

Culture makes the human beings distinctively human. It consists of the belief, ideas, sentiments and symbols in short, the collective representations that people share. It is a pattern system of symbols that mediate and regulate communication. Culture include the whole body of knowledge that people hold in common and the various ideas and values that provided them with general principle of action and rules of behaviour. It is transmitted from person to person through communication and it is acquired by new members of society (infants and children) through socialization. Individual personalities are formed through the internalization of cultural ideas and this internalization ensures a degree of uniformity in personality or character of those who live in particular policy.

Above discussion on culture put forth a question that where the culture exists in the society. Culture exists within the individual minds. Linton rightly says that the culture of society is a abstraction that is identified by the sociologist or anthropologist from the contents of individual minds and the artifacts that people produce. Similarly, in Khukhon's works, a culture is the network of abstracted patterns, generalized by the anthropologists to represent the regularities distinctive of the group in question.

As it has no substantial existences outside individual minds, the mental processes inform their action. But culture is not only a subjective reality. As a collective representations, cultural also have a objection reality. This is not the reality of a social or group mind, but the reality of shared values and idea. Margret Archar has recently cost this as more abstract terms. Acultural system is a corpus of existing intelligiblia, a collection of things capable of being grasped, deciphered, understoond or known. The relations among the elements that make up culture are not relations of real inter-connection of causal or functional connection. The coherence of a culture is a matter of the internal relation between meaning components.

After a brief discussion on culture, you must be well aware that culture is a human creation and may be taken as constituting the way of entire society this will include codes of meanness, dress, language and rituals, norms of behaviour and system of

belief. Sociologists stress that human behaviour is primarily the result of nature rather than nature knowledge of culture is acquired through a complex process which is fundamentally social in origin. Human being are both acted on by culture and act back and so generate new cultural forms and meaning. Culture once developed, undergo change, along side changes in economic, social, political organization of society. It is virtually impossible for any human behaviour to recide outside the cultural influences.

4.2 MEANING AND DEFINITION

There are atleast two every day, common sense meaning of culture. The first is the 'best' achievements and Products in art, literature and music. The second is artificial growth or development of microscopic organisms or species of plant, a meaning derived from a much older usage of the verb 'to cultivate'.

Here we need to remember that although sociology is concerned with common sence meaning, it must look beyond them for theories, explanations and interpretations. Durkheim saw the study of 'Collective representation' and their symbolic meaning as central to sociological understanding. In a very different tridition, Max Weber saw sociology as one of the 'cultural sciences' concerned with value and meaning, developing concepts and interpretations to a society in which they take shape.

The English term culture has been used in various concepts. Kroeber and Kluckhon in their paper entitled "Culture A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions", have collected the concept and definitions of culture. According to them, the term culture, has been defined as having 108 different meanings. Literaturists have used the term culture for social charm and intellectuals excellence. Some sociologist have accepted intellectual readings as cultural elites or leaders of society. According to Sorokin and MacIver, culture stands for moral spiritual and intellectual attainments of men.

In Hindi, the term Sanskrit (culture) has been taken from Sanskrit language. Both terms Sanskriti and Sanskrit have been composed from the term Sanskar. The meaning of Sanskar is satisfaction of total rituals. In Hindu Society, an individual has to go through various ritual performances from the very day of his or her birth. In this sense, culture means fulfillment of aims of social life through different sanskars. It is a process of integration. By performing sanskar a man becomes social being.

Here in above discussion, about the meaning of culture you must have clearly understood that the Sociological meaning of culture differs sharply from the ordinary and literary uses of the terms. In connectional usage, it designate those traits that are regarded as refinements, such as painting, music, poetry etc. The Sociological usage of the term culture exclude music, painting, art galleries etc. but includes football, beliefs, superstitions, practices and even crimes. It includes all activities that are characteristics of a given group of people, their complete design for living.

Definition

Culture has been defined by different thinkers in different ways and in a different senses. Edwars. B. Taylor was the first anthropologist to provide a scientific definition of culture.

He is his book entitled, 'Primitive Culture' (1871), defines culture as that complex whole which includes art, belief, knowledge, morals, laws, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. According to this definition, culture is a social heritage which is given by society to its individuals. The Phrase acquired by man throws light on the fact that one cannot acquire culture in isolation from society. In other words, the concept of culture has a social context.

According to Molinowski, culture is that way of life and it includes all the mental, social and physical means which make life run its course. In other words, culture may be defined as a system of desired needs and an organised system of purposeful activities.

Bidney in this book, holds the view that culture of a people may be defined as the sum total of materials and intellectual equipment, whereby they satisfy their biological and social needs and adapts themselves to their environment.

E. A. Hobal in his book, 'Man in primitive world' has defined culture as sum total of integrated behaviour pattern, which are characteristic of the members of a society, and which are, therefore, not the result of biological inheritance. Thus according to him, culture is not determined by heredity but it is a result of total social inventions. In other words, culture is invention of man for the fulfillment of social needs. It is transferred from one generation to another through socialization

process and exchange of ideas.

Herskovits, in his book 'Man and his work', classify environment into natural environment represents the culture of man because it is made by man himself. The natural things which are shaped into different forms represent the work of the man. Thus all material and non-material things made by man represents culture.

According to Redfield, culture is an organised body of conventional understandings manifest in art and artifacts which persisting through traditions, characterizes a human group. For him culture is sum total of conventional meaning embodied in artifacts, social structure and symbols.

From the above analysis of definitions of culture, it is clear that there is no unanimity among the sociologist and anthropologist so far as one definition of culture is concerned. This reveals its merits and demerits. Beals and Hoiger in their book, 'An introduction to Anthropology' have attempted to summarise the definitions of culture as suggested by anthropologists. According to them, the term culture, as used by anthropologists, may be applied as follows :

(i) To the ways of life or designs for living common at any one time to all mankind.

(ii) To the way of living peculiar to a group of societies between which there is greater or lesser degree of integration.

(iii) To the patterns of behaviour peculiar to given society.

(iv) To special ways of behaving characteristic of segments of a large and complex organised society.

You can easily understand from this discussion that sociologist and Anthropologists adopted different mode to define culture. Some have seen culture in concrete and abstract from i.e. material and non-material culture. Malinowski and Radcliff Brown have given an instructional and humanistic definition of culture. For Malinowski, culture is an instrument for the satisfaction of needs of man whereas Radcliff Brown regards culture as a social heritage which perpetuates social life. The structural functionalist have regarded the whole of culture as a unit

of study. They take a holistic view of culture. Some anthropologists have also regarded culture to be subjective.

Though the different thinkers have adopted different mode to define culture but all of them agree that culture cannot originate and develop in isolation.

4.3 COMPONENTS OF CULTURE

Explicit of Culture

According to Clyde Kluckhohn (1949) "explicit is the outer and facial aspect of culture, where intrinsic elements, core etc. of culture are not "discussed".

Implicit of culture

Just contrary to the former, according to Kluckhohn (*ibid*), implicit of culture deals with the integral aspect of culture. Here a inside view of culture is presented.

Culture and Culture Construct

Ralph Linton (1945) was of opinion hat when we see some thing from our own eyes and if that is culture, then whatever we write about the inside aspect of culture, that should be called "culture construct".

Themes

Morris Opler is of opinion that the integral aspect of culture can be understood through "themes" of the culture. Thus, according to him, while studying a particular society, one should locate and identify different themes of the culture, which would ultimately reveal an integrated form of culture.

Autonomous Culture

Robert Redifield (1956) was of opinion that there are some primitive tribes in the world, which are self sufficient and require nothing from the outside world and hence their culture is also autonomous. He said that the tribes of Andman, specially the Jarwa, who have not yet come into the contact of the outside world, are self-sufficient and, therefore, their culture should be designated as an autonomous culture, while the culture of the peasant society, which shares many thing from the outside world, is "half-culture".

Ethos and Eido

According to Kroeber eidos is the formal appearance of a culture derived from its constituents. Constructed with the aggregate of constituents, according to Kroeber, is the ethos.

Covert and Overt Culture

This term covert refers to those aspects of a group's culture which are not amenable to direct observation by the ethnographer. It include values, beliefs, dreams, fears etc.

The term over prefers to actions and artifacts of a people which can be directly perceived by the ethnographer–such as housetypes, clothing, gestures, speeches etc.

Etic and Emic Culture

Etics is a label for a variety of theoretical approaches in anthropology concerned with the outsider's view of culture. Etics involves the careful specification of the categories, the logical relations between categories and assumptions underlying the uses of these categories by social scientists.

Emics refers to a variety of theoretical field approaches in anthropology concerned with the inside or native view of culture. The concept is based on the formulation of Kenneth Pike (1954), who proposed that a model for studying non-linguistic behaviour be devised analogous to the phonetic and phonemic approaches in linguistic theory and hence emic and etic.

Culture Pluralism

When two or more cultural systems in long continued contact work out a mutual accommodation which allows each to sustain its distinctive way of life, a condition of stabilised cultural pluralism is achieved.

Cultural Relativism

The concept of cultural relativism subsumes two components : an ideological affirmation of the existential uniqueness of every culture and a pragmatic rule of anthropological research, both theoretical and applied. Hence, cultural relativism is an anthropological dogma, which developed in reaction to the blatant ethnocentrism that characterised the reports about "primitive" peoples by European travellers and the naive early ethnographers.

Cultural Revitalization

This term refers to the process through which a society in decline reinterprets symbols from its cultural repertoire and revives its members will be survive. The new identity is a combination of old and new elements.

Mass Culture

According to some social scientists, industrialisation, bureaucratization, urbanisation and geographical mobility have undermined the importance of primary groups or close relationships among people. As a consequence, society tends to be a mass of atomized, undifferentiated and shapeless individuals. Thus, mass society generates mass culture.

Counter Culture

Group ways of thinking and acting which are in opposition to the prevailing norms and values of the society. Since the mid 1960s the term has come to means a specific form of youth culture found in most of the industrialised western societies.

Universals of Culture

This phrase refers to two distinct phenomena, one within a culture and another between cultures. Within a culture, a universal, as defined by Ralph Linton, includes all the culture content, ideas, behaviours and conditioned emotional responses that are common to all normal adult members of the culture.

On an inter-cultural level the terms refers to aspects of culture believed to exist in all human societies.

Ethnocentricism

This term refers to the tendency to use the norms and values of one's own culture or sub-culture as a basis for judging others. The concept of ethnocentrism is often contrasted with that of cultural relativism–the perception that the norms and values of each culture have their own validity and cannot be used as a standard for evaluating other cultures.

Ethnogenesis

This term refers to the creation of a new group of tribal identity. The

development of a new tribe with its own distinctive culture and language generally involves the splitting of one society. In course of time the scattered groups of refugees from several tribes or groups may coalesce to form a distinctly new society.

With these brief interpretations and approaches to the study of culture in anthropology, which have been referred to earlier just as a prelude to anthropological development, I now take up the discussion of different schools of anthropological thought in next chapter.

4.4 CULTURE AND SOCIETY–RELATION

Three main group of anthropologists have come to establish culture as concept in the study of social science. These consists of :

(i) Anthropologist, who define culture and all embracing including society. One of the chief exponent of this view was Malinowski.

(ii) Anthropologist who dischotomise between society and culture. For example, Radcliffe Brown, Evans Pritchard, Leach and most British anthropologists.

(iii) Anthropologist, who steer a middle course by accepting the society and culture of this aspect of social realities, viewed from different dimensions, that of relationship and grouping and that of action and behaviour. The chief advocate of this approach in Levistrauss, a French anthropologist.

Levi struss statement reveals that society appeared before culture because it obliquely refers to evolutionary development of culture and society.

Krocber, an American diffusionist, was one of the earliest anthropologist to say that society do not exist without culture and culture makes human society, different from other animal society.

Krocber pointed out that culture and society are arbitrary concept and as actual phenomena are Interwoven and difficult to distinguish. He postulated a truism in the study of man. No society, no culture, no culture no society. By this, he was emphasising upon the uniqueness of human society as opposed to that animal society.

Leslie White, in his neo-evolutionary approach to culture, holds that man is

the only living species that has culture. Culture depends upon symboling. He defines symboling as the ability to originate and bestow meaning upon a thing and ability to grasp and appreciate such meaning. The transition from anthropoid society to human social organisation was made possible by the emergence of faculty of symboling.

It is clear from this reasoning that human society is different from that of animals or empthropoid apes. Thus, culture is society based, an ability to use symbols.

The civilizationists or Redfieldians have used the term culture and society as synonymic. They have regarded both as interrelated and inseparable.

4.5 SUM UP :

From the above discussion, one can easily understand that culture is a post of every society but every society have its own culture. It is the culture that differentiates one society from another. In order to understand any society, understanding of its culture is very important.

4.6 ASK YOURSELF ?

Q. 1 Define culture ? Describe the components of culture ?

Q. 2. 'Culture of Society is an Abstraction' Comment.

4.7 KEY WORDS

Culture	:	Shared set of symbols and their definitions or meanings prevailing in a society.
Sub culture	:	More or less distinctive beliefs, norms, symbols, values and idiologies shared by groups with in a larger population.

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 5
UNIT-I	NORMS AND VALUES	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

5.1 Social Control

5.1.1 Definitions

5.1.2 Objectives

5.1.3 Functions

5.1.4 Forms

5.2 Social Sanctions

5.2.1 Introduction

5.2.2 Meaning

5.2.3 Types of Sanction

5.3 Norms and Sanctions

5.4 Values

5.4.1 Introduction

5.4.2 Meaning

5.4.3 Characteristics

5.4.4 Types of Values

5.4.5 Importance & function of values

5.5 Norms and Values

5.5.1 Meaning

5.5.2 Types

5.6 Conclusion

5.7 Ask yourself.

5.8 Key words

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 far 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.

5.1.1 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 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 refers 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 of 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) forcing them to conform to the accepted standard behaviours.

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 well-being, 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.

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 have 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.

5.1.2 OBJECTIVES

Kimball Young (1942) stated that the social control aims to "bring about conformity, solidarity, and continuity of a particular group or society". It is essential for the continued existence of the society. On the basis of above analysis, the main objectives of social control may be stated as under:

(1) To regulate the individual behaviour and avoid clash in the society

(2) To maintain and re-establish the social order.

(3) To establish unity and solidarity among the members.

(4) To ensure the continuity of the group or the society.

(5) To secure member's conformity to the group expectations.

(6) To bring society's recalcitrant and deviant members back into the line.

(7) To check cultural degeneration and social disintegration.

5.1.3 FUNCTIONS

The major functions of social control are:

(1) It forces persons to get obeyed by 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 the 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.

5.1.4 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 than 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 importance 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 betel nut), become difficult to enforce.

5.2 SOCIAL SANCTIONS

5.2.1 INTRODUCTION

What happens when people violate a widely shared and understood norm? Suppose that a football coach sends a twelfth player onto the field. Imagine a college graduate showing up in cutoffs for a job interview at a large bank. Or consider a driver who neglects to put any money in a parking meter. In each of these situations, the person will receive sanctions if his or her behaviour is detected.

Sanctions are penalties and rewards for conduct concerning a social norm. Note that the concept of reward is included in this definition. Conformity to a norm can lead to positive sanctions such as a pay raise, medal, a word of gratitude, or a pat on the back. Negative sanctions include fines, threats, imprisonment, and even stares of contempt.

5.2.2 MEANING

All social norms are accompanied by social sanctions. Any system of social control depends on sanctions. The sanctions which enforce norms are a major part of the mechanism of social control. A sanction is any reaction from others to the behaviour of an individual or group. According to Oxford Dictionary of Sociology (1994), any means by which conformity to socially approved standards is enforced, is called social sanctions. Sanctions may also be defined as the deprivations which accompany or follow behaviour which is disapproved. The concept has played an important part in the explanation of social order.

5.2.3 TYPES OF SOCIAL SANCTIONS

Sanctions may be both positive and negative. In folk wisdom, it is known as the "carrot and the stick principle". When our actions meet normative expectations or conform to wider expectations, we are generally rewarded (or subject to a positive

sanction); failure to meet such expectations, we are generally rewarded (or subject to a positive sanction); failure to meet such expectations leads to punishment (punishing the various forms of deviance) known as negative sanction. Not all norms carry the same sanctions because not all norms are of equal importance in a culture. Rewards are explicit and definite expressions of group approval. The thing given as reward may be wholly immaterial. Penalties (punishments) are always coercive. They may vary in severity from death or violence against the person, imprisonment, and deprivation of some sort, the infliction of pain, or mutilation, loss of liberty or civil privileges, social disapproval like avoidance, ostracism, jeering, or the use of unfriendly nicknames. There is a considerable variation in different societies in who is supposed to apply the sanctions. The list of possible sanctions in social interaction is huge, as is the range of their severity.

Sanctions can be informal, such as approving or disapproving glance or verbal abuse and formal, such as a fine or reward given by an official body or some kind of legal restraint. Sanctions serve to reinforce both formal and informal social norms. Sanctions may also be divided into external and internal. External sanctions are those which are applied by others to the actor of whose acts they disapprove, whereas internal sanctions are applied by the actor to himself. A person who has done wrong in other's eyes has also done wrong in his own, and experiences accordingly unpleasant feeling of guilt, shame, remorse, or sef-accusation. Social control depends more on internal sanctions than external ones. To rely entirely on external sanctions would be wasteful of time and effort both.

5.3 NORMS AND SANCTIONS

The relationship between norms and sanctions is summarized. As one can see in this table, the sanctions that are associated with formal norms (those written down and codified) tend to be formalized as well. If a coach sends too many players onto the field, the team will be penalized 15 yards. The college graduate who comes to the bank interview in cutoff blue jeans will probably be treated with contempt by bank officials and will almost certainly lose any chance of getting the job. The driver who fails to put money in the parking meter will be given a ticket and expected to pay a fine.

Table 1.1 Norms and Sanctions		
	Sanctions	
Norms	Positive	Negative
Formal	Salary bonus	Demotion
	Testimonial Dinner	Firing from a job
	Medal	Jail sentence
	Diploma	Expulsion
Informal	Smile	Frown
	Compliment	Belittling
	Cheers	Humiliation

Implicit in the application of sanctions is the detecting of norm violation or obedience. A person cannot be penalized or rewarded unless someone with the power to provide sanctions is aware of the person's actions. Therefore, if none of the officials in the football game realizes that there is an extra player on the field, there will be no penalty. If the police do not see the car which is illegally parked, there will be no fine or ticket. Furthermore, there can be improper application of sanctions in certain situations. The referee may make an error in counting the number of football players and levy an undeserved penalty on one team for "too many players on the field".

An examination of data on fires reveals interesting cross-cultural differences in norms and sanctions. While the United States has the world's most advanced fire-prevention technology and the best-trained firefighters, it nevertheless has registered the worst fire death rate in the industrialized world for decades. In Japan and several European nations, there are severe penalties for "unintentionally" (negligently) causing a fire. You can receive a long prison term sometimes even a life sentence, for carelessly causing a fire by smoking in bed, leaving pans cooking on a stove, or overloading your electric circuits. But in the United States - where there are about 5000 fire-related deaths each year and 2 million severe burn injuries-such fires are treated by the criminal justice system as "accidents." Our culture maintains strong norms concerning people's behaviour in the privacy of their own homes, even when they may endanger others (McMillan, 1995).

The entire fabric of norms and sanction in a culture reflects the culture's values and priorities. The most cherished values will be most heavily sanctioned; matters regarded as less critical, on the other hand, will carry light and informal sanctions.

Conclusion

Social sanctions are used by society to motivate people to act in ways considered right. Sanctions do not have to be activated to be effective; often, the anticipation of reward or punishment is sufficient to ensure conformity. C.W. Mills (1951) wrote: "the mere anticipation of probable sanctions (ranging from embarrassment to imprisonment) is often sufficient to restrain the behaviour in question".

5.4 VALUES

5.4.1 INTRODUCTION

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).

5.4.2 MEANING OF VALUES

Generally, values have 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 themselves. It is not easy to clarify the fundamental values of a given society because of their sheer breadth.

5.4.3 CHARACTERISTICS

Values may be specific, such as honouring 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 does the reverse, and a third gives 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.

5.4.4 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 recognisation and protection of the human personality such as honesty, loyalty, veracity and honour.

2) Collective Values

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

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

(1) Intrinsic Values

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

(2) Instrumental Values

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

5.4.5 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 emphasised 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. They 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.

5..5 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 norms. 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 conform to a particular value of a society, there can be many norms. Norms link values with actual norms. In brief,

values are ends while nonns 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.

5.5.1 MEANING

A norm is an 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.

5.5.2 TYPES

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

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.

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.

5.6 CONCLUSION

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 life. Socially shared, intensely felt values are a fundamental part of our lives in the United States.

5.7 ASK YOURSELF

Q. 1. Define social control and Describe its forms and functions ?

Q. 2. 'Sanctions are associated with Norms' comment.

Q. 3. Explain the relationship between Norms and Values ?

5.8 KEY WORDS

Norms : Formal or informal rules ftating how categories of people are expected to act in particular situations, violations of which are subjected to sanction.

Values : Cultural conceptions about what are desireable goals and what are appropriate standards for judging actions.

Folkways : Traditional rules about customary ways of behaving that are informally enforced and of mild concern to society members.

Mores : Traditional rules about how the individual must or must not behave, invested with strong feelings and informally enforced.

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 6
UNIT-I	SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

6.0 Objective

6.1 Introduction

6.2 Functional Perspective

6.3 Conflict Perspective

6.4 Posivistic Perspective

6.5 Evolutionary Perspective

6.6 Key words

6.7 References

6.0 OBJECTIVE

After going through this chapter, the learner is able

→ understand the point of view of thinkers

→ Functional as well as conflict perspective.

→ Posiritic as well as Evolutionary perspective

6.1 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-are point of view that is needed, identifies certain facts of most importance 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 will use the term as an orientation or point of view.

A distinctive perspective is central to the discipline of Sociology which is defined as 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, looks into micro tradition and the perspective that will be discussed under the heading that is away from positivism.

6.2 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 interms 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 have 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 pre-requisite 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 there is no 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 functionalist 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 as 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 analyze 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 and 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. 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', that is on agreement about values by members of society. Thus if the major values of society are expressed in the various parts of the social structure, those parts will be integrated. For example, 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 suits. 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 value 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.

6.3 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 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 as 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 theorists throughout the history including Thomas Hobbes, 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 as 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 it 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. Karl Marx and Class Conflict:

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. Ralph Dahrendorf and Conflict:

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 more 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 of perpetual struggles for power and outlawry that sees only in death. Dahrendorf's point of departure is the assertion that all social organizations are infact best an hierarchies of power. The powerful and able 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 are always in a state of conflict and the interest of some persons are always opposed to those of others. Dahrendorf saw these interests not in economic terms, as 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.

The functional and Marxian Perspective though provides different point of view in many respects but they have number of factors in common, most important of them is that offer a general explanation of whole and are known of macro-theories but interaction perspectives are micro perspectives and it focuses on small scale units rather than society as a whole. As the name suggests, interactionism is concerned with the interaction which means action between individuals. The interactionist perspective seeks to understand this process. It begins with the assumption that action is meaningful to those involved. It therefore, follows that an understanding of action requires an interpretation of meanings which actors give to their activities.

The interactionist 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's 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.

6.4 POSITIVIST PERSPECTIVE

The acknowledged founder of *"positivism"* or *"positive philosophy"* is no other than the French philosopher Comte himself. "Positivism" is nothing but a *"philosophy of science."* It has its roots in the *"empiricist tradition."* It rejects metaphysical speculation in favour of "positive" knowledge based on systematic observation and experiment. Though Comte is regarded as the founder of positivism, he was influenced by the writings of **David Hume and Claude H. Saint-Simon.**

Meaning of Positivism

- Positivism refers to "the doctrine formulated by Comte which asserts that the only true knowledge is scientific knowledge, that is, knowledge which describes and explains the co-existence and succession of observable phenomena, including both physical and social phenomena."
- Positivism denotes "any sociological approach which operates on the general assumption that the methods of physical sciences (example, measurement, search for general laws, etc.) can be carried over into the social sciences."

Nature of Comtean Positivism

Comte used the term "positivism" in two distincitve ways: (i) *positivism as a "doctrine"* and (ii) *positivism as a* "method".

Positivism As a Doctrine

Positivism as a Way of Thinking : (As developed by Auguste Comte, positivism is a way of thinking based on the assumption that it is possible to observe social life and establish reliable, valid knowledge about how it works.) Such knowledge can be used to affect the course of change and improve the human condition.

Positivism of Comte which represents a philosophical position states that knowledge can be derived only from sensory experience. Metaphysical speculation, subjective or intuitive insight, and purely logical analysis, are rejected as outside the realm of true knowledge. The methods of the physical sciences are regarded as ***the***

only accurate means of obtaining knowledge, and therefore, the social sciences should be limited to the use of these methods and modelled after the physical sciences.

Positivism As a Method

Positivism Implies the Use of Scientific Method : By the concept of "positivism", Comte meant the application of scientific methods to understand society and its changes. Applying this concept to the modern societies, Comte emphasised that sociology must depend on careful observation, usually based on statistical measures of social statics and social dynamics. He also recognised that sociology would have to be less experimental than the physical sciences because of the ethical and practical difficulties intervening in people's lives.

Comte believed that social life is governed by underlying laws and principles that can be discovered through the use of methods most often associated with the physical sciences. In choosing the term "positivism", Comte conveyed his intention to repudiate all reliance on earlier religious or speculative metaphysical bases of knowledge. However, Comte regarded scientific knowledge as *'relative knowledge',* not absolute. Absolute knowledge was and always would be unavailable.

Positivism would essentially mean a method of approach. The methods of science can give us knowledge of the laws of co-existence and succession of phenomena, but can never penetrate to the inner *"essence"* or *"nature"* of things. As applied to the human social world, the positive method yields a law of successive states through which each branch of knowledge must first pass, that is, the theological, then metaphysical, and finally positive [or scientific] state. Since the character of society flows from the intellectual forms which predominate in it, this gives Comte a law of the development of human society itself.

Observation and Classification of Data : According to Comte, positivism is purely an intellectual way of looking at the world. He believed that the mind should concentrate on the observation and classification of phenomena. He believed that both theological and metaphysical speculations as he used the terms, were as likely to be fiction as truth, and that there is no way of determining which is the cause. Thus, it would be more profitable if a person would direct his thoughts to the lines of thinking which are most truly prolific, namely to observation and classification of data. Comte even took the position that it is futile to try to determine causes. We can observe

uniformities, or laws, but it is mere speculation to assign causes to these uniformities. *Positivism deified observation and classification of data.*

Impact of Positivism on Social Thinking

Comte's "positivism" has its own impact on the world of social thinking. Today, positivism signifies adherence to an empiricist view of the nature of science. It also projects a scientific approach to the study of social life on the empiricist model. As far as the social sciences are concerned, this would mean modelling of the methods of social sciences on those of natural science. It also signifies an attempt to discover social laws similar to the law-like regularities discoverd by natural sciences and an absolute insistence on the separation of facts and values.

Criticisms Against Positivism

1. ***Positivism is Not Influential at Presnt :*** Positivism has had relatively little influence in contemporary sociology for several reasons. Current views argue that positivism encourages a misleading emphasis on superficial facts without any attention to underlying mechanisms that cannot be observed. ***For example,*** we cannot observe human motive or the meaning that people give to behaviour and other aspects of social life, but this does not mean that meaning and motive are nonexistent or irrelevant. Some argue that the nature of social life is such that the methods used in the physical sciences are simply inapplicable and must be replaced with a less rigid approach.

2. Methological Gulf Between the Physical and Social Sciences: "Criticisms of positivism commonly focus on the inappropriateness of natural-scientific methods in the human or social sciences.Consciousness, cultural norms, symbolic meaning, and intentionality, etc., are variously held to be distinctive human attributes which dictate a methodological gulf between natural science and the study of human social life."

3. Problem of Verification : "Methodologically, a central problem of positivism arises from the so-called 'problem of empiricism'; the lack of any conclusive basis for *'verification'* in *'inductive logic'*. A further telling criticism-the so-called 'paradox of positivism'- is that the verification principle is itself unverifiable.

Social Statics and Social Dynamics

According to Comte, there are two divisions in sociology: *Social statics and social dynamics.* The distinction btween these two does not refer to two classes of facts, but they represent two aspects of the same theory. The distinction corresponds to the double conception of order and progress. Order and progress, or statics and dynamics, are hence always correlative to each other.

(i) ***Social Statics :*** Social statics refers to "the study of the laws of action and reaction of the different parts of social order.." It studies the balance of mutual relations of elements within a social whole. It deals with the major institutions of society such as family, economy or policy. It inquires into the co-existence of social phenomena. Comte stressed that there must always be a *"spontaneous harmony between the whole and the part of the social system."* The parts of a society cannot be studied separately, "as if they had an independent existence". When the harmony between the parts is lacking a pathological situation may prevail. *Social statics emphasises the unity of society or social organisation.*

(ii) ***Social Dynamics :*** If statics examines how the parts of societies are interrelated, social dynamics focuses on whole societies as the unit of analysis, and reveals how they developed and changed through time. Social dynamics was equated by Comte with human progress and evolution. It inquires as to how the human civilisation progresses in different stages. Comte was conviced towards ever increasing perfection.

6.5 EVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE

"Evolutionary Theory" or *"The Laws of Evolution"* is often regarded as the greatest contribution of the British sociologist Herbert Spencer to the realm of social thought. Spencer's ideals have left an indelible impression on the succeeding writers.

"Evolution" was one of the most exciting ideas of the 19th century. Its most influential sponsor was the naturalist Charles Darwin. Darwin developed the concept of *"Evolution"* in his *"Origin of Species - 1859."* Spencer, the sociological giant of the second half of the 19th century, was enamoured by the idea of evolution. He applied the principle of evolution to the social world and called it *"social evolution."* He saw social evolution as *"a set of stages through which all the*

societies moved from simple to the complex and from the homogenous to the heterogeneous."

Meaning of the Concept of *"Evolution"*

The term "evoloution" comes from the Latin word *"evolvere*" which means *"to develop"* or to *"unfold."* It closely corresponds to the Sanskrit word *"Vikas"*. Evolution literally means gradual *"unfolding"* or *"unrolling."* It indicates changes from *"whith in"* and not from "without"; it is spontaneous, but not automatic. It must take place on its own accord. It implies continuous change that takes place especially in some structure. The concept applies more precisely to the internal growth of an organism.

Meaning of "Social Evolution"

The term *"evolution"* is borrowed from biological science to sociology. The term *"organic evolution" is replaced by "social evolution" in sociology. Whereas the term "organic evolution"* is used to denote the evolution of organism, the expression "social evolution" is used to explain the evolution of human society. Here the term implies the evolution of man's social relations. It was hoped that the theory of social evolution would explain the origin and development of man. Anthropologists and sociologists wanted to find a satisfactory and significant explanation of how our society evolved. They wanted an explanation in this regard rather than a description. They were impressed by the idea of organic evolution which could convincingly explain how one species evolves into another, and wanted to apply the same to the social world. Hence the concept of social evolution is quite popular in sociological discussion. It was Herbert Spencer who made the concepts of *"evolution" and "social evolution",* the central concepts in his sociological theories.

Social Evolution Theory

Two of the main books written by Spencer namely, (i) *"The Study of Sociology", (ii) "The Principles of Sociology",* provide us more details about his *"theory of social evolution."* Just as *"the theory of organic evolution"* analyses the birth, development, evolution and finally death of the organism, in the same manner *"the theory of social evolution"* analyses the genesis, development, evolution and finally the decay (?) of the society.

Spencer was of the opinion that the evolutionary principle could be applied to the human society for he treated human society as an organism. Both the organism and the society grow from simple to complex and from homogeneous to heterogeneous.

As **Abraham** and **Morgan** have pointed out *"Spencer's Theory of Evolution" involves two essential but interrelated trends or strains of thought:*

(i) *Change from simplicity to complexity or movement from simple society to various levels of compound societies; and*

(ii) *Change from military society to industrial society.*

(i) ***Change from simplicity to complexity or movement from simple society to various levels of compound societies; and***

As Spencer repeatedly argued all phenomena in all fields proceed from simplicity to complexity. Societies also undergo evolutionary stages of development. Spencer identified four types of societies in terms of stages of their evolutionary development - *simple, compound, doubly compound and trebly compound.*

(a) ***Simple Society :*** This is the most primitive society without any complexities and consisting of several families.

(b) ***Compound Society :*** Here the tribes are organised into nation states

(c) ***Doubly Compound Society :*** These consist of several clans compounded into tribes or tribal society.

6.6 KEY WORDS

Conflict perspective –	A macrosociological view emphasizing that conflict, power and change are permanent features of society.
Functional perspective –	Adjective applied to parts of a social system that contribute to overall stability of system.
Sociological perspective –	Point of view about society and social behaviour that provides an overall orientation for examining sociological problems.

6.7 REFERENCES

Hagedorn, Robert	:	'Sociology' Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, Toronto, 1990
Rawat, H.K.	:	'Sociology' Rawat Publications, Jaipur & New Delhi, 2007
MacIver & Page	:	'Society' Introductory Analysis, Macmillan, Delhi, 2001

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 7
UNIT-II	SOCIAL GROUP	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

7.1 Introduction
7.2 Definition and meaning of Group
7.3 Characteristics of Group
7.4 Types of Groups
7.4.1 Primary and Secondary Groups
7.4.2 Ingroup and Outgroup
7.4.3 Formal and Informal Group
7.4.4 Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft
7.4.5 Quasi Group
7.4.6 Reference Group
7.5 Ask Yourself
7.6 References

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Man's life is to an enormous extent a group life. He not only lives in groups but continuously creates with his fellows new groups. The literal meaning of a group is a number of persons classed together and we refer to such diverse collectives as the family, the crowd, the social class, informal cheques, vast communities, the member of races, religions or occupations, the diversion of sex, age, intelligence or temperament. The basic feature of a social group is two or more persons in contact either directly or indirectly. 'Contact' in the sociological sense means that the individuals either (a) are in a position to stimulate each other and to respond to each other's stimulate meaningfully to a common stimulus. The result is social interaction or social relations of one sort of other. In the latter case and aggregation of persons not otherwise social can often be transferred at least into a temporary and ephemeral group like a crowd by presenting a single strong stimulus or situation to which all respond with some similarity. The ordinary occupants of a railway waiting room, for example cannot usually be considered a social group, for they are not in social contact. But when the land speaker blares for the a train announcement they are welded momentarily into a crowd, all responding first in terms of curiosity, then in terms of the meaning by the voice. Further when we say that contact involves meaningful response, a certain amount of similar past experience or tracing is implied. More stimulation will not necessarily produce this type or response, even though the situation be a face to face one. A foreigner who does not know the language of the people around him finds it very difficult to establish social contact and to enter into group life. Thus 'meaningfulness' implies some basis of common understanding and this feature seems to be basic to all types of groups relations of the truly social sort. Once interaction or a meaningful plane, even though it may be a relatively superficial one, has been established we may speak of social relations within the group. This is another way of saying that the members are united by common understanding.

Common understanding revolves about a common interact or common interest. Interest is commonly defined as "attention with a sense of concern processed upon some object or objective such objective may be the satisfaction of innate desires rooted in the human organism, desires derived in the course of

the experience or those created by cultural experience, not to mention a host of other objects or objectives. In any case, the interest is common in some degree to the members of the groups, and together with the other basic features already mentioned, accounts in a measure for the feeling of group life. "A social group thus grows out of and requires a situation which permits meaningful inter stimulation and meaningful response between the individuals mobiled, common focusing of attention or common stimulate and/or interest and the development of certain common drives, motivations or emotions. "Thus the important elements of a social group are social contact direct or indirect, common interests and common emotions. People enter groups for three general reasons or combination of reasons namely personal attraction group prestige and task performance.

7.2 DEFINITION AND MEANING OF GROUP

Some of the important definitions of 'Group' are enlisted below :

(i) Mactrer and page define 'Social Group' as any collection of human beings who are brought into human relationships with one another.

(ii) Ogburn and Nimkoff explain that whenever two or more individuals come together and influence one another, they may be said to constitute a social group.

(iii) Marshal Jones defines social group as 'Social Group is two or more people between whom there is an established pattern of interaction'.

Thus a social group may be defined as an aggregate of individuals which (i) definite relations exist between the individuals comprising it and (ii) each individual is conscious of the group itself and its symbols. In other words, a social group has at least a rudimentary structure and organisation (including rules, rituals etc.) and a psychological basis in the consciousness of its members. A family, a village, a nation, a trade union or a political party is a social groups in this sense. Maciver and page argue that a group means any collections of human beings who are brought into social relationships involve, as we have seen some degree of reciprocity between those related, some measure of mutual awareness as reflected in the attitudes of the members of the groups. On the basis

of this criterion, many of those diversions of a population that are sometimes named social groups, such as the people of a certain age or income level or intelligence range, are moral properly thought of as statistical aggregates. However, the old aged, for example, many become social groups if they are set apart by institutional arrangement as in some prcavitive sometimes or if they develop similar attitudes and interests as in 'Youth movements, or 'Age' movements such as that represented by the townered plan. Again, those in different income brackets may a the some times possess an awareness of their difference and the contrasting attitudes that mark as different social classes.

7.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF GROUPS

A social group is a psychic construct and the members exhibit a behaviour towards the outside world. According to Znaniscks, the group is not an association of concrete individuals, but the synthesis of members roles. Aggregation become social groups only when interrelations have been established between the individuals and the 'We Feeling' has arisen. These are certain other characteristics of groups two which can be discussed here.

1. Group is independent of Individual will

One who lives in a group or functions within it begins to feel that he is part of something larger than himself and that he is involved in a whole which often acts quite independently of his wishes. Social life tends to make individuals realize that groups is larger than, and in some respects, independent of themselves. Certain aspects of this matter can be discussed under 'Collective will' the group exists even when are individual leaves it.

2. Group exerts pressure on an individual

Member of group tend to become aware that the group is capable of and invariably does exert pressure on the activities of the individual and life in the group becomes somewhat frustrating for the individual in certain respects. Group presence may be direct and obvious or indirect and subtle but it is always present.

3. Collection of individuals

Social group consists of people, without individuals there can be no

group. Just as we cannot have a college or university without students and teachers we cannot have group in the absence of individuals.

4. Interaction among members :

Social interaction is the very basis of group life. Hence mere collection of individual does not make a group. The members must have interaction. A social group, is in fact, a system of social interaction. The limits of social group are marked by the limits of social interaction.

5. Members reciprocity :

The group situation calls forth in its members reciprocity. This reciprocity is the basis for cooperation among the members and lends to promote the conciousness and solidarity of the group as a unit. In the family, the father provides sustenance and production for the child, who reciprocates with obedience and respect.

6. We feeling :

Among the members of a social group there is a group spirit. In other words, there is the feeling of well being associated with the commencity of ideas, values and activities shared among the members. The individual becomes habituated to the behaviour of his fellow member in the group and feels a certain pride in sharing in the life of the group.

7. Common Interests :

The interests and ideals of group are common. Groups are mostly formed or established for the fulfilment of certain interests. Infact, even not only join groups but also form group for the realisation of then objectives or interest. Form of the groups differs depending upon the common interests of the groups. Hence, there are political group, religious groups etc.

8. Size of the group :

Every group involves the idea of size. Social group vary in size. Group size depends upon the membership. Size will have into own impact or the character of the group.

9. Groups are dynamic :

Social groups are not static but dynamic. They are subject to changes

whether slow or rapid, old members die and new members are born, whether due to interact an external pressures & forces, group undergo changes.

10. Stability

Groups are stable or unstable; permanent or temporary in character. Some groups like the crowd, mob, audience, spectators group etc. are temporary and unstable. But many groups are relatively permanent and stable in character.

7.4 TYPES OF GROUPS

There are different types of groups found in the society. There are various variables based, on which the classification of groups is done. Some of the important types of groups are :

1. Primary and Secondary groups
2. Ingroup and Out group
3. Reference group
4. Organised and Unorganised group.
5. Voluntary and Involuntary group.
6. Temporary and Permanent group.
7. Small and large groups
8. Institutional and Non -Institutional groups
9. Gememschaft (community) and Gesselschaft (society)

Some of these will be discussed in detail in the next lesson.

7.4.1 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS

The distributions of the population in social groups and the size, number and characteristics of such groups, are important features of the structure of a society. The description and classification of the principal types of social groups and institutions in Gmsbergs Mew, make up the study of social structure. A social group may be defined as an aggregate of individuals in which (1) Definite relations exist between the individuals comprising it and (ii) Each individual is conscious of the group itself and its symbols. In other words, a social group has at least a rudimentary structure and

organisation (including rules, rituals, etc.) and a psychological basis in the consciousness of its members. A family, a village, a nation, a trade union, or a political party is a social group in this sense.

Social groups can be classified in a variety of ways the best known distinction here is that first proposed by Tonnies between Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society or association). Community is defined as 'intimate, private, and exclusive living together', and Tonnies gives as examples of groups bases on this type of relationship the family of kin group, the neighbourhood (rural village), and the group of friends. Association is defined as 'public life', as something which is consciously and deliberately entered upon; and Tonnies mentions as examples principally those groups which are concerned with economic interests. Two major criteria are used by Tonnies in defining community and association. First, in communities individuals are involved as complete persons who can satisfy all or most of a wide range of purposes in the group, while in association of specific and partial ends. Secondly, a community is united by an accord of feeling or sentiment between individuals whereas an association is united by a rational agreement of interest.

Primary Group

The primary group as the nucleus of all social organisation. : The simplest, the first, the most universal of all forms of association is that in which a small number of persons meet "face-to-face" for companionship, mutual aid, the discussion of some questions that concern them all, or the discovery and execution of some common policy. The face-to-face group is the nucleus of all organisation and is found in some form within the most complex system it is the unit cell of the social structure. The primary group in the form of the family, initiates us into the secrets of society. It is the group through which we first give creative expression to our social imputes. It is the breeding ground of our mores, the nurse of our loyalties.

Cooley, who introduced the term primary group, emphasised the face-to-face character of primary groups. "By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate face-to-face association and co-operation. They are

primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming 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 many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group—it involves the sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which "we" is the natural expression.

Cooley's definition of the Primary group, implied three conditions ; Physical proximity of the members, smallness of the group, and the enduring character of the relation.

Characteristics of Primary Group :

*1. Dominance of face-to-face relations :*Primary groups are characterised by close and intimate relationships. There exists a face-to-face relationship among the members. In Primary groups every one knows every one else ; one's name and fame, one's status, wealth, occupation, lived of education etc. Close contact between them increases intimacy among the members.

2. Physical Proximity or Nearness : Face-to-Face relations can be found only when members reside in a particulars area more or less permanently. Seeing and talking with each other facilitates the exchange of ideas, opinions and sentiments. Physical proximity provides an opportunity for the very development of primary groups.

3. Similarity of Background :The members of a Primary group must have more or less the same background. There must be some approximations in their levels of experience. Each must have some thing to contribute, to give as well as to take.

4. Size : Primary groups are smaller in size. Effective participation of the members is possible only when the group is of a small size. The increase in the size of the group will have a negative effect on the intimacy of the members.

5. Stability of the Groups : A primary group is relatively a permanent group. The longer the group remains together, the more numberous and deepers are the contacts between its members.

6. Limited self-interest : Members of the primary group subordinate

their personal interests to the interests of the group. The common interest of the group is strong enough to control individual interest. The commonness of interests provides mental pleasure and contentment to the members.

7. ***Communication :*** Communication in the case of Primary group is very quick and effective. Direct or face-to-face contact helps easy communication between the members.

8. ***Direct Co-operation :*** Direct co-operation characterises primary group. Members work directly and in co-operation with each other to achieve their common interests. The group is a unity in the performance of its functions.

Importance of Primary Group :

1. ***Primary Group a Socializing agent :*** The primary group enacts the role of a socializing agency. Family is the immediate primary group in which a child finds itself as soon as it is born. The family, peer group and the neighbourhood play an important role in sociolizing or humanizing the child. Primary group teach the child the social norms, standards, morals, beliefs, values and ideas of the society. It introduce to the child the culture of the society. The primary groups, as MacIver says, are 'the nursery of human nature'.

2. ***Development of Personality :*** C. H. Cooley is of the opinion that the primary group, particularly the family, is the chief moulder of the human personality. The Primary group is the source of 'our notions of love, freedom, justice and the like'. The qualities of behaviours that a child picks up during the early years in primary groups find their expression in his adult life. Primary groups mould our opinion, guide our affections, influence our actions and in large measure determine our loyalties.

3. ***Satisfaction of Psychological Needs :*** Primary groups satisfy many psychological needs of the individuals. Individuals get mental happiness, contentment and security from the primary groups. They get the advantages of companionships, sympathy and exchange of thoughts and feelings. They reduces mental tensions and emotional stresses and strains.

4. ***Acts as an agent of Social Control :*** Primary group not only provide security to the members but also control their behaviour and regulate their

relations. For example, family, neighbourhood, peer group or friend's group control much of the activities of their members.

6. Provision of Stimulus : The primary group not only provides satisfaction and happiness to the individuals, but it also provides a stimulus to pursue their interests with confidence and courage the individual members work, strive and struggle to achieves their goals.

SECONDARY GROUP

An understanding of the modern industrial society requires an understanding of the secondary groups MacIver and Page refer to them as 'great associations. According to him, their appearance is mainly due to the growing cultural complexity.

Primary groups are found predominately in societies where life is relatively simple. With the expansion in population and territory of a society, however, interests become diversified and other types of relationships, which can be called 'Secondary' or Impersonal become necessary. The members are numerous and too scattered to conduct their business through face-to-face relationship. Specially selected persons must action of behalf of all and hence, arises a hierarchy of officials called 'bureaucracy' and the executive or controlling groups become distinct from the mass of the members. These features mark the rise of the modern state, the great corporation, the international cartel, the large church, the nation-wide political party, and the labour union, a university etc.

Definitions

Ogburn and Nimkoff says that the 'groups which provide experience lacking in intimacy' can be called secondary groups.

Characteristics

1. Indirect Co-operation : As the group grows in size, indirect co-operation dominates our direct. In the small group the members work together, listen together, play together, workshop together, discuss together, decision together. In the large organization it is only the group's objective to maintain order, to provide goods (or profits), to create bargaining strength and so on

no longer the intragroup process, that binds the members together. One person works for the other, not with him, they do different tasks towards a common product ; they have not only different functions but different powers, different degree of participation, different rights and obligations.

2. Voluntary Membership : Membership in the case of Secondary groups is mainly voluntary. Individuals are at liberty to join or to go away from the groups. For example, they are at liberty to join political parties, international associations like the Rotary Club, Lion Club, Business Corporations and so on.

3. Contractual Relations Dominance : In the larger organizations the duties and functions of the various members must be defined, made specific, and thus explicitly or implicity contractual, the working of a complex system cannot be entrusted to the spontaneous adjustment which occur in the face-to-face group.

4. Large Size : Secondary group are relatively larger in size. City, nation, political parties, trade unions, Corporations, international associations, such as the Rotary Club, Lion Club, Vishwa Hindu Parishad etc. are for example, bigger in size. They may have thousand and lakhs of members. There may not be any limit to the membership in the case of some secondary groups.

5. Impersonality : Secondary groups are characterised by indirect, impersonal, contractual and non-inclusive relations. Relations are impersonal because secondary groups are bigger in size. They are more concerned with their self centred interests than with other persons. These kinds of relations among people can be found in big factories, business corporations, governmental offices banks etc.

6. Specific ends or Interests : Secondary groups are formed for the realisation of some specific interests or ends. They are called 'special The following points elaborate the relationship between these two groups :

1. The members of an 'ingroup' are always hostile or at any rate less friendly towards the members of 'outgroup' the term ingroup stresses the 'oneness' or solidarity of the group as against outsides.
2. The terms 'ingroup' and 'outgroup' reflect that members of the

complexity of social structure and differentiation of interests, primary groups could not meet the requirements so secondary groups have become a necessity. Particularly, the processes of industrialisation and urbanisation have added to the unprecedented expansion and growth of society. As a result, the simple face-to-face groups could no longer serve the basic needs of the people.

2. Our life, to a great extent, lived and controlled by large number of secondary groups. Our social set-up is such that we are often inevitably dragged into one kind of secondary group or another. For example, a labourer working in a factory is forced to join a trade union whether he wants to or not. It becomes almost a necessity for the labourer to join one union or the other to protect his rights and fulfil his interests. Secondary groups have entered almost all the fields political, economic, commercial, industrial, religious, educational, cultural etc.

3. They provide opportunities for us to develop our faculties and express our talents. They liberate and limit our energy. Much of our attitudes and outlook, ideas and ideologies are shaped and moulded by them.

7.4.2 INGROUP AND OUTGROUP :

Summer has divided groups into two types, ingroup and outgroup. Man in the process of socialisation learns to divide people into the 'we' and 'They'. The common interests of a group and the attitudes that support the interests are reflected in the group distiactions made by the individual.

Ingroup : The group with which the individual identifies himself are his ingroups, his family tribe, college, religion or occupation, by virtue of his awareness of likeness or 'consciousness of kind'. Thus, the subjective attitudes of the individual person reveals his ingroup membership. It is the ingroup in which an individual feels that he belongs to. Therefore, feeling of belongingness is also associated with ingroup. Ingroup attitudes contain some element of sympathy and always a sense of attachment to other members of the group. For example, our nature our religion, friendship etc.

Outgroup : The outgroup is defined by the individual with relation to the ingroup usually expressed in contrast between 'we' and 'they' or 'other'. Thus outgroups are other-groups, other occupations other families etc. An

outgroup is a group of individuals to which one feels no sense of belongingness outgroup attitudes are marked by a sense of difference and frequently, though not, always, by some degree of antagonism. For example other nations, other religious etc.

There are two aspect related to ingroup and outgroup :

(a) Individual's mental readiness to identify himself with a group and to separate himself from other groups.

(b) Individuals attempt to identify boundaries of groups identification of boundary is there.

Relationship between Ingroup and Outgroup.

The following points elaborate the relationship between these two groups :

1. The members of an 'ingroup' are always hostile or at any rate less friendly towards the members of 'outgroup' the term ingroup stresses the 'oneness' or solidarity of the group as against outsides.
2. The terms 'ingroup' and 'outgroup' reflect that members of the first, treat fellow members better than they treat members of the outgroup.
3. Sometimes both the groups have overlapping relationship, often confronting the individual with contradictions and confusion.
4. Both the groups influence each other and also affect the behaviour of each other. They both are related and lead to some consequence.

7.4.3 FORMAL AND INFORMAL GROUPS :

A normative, heretical and structured group is known as formal group. It has formal authority, organised structure, and institutional influence. It is generally large in size. Law like formalities and institutions are very important in formal groups. For example Army, State, Govt., a labour union etc.

An informal group is without strong group norms, legal status and without stated group rules, goals or leaders. It is generally small unorganised, casually and spontaneously formed. It doesn't have the standardised group goals and its members are brought together because of some common interests.

For example audience, crowds, children play groups etc.

first, treat fellow members better than they treat members of the outgroup.

3. Sometimes both the groups have overlapping relationship, often confronting the individual with contradictions and confusion.
4. Both the groups influence each other and also affect the behaviour of each other. They both are related and lead to some consequence.

7.4.3 FORMAL AND INFORMAL GROUPS :

A normative, heretical and structured group is known as formal group. It has formal authority, organised structure, and institutional influence. It is generally large in size. Law like formalities and institutions are very important in formal groups. For example Army, State, Govt., a labour union etc.

An informal group is without strong group norms, legal status and without stated group rules, goals or leaders. It is generally small unorganised, casually and spontaneously formed. It doesn't have the standardised group goals and its members are brought together because of some common interests.

For example audience, crowds, children play groups etc.

7.4.4 GEMEINSCHAFT AND GESELLSCHAFT

Somewhat similar to the concepts of primary and secondary groups are the conepts of gemeinschaft and gesellschaft. These are German terms and used to represent community and society or association respectively. These concepts were developed by German sociologist Ferdinand Tonnies (1887) to differentiate between urban and rural life or community living and living in the mass society. The concept gemeinschaft is closer to the concept of community. According to Tonnies, it refers to social relations whatever functions characterized by relative smallness, cohesion, long duration and emotional intensity". It is characterized by a sense of solidarity and a common identity. There is a strong emphasis on shared values and sentiments, of we feeling., Horace Miner (in International Encylopaedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 3, 1968) described it as referring to a community of feeling (a kind of associative unity of ideas and emotions) and notes that it derives from likeness and shared life experience. People frequently interact with one another and tend to establish deep and long-term relationships. Social control in gemeinschaft is maintained through informal means such as moral, persuasion, gossip, and even gestures.

By contrast, 'gesellschaft' is an ideal type characteristic of modern urban life. It is often conceptualized as a corporate or mass society - a society based on relations on roles and consisting of associational groups. It is characterized by individualism, mobility, impersonality, the pursuit of self-interest and an emphasis on progress rather than tradition. Shared values and total personal involvement become secondary. Tonnies (1987) writes : "Everybody is by himself isolated, and there exists a conditions of tension against all others." Gesellschaft, in short, is the logic of the market place, where relationships are contractual, impersonal and temporary. There is little sense of commonality and social relationships often grow out of immediate task, such as purchasing a product.

Largely, as a result of industralisation, urbanization, technological revolution, division of labour and population growth, the gesellschaft has replaced the society of tradition with the society of contract. In this society, neither personal attachment nor traditional rights and duties are important. The relationships between men are determined by bargaining and defined in written agreement.

Comparison of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft

Gemeinschaft Relationships	***Gesellschaft Relationship***
Personal	Impersonal
Informal	Formal and contractual
Intimiate and familiar	Task specific
Traditional	Utilisation
Sentimental	Realistic
Emphasis on ascribed statuses	Emphasis on achieved statuses
Less tolerance to deviance	Greater tolerance to deviance
Holistic relationships	Segmental (partial) relationship
Long duration	Transient and Fragmented
Relatively limited Social change	Very evident social change
Freedominance of informal social control	Greater formal social control

We-feeling	They-feeling
Typifies rural life	Typifies urban life

In the end, it may be noted that there is a great deal of similarity between the typologies of C.H. Cooley (primary and secondary groups). Ferdinant Tonnies (gemeinschaft and gesellshcaft). Emile Durkheim (mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity) and Robert Redfield (folk and urban continuum). The regular rediscovery, restatement and reiteration of the same dichotomy of social types suggests that the distinction being made is very fundamental.

8.4.5 QUASI GROUPS

These groups stand in between theprimary and secondary groups. In such groups some characteristics of both these groups are found. Generally, many primary group characteristics, such as intimacy and face-to-face relations are seen but in other matters they resemble with secondary groups. Bottomore (1975) observed that quasi groups are collections of people which lack organization and structure and the members do not have much awareness about the existence of their groups. In other words, quasi groups are collection of human beings having no structure but are bound on the basis of similar interests and behaviour pattern. They also lack continuity of relationship. In these groups, contacts are direct but the frequency is lesser than in the primary groups and what is more important, emotions are superficial and for the time being. Generally, they have no definite or specific organization but at times they turn into organized groups. Social classes, status groups, age groups, sex groups, racial groups, crowds, public's audiences are some of the examples of quasi groups. Although, the various types of these groups have some distinguishing characteristics, it is not unusual for them to overlap or to change from one type to another.

8.4.6 REFERENCE GROUPS

Etymological Meaning : In the oxford English Dictionary, the word 'reference' means, 1. Referring of Matter for decision, settlement or consideration, to some authority. 2. Relation, respect, correspondence to; in within to irrespective of. 3. Direction to book, passage etc. where information may be found etc. 4. of referring another or apply to person, for information. 6. person named by one applying for post or offering goods etc. 6. the act of

referring one person to another for information or an explanation; hence a person to whom one is or may be referred for this purpose etc. and when 2 & 3 meanings combined with groups then becomes references group. In sociology, reference groups are those that individuals use as reference.

Reference Group in Social Sciences :

The term Reference Group was first used by Herbert H. Hyman in his study The Psychology of Status in 1942 to understand the ways in which individuals themselves in terms of their choice of a social frame work in comparison. He first explored by interviews the reference individuals that subjects employed and some of the dynamics underlying such selection and then used experimental manipulation to determine the effects of particular reference groups on self appraisal. The term "Reference Group" was introduced on small groups by MUZAFER SERIF in his book, An outline of Social Psychology in 1948. He used it in contrast to the term membership, group while the latter obviously refers to 'a group', a person belong to the former if one which affects his behaviour. Of course, the two may coincide and it is usually the case that a person membership groups are also his references groups. But the distinction is made in order to indicate the fact that the norms and standards governing a person's behaviour may be those of a groups he would like to have membership in, but which he cannot easily join.

The whole instincts world and society is divided into various groups. "Reference Groups" are based on instant of imitation, which is one of the fundamental instincts of human beings. Reference groups are those groups in which group people compare their behaviour with other and try to act like them. The groups that individuals use as reference points by which they evaluate themselves or their activities are known in sociology as "Reference Groups". In a particular socially relevant stimulus situation, a person's reference group or reference groups determine his characteristic judgement and responses etc. They need not be groups to which an individuals belong. Individuals attitudes and conduct are shaped by the group in which he had a membership and that self appraisal and the correlative feelings and behaviour flow from the individuals location in a particular group within social hierarchy in the process of self

appraisal. From many possible groups, which are available as a framework for social comparison, individual make their own particular selections. In shaping their attitudes they may orient themselves to groups than their own.

This is clearly often the case with socially mobile people Hyman studied the individual's conception of his own status position relative to his reference groups as well as his reference individuals. The concept appears in Australia. Israel and India, in studies of farmers, scientists, drunkards and newspaperman.

Reference group means "others" with whom the individuals does not interact are designated non-membership group or out groups is that group in which a man lives, acts and takes an active part. The norms and values of that group are imbibed by him. But there is another group. He is not a member and tries to leave up the norms and standards of his own group. A reference group is that group whose perceived facts constitute a stimulus for certain types of beliefs and action on the art of the percerver. Reference group by definition means a group with which the individual indentifies himself and which he uses as a standard for his own behaviour.

Although the socialization process requires a societal element and this is where reference individuals and group are important. The 'reference & other orientation' involves kind of reference other the "reference individual". A group can be reference group for one person but not for another.

New comb used the concept in order to understand the process of an attitude change, among individuals who are the members of Bennington College, testing the various ways in which they choose their reference groups. The concept of reference group for an individual is with respect to certain object, when the group and its attitude towards the objects are part of the same system as the individual own attitude towards the object. References groups need by no means coincide with membership groups. This is not obvious when a person takes a group of which he is non member as a negative reference point. A non membership group may serve as a positive reference group. For a higher status of which an individual is not (yet) a member are likely to be taken as his positive references groups.

From symbolic interactionism, the concept of reference group has been derived. It was the early school of symbolic interactionism. A relationship between reference group and symbolic interaction is frequently recognized in the literature.

The originator of term, Hyman, showed that actors took individuals of high status as their reference groups. Sherif and Sherif in their social psychological texts concentrated upon the identificatory orientation. Kellye Shaver differentiates between the normative and comparative functions of the reference group. M. Lynch differentiates between reference group of imitation and reference group of indentification in his study. There is a normal distinction between membership and non-membership, R. K. Merton states that there appears to be the degree of membership and basic distinction in kinds of non-membership.

According to reference group theory a reference group is any group that is used as a standard of self evaluation or attitude formation, regardless of whether it is also a membership group for the person doing the comparison. Reference group theory allows to delineate with some precision the potential types of influence over individuals' factors in their interactions with local fellowships and denominational organizations. In terms of the theory, the membership group consisted of at least three major possibilities for reference groups ; family and friends at home, the faculty or other students at the college and the last were the campus leaders. Friendship groups are also a reference groups. Any social group may be used as a standard for self-evaluation or attitude formation. The group may be used either as a positive reference group of a negative reference group. All reference groups are not of equal importance for ego.

There are well established connections between reference group theory and functional sociology. In the vocabulary of sociology, social conformity usually denotes conformity to the norms and expectations converted in the individual's own membership group. In the language of reference group theory, therefore attitudes of conformity to the official mores can be described as a positive orientation to the norms of a non-membership i.e. taken as a frame of

reference. ‘Reference groups concern the members, their activities in concern, their individual claims and aspirations. For these reasons, the behaviour of individual members, their activities in concern, their individual claims and aspirations. For these reasons the behaviour of individual members, their organizations and values and the characteristics of their settings were included. Sociology’s province traditionally includes problems of social control, social organization and stratification in communities and societies. Sociologists report that groups have distinctive properties such as organizations and values. On the sociological level of analysis, the units of study are groups and their settings. The data used by Merton pertain to the organization or patterning of status role relationships and values or norms of the group, to the features of neighbourhood relevant to group interactions including its facilities and spatial arrangements its population and their occupation, educational levels, living standards and their prevalent latitudes of acceptance-rejection defining the bounds of propriety and aspiration. The term reference groups as originally used was applied to both the single individual and the group but reference individuals have been more recently referred to as opinion leaders.

R. K. Merton gave greater prominence to the reference individual Sheri gave the apt title to reference individual the “reference idol”. He defines reference groups as those groups to which the individual relates himself as a part as to which he aspires to relate himself. Group to which a person belongs are not always reference groups for him. Although a reference group that he dislikes. In this case the group is termed as negative reference group. The person’s family, his relatives and members of his caste group are the primary reference groups. Merton and Kitt in 1950 took note of the attitudes of soldiers who are being posted to the front line. They find out that eagerness to go to the battle field depended on the group to which one belongs. Except family or a group to which an individual belongs, there are salient reference groups which are related to persons through various communications Ogburn and Nimkoff, 1958 : 65-68. The reference groups provide social support for person Groups whose opinions we value become our reference groups. The influential other is that of reference group by which is meant the group from which we get our values or whose

approval we seek. The concept of reference groups as distinct from membership groups, has particular relevance for modern, complex, heterogeneous society with its high rate of physical and occupational mobility, where a person may be member of one group but prefer membership or aspire for membership in another. There is a distinction between membership and reference group is less common in a small folk society. Others influence us and the significant others influence us most, values are more subject to change, especially if they are not "ego involved" i.e. not tried in so closely with self that an attack on the values regarded as an attack on the self. Thus reference groups are an important key to our personality and especially to our values. All the people are 'other-directed' in the sense that others are the source of most of their values, they internalize the values of others. Individuals in their lives, in the degree of identification and influence and the behaviour learn from the 'others'. Riesman points out, all people want to be liked by some one of the time, but some people want to be liked by more people more of the time".

The concept of Reference Group arises essentially from the fact that any person, acting in any situation may be influenced, not only by the position he occupies in one or more interaction groups or status groups and by his conceptions and expectations of the group or groups with which he may be interacting but all his conceptions of still other group of which he is not a member and apart from any interaction he may be having with them. These groups may be interaction groups or status group. Any group is a reference group for some one of his conception of it, which may or may not be realistic, is part of his frame of reference for appraisal of himself or his situation, aspiration for himself aspiration for one of the group to which he belongs. The social structure itself largely determines which groups will have influence as reference groups in a particular situation. A reference group is a standard or check point which an actor uses informing his estimate of the situation particularly his own position within it. Logically any group with which an actor is familiar may become a reference group. The reference group of the socially ambitious is said to consist of those people of higher strata whose status symbol are imitated. A reference group is that group whose outlook is used by the actor as the frame of reference in the organization of his perceptional field. Those groups in

which most people participate directly are called membership groups. Reference groups may be imaginary which arise through the internalization of norms. Choice of reference groups rests upon personal loyalty to significant others of that social world. Change in the membership of a group is possible. Reference groups may be positive as well as negative for a particular person.

Reference group can be selected on the basis of 'Role' i.e. certain students like the pattern of behaviour of their teacher with his students and decide to choose teaching profession and adopt the behaviour of their teacher who serves as a model or ideal before them.

The term 'in group' stresses the "we-ness" or solidarity of the groups as against outsiders. The members of one group may not be all the time hostile towards their non-membership of one group, e.g. we found that minority group members are sometimes hostile towards their 'group'. The actual reference group is dynamic and motivating force.

Reference groups are almost innumerable and vary in their degree of power and the groups of which one is not a member are comparatively few and the groups of which one is not a member are many they can become points of reference for shaping one's attitudes. It is a result of aspirations of an individual because of which he wants to associate himself with such a group that has a place in society. This desire makes him attached to reference groups. A society, may have different groups and different individuals being members of one reference group. Individuals imitate the behavious and standard of Reference Groups.

Functional Types of Reference Groups–Reference Groups serve two kinds of functions—

1. Normative function.
2. Comparative function.

1. Normative function : Reference group set standards for the behaviour of the individual. The individual takes the standards and values judgements of the reference group and shapes his attitudes and behaviour in accordance with

them. Thus the high school student who wants the approval of the Punk Rock crowd will have to follow the groups dictates to at lest some extent. He or she will be expected to cut classes along with group members and to rebel against parental carefews.

The two classification given by Merton under normative functions are :

(a) Positive reference group.

(b) Negative reference group.

(a) Positive reference group : When the individual has a positive orientation towards a reference group and shows an aspiration to membership into it or strives to be like it by assimilating its norms and values, such a reference group is called positive reference group. In short the positive reference group involves the motivated assimilation of the norms by the group.

(b) Negative reference group : When the individual rejects the norms of a group and strives to be unlike it by forming and following counter-norms, such reference group is called negative reference group. In short negative reference group involves the motivated rejection i.e. not merely the non acceptance of the norms of the group but the formation of counter norms.

2. Comparative Reference Group : Reference groups also perform a comparison function by reserving as a standard against which people can measure themselves and others. For example A law students will evaluate himself or herself against a reference group composed of lawyers laws professors and judges.

For comparison it is not necessary that the individual should be or have been in actual social relation with the reference group. Even with the impersonal status categories he can make comparison.

In the end we can conclude that reference group is a group with which an individual feels identified. The norms which he shares and the objectives of which he accepts. Every individual is a part of reference group. It is important to recognise that individual are often influenced by two or more reference group at the same time. An individual can change his reference group as he take on different statues during his life.

7.5 ASK YOURSELF :

Q. 1. Define reference group and decision how has it been student in social sciences.

Q. 2. Based on the functions of reference group, what are the different types of reference group identified in the society.

Q. 3. Define group and discuss its meaning in detail.

Q. 4. Discuss the group characteristics of the social groups.

Q. 5. Enlist the various types of group found in the society.

Q. 6. Distinguish between Primary and Secondary groups.

Q. 7. Discuss Ingroup and Outgroup. Give examples.

Q. 8. Define Formal and Informal group.

7.6 REFERENCES :

1. Sociology—A systematic Introduction—by Harry M. Johson.

COURSE: SOC-C-101 **LESSON NO. 8**

UNIT-III EDUCATION–AS AN INSTITUTION SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

8.1 Introduction

8.2 Meaning and Definition

8.3 Education as a Social Process

8.4 Social Functions

8.5 Education and Social Change

8.6 Social Stratification and Mobility

8.7 Equality of Educational Opportunities

8.8 Ask yourself

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Meaning of Education - Education as a Social Process - Social Functions of Education Education and Social Change - Education - Social Stratification and Social Mobility — Education As a Powerful Correlate of Social Stratification and Social Mobility - Education and Social Stratification - Education and Social Mobility, Equality of Educational Opportunities - Education and Modernisation

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

fulfilling this need, 'Education' has come to be one of the ways of fulfilling this need.

The term *education* is derived from the Latin *educare* which literally means to *'bring up',* and is connected with the verb' *educare'* which means to *'bring forth'*. The idea of education is not merely to impart knowledge to the pupil in some subjects but to develop in in hosel habits and attitudes with which he may successfully face the future. The Latin author *Varro* wrote. *'The mid. wife brings forth, the nurse brings up, the tutor trains and the master teaches',* Plato was of the opinion that the end of education was' *to develop in the body and in the soul (of the pupil) all the beauty and all the perfection of which they are capable.* ' It means, in short, *'a sound mind in a sound body'; (men sana in corpore sano).* According to the Aristotelian conceptual, the aim of education is "to develop man's faculties, especially, his mind, so that he may be able to enjoy the contemption of the supreme truth, goodness and beauty in which perfect happiness essentially consists".

As *Peter Worsely* says, "A large part of our social and technical skills are acquired through deliberate instruction which we call education. It is the main working activity of children from the ages of five to fifteen and often beyond " A large part of the budget of many developed and developing countries is set apart for education. Education employs a large army of people. Socialists are becoming more and more aware of the importance and role of educational institutions in the modern industrialised societies. In recent years education has become the major interest of some sociologists. As a result a new branch of sociology called *Sociology of Education* has become established.

8.2 MEANING AND DEFINITION OF EDUCATION

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

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

(3) *F. J. Brown* and 1.8. *Roucek* say that education is "the sum total of the experience which moulds the attitudes and determines the conduct of both the child

and the adult'.

(4) *James Welton* in Encyclopaedia Britannica (11 th Edition) writes that education consists in "an attempt on the part of the adult members of human society to shape the development of the coming generation with its own ideals of life".

(5) *A. W. Green* writes: "Historically, it (education) has meant the conscious training of the young for the later adoption of adult roles. By modem convention, however, education has come to mean formal training by specialists within the formal organisation of the school."

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

8.3 EDUCATION AS A SOCIAL PROCESS

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

Firstly, education, viewed as *socialisation.* is continuous. Socialization is social learning. This social learning is not intermittent but continuous. Perfection in social learning is rarely achieved. The more we try to learn about our own society and fellow beings the more remains to be learned. Social learning begins at birth and ends only at death. It continues throughout our life. There is no point or state in our life at which we have learnt everything about one group or society and beyond that nothing remains to be studied. We belong to different groups at different stages of our life. As these groups change we must learn new rules and new patterns of behaviour. Furthermore we do not always remain within the same

role. We begin as children, pass through adolescence into adulthood, marry, become parents, enter middle age, retire, grow old and finally die. With each role, comes pattern of behaviour that we must learn and, thus, throughout our life, we are involved in the , socialisation process. Even at the door of death we are being socialised.

Secondly, education, viewed as *an agent of cultural transmission. is also continuous.* Culture is a *growing whole.* There can be no break in the continuity of culture. If at all there is a break, it only medicates the end of a particular human group. The cultural elements are passed on from generation to generation. The family, school, and various other associations act as the agents of cultural transmission. Education in its formal or informal pattern, has been performing this role since time immemorial. Education can be looked upon as process from this point of view also.

Thirdly, education, implied as an *attempt to acquire knowledge,* is also continuous. Knowledge is like an ocean, boundless or limitless. No one has mastered it or exhausted it. No one can claim to do so. There is a limit to the human genius or the human grasp of the things. The moral man can latterly know anything and everything about nature which is immoral. The universe is a miraculous entity. The more one tries to know of it, the more it becomes mysterious. Not only the Natural Universe but also the Social Universe is complex. The Pullman experience is limited to have a thorough knowledge of this universe. Hence, man since time immemorial, has been engaged in this ~less endeavour of acquiring more and more knowledge about the Universe with all its complexity. Education, thus, is a continuous endeavour, a process.

8.4 SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF EDUCATION

Education, as a social institution has a great social importance especially in the modern, complex industrialised societies. Philosophers of all periods, beginning with ancient sages, devoted to it a great deal of attention. Accordingly, various theories regarding its nature and objectives have come into being. Let us now examine some of the significant functions of education.

(I) *To complete the Socialization Process.* The main social objective of education is *to complete the socialization process.* The family gets the child, but

the modern family tends to leave much undone in the socialisation process. The school and other institutions have come into being in place of family to complete the socialisation process. Now, the people feel that it is "the school's business to train the whole child even to the extent of teaching him his honesty, fair play, consideration for others and a sense of right and wrong". The school devotes much of its time and energy to the matter such as co-operation, good citizenship, doing one's duty, and upholding the law. Directly through text. books, and indirectly through celebration of programmes, patriotic sentiments are instilled. The nation's past is glorified, its legendary heroes respected, and its military ventures justified.

(2) *To Transmit the Central Heritage.* All societies maintain themselves by the exploitation of a culture. Culture here refers to a set of beliefs and skills, art, literature, philosophy, religion, music etc. that are not carried through the mechanism of heredity. They must be learned. This social heritage (culture) must be transmitted through social organisations. Education has this function of *cultural transmission* in all societies. It is only at the upper levels of the school that any serious attempt has been, or now is, made to deal with this area.

(3) *For the Formation of Social Personality.* Individuals must have personalities shaped or fashioned in ways that fit into the culture. Education, everywhere, has the function of *the formation of social personalities.* Education helps in transmitting culture through proper moulding of social personalities. In this way, it contributes to the integration of society. It helps men to adapt themselves to their environment, to survive, and to reproduce themselves.

(4) *Reformation of Attitudes.* Education aims at the reformation of attitudes wrongly developed by the children already. For various reasons the child may have absorbed a host of attitudes, beliefs and disbeliefs, loyalties and prejudices, jealousy and hatred, etc. These are to be reformed. It is the function of education to see that unfounded beliefs, illogical prejudices and unreasoned loyalties are removed from the child's mind. Though the school has its own limitations in this regard, it is expected to continue its efforts in reforming the attitudes of the child.

(5) *Education for Occupational Placement-An Instrument of Livelihood.* Education has a practical end also. It should help the adolescent for earning his

livelihood. Education has come to be today as nothing more than an instrument of livelihood. It should enable the student to eke out his livelihood. Education must *prepare* the student for *future occupational positions*~ The youth should be enabled to playa productive role in society. Accordingly, great emphasis has been placed on vocational training.

(6) *Conferring of Status.* Conferring of status is one of the most important functions of education. The amount of education one has, is correlated with his class position. This is true in U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Japan, Germany and some other societies. Education is related to one's position in the stratification structure in two ways: (1) An evaluation of one's status is partially decided by *what kind of education* one has received and (2) many of the other important criteria of class position such as occupation, income, and style of life, are partially the results of the type and *amount of education* one has had. Men who finish college, for example, earn two and a half times as much as those who have only a grammar school education.

(7) *Education Encourages the Spirit of Competition.* The school instills co-operative values through civic and patriotic exhortation or advice. Yet the school's main emphasis is upon personal competition. For each subject studied the child is compared with the companions by percentage of marks or rankings. The teacher admires and praises those who do well and frowns upon those who fail to do well. The school's ranking system serves to prepare for a later ranking system. Many of those who are emotionally disappointed by low ranking in the school are thereby prepared to accept limited achievement in the larger world outside the school.

Other Functions of Education

Peter Worsley has spoken of a few more functions of education. Some of them may be noted:

A. *Education Trains in Skills that are Required by the Economy.* The relation between the economy and education can be an exact one. For example, the number and productive capacity of engineering firms are limited by the number of engineers produced by education. In planned economy, normally, it is planned years in advance to produce a definite number of doctors, engineers, teachers,

technicians, scientists, etc. to meet the social and economic needs of the society.

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

C. *Education Imparts Values.* The curriculum of a school, its "extra-curricular" activities and the informal relationships amongst students and teachers communicate social skills and values. Through various activities a school imparts values such as 'co-operation' or team-spirit, obedience, 'fair play'. This is also done through curriculum, that is, through lessons in history, literature, etc.

D. *Education Acts as an Integrative Force.* Education acts as an integrative force in society by communicating values that unite different sections of society. The family may fail to provide the child the essential knowledge of the social skills, and values of the wider society. The school or the educational institutions can help the child to learn new skills and learn to interact with people of Different social backgrounds.

E. *Values and Orientations which are Specific to Certain Occupations are a/so Provided by Education.* For example, the medical students are socialised and educated in a particular way in medical college. This may help them to become proper medical practitioners. Other values and orientations relevant to the functioning of industrial society are also provided by education.

8.5 EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The role of education as an agent or instrument of social change and social development is widely recognised today. Social change may take place- (i) *When human needs change,* (ii) *When inexisting social system or network of social institutions fail to meet the existing human needs.* and (iii) *When new materials suggest better ways of meeting human needs. Social* changes do not take place automatically or by themselves. As MacIver says, social change takes place as a *response to many types of changes* that take place in the social and non-social environment. Education can initiate social changes by bringing

about a change in outlook and attitude of man. It can bring about a change in the pattern of social relationships and thereby it may cause social changes.

There was a time when educational institutions and teachers were engaged in *transmitting a way of life* to the students. During those days, education was more *a means of social control than an Instrument of social change.* Modern schools, colleges and universities do not place much emphasis upon transmitting a way of life to the students. The traditional education was meant for an unchanged, static society, not marked by rapid changes. But today, education aims at imparting empirical knowledge that is, knowledge about science, technology and other type of specialised knowledge. Education was associated with religion. It has, however, become secular today. It is an independent institution now. Education today has been chiefly instrumental in preparing the way for the development of science and technology.

Education has brought about phenomenal changes in every aspect of man's life. *France Brown* remarks that education is a process which *brings about changes in the behaviour of society.* It is a process which enables every individual to effectively participate in the activities of society, and to make positive contribution to the progress of society. (For more details please see the chapter on "Social Change".

8.6 SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

"Social Stratification" which is necessitated by the phenomenon of social differentiation refers to *"a process of placing people in different strata or layers"*. It is an ubiquitous phenomenon of human society. All the existing societies are stratified. The essence of social stratification is social inequality which manifests in various forms. It may involve the differential allocation of income, status, privileges, and opportunities. A stratified society represents a ladder of hierarchy in which its population is distributed. People who occupy the higher place in this hierarchy or ladder enjoy higher status, opportunities and privileges and the people who occupy lower positions have limited access to the same.***"Social Mobility"*** refers to the movement of an individual or group from one social position or status to that of another. People who occupy different status or places in the above said hierarchy may often change their places depending upon the opportunities made available to them.

Based on this movement of people from status to stratum which is called *"social mobility"* Two systems of social stratification are distinguished:

(i) The open society or the *fluid system of stratification* in which there is greater scope for movement up and down the hierarchy. The Western society with its class system of stratification is very often cited as the typical illustration of this.

(ii) **The *closed society*** or the *rigid system of stratification* is the second one in which the boundaries of various strata are very rigid and movement between the strata is extremely difficult, if not impossible. The Indian caste is very often mentioned here as the typical example of this. It may, however, be noted that as two broad types they are not found in pure form in any society of the world. Existing societies, however, lean towards one or the other depending upon certain economic and cultural conditions.

Education - as a Powerful Correlate of Social Stratification and Social Mobility

There are various correlates of social stratification and mobility. These correlates vary from society to society depending upon the level of their socio-economic and technological development. In general, in urban - industrial societies - education, occupation, income and wealth - have been found to be the main correlates of social stratification and also of mobility.

Education - As a Criterion of Social Stratification

In technologically advanced countries education has become the most important criterion of social stratification. In such societies occupation is the determinant of income. It is also found that recruitment to various occupations in these societies is determined by the education levels of individuals.

Education - As a Determinant of Social Placement and Social Stratification

In the technologically advanced countries normally the status gradation is defined by the occupational and educational levels of education. *"Briefly, in view of the close relationship between education and occupation, and to the extent that occupation is an important, if not the only avenue, for income and social status, education acquires significance as a determinant of social placement and social stratification.*

It is noticeable that in the industrial societies the most prestigious jobs tend to be not only those that yield the highest incomes but also the ones that require the longest education. The more education people have, the more likely they are to obtain good jobs and to enjoy high incomes.

The Complex Relationship between Education and Social Stratification

Though education acts as a generator of upward mobility it does not invariably do that. Empirical evidences suggest that in the reciprocal relationship between education and social stratification it is stratification that affects education primarily. This effect is greater than the effect of education on stratification.

In many societies the facilities for education leading to higher levels of occupations and professions like medicine, engineering, management, etc. , are limited. But the number of aspirants to make use of such facilities is very high. Since the cost of higher education is very high and several constraints govern admission to such education courses, only a select section of the society can manage to enter such courses. This section is normally the privileged section of the society, which occupies a top position in the stratification system. Such a system of higher education with all its constraints etc., is often defended on *meritocratic grounds. Thus education instead of being a generator of upward social mobility* is *forced to function as an agency of stratification. to function as an agency of 'status retention'*[1]

Social Stratification Affecting Lower Levels of Education: Social Stratification affects lower levels of education especially in the rural areas. In many of the developing countries wastage and stagnation in school education is found to be very high. This problem seems to exist even in the advanced countries to a certain extent It is found that generally students belonging to the lower stratum background drop out of the school in a large number. Even though education is provided free and additional incentives are given, the situation does not seem to improve much.

It is clear from the above that the relationship between education and social stratification is more complex than what it appears to be. It is true that education has enough potentiality for changing the system of stratification. But this potentiality

itself seems to be governed by the existing system of stratification.

In conclusion, it can be said that from the point of view of an educational system those who are already at the upper strata of the society are likely to gain more. They have higher achievement motivation and their environment helps them. If we wish to provide equality of educational opportunities we will have to keep this aspect in mind.

Education and Social Mobility

Education as a Promoter of Upward Mobility

In the context of urban-industrial society education functions as a promoter of upward social mobility, In such societies occupation is the principal channel of social mobility. Occupations that elpsocial mobility require certain educational qualifications. It is in this context education acquires significance as a promoter of upward social mobility. Sociologist Reid Writes: *"The functions of the educational system are to provide people with the qualifications and aspirations to meet society's occupational needs, Built into the system* is *that assumptions that people will or should want to be . upwardly mobile. Underlying such reasoning* is. *then. the belief that social mobility* is *a desirable characteristic of that society and that the education system exists to promote and facilitate it"* [Quoted by N. J ayaram - Page: 121]

Peter Blau and Otis Duncan (1967), in their study of social mobility in America, found that Iheimportant factor affecting whether a son moved to a higher social status than his father's was the amount of education the son received. *A high level of education is a scarce and valued resource,* ana -one for which people compete vigorously.

Due to the increased awareness regarding the importance of college-level education, large number of persons are trying to avail of the same to increase their social standing. As a result, the number of new college graduates is now far greater than the number of' *college-level'* jobs available to them. *"Infact. it has been calculated that only* 15% *of the increase in educational requirementsfor jobs*

during the course of this century can be attributed to the replacement of low-skill jobs by new jobs requiring greater expertise [Collins - 1971]". *What has actually happened is that the "educational threshold" has risen: people need higher qualifications to get jobs that previously required much lower educational credentials".*

Lack of Educational Qualification Restricts Social Mobility

In developed nations people want to attain higher level of education to equip themselves to obtain more prestigious jobs. What is observed is that people want to receive extra years of education even if it is not necessary for some of the jobs or occupations that they are seeking for. There is evidence that educational achievement has no consistent relationship to later job performance and productivity. What is significant, however, is that *the lack of educational qualifications resurrects social mobility of those people* who for one reason or another, have been unable to obtain them.

Education as a Solvent of Inequalities ?

Education serves as a solvent of inequalities to certain extent especially in societies where the. Traditional systems of stratification did not permit large scale social mobility. Here the introduction: of formal education [as was done by the British in India] gave an opportunity for people who were' hitherto confined to lower or intermediary statuses in the traditional system of stratification [say caste] to try for attaining a higher status in the changed situation. That is what the scheduled caste and the scheduled tribe people and the people belonging to the backward classes have done and are doing. Thus, education under conditions has the potentiality of radically altering the previous system of stratification. Thus education has often been hailed as a solvent of inequalities.

Education and Internal and External Constraints on Mobility

There are a number of factors which impede mobility of the individuals in a social structure. They are referred to here as constraints on mobility. These constraints may be internal or external. The internal constraints are *values, aspirations and personality patterns of the individuals.* The external constraints are the *opportunity structure of a society* with which the individual is influenced.

(i) System of Beliefs and Values. The major constraints in the upward mobility is a system of beliefs and values prevailing in social structure. *H. H. Human* in his study regarding - class differences in educational values, motivational for economic advancement and perceptions of the operate- I nity structure -found that the lower socioeconomic groups place less emphasis upon college education as necessary for advancement, and are less likely to desire college education for their children. , This holds true in the Indian situation also.

Further, *opportunities for education to the lower classes are very limited. particularly in the rural areas.* Thus the prevalent value system governs their aspirations and actions. Hence they may lag behind the upper classes in this regard.

(ii) **Family Influence.** Upward mobility is also restricted due to the family influences. In a study made by Stephenson J it was found that both occupational plans and aspirations are positively associated with the prestige ranking of father's occupation. If the family itself lacks initiative it is reflected in the child's desire for not moving out of the family bonds. The child develops a tendency to take up a job which the parent wants him to take up in his hierarchical set up. The child also does not show much interest in education because the parents are least concerned about it. This influence is very much visible in joint families.

(iii) Factors in individual personality. Individual's personality structure may also contribute to his immobility. It has been found in a number of studies that achievement motivation, intelligence, aspirations and values are related with mobility. In one study it was found that I.Q (Intelligence Quotient] plays an important role in the school performance in the early years of an individual's life. But as the person grows older he begins to shape his performance according to certain values that he learns from his family and friends. Here desire to go to the college is taken as an aspect of mobility. One who performs well is expected to go to college and thus is mobile in upward direction. In the above mentioned study it was found that upper-status boys learn that good performance in school is necessary, and that they are expected to do well enough in secondary school to get admitted to college. On the other hand, *a boy from a lower status home* is *taught that college* is *either not meant for him or at best a matter of indifference to his parents.* The boy's friends are not interested in college nor in high school. Consequently, even a bright

boy among them gets discouraged.

Various findings have revealed that *the strength of the achievement motive* is *clearly related to upward mobility.* It seems that youth from upper strata of society may not need strong personal motivation for mobility. Such youth get good advice, they live in such environment where' *looking up'* is encouraged and where they are provided with wise decisions for setting up their careers. This is not the case of lower class youth. They have to learn a great deal to make these decisions.

8.7 EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

It is an accepted working policy of all the democratic nations to make provision for equal opportunities. As Dr. Radhakrishnan had pointed out long back *"Democracy only provides that all men should have equal opportunities for the development of their unequal talents"*. The Indian Constitution also as per the articles 15, 16, 17, 38 and 48, guarantee that the State shall not discriminate between persons on account of their religion or region and caste or class. The Preamble to the Constitution also assures equality to all the citizens. It means that our Constitution is committed to the principle of equality and accepted it as an article of faith.

It is in tune with this spirit of the constitution the *Education Commission* has observed thus: *"One of the important social objectives of education* is *to equalise opportunity. enabling the backward or underprivileged classes and individuals to use education as a lever for the improvement of their condition. Every society that values social justice and* is *anxious to improve the lot of the common man and cultivate all available talent. must ensure progressive equality of opportunity to all sections of the population. This* is *the only guarantee for the building up of an egalitarian and human society by which the exploitation of the weak will be minimised."*

8.8 SUM UP

One of the main effects of educational expansion has been an escalation of educational requirements. This has undermined both its economic and social rationales. Although some absolute gains have been made in the area of social justice, existing gender and class inequalities, in relative terms, have not been resolved.

The sociological counterpart to human capital theory is technological functionalism, a perspective that sees the school as a neutral instrument for satisfying a society's technological needs. There are two alternatives, both involving conflict interpretations of the role of education: Collins has presented a Weberianinspired and Bevvies and Gintis a Marxist-inspired theory of education. Both stress the role of the school as an instrument of social domination.

Two strategies for improving educational opportunities can be distinguished: equality of access and equality of nurture. Each implies different responsibilities for the school system.

Two- home-based and three school-related sources of unequal hurture have been identified. The home-based sources are achievement motivation and language use; the school related sources are the influence structure of the school, its selection procedures, and the cultural transmission role it performs. Structural functionalists (here represented by technological functionalists) and conflict theorists dkffer in the emphasis thev place on these factors.

The functional and conflict perspectives have been compared along four dimensions: societal determinants of education, the stratitification role of eduiation, the relevance of education as a credential, and soiinrs of unequal academic achievement Some of the differences are more apparent than real and represent only differences in emphasis. Others are more substantive. Both perspectives have been criticized for ignoring the study of school life as a variable in its own right.

Education in the future will probably be lifelong,with schools becoming just part of a larger network of educational facilities. Instructional technology, many predict, will make available more individualized and decentralized forms of learning.

8.9 ASK YOURSELF.

Q. 1. Explain how social statification and mobility effects Education ?

Q. 2. Define Education as a social process ?

Q. 3. Explain the social functions of Education as an Institutions ?

8.10 KEY WORDS

Contest mobility. Opt'n competition tor elite status.

Democratic citizenship training. Preparation for political participation in the affairs of a democratic society.

Education. Deliberate, organized transmission of values, knowledge, and skills.

Elaborated language code. Form of communication that makes meanings explicit and universal.

Elite preparatory. Stage of educational development in a society: the majority of students do not finish high school, and the function of the high school is restricted to preparing a select group of students for university education.

Empty box view of education. View that schools are passive transmitters for outside influences, with no life of their own.

Equality of access. Removal of external barriers to educational participation.

Equality of nurture. Removal of barriers to educational performance.

Human capital theory. Economic theory holding that the skill level of the labour force is the prime determinant of economic growth.

Mass terminal. Stage of educational development in a society: secondary education has become universal, but post-secundarv education is pursued by a minority only.

Meritocracy. Society in which merit constitutes the basis for social stratification and in which all people have an equal chance to display their talents and to be evaluated fairly.

Occupational socialization. Preparation for entering the job market.

Restricted language code. Form of communication that leaves meanings implicit.

Sponsored mobility. Competition tor elite status on the basis of criteria set up by the existing elite.

Status socialization. Process of teaching people to accept their position in the social stratification system.

Includes two components : ambition regulaton and legitimation

Technological functionalism. A perspective that sees rising educational requirements as a reflection of the increased complexity of the occupational structure.

COURSE: SOC-C-101 **LESSON NO. 9**

UNIT-III **ECONOMY–AS AN INSTITUTION** **SEMESTER-I**

STRUCTURE

9.1 Introduction

9.2 Features of Primitive Economy

9.3 Features of Modern Economy

9.4 Theoretical Perspectives

9.5 Concept of Property

9.6 Conclusion

9.7 Ask yourself.

9.1 INTRODUCTION :

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 hours 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 organisation of ours has its humble beginning in the food gathering and hunting cultures of old. There was simple division of labour between men and women. Men and not women were generally the hunters ; women were the gatherers of fruits. The family was generally the producing and consuming unit. The wife prepared the food which 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 exit. 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.

Within a particular settlement, however, exchange was effected by hospitality of by gifts. Services were rendered or goods given without payment, but with the expectation of a return in kind at a later date. Hospitality was not wholly one-sided ; it was reciprocal in the long run. Hospitality and gifts, therefore, rendered functions which money renders to us at present. In the words of Ogburn and Nimkoff : "A gift is a social substitute for money among moneyless cultures".

Both private ownership and common use prevailed among these hunting tribes. All personal effects such as clothing, utensils etc., including dwelling huts, were privately owned. Land was used in common. And the reason is obvious. Since hunting was their main occupation and since animals moved from place to 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 became more certain and substantial and an element of stability was introduced in the community.

Thirdly, with stability came specialisation and development of skills in different lines, viz., weaving of cotton, wool etc. pottery-making and similar other handicrafts. Specialization in turn led to trade and other kinds of exchange against payment. Another offshoot of agriculture, that is particularly significant from the sociological point of view, is the development of the 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 holdings 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 classes 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 rule of the husband became quite important in the family economy.

9.2 FEATURE OF PRIMITIVE ECONOMICS

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

(i) Shifting cultivation

Primitive economic organisations 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, as is illustrated by shifting cultivation. Shifting cultivation means that the same plots of land are not cultivated for long and that cultivators move from one plot to another. The reasons for doing so are understandable. The decreasing yield of land as a result of continuous cultivation can be counteracted through proper manuring. But manuring represents a rather advanced scientific level of cultivation. 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 :—

Barter

Barter is a direct form of exchange. It involves bargaining and haggling unless it is regulated by customs or norms. Barter is an exchange of (a) service for services, (b) goods for service and (c) goods for goods. Money does not figure in the barter transactions.

Silent trade/exchange

There is another type of exchange called silent trade or silent exchange. There are societies 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. According to Herskovits : "Similar means of effectuating 'silent' exchanges occur today, or did occur until recent times, between the Chuckchee of Siberia and the inhabitants of Alaska".

Jajmani system

Jajmani system is another type of exchange. It is akin 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 means, therefore, jajmani economic relations involved the exchanges of gifts for service rendered or to be rendered in future. This meaning has not changed even today. But its ambit has been widened in course of time. Jajmani has come to mean all the basic reciprocal relations of patronage. It was a privilege and a responsibility for a family to patronize not only the family priest but also all other specialists in the village. The system ensures the services of specialists like cobblers, washermen, barbers, potters, blacksmiths, 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. According to Lannoy : "The intrinsically religious nature of the system is dramatised during the occasions when it combines exchange of service and of gifts with family rites, festivals and, above all, marriages".

The jajmani links are between family rather than between jatis. Thus, a farmer's family gets its metal agricultural tools from a particular blacksmith family and in return the latter gets a share of the farmer's crop at harvest.

The jajmani relationship is supposed to be and often is durable exclusive and multiple.

The relationship is durable in the sense that the link may be inherited on both sides. Thus, a blacksmith services the same farmer family that his father and grandfathers served. In the same manner, the farmer family gets its tools made and repaired by the descendants of the blacksmith family whose members made tools for their forefather. If a member of a family dies without any issue, another of its lineage may take its place in the relationship. Again, if a blacksmith family (and for the matter of that any specialist family) has more sons than its clientele can support some seek other associates in place where there is a shortage of smiths. Some may even take up other employment, often in farming, since, traditionally, men of any jati may work on the land.

Jajmani relationships are exclusive in the sense that the farmer family is supposed to carry on such transactions with a particular blacksmith family only.

Reciprocally, these blacksmiths should make tools for their own families only. The are free to make some tools for sale in the market. But they are not allowed to poach jajmani associates from the other blacksmiths.

Jajmani relationship are multiple in the sense that more than economic exchange is involved. Economic exchange is only one facets of jajmani relations. Thus, "a family of cultivators expects help on its ceremonial occasions from most of the associated families. There is also an expectation of mutual personal support in family emergencies or factional quarrels. Sometimes the specialists families are pressured to support the jati of their patrons when that whole jati is embattled". (Mandelbaum p. 165).

According to Dr. D. N. Majumadar, such reciprocal services are often formally prescribed, particularly for life-cycle rites. He notes : In a village of Lucknow district, a marriage in a family of Thakurs, the dominant landowners, involves the formal participation of families from ten of the fourteen jatis represented

in the village. (D. N. Majumdar et al, Inter-caste relations in Gohanakallan, a village near Lucknow. The Eastern Anthropologist, 1955). Mandelbaum cites an interesting example in this regard : "A principal ceremonial role is taken by the associates family of the barber jati. The barber's wife cleans and refurbishes the house ; she massage the bride, helps her bathe and dress. She joins in the wedding songs and the stylized derisions with which the groom's party is met. The barber himself accompanies the marriage party in the ceremonial round, doing for the members of the wedding whatever tasks need to be done. He is present through all the ritual, helping the priest, performing such bits as the formal typing of the grooms shirt to the corner of the bride's dress. In return the barber and his wife are given a sum of money.... when they perform some special service in the course of the rite." These examples clearly indicate that more than economic exchange is involved in jajmani relationships.

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 relative, friend or a neighbour without expecting immediate reciprocity. The return is expected to follow in course of time on an appropriate future occasion. For example, birthday gifts, gifts on the occasion of marriage, diwali etc.

The features of ceremonial exchange are the following :

(a) Value or quality of the gifts is not a consideration. That it matters in certain cases cannot be denied. Gifts of low value or inferior quality may raise frowns or cause anger. The relationships may also be adversely affected. But, usually, the reciprocity is regulated by customs.

(b) Ceremonial exchange symbolises good will, trust and mutuality. It stimulates social relations.

(c) The form of goods given or the amount of money given as gifts is indicative of the closeness of the relations.

(d) Ceremonial exchange does not involve discussion or bargaining. It "involves the principle that one person does another a favour, and where there is a generally

expectation of some future return, its expect nature is definitely not stipulated in advance". With reference to a Kula, a Western Pacific Community ceremonial exchange, repaid by an equivalent counter-gift after a lapse of time..... The second very important principle is that the equivalence of counter-gift is left to the giver, and it cannot be enforced by any kind of coercion... If the article given as a counter-gift is not equivalent, the recipient will be disappointed and angry, but he has no direct means of redress no means of coercing his partner".

(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 co-operative 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 possessory rights as reported from New Zealand, Melanesia and West Africa. Under this practice several possessors use the same thing, say land, for different purposes. Thus, in Melanesia and West Africa a person can own trees on another's land whereon the latter cultivates crops. In whatever form property may be recognized, its recognition entails the existence of some rules of inheritance. Inheritance acquires particular importance when individual possess property. In case of communal ownership, the group as a whole never ceases to exist suddenly as an individual does, and is replenished through fresh recruitment from time to time.

9.3FEATURES OF MODERN COMPLEX ECONOMIC ORDER

The economic life was radically changed within the development of power, specially the development of steam, later augmented by electrical power and industrial chemistry, and further augmented 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 this 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. The notion of profit was unknown when exchange was effected by barter or by various forms of gifts.

(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. There is no guarantee, however, that profit will correspond to service, that these economic activities will automatically further the interests of the community.

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

(iv) Capitalistic order brings into being large joint stock business. Mass production requires large capital which can be collected through the sale of shares among innumerable shareholders. Joint stock business enterprise has the following features : (a) It enjoys a legal personality with definite rights and responsibilities. (b) The liability of the shareholders is limited to the value of the shares one owns. (c) Under it, ownership is diffused and there is separation between ownership and management. "This process accentuates the separation of the financial from the industrial administration, of the pecuniary interest from the technological interest". At present, the large companies which dominate the major branches of industry are managed and directed by individuals who do not own them. The owners are the thousands of small and medium shareholders who have little interest except in the profitability of the company and may not even known what the Company produces. Some writers have characterised this development as the 'managerial revolution' and emphasized the transformation of capitalistic order. This view is, however, criticised by some others who point out the those who are on the Board of Directors have an important share holders, and that they are wealthy in their own right. In case like these, ownership and control are not separated C. Wright Mills in his book. 'The Power Elite' has shown how ownership and control are interwoven in American industries. Mills observes further that "the chief executive and the very rich are not two distinct and clearly segregated groups".

(v) Capitalism brought in factories which employed thousands of workers whom the employers do not know. "A factory is seen as a mechanistic arrangement and not as a society of human beings". Again, under capitalism labour has become a free contractual good ; it is bought and sold freely under terms mutually agreed upon between the employers and the employees. Labour has, therefore, "passed from a condition of status to one of contract". Labour unions are natural offshoots of this system since these unions help them to wrest better terms from their employers.

(vi) This brings us to another aspect of capitalistic order. "It is always an arena of contending forces, for it rests on two premises, competition and bargain". Competition refers to simultaneous offer of similar or alternative services for

acceptance by the buyer. Bargaining, on the other hand, refers to the process by which the opposite interests of buyers and sellers, employers and employees, are sought to be settled or adjusted.

(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 children and to provide a measure of security in case of accidents, unemployment, sickness and old age". Another interesting development has been that the services of sociologists and other social scientists have been commissioned to improve the relations between employers and management, with the goals of preventing work-stoppages and increasing efficiency. Sociologists look upon the factory as a social system, and on this assumption, they have developed a science relating to interaction of individuals within the factory, known as Industrial Sociology.

(viii) Minute division of labour, which is both a cause and consequence of modern technological method of production, is an important feature of all modern economies. Its social and psychological consequences and implications have been examined by many scholars. We shall discuss these consequences and implications in the following sections under appropriate heads.

9.4THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

One of the striking features of modern industrial economy is the complex division of labour. The complex nature of division of labour was brought out very dramatically by Adam Smith as late as 1776 when he described the production of a very simple product like 'pin' "one man draws out the wire, another straightens it ; a third cuts it ; a fourth points it ; a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head ; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations ; to put it on is a peculiar business ; to whiten the pins is another ; it is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper ; and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about eighteen distinct operations..." 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 Durkheim have examined these aspect 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 humanity". 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 products is appreciated by others. At this stage, his work becomes a 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. In Marx's words, 'each of us would in his production have doubly affirmed himself and his fellow men'. That is, work becomes a fully satisfying activity when an individual works both for meeting his needs as well as the needs of others. Marx observes that apart from possibly the drawn of history, this ideal relationship of work to man has never been established. On the contrary, work has been "destructive both to the human spirit and to human relationships" throughout history.

Marx sought to focus attention to this state of affairs by developing the idea of 'alienated labour'. 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 true self. 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.

Why and how does this happen ? Marx argues that the source of alienation is to be sought in man's distorted view of the nature of a commodity or an object.

A commodity or object is meant for consumption and not for accumulation. That is a commodity is a means, and not an end in itself. When, however, man

makes commodity in the end, it is only a short step to the idea of private ownership. The idea of private ownership finds a dramatic expression in a capitalist economy in which the ownership of the means of production is concentrated in the hands of a very small, number of individuals. They engage workers who simply carry out the biddings of their employers. The workers do not follow their own creative urges. Goods are thus no longer a proud possession of those who produce them. In this way "the worker is related to the product of his labour as to an alien object". In course of time, alienation is further increased by the complex division of labour and the introduction of machine. Marx gives us a step by step analysis of the accentuation of alienation in a capitalist economy. This fascinating story is narrated in the following paragraphs.

The first phase in the development of the productive forces within the capitalist mode of production was described by Marx as 'simple co-operation'. Simple co-operation prevails during that period in which capital operates on a large scale, but division of labour and machinery play a subordinate part.

Co-operation of this kind takes place mainly in hand production. Production in these early stages is distinguished from handicraft simultaneously employed by one and the same capitalist. Here the emphasis is on the socially productive force that comes into being by bringing many men together to work side by side and to co-operate with one another. The capitalist pays each individual worker for his individual labour. The amount so paid is much less than the value of the product which the workers help to produce. As a result, the capitalist gets more than he bargained for.

At this stage, the existence of large outlays of capital becomes a pre-conditions for the co-operation of many workers. The co-operation among workers is not possible unless they are employed simultaneously by the same capitalist. During this phase, capitalist with adequate means of production and money engages workers who do not own either of these viz. means of production and money. Thus, the 'productive forces' do not come into conflict with 'relations of production'.

The later phase of hand production is based on a more complex division

of labour, each worker doing only a part of what he did before. Manufacture naturally involves the union of the formerly independent craftsmen, forgoing them into one productive organisation whose parts are human beings. This is a new phase in the growth of productive forces. This phase, however, retains the character of handicraft because each operation is still performed by hand, and is, therefore, dependent on the skill and dexterity of the individual worker in handling his tools.

Since he is now engaged in one simple operation, the worker is "alienated from some of the creative prerogatives he exercised before". What he loses in creativity, he gains in efficiency. This is because of the fact that he now takes less time in performing the specific operation than the craftsman who performs the entire series of operation in succession. The division of labour among many workers, each doing a specialised operation, is the basis of the productive system called manufacture.

Such a division of labour enables the manufacturer to make necessary changes in the tools employed in production. Unlike the craftsman who used a number of tools for different operations, the workers now use only a specialized tools designed for each specialized operation.

To Marx, this development is important for a number of reasons. First, it brings about radical changes in the personality of the worker. The increasingly complex division of labour alienates the worker from this creative powers and thus diminishes him as a human being. Second, what is taken away from the individual worker in artistic skill, creative and reflective powers is given to the organisation in terms of higher productivity. The deficiencies of the former becomes the virtues of the latter. The organisation as a whole is enriched by alienating the worker from his individual powers. Third, manufacture develops a hierarchy of labour. At the very bottom of the hierarchy are those who perform the simplest operations of which anyone is capable. Hence, in contrast to guild production, manufacture bring into being a class of unskilled labourers, a class unknown in handicraft production. The separation of the workers into skilled and unskilled is thus brought into being. According to Marx, therefore, the main tendencies of the

capitalist system appear during this phase of production.

The next phase was the introduction of machine. In manufacture the revolution in production began with the organisation of labour power. In modern industry, it beings with the introduction of machine. According to Marx, the employment of machinery in the modern industry is the most important phase in the development of the capitalist mode of production.

The changes, brought about by machine, were far-reaching in their effect on the worker. In manufacture, the productive process was adapted to the skills of the worker, the machine systems compelled the worker to adapt himself to it. "Tife-long speciality of handling one and the same tool now becomes the life-long speciality of serving one and the same machine". In manufacture, the worker used the tool ; in the factory the machine uses him. In this way, the worker's dependence upon the factory, and hence on the capitalist, is rendered complete. Under these circumstances the intellectual powers of the worker become redundant and completely disappear in the face of the gigantic physical set-up of the total factory organisation and the mind hidden behind it all. Hence the Marxian concept of the alientation which emphasizes the growing de-humanization of man in a capitalist society.

What is the Marxian answer to this problem ? His solution to the problem of alienated labour is a communist society in which the forces of production are communally owned. According to Marx, the concentration of alienated labour in large industrial establishments would encourage awareness of exploitation and oppression. They would sooner or later find these conditions intolerable and wrest all capital and power from their oppressors. This would lead to the eventual abolition of classes and class conflicts. In such a society, workmen would at one and the same time produce goods for themselves and the community and thereby satisfy both individual and collective needs.

Marx gives the little indication of how the specialised division of labour can be dispensed with in a socialist or communist society. Marx simply states.

"In a communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and

another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, near cattle in the evening and criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd, or critic". Marx thus conjures up the vision of a society in which each individual is free to choose his occupation in terms of his inclinations and to move from one occupation to the other in terms of his changing moods.

Marxian view that alienated labour would not exist in a socialist or communist society is criticised as being too simplistic and naive. "In his analysis of East European Communism, Milovan Djilas argues that though the forces of production are communally owned, they are controlled by and for the benefit of a ruling elite. Djilas, therefore, concludes: "labour cannot be free in a society where all material goods are monopolized by one group. It is also pointed out by criticism that the picture of a society in which a worker would not be tied down to one job against his mood is too unrealistic and exceeds the bounds of practical possibility. We can also assume that in socialist societies technology would be increasingly used in production in future on a scale comparable to that in capitalist societies. This needs must be done in order to give the people goods of better quality and of adequate quantity. Increasing use of technology demands greater and more complex division of labour. It is not clear as to how a socialist society can avoid the problem of alienated labour when a worker would be reduced to an appendage of the machine as a result of mechanisation of the processes of production. That machine tends to de-humanize the worker has been recognised by many philosophers, social scientists and writers. The crucial questions are : Can machine be dispensed with ? Can complex division of labour in a highly technology society be eliminated ? The answers to both the questions will probably be in the negative. What is, then, the remedy ?

If machines and division of labour cannot be dispensed with, the solution, though partial and inadequate, probably lies in giving the workers more free time, so that they can pursue their leisure-time activities according to their inclinations and changing moods. It will be quite pertinent to consider that when Marx outlined his views on alienated labour in 1844, the working hours in a factory varied

between 12 and 16 hours a day. Naturally, he had little time for anything else except what Marx described as "animal functions"— i.e., eating sleeping and procreating. The situation has radically changed today in advanced industrial societies. There has been a significant reduction in working hours and a steady rise in the living standards and income of the population as a whole.

Writers of leftist persuasion, such as the French sociologist and journalist Andre Gorz and Herbert Marcuse, however, argue that the leisure-time activities of workers are also planned and channelised by big business. There is little or no scope of self-directed and creative leisure. Marcuse argues that : "The people recognize themselves in their commodities ; they find their soul in their automobile, hi-fi set, split-levels home kitchen equipment". It is pointed out that "relative affluences and the extension of leisure have simple changed chains of iron into chains of gold. These observations seems to be an implied call for restoration of pristine values and making people aware of those values. A Herculean task indeed which only a handful of brave souls can undertake. The old maxim that man does not live by bread alone seems to acquire a new dimension and urgency in modern affluent societies. It is a challenge for which adequate response has to be found in the coming years.

In this context, it will be illuminating to consider the views of Marx and Rousseau on the question of alienation. There are some striking similarities in their views. In the first place, both the philosophers have faith in the inherent goodness, strength of character and power of discrimination of the people. Secondly, both the philosophers agree that man was initially in possession of his self. According to Rousseau, that initial condition was the state of nature and, according to Marx, it was primitive communism. Thirdly, both the philosophers agree that the origin of private ownership of property and the situations which developed around 'property' distorted values and introduced aberrations in the natural flow of life. Fourthly, both the philosophers agree that class divisions with accent on inequality bring to the fore the oppressive and distorted view of society. Class divisions keep people apart and artificial barriers to spontaneous social relationships are created. Man becomes the greatest enemy of man. Fifthly, both agree that man was born free and that gradually with the unfolding of civilization this freedom has been

restricted. According to Rousseau, the norms prescribed by society imposed these restrictions. Marx pointed his accusing finger at the growth and development of capitalism which tends to dwarf human personality and stifle the spontaneity of his thinking and action.

Emile Durkheim : A functionalist perspective

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, Durkeim 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 Dukheimian thought, as expressed in his book, The Division of Labour in Society (first published in 1883), is the relation between individuals and the collectivity. He posed the problem thus : How can a multiplicity of individuals make up a society ? How can individuals achieve a consensus which is the condition of social existence ?

In answer to this central question, Dukheim kept in view a fundamental difference between pre-industrial and industrial societies, and made a 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 characteristic of a society in which mechanical solidarity prevails is that the individuals 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 same collectivity are not similar, but different. In such a situation the consensus is achieved precisely

because the individuals are different. Their interdependence brings them closer and social solidarity is established. Why does he refer to this from of unit as "organic solidarity" ? The reason for this terminology is probably this. The parts of a living organism do not resemble one another. Each of the organs of a living creature (for example, the heart, liver, brain etc.) performs a function. Each such organ is however indispensable to life. There is thus a unit of interdependence of these different parts of organs.

In Durkheim's thought, these two forms of solidarity correspond to two extreme forms of social organisation. The pre-industrial society or the society which was called primitive in Durkheim's day is characterized by the predominance of mechanical solidarity. The individuals of a clan are so to speak interchangeable. It follows from this and this idea is central to Durkheim's conception—that the individual does not come first historically. The individual, the awareness of oneself as an individual, is born of the development of society itself. In primitive societies, each man is the same as the other. In the consciousness of each collective feelings—i.e. feelings common to all predominate in number and intensity.

As social organisation becomes more differentiated, characterized by multiplication of industrial activities the 'sameness' among the members in terms of ideas and outlook is missing. There are differences amongst the members by virtue of variety of experience, upbringings and training—in short, by the division of labour. It is to be noted that the division of labour which Durkheim refers to is not to be confused with the one envisaged by economists. According to his use of the term division of labour refers to social differentiation which is associated with differentiations of occupations and multiplication of industrial activities. The divisions of labour Durkheim speaks about concerns the structure of the society as a whole of which economic division of labour is merely an expression. Durkheim raises the question. If an industrial society is marked by so much of social differentiation, how is it that such a society coheres ? Why is there not more social disruption and more social disorganization. Durkheim argues that it is the very function of the division of labour to provide this cohesive factor.

Durkheim also discusses other characteristics of these two types of society. In societies marked by mechanical solidarity, law is repressive because in such

society an offence against the community is met with collective reaction of a punitive and repressive kind. On the other hand, in societies marked by organic solidarity, there is a greater preponderance of restitutive law—i.e. law which endeavours after a breach to restore the status quo ante. In such a society, law is also differentiated in the sense that some portions of law apply to merchants only, some portions to employers, to professional men and so forth.

In a society marked by organic solidarity, there is also repressive law. But it is only a small part of the total, and it is resorted to only after other measures have failed. Dukheim further points out that in the primitive society most offences are public while in modern societies they are private, civil rather than criminal, calling for adjustment rather than strong and violent reactions.

Durkheim classifies division of labour into two categories : normal division of labour and abnormal division of labour. The division of labour which strengthens social solidarity is characterized by him as normal division of labour. The division of labour which weakens social solidarity is called abnormal division of labour.

He further classified abnormal division of labour into two categories anomic division of labour and forced division of labour. When division of labour is pushed to such an extreme limit that the workers are divorced completely from the entire production process and there is a permanent estrangement between the employers on the one hand and the workers on the other, such a division of labour is called by Durkheim as anomic division of labour. R. A. Nisbet explains the nature of anomic division of labour thus. "In this division of labour, Durkheim had noted the virtually inverse relation between the development of culture and human happiness. States of boredom, anxiety, and despair are relatively unknown in primitive or simple society... In civilisation they mount and, with them, endemic unhappiness".

When workers are forced to take up some employment against their will in the absence of an alternative occupation, such division of labour is characterised by Durkheim as forced division of labour. In his view, absence of co-operation or adjustment between job requirements and professional

competence gives rise to this kind of problem.

In order to meet the problems of anomic division of labour, Durkheim advocates the setting up of professional association and corporations with a view to facilitating regular contact among workers. He also advocates the setting up of an agency for the purpose of reconciling disputes between the workers on the one hand and the employers on the other.

Whereas Marx suggests a radical solution to the problem of alienation, viz., the abolition of capitalism and its replacement by socialism, Durkheim suggests that the solution to the problem of anomie can be provided within the existing framework of industrial society. According to him, self-interest which dominates business and commerce should be replaced by a code of ethics which emphasises the needs of society as a whole. He looks upon occupational associations as the means to subject economic activity to moral regulation. Such associations would solve the problem of anomie in two ways. First, professional or occupational associations would check individualistic inclinations by re-integrating individuals into a social group within the membership of these associations which would re-enforce social controls. Second, these associations would lay down a code of conduct for their members, their rights as well as their obligations to the community as a whole. Durkheim is obviously influenced by his view of professional associations, such as those of doctors and lawyers, which lay down a code of conduct that is binding on their members. Through control of training and education, the professional associations establish both professional competence and professional ethics. Thus, the lawyer is the guardian of the law in the interests of society as a whole. The doctor, directed by his Hippocratic oath, is concerned primarily in his occupation with the health of the community. These features are lacking in commerce and industry. In his view, professional ethics must permeate all spheres of economic activities, and that is "the key to a future moral order in industrial society".

In order to meet the problems arising out of forced division of labour he advocates the expansion of opportunities for the spread of general education and technical training among workers.

In modern industrialized societies, the above proposals of Durkheim are being seriously considered and put into effect. The branch of sociology which is concerned with these problems is known as Occupational Sociology.

It will, however, be quite in order to consider also the anti-professional perspectives. Accordingly to one view, professional or occupational groups deliberately control entry into respective professional in order to restrict competition and obtain high rewards for the service rendered by the professional group. It is argued that "professional ethics, and in particular the emphasis on altruism, care and community service, are simply a smokescreen which serves to disguise professional self-interest".

The second anti-professional view is presented from the Marxian perspective. It is argued that professionals are servants of ruling classes and ruling elites. Their services are requisitioned by the state and private industry. It is particularly so in the case of lawyers accountants and engineers. They serve the interests of those who can pay their high fees and not the interests of the large number of people who cannot do so. It is doubtful as to whether doctors and teachers may be excluded from this charmed circle.

9.5CONCEPT OF PROPERTY

While we discussed division of labour or work ethics, we confined our attention to the productive system. But equally important as a productive system is a distributive system. This is concerned with the allocation of rights and obligations with regard to the fruits of productive efforts, irrespective of whether it is simple agriculture or a highly sophisticated technological method of production. Man does not produce all that he needs. There is, therefore, the necessity for exchange. An individual part with what he has in excess of his requirements and receives in exchanges what he does not have or what he has falls short of his requirements. The kind of exchange leads to the social phenomenon of some having more and some having less. It is on the distributive level that conflict of interest arises. Both productive and distributive systems constitute what is broadly called economic institutions. Property, which is described by Kingsley Davis as "essentially the distributive system in its static aspect, is one of the most important economic institutions. It is also universally institutionalised.

Defining property

Morris Ginsberg defines property thus : "Property may be described as the

set of rights and obligations which define the relations between individuals or groups in respect of their control over material things (or persons treated as things). The essential point in the notion of property is that there is a recognised right of control over things vested in a particular person or persons, and within various limits, excluding interference by other. By saying that there is a recognised right, we meant that there are regular sanctions attached to it, that is, approved methods of dealing with infringements. The amount and nature of the control with which owners are endowed various considerably in different legal systems and there is not always precise correspondence between legal theory and economic usage". According to Kingsley Davis, property "consists of the rights and duties of one person or group (the owner) as against all other persons and groups with respect to some scarce good. It is thus exclusive, for it sets off what is mine from what is thine ; but it is also social, being rooted in custom and protected by law".

It appears from these two definitions that property refers to the whole pattern of rights and obligations with respect to the possession, use, acquisition and disposal of scarce valuable things. It is to be noted that the term 'property' is used both for rights and for the things in which rights are held. The context should always make it clear which reference is intended.

Understood in terms of rights the following are the characteristics of property rights :

(i) Property can be transferred by its owned by way of sale, exchange of gift.

(ii) The things in which an individuals may hold property rights may be both tangible and intangible. Examples of the latter are copyright of books or goodwill of a business.

(iii) Property rights do not necessarily imply actual use and enjoyment of the relevant things by the owner. Law makes a distinction between ownership and possession. The many kinds of property right may be summarised as possession, use, alteration, using up, usufruct, income and disposition. These are explained ad seriatim.

(iv) The possession of property may mean possession of power over other. Money and such other tangibles as well as intangibles like one's good reputation may be basis of power. "The possession of exclusive rights of something that is scarce and valuable necessarily implies the possession of power over other who also desire the scarce and valuable things. The amount of power which property gives to the owners depends not only upon the definition of his rights but also on the intensity of others' needs for that which is owned".

COURSE: SOC-C-101 **LESSON NO. 10**

UNIT-III **POLITY–AS AN INSTITUTION** **SEMESTER-I**

STRUCTURE

10.1 Introduction

10.2 Political Institution in Primitive Societies

10.3 Political Institutions in Modern Societies

10.4 Theoretical Perspectives

10.5 Pressure Group

10.6 Analysis of Social Power

10.7 Elite Theory

10.8 Sum up

10.9 References

10.10 Key Words

10.1 INTRODUCTION :

Political institutions are concerned with the distribution of power in society. Max Weber defined the state as 'a human community which successfully claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory'. Thus the state is one of the important agencies of social control, whose functions are carried out by means of law, backed ultimately by physical force. It is one association within society, and not society as a whole. And Weber made territoriality one of the characteristics of a political system. The early sociologists, proceeded to examine the relationship between civil society and the state, and to attempt a

classification of political systems based upon the different forms of civil society. Their approach was evolutionary : they were interested in the origins and development of the state. Regarding the state as one association within society, and as characterized by definite territorial limits, and being acquainted through the growing literature of ethnography with primitive societies which seemed to have no political organization, they were naturally led to consider the question of origins ; and some of them went on to speculate, under the influence of the philosophy of history, about the future of the state. This same philosophy of history (and the political revolutions of the age) determined their interest in the different historical forms of the state, especially in Western civilization.

10.2 POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN PRIMITIVE SOCIEITES

Being disturbed by the existence of a government which denies the just rights and liberties of citizens, many people have dreamed of abolishing political institutions altogether. They assumed that since the government was not a natural institution but was created by man and rested on the willing consent of the people, it was easy to eliminate the institutions altogether, so that people could pursue their natural inclinations and find their true happiness. Such anarchistic arguments appealed to countless people in all ages. But the idea has ever remained an aspiration. There is an overwhelming opinion now that the idea is merely a utopian dream.

The idea of a stateless society was strengthened by what some people considered to be an almost complete absence of different political institutions in some primitive societies. The statement is not, however, accurate. It is true that in primitive societies, there is no law, no court, no legislature and no executive in the form in which we find them in a complex society like ours. Nevertheless, no discerning observer of a primitive society failed to notice that in such societies, there was a need for political control and that institutions of a non-political nature were made to serve such a need.

Why is the need for political control a universal feature of social living ? Are non-political agencies of social control not adequate enough to keep occasional violence of social norms in line ? The answer is obviously in the negative. There are in all societies persons who are persistent violators of social norms and are not amenable to social pressures. In their case, social norms have to be enforced. Political control,

thus, becomes indispensable, because political control involves not simply authority but ultimate authority, backed whenever necessary by the use of force. No society can dispense with the use of force in extreme cases. Hence, the need and indispensability of political institution.

Apart from this functional explanation of the emergence of the state, there are two other explanations. Political institution, it is argued, is the consequence of the increasing size and complexity of societies in which warfare was a major factor. Oppenheimer, for example, discussed the origin of the state in terms of the "conquest of one tribe by another with the sole object of subjecting them to tribute...." Marxist theory, on the other hand, accounts for the emergence of the state in terms of differentiation into social classes within the community following the growth of productive forces and of wealth.

Whatever be the explanation, one distinctive feature of primitive and early societies was that where a separate political authority existed, it was closely bound up with kinship, religion and other institutions.

10.3 POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS OF MODERN TIMES

Botomore has identified three types of political situation in the contemporary world.

First, there are tribal societies, mainly in African countries, which are being modernised 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 tribe feuds and establish national unity and cohesion on a firm foundation. Africa was parcelled out among colonial powers according to their need and convenience. As a consequence, a particular tribe had been distributed among three or four neighbouring colonies under different European powers. This created tension and produced instability both within a nation-state and among newly independent 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 group whose existence within their frontiers is in some measure the result of the arbitrary division of Africa among the colonial

powers".

Second, another type of political situation obtains in those developing countries of ancient civilization 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 Arab States of the Middle East and North Africa, the Asian States and the Latin American States fall under this category.

There are some political conditions and problems which are common to most, if not all, of these 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 level of living of the common people.

These developing countries face a number of difficulties in implementing the aforesaid programmers 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 familial ties, class divisions, and above all, traditional outlook on life do not favour smooth functioning of a modern political system. These factors are also not very conducive to the growth of 'work culture'. As a consequence thereof, economic growth is halting. Failures of the government in meeting the aspirations of the people encourage army generals of ambitious political leaders in some of these countries to assume dictatorial power and do away with democratic political institutions. Bangladesh, Pakistan, Burma and a host of countries in Africa and Latin America bear testimony to this type of development.

In the third category are included industrially advanced countries of Europe, North American, Australia, Japan, etc. Here a distinction should be made between two types of political systems obtaining in countries under this category : the democratic-capitalist or 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 community, (ii) the existence of political parties, pressure groups and political movements, (iii) the election of the political executive by universal adult suffrage and (iv) the administration of public affairs by a large bureaucracy.

The most important characteristic feature of the industrial societies of the second type is the existence of single party which monopolises political power. "This situation is justified in terms of Marxist theory as the expression of social unity resulting from the dictatorship 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 classes 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'. The theory and practice of communism have, however, been criticised. It is pointed out that the coercive apparatus of the state in communist societies has vastly increased, jeopardizing in the process the liberty of the individual and unfettered freedom of expression. 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. In Yugoslavia, there was an attempt to decentralise political authority. "The major sociological criticism of most orthodox Marxism is that it asserts, against the evidence, that political power is always based upon, and can only be based upon economic power, and fails to analyse in a scientific and exact way in notion of 'economic power'.

The assertion of a one to one causal relationship between economic power and political power goes back to the eighteenth century distinction between 'civil society' and the state, and to the impression made upon social theorists by the rapid emancipation of economic life from political regulation in the early stages of industrial capitalism. But in a broader historical perspective, while recognising the important influence of economic structure upon other social institutions, we must also admit the relative autonomy of politics. 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 in industry.

The events which have taken place in the Soviet Union and in the countries of Eastern Europe in the year 1989 clearly prove that concentration of power in the hands of the office-bearers of the Communist Party does not ensure the end of exploitation and the promise of freedom for the vast majority of the population.

10.4 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

All contemporary societies are essentially organisational socialites in the sense that almost all our needs are met in organisational settings. If we look at any urban area in India, either large or small, we can see how true is the above statement. Our babies in cities and towns are born in hospitals, educated in schools, subsequently employed in government or private organisations, enrolled as members of professional or recreational organisations and myriad other associations. In course of time, rural areas in India will also fall in line, as is the case in all advanced societies. It is to be noted that organisations differ from 'social units'. Such as the family, friendship or kin groups or the community, in that these are designed to realise clearly defined goals.

Weberian Perspectives

As there is more specialised division of labour in society, organisations also increase in number and variety, each organisation performing one or a few specialised functions. In the interest of efficiency, these organisations must develop a hierarchy or authority and devise a system of rules designed toward the pursuit of a specific goals. Thus, a particular form of organisation, known as bureaucracy, emerges. Bureaucratic organisation is increasingly becoming the defining characteristic of modern industrial society. Max Weber's analysis of bureaucracy is a pioneering study in this particular field in sociology.

Weber's views on bureaucracy should be seen in the context of his general theory of social action (for details consult Chapter 2). It is Weber's thesis that every man gives some meaning to his conduct. Human action can, therefore, be understood and appreciated in terms of the meaning and motives which lie behind it. Weber identified four types of social action. These include (i) rational action in

relation to a goal, (ii) rational action in relation to a value, (iii) affective or emotional action and (iv) traditional action.

The classification of types of action governs, to a certain extent, the Weberian interpretation of the contemporary era. According to him, the chief characteristic of the world we live in is rationalisation. For example, economic enterprise is rational, become it entails precise calculation of costs and careful weighing of the advantages and disadvantages of the various factors involved in the enterprise. So also is the control of the state by bureaucracy. In fact, society as a whole tends towards goal-oriented organisation. "Bureaucratisation is the prime example of this process. A bureaucratic organisation has a clearly defined goal. It involves precise calculation of the means to attain this goal and systematically eliminates those factors which stand in the way of the achievement of its objectives. Bureaucracy is, therefore, rational action in an institutional form. (Italic added).

Bureaucracy is also a form of control. It implies a hierachical organisation in which there are superiors and subordinates with clearly defined responsibilities and powers. Some are required to issue orders, and some others to carry out those orders. In a large-sized organisation. All these imply control of those in the lower ranks of the hierarchy by those in the higher. Such controls become effective as well as smooth if there is a minimum of voluntary submission to higher authority. People voluntarily submit to authority when it is regarded as legitimate. Max Weber identified three forms of legitimacy which derive from three kinds of social action. Thus, it can derive from traditional meanings. Legitimacy of this kind, which we may call traditional legitimacy, depends on belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the right to those established on the strength of tradition in position of authority to exercise it. Similarly, legitimacy can derive from rational meanings. Such legitimacy may be called rational legitimacy which reflects belief in the legality of patterns of normative rules and the right of those people designated by the rules to exercise authority command. There is another type of legitimacy, called charismatic legitimacy (so termed after the Greek word for grace), which depends on the devotion of followers to an individual who, according to their perception, is endowed by exceptional sanctity, heroism or other personal qualities. Charismatic legitimacy, therefore, derives from affective on emotional action.

The organisational structure derives its form from the type of legitimacy on which it is based. While emphasising this aspect. Max Weber observes as follows : "According to the kind of legitimacy which is claimed, the type of obedience, the type of administrative staff developed to guarantee it and the mode of exercising authority, will all differ fundamentally". In order to understand bureaucracy, it is, therefore, necessary to take into account the type of legitimacy on which bureaucratic control is based.

The corresponding type of authority which emerges from his typology is as follows : Traditional authority rational legal authority and charismatic authority. Weber, however, points out that none of these ideal types are to be found in a pure form in any historical instance. But any case can be seen to approximate to any of these types.

While analysing types of administrative organisation, Max Weber selects the ideal type of bureaucracy (for Weber's conception of the Ideal Type, consult the section on Max Weber in the concluding chapter) for special attention. It is based on rational-legal authority which is the source of its legitimacy.

Weber brings out the following characteristics of a bureaucratic organisation.

(i) As an organisation, bureaucracy implies a continuous performance of official functions according to rules.

(ii) Complex tasks of an organisation are broken down into manageable parts with each official specialising in a particular area. For example, governmental functions are divided into various departments, such as health, education, agriculture, defence, etc. Within each department, every official has a clearly defined sphere of competence and responsibility. They are given the necessary authority to enable them to fulfil their duties.

(iii) This authority is differentially distributed so that a hierarchy of official positions is formed, some officials having controlling and supervisory duties with respect to others.

(iv) "Bureaucratic administration", says Weber, "means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge. This is the feature of it which makes

it specially rational". Certain specified qualifications are required of those who are to exercise authority. They are appointed according to their possessions of formal qualifications, usually based on examinations.

(v) The bureaucrats do not own the means of production of administration. They are also not allowed to make use of their official position for private purposes. Official quarters or other perquisites which are occupied or enjoyed by the persons while in service can not be appropriated by them after superannuation or termination of service.

(vi) Acts of administrative kind are recorded in writing, thereby ensuring continuity and consistency of the administrative process.

(vii) The officials are personally free agents. But they are required to act impersonally accordingly to rules which define their specific spheres of competence. The activities of the bureaucrat are governed by the rules, not by personal considerations, such as his feelings towards colleagues or clients. His actions are, therefore, rational rather than affective.

(viii) The bureaucrats are paid a salary, although this may be on a scale of pay, increments being given according to age and experience, and they are paid a pension after a fixed number of years of employment and at a given age.

(ix) Normally, bureaucrats have no other employment and at all times during their services career the officials are subject to rules governing their conduct in so far as it is related to their official duties.

Max Weber's portrayal of a rational legal bureaucratic organisation may be contrasted with administrative organisation associated with the traditional form of authority. In the latter case, "obedience is not owned to enacted rules, but to the person who occupies a position of authority by tradition". The tradition may either determine the way of a chief acts and the contents of the commands he issues. Or, the tradition may leave him free to act arbitrarily. In making use of his follows, he may recruit from among those who are bound to him by particular traditional ties of loyalty, or he may choose favourities who owe a purely personal loyalty.

Although Weber was aware of the positive contribution, and even

indispensability, of bureaucracy to the operation of large-scale industrial societies, he was equally aware of its limitations. He pointed out that specification, which is the essence of bureaucratic set-up, may contribute to efficiency in the performance of specialised tasks, but too much of specialisation may rob the bureaucrats of their spontaneity, creativity and individual initiative. The impersonality of official conduct and meticulous observance of rules may tend to produce 'specialists which spirit'. Being trained to observe carefully, and almost blindly the enacted rules of the organisation, particularly governmental organisation, and enjoying, as they do, security of service, the bureaucrats tend to forget that rules are meant for men and not men for rules. To Weber, therefore, "the process of rationalisation, of which bureaucracy is the prime expression, is basically irrational. It is ultimately aimless since it tends to destroy the traditional values which give meaning and purpose to life".

Weber also pointed to two inherent dangers of bureaucratic set-up in government organisation. According to him, the bureaucrats in government offices represent the most complete and effective institutionalization of power so far created. Such power, if left unchecked and uncontrolled, is undesirable from two points of view. To begin with, bureaucracy is unsuitable during period of crisis. The civil servants are trained to observe procedure and apply rules to particular cases and not to take decisions, Crisis situation demands innovation and improvisation, and, if situation so requires, even scrapping of routine procedures. In terms of training and orientation, they are all equipped for the task. Secondly, "in capitalist society, top bureaucrats may be swayed by the pressure of capitalist interests and tailor their administrative practices to fit the demands of capital.

According to Max Weber, these two dangers "could only be avoided by strong parliamentary control of the state bureaucracy in particular, professional politicians must hold the top positions in the various departments of state. This will encourage strong and effective leadership since politicians are trained to take decisions. If the political executive is placed in charge of a department, "it will help to open the bureaucracy to public view and reveal behind the scenes wheeling and dealing between bureaucrats and powerful interests. Politicians are public figures, open to public scrutiny and the criticism of opposition parties. They are, therefore, accountable for their actions".

It may be pointed out that Weber was not oblivious of the fact that politicians are amateurs, and lack technical knowledge in many fields. In the circumstances, the bureaucrats, who possess both technical expertise and experience, may guide, and even control, their political bosses. In the words of Max Weber : "The political master always funds himself vis-a-vis the trained official, in the position of a dilettante facing the expert".

Marxian perspective

According to Max Weber, bureaucracy is a defining feature of an industrial society, irrespective of whether it is capitalistic or socialistic. The question as to who owns the means of production is not relevant. Marx, however, looks upon bureaucracy as an essential feature of a capitalist society. In such a society, a small minority owns the forces of production. Bureaucracy is a tool in the hands of this small minority to serve the interest of the ruling group. A socialist society, in which the forces of production are communally owned, can, therefore, dispense with bureaucracy in the form in which it prevails in a capitalist society. "Lenin believe that after the dictatorship of the proletariat was established in the USSR in 1917, there would be a steady decline in state bureaucracy". He was conscious of the fact that some form of bureaucracy was essential. But he wanted it to be remodelled on the lines suggested by Marx and Engels. One such proposal was that administrators would be directly appointed and subject to recall at any time. The second proposal was that the salary of the administrators would be at par with that of an ordinary worker. The third proposal was to simplify the work to a point "where basic literacy and numeracy were sufficient for their performance". Lenin visualised a state of affairs in which there might be a mass participation in administration, since all would possess the necessary skills to participate in the administrative process. Since every one could be a bureaucrat for a time, none would develop the bureaucratic style of functioning or the bureaucratic attitude.

Marx, Engels or Lenin did not however, give a detailed blue-print of how this system would work, how the democratisation of bureaucracy would actually take place. It is to be noted that the Russian Revolution of 1917 was not followed by dismantling of the bureaucratic structure. On the contrary, there was expansion of

bureaucracy. The observers of the Russian scene have not reported the existence of any evidence of the weakening or shrinking of the bureaucratic set-up. There are some who justify the expansion and strengthening of the bureaucratic structure on the ground that central economic planning, which is directed toward the economic well-being of the entire population, required for its successful implementation a well-knit bureaucracy. They are also of the view that since the forces of production are communally owned, the functioning of bureaucracy would be different from that in a capitalist society.

During the period of 'cultural revolution' in China, attempt was made under the leadership of Mao-Tse-Tung to modify bureaucracy of the ideal type provided by Max Weber. The re-organisation, that was attempted, may be pictured as follows : "The rigid hierarchy of officials will be abolished... Leaders will remain but they will lead rather than command. The specialised division of labour and the fragmentation of tasks are rejected in favour of a system whereby everyone should 'take care of everything' within the organisation. The expert will become a figures of the past since his technical knowledge and expertise will be spread among the masses. The full-time professional administrator will disappear. All administrative leaders must spend some of their time involved in actual production in the fields and factories. Finally, the fixed rules and regulations which characterise the typical bureaucracy are seen as instrument to repress the massess. They should therefore be changed as the masses see fit".

The aforesaid changes were sought to be enforced (a) by 'role shifting system' in terms of which the leaders would periodically be moved to the base of the organisation in order to acquaint themselves with problems at the grass-roots level, and (b) by means of 'group-based decision-making system' in order to enable workers to participate directly in the decision-making process of the factory.

It appears that China's recent moves towards modernisation have halted the process of democratisation on the above lines. It has been suggested that "Mao's intervention was a kind of charismatic breakthrough from the bureaucratic routinisation". If, as indicated by Max Weber, charismatic authority is routinised into traditional or rational-legal authority, then the experiments of the cultural revolution were bound to be short-lived. Some have even commented that "Marxian predictions

of the disappearance of bureaucracy in a classless society owe much to a commitment to a utopian vision".

10.5 PRESSURE GROUP OR INTEREST GROUP

In order to have an adequate appreciation of the working of governmental machinery in a democratic set-up, 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 and programmes and solicit public support. The members of the public are broadly aware of what the political parties do or propose to do. 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 processes are/is enormous.

We may identify three distinguishing features of a pressure group. In the first place, the members who comprise a particular pressure group share similar attitude, common objectives and ideals. Secondly, they share a common interest which binds the group together. Thirdly, they exercise indirect pressure upon the departments concerned to influence Government policy concerning their fields of activity to their advantage. For example, the Farmers' Lobby tries to influence the officials of the Agricultural Ministry to draw up government policy in a manner so as to safeguard and promote the interests of the farmers. Likewise, Industrialists' Lobby and Merchant Lobby and all other lobbies of various interest groups act in a similar manner to further their respective interests. Besides economic pressure group's, there are pressure groups which are designed to promote non-economic interests, for example, Environmentalists' Lobby, Lobby for preventing cruelty to animals, etc.

There are two basic differences between political parties and pressure groups. First, political parties, as already stated, function in the "pitiless glare of publicity" while pressure groups function in a somewhat secretive manner. Secondly, political parties aim at capturing political power and at using political power to implement the policies and 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 extent 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. Harry M. Johnson says: "Pressure groups….often present the interests of one segment of the population as if they were the interests of all". Referring to the success of public relations programmes of the pressure groups, Bone and Ranney observe as follows: "Notwithstanding their critical comments about certain businessmen, millions of Americans outside industry subscribe to the view that what is good for business is good for the country - a tribute in part to the public relations program of business."

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. We may note a few points in this regard. In the first place; they contribute in a large measure to the qualitative improvement of legislation. Spokesmen of various pressure groups have facts figures as well as interpretations on how particular legislative proposals can or do affect people. They place their respective points of view before the House. The law-makers may thus get the benefit of the expert opinion of different groups and recast the proposed legislative proposals so as to make them more meaningful to the concerned people.

Secondly, most of the members of the legislature who are elected from territorial

constituencies lack any specialised Knowledge about various professions and economic activities. Spokesmen of different pressure groups having specialised knowledge in their respective fields, on the other hand, place their respective points of view before the House. The members of the legislature have thus an opportunity of becoming more knowledgeable.

It follows, therefore, that pressure groups play a very important and useful role in the political process. The use of the qualifying adjective 'pressure' is unfortunate because it conveys an erroneous impression about the role of pressure groups. If the political authority is stable and strong, pressure groups may be a useful additional means of knowing sectional desires or grievances or of conveying information which is valuable to the administration. Where, however, "political authority is weak, the more powerful pressure groups may usurp governmental functions or hold the rest of the community to ransom.

10.6 ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL POWER: POWER, AUTHORITY & FORCE

It is difficult to analyse the nature of social power for the simple reason that it cannot be perceived be senses, we feel the existence of this power at all levels. The consequences that follow from the application of power are also evident. But it is not possible to define in precise terms the meaning of social power. In this respect, it is comparable to electricity. There is no definition which can adequately bring out the essence of electricity. It has been described as 'a fundamental entity of nature'. Its outward expression can be seen in the form of light, heat and motion. We are familiar with these outward manifestations, but not with electricity. Likewise, social power is an immanent feature of society. We can experience its outward manifestations in the form of order, force and authority, but not the phenomenon itself. In all walks of life, such as educational institutions, family relationships, playfields, social groups and associations, power is expressed in one of these three forms. In fact, it is difficult to find any social relationships which are not in some way influenced by social power. The only exception we can think of relates to what Simmel characterised as "polite acquaintance". When, for instance, we meet somebody in a wedding reception for a very brief period, the social encounter does not apparently bear any trace of power. It will, therefore, not be an exaggeration to say that social power is a fundamental entity

of society.

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 a 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 workforce 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 a '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, other do not. The underlying assumption is that the amount of power is constant.

Views of Talcott Parsons : 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 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 is the power and vice versa. This view is sometimes known as a 'variable-sum' concept of power in as much as power is not constant or fixed, but variable in the sense that it may increase or decrease.

Parson's views on power are developed from his general theory of society. He assumes that consensus among members of society with regard to value is essential for social stability. The next step is to have common goals which they all share. The power of the social system lies in the extent to which the society is able to realise these goals. The more able a society is to realise these goals, the greater

the power that resides in the social system. Persons also assumes that since goals are shared by the collectivity, the power of the society will be used toward the furtherance of the interest of the collectivity and not toward the futherence of sectional interests.

Parsons' analysis as the basis of political power in Western democracies provides typical illustration of his views on the nature of power. "Political support", he says, "should be conceived of as a generalised grant of power which, if it leads to electoral success, puts elected leadership in a position analogous to a banker. The 'deposits' of power made by constituents are revocable, if not at will at the next election." Just as money is deposited in the bank, members of society deposit power in political leaders. Just as the depositor can withdraw his money form the bank, so the electorate can withdraw its grant of power from political leaders at the next election. In this sense, power resides ultimately with members of society as a whole. Finally, just as money generates interest for the depositor, so grants of power generate benefits for the electorate since they are used primarily to further collective goals. In this way, power in society can increase.

Persons' views on the nature and application of power have been criticised. First, Parsons simply translates into sociological jargon the arguments which the holders of power in society advance by way of justifying their use and enjoyment of power. Second, Persons has failed to appreciate that power may not always be applied in furtherance of collective interest. That power is not infrequently used in furtherance of sectional interest in common knowledge. Marxian analysis of power, to which we shall turn in the next paragraph, emphasises this aspect.

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 'constant-sum' concept of power in the sense that the net accretion of power in the hands of the dominant

group means a net less of power for the rest.

"This is very different from the picture presented by Parsons in which rulers and the ruled pull together for the benefit of society as a whole, undivided by any fundamental conflicts in interest". From a Marxian point of view, the source of power lies in the economic infra-structure. Forces of production determine the relations of production. Those who emerge as economically dominant are able to grab power which they use in futherance of their interest. According to Marxist theory, power of the ruling class extends beyond specific economic relationships, and pervades the entire super-structure.

10.7 ELITE THEORY

Elite theory was first developed by two Italian sociologist, Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923) and Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941). Elite theory developed as a reaction to Marxist theory. The Marxist dream of a classless society was rejected by it as an illusion. All societies, according to Elite theory, are divided into two main groups—the ruling minority and the majority of the ruled. This kind of division is accepted as inevitable, irrespective of whether society is capitalist or socialist. Even a proletarian revolution will mean replacement of one ruling elite by another.

According to Pareto and Mosca, the elite owe their position to the superiority of their personal characteristics or attributes. Pareto and Mosca, however, differ with regard to the nature of these personal characteristics. While Pareto emphasised personal qualities of cunningness and intelligence of a high order as important prerequisites of power, Mosca emphasised personal qualities of considerable organisational ability as prerequisites of leadership, and hence of power.

Later versions of the elite theory do not emphasis the personal qualities of those who happen to enjoy power, but the institutional framework of society. It is held that the hierarchical organisation of social institutions allows a minority to monopolize power.

Vilfredo Pareto : The Circulation of Elites

For centuries, attempts have been made to explain the behaviour of men by

attributing it to 'human nature'. Perhaps the most famous attempt by a sociologist to deal with the problems of human motivation is that of Vilfredo Pareto. He views human conduct as inspired by certain constant ingredients of human nature which he terms "residues". He classifies the residues under six main groups : residues of combinations (the faculty of associating things or thinking them together), of group persistence or persistence of aggregates (the conservative tendency), of self-expression, of sociability, of individual integrity, and of sex. According to Pareto, these are the actual motivation of human conduct. But these are obscured by all sorts of unsound reasoning and misleading explanations which he names "derivations". According to his interpretation, "derivations" are nothing but logical explanation of non-logical actions. Pareto refers to the human tendency to 'rationalise' motives, "to from habits of concealing petty and self-seeking motive under high names, like duty and honour and principle and patriotism', and "to stand well in the sight of others and in own eyes".

Having made a detailed analysis of the 'theories' of action, distinguishing between logical action, residues and derivation, Pareto discusses the place of various elements of action in the equilibrium of the social system. Here, for purpose of detailed discussion, he confines himself to two of his six classes of residues—The 'residues of combinations' and the 'persistence of aggregates'. Very broadly, the former consists of the commitments or propensities in social groups to adapt flexibly to environmental or situational exigencies, while the latter consists of the propensities in social groups to maintain patterns of commitment once they have become institutionalised.

Pareto makes one of his import empirical generalisations by combining this analytical distinction with a conception of the elite element in social stratification systems. He confines himself to the simplest level of analysis of such systems, distinguishing only between elite groups which combine control of great political power with the enjoyment of high prestige in various other respects, and the other groups which constitute the mass of the society and which have relatively little power, prestige or wealth.

Pareto makes psychological characteristics the basis of elite rule. In his view, there are two main types of governing elite which, following Machiavelli, he calls

‘lions’ and ‘foxes’. ‘Lions’ are those who are more actuated by ‘the persistence of aggregates’. Pareto shows that in a political context, the commitment of the lions to belief systems and values is connected with a readiness to resort to force and to rule by force. Military dictatorships provide an example of this type of governing elite. ‘Foxes’ are more actuated by ‘the residues of combinations’. In a political context, the flexibility and adaptability of the foxes means that they are not likely to be very much concerned about the stability of the political system in which they operate. ‘Foxes rule by cunningness, guile and manipulation. In his view, European democracies provide an example of this type of elite. Thus, Pareto argues that members of a governing elite owe their positions primarily to their personal qualities either to their lion-like or fox-like characteristics.

He, then develops the idea that the composition of the elites alternates, cyclically, a process which Pareto calls the ‘circulation of elites’. All elites tend to decay in quality and lose their vigour. Being used to easy life, they may become soft and ineffective. The privileges of office may make them set in their ways and too inflexible to changing circumstances. Moreover, an elite may lack the qualities of their counterpart, qualities which, in long run, are essential to maintain power. “An elite of lions lacks the imagination and cunningness necessary to maintain its rule and will have to admit foxes from the masses to make up for this deficiency. Gradually, foxes infiltrate the entire elite and so transform its character. Foxes, however, lack the ability to take forceful and decisive action which at various times is essential to retain power. An organised minority of lions committed to the restoration of strong government develops and eventually overthrows the elite of foxes”.

The difference of views of Marxists and Pareto with regard to the transformation of class systems may be noted. Pareto maintains that the fall of elites is due to their decline in relative numbers and to their decay in quality. The Marxists insist that the material conditions of a social order inevitably bring about the transformation of class power. Further, to Marx, history ultimately leads to and ends with the community utopia ; to Pareto, history is a never-ending circulation of elites. According to Pareto, nothing every really changes and history is, and always will be, “a graveyard of aristocracies”.

Pareto's analysis of circulation of elites led to a set of empirical generalisation. In modern terms, Pareto's analysis throws light on "an important rhythm in the processes of change in dynamic societies (like that of the West, both ancient and modern), consisting of successive phases in which leadership is primarily in the hands of adaptive-innovative and then of conservative-regressive groups".

C. Wright Mills : The Power Elite

C. Wright Mills published a book entitled The Power Elite in 1956. In his book Mill does not provide a general theory to explain the nature and distribution of power in all societies in the manner Pareto has done. On the contrary, he limits his study to the analysis of American society. Unlike Pareto, he does not believe in the inevitability of the elite rule. Nor does he accept it as something inescapable. In so many words he condemns it.

Unlike Pareto, again, Mills does not explain elite rule in psychological terms, in terms of personal qualities of the rulers. He does not believe that the elite groups find themselves in positions of authority by virtue of their superior fox-like or lion-like qualities which distinguish them from the rest of the population.

Mills seeks to explain elite rule in institutional terms : He identifies three key institutions in the U.S.A. (i) the major business corporation, (ii) the military and (iii) the federal government. These institutions occupy 'pivotal position' in society. Those who occupy 'command posts' in these three key institutions constitute the elite. Mills argues that to holders of those 'command posts', though apparently distinguishable from one another in terms of their association with three key institutions, are sufficiently similar in their values, interests and ideals and are interconnected to form a single ruling minority. He names this ruling minority 'the power elite'. He argues that economic military and political interests which these three groups represent are promoted to the extent that there is co-operation and sharing among them. Thus, as armaments pour out of factories in huge quantities, the interests of both economic and military elites are served. Likewise, business and government "cannot now be seen as two distinct worlds". Economic pressure groups influence governmental decisions on economic matters, particularly those

pertaining to giant corporations Moreover, those who are in government have substantial interest in these corporations. “The net result of the coincidence of economic, military and political power is a power elite which dominates Amerian society and takes all decisions of major national and international importance”.

Another cementing bond which further strengthens the cohesiveness and unity of the power elite is the similarity of the social background of its members and interchange and overlapping of personnel of the three components of the power elite. They share similar educational background, similar values as well as similar life-styles. There is, as is to be expected in such circumstance, mutual trust, understanding and co-operation among them. The Director of a giant corporation may be associated with the government, either directly or indirectly, for some time. Similarly, an army general may be on the Board of Directors of a business corporation. Mills argues that there are many such cases of interchange and overlapping of personnel among the thee elite groups which tend to strengthen the power-elite further.

Mills posits the view that American society is dominated by a power elite of “unprecedented power and unaccountability”. By way of illustrating his statement, he refers to the dropping of atom bomb over Hiroshima. Such a decision of stupendous importance to the world at large and to the people of the United States in particular was taken by the power elite. Another disquieting feature is that the power elite is not accountable for its actions either directly to the public or to any body which represents public interest. Mills sounds a note of warning that the rise of power elite has led to “the decline of politics as a genuine and public debate of alternative decisions”.

Mills points out that the power elite has at its disposal the media of mass communication which he describes as “instruments of psychic management and manipulation”. With a great deal of subtlety and behave in certain ways. Ideas of consumerism, recreation and leisure grip the minds of the common people. They are occupied with their respective words of work, and outside working hours they spend their time with their families and passively participate in entertainment programmes presented by the mass media, such as the T. V. and the Cinema. They

do not, therefore, bother at all with the activities of the power elite. Free from popular control, the latter pursues its own concerns–power and self-aggrandisement.

Robert A. Dahl has critised Mills on the ground that his evidence is suggestive rather than conclusive. Even it is granted that the power elite has the 'potential for control', we should recognise that 'potential for control' is not 'equivalent to actual control'. A series of concrete cases, particularly those pertaining to matters of public concerned, such as taxation, social welfare programmes, etc. must be taken into account in order to establish the thesis that the power elite has the power to decide such issues. Dahl argues that since Mills has not investigated a range of such key decisions, the thesis that 'actual control' lies with the power elite remains unestablished.

Elite Theory and Communist Societies

Though elite theory does not fit in with the Marxian vision of a classless society, a number of scholars have argued that the nature and distribution of power in communist societies can be best explained in terms of elite theory. T. B. Bottomore, for instance, observes as follows : "The political system of Communist countries seems to me to approach the pure type of 'power elite', that is, a group which having come to power with the support or acquiescence of particular classes in the population, maintains itself in power chiefly by virtue of being an organised minority confronting the unorganised majority",

Raymond Aron argues in the same vein that power in communist societies can be best interpreted in terms of an elite model. He argues that in the U.S.S.R. a 'unified elite' monopolises political, economic and military powers which are 'absolute and unbounded'. This small minority of ruling elite takes all crucial economic decisions pertaining to production, investment, wage differentials and pricing. The entire military establishment is under the control and direction of this ruling elite. All political decisions, both national and international, are also taken by the same group. To cap it all, the constitution recognises the existence of one political party. Pointing to this aspect, Aron observes : "Politicians, trade union leaders, public officials, generals and managers all belong to one party and are part of an authoritarian organisation". Aron proceeds further to say that the common people are left "without any means of

defence against the elite". Bottomore emphasises this aspect thus : "Contrary to the orthodox Marxist view, popular control may well be greater in some of the capitalist countries, where independent trade unions can bring pressure to bear upon managements, and where the competition among political groups prevents the emergence of a single, omnipotent elite". It has also been argued by some, Milovan Djilas is one of the, that the members of the ruling elite are self-seekers who pursue itself-interest at them cost of the interest of the society as whole.

10.8 SUM UP

1. Government is the only one power centre in society.
2. Important for the wellbeing of society as the decisions made by government.
3. The democratic revolution initiated a movement toward equality in modem societies. The capitalist economic system that arose out of the industrial revolution has generated long lasting inequalities. The wide-ranging consequences of both revolutions persist. Thus, they provide checks on each other's effects.
4. The dominant perspective in political sociology is conflict theory. The ideas of Marx and Weber continue to influence the development of conflict theory, albeit in different directions.
5. Structural functionalism is not as dominant as it was in the two post-war decades (1945-65). This perspective figured prominently in John Porter's The Vertical Mosaic, the most influential book in Canadian political sociology.
6. Symbolic interaction has not as yet had a significant impact on studies of the Canadian polity. But the use of symbols in a variety of forms, including the mass media, is of great importance in the political process. So the neglect of symbolic interaction relative to other perspectives is likely to be only temporary.
7. While elected politicians do govern, the role of higher dvil servants in the decision-making process is undeniable. Bureaucratic power is here to stay. The only question is whether it can be kept within reasonable limits.

10.9 REFERENCES

10.10 KEY WORDS

Bourgeois democracy. The view held by Mand government policies in a capitalist society neo favour the bourgeoisie — that is, the capitalis. This is so even in polities with universal voting

Corporate elite. Those who sit on the boards otors of the largest corporations and financial insti

Democratic elitism. Idea that the most importai tion of mass participation in politics is the form. a political elite, the members of which compete votes of a largely passive electorate.

Elite. A relatively small number of persons v cupy the key decision-making positions in an tional sphere.

Federal system. Political system in wffich entr powers are divided between a central govemnn subcentral governments. In Canada, the latter ar provinces.

Forces of production. A Marxist term for the res both natural and human, and for the technology of a particular economic system.

Industrial capitalism. Economic system in whi ductive property (for example, factories) is pi owned and goods and services are produced foi

Industrial revolution. The changeover, occurri in Britain, to an economic system marked b) spread we of high-energy technology and ina sources of energy.

Ministerial responsibility. Principle that cabin isters in a parliamentary system are held aceoi for the actions of dvil service officials in the ments over which the ministers preside.

"New left" movement. A largely student-movement in many Western societies in the early 1970s that emphasized participatory den (in contrast to the state-centred views of what ents called the "old left"). In both cases, a society was the goal.

Plural elites. Situation in which the elites in the major institutional spheres remain suffider tonomous to enable them to check each other's and compete for additional power resources.

Proportional representation. Electoral system in each party is allotted seats according to the pen of the popular vote it receives.

Ruling class concept. Idea that the economicall inant class has the overriding influence on gove: polices; a central tenet of Marxist theory.

Single-member plurality system. Electoral syi which the candidate with the most votes wins in each constituency, and the number of seats each political party is determined on a constil by-constituency basis.

Status quo. The existing state of affairs.

Third parties. In Canada, any party contesting; tion other than one of the two major parties th. formed the government and the offidal opp changing places from time to time, since Confed.

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 11
UNIT-III	RELIGION	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

11.1 Introduction

11.2 Meaning and Definition

11.3 Characteristics

11.4 Forms of Religion

11.4.1 Totemism and Animism

11.4.2 Judaism, Christianity and Islam

11.4.3 Hinduism

11.4.4 Budhism

11.5 Theories of Religion

11.6 Sum up

11.7 Ask yourself

11.8 Key words

11.1 INTRODUCTION:

Social institutions incorporate a body of formal or informal rules and regulations through which activities of a society or an organization are carried out or regulated. Indeed, social institutions are the means to the social end. It can be exemplified that through the institution of marriage the sexual life of the members of the society is regulated. Similarly, religious institutions look after the beliefs and unity and educational institutions promote knowledge, skill and socialization processes of the society. The forms of social institutions are not uniform one all over the societies. They are widely shaped by the existing values and norms of

the society.

It is said that there is no human society in which there is no religion. Religion is not only found everywhere, but it also plays a very important role in human society. It has a bearing on different spheres of the individual's life viz. Economic, political, social, cultural and so on. The study of religion is a challenging enterprise which places quite special demands on the sociological imagination. In analyzing religious practices one has to make sense of many different beliefs and rituals found in the various human cultures. One must be sensitive to ideals that inspire profound conviction in believers, yet at the same time take a balanced view of them. One has to confront ideas that seek the external, while recognizing that religious groups also promote quite mundane goals - such as acquiring finance or soliciting for followers.

11.2 MEANING AND DEFINITION

The variety of religious beliefs and organizations is so immense that scholars have found great difficulty in reaching a generally accepted definition of religion. In the west, most people identify religion with Christianity - a belief in a supreme being, who commands us to behave in a moral fashion. On the earth and promises an after - life to come. Yet one certainly cannot define religion as a whole in these terms. These beliefs and many other aspects of Christianity are absent from most of the world's religions.

In order to overcome the pitfalls of culturally biased thinking about Religion, it is probably best to begin by saying that; first, religion should not be identified with monotheism (belief in one God). Most religions involve many deities. Even in some versions of Christianity, there are several figures with sacred qualities: God, Jesus, Mary, the Holy Ghost, angels and saints. In certain religions there are no gods at all.

Second, religion should not be identified with moral prescriptions controlling the behaviour of believers. The idea that gods are interested in how one has to behave on this earth is alien to many religions. To the ancient Greeks, e.g., the gods were largely indifferent to the activities of humanity.

Third, religion is not necessarily concerned with explaining how the world

came to be as it is. In Christianity, the myth of Adam and Eve purports to explain the origin of human existence, and many religions have myths of origin of this sort; but equally many do not.

Fourth, religion cannot be identified with the supernatural, as intrinsically involving belief in a universe 'beyond the realm of the senses'.

11.3 CHARACTERISTICS

Religions involve a set of symbols, involving feelings of reverence or awe, fear linked to rituals or ceremonies (such as church services) engaged in by a community of believers. Each of these elements needs some elaboration. Whether or not the beliefs in a religion involve Gods, there are virtually always beings or objects inspiring attitudes of awe or wonder.

The rituals associated with religion are very diverse. Ritual acts include praying, chanting, singing, eating certain kinds of food - or refraining from doing so - fasting on certain days, and so on. Since rituals acts are oriented towards religious symbols, they are usually seen as quite distinct from the habits and procedures of ordinary life. Lightening a candle to honour or placate a god differs completely in its significance from doing so to provide illumination. Religious rituals are often carried on by individuals in isolation, but all religions also involve ceremonial practiced collectively by believers. Regular ceremonials normally occur in special places - churches, temples or ceremonial grounds.

The existence of collective ceremonial is usually recorded by sociologists as one of the main factors distinguishing religion from magic, although the border lines or by no means clear-cut. Magic is the influencing of events by the use of potions, chanting or ritual practice. It is generally practiced by individuals, not by a community of believers. People often choose to resort to magic in situations of misfortune or danger. Thus, Bronislaw Malinowskis classic study of the Trobriand is lenders of the pacific describes a variety of magical rites perform before any hazardous voyage by canoe. The islanders omit such rites when they are simply going fishing or the safe and placid waters of a local lagoon.

Although magical practices have mostly disappeared from modern societies, in situations of danger magic - like superstitions or still common. Many who work

in occupations that are dangerous or where chance factors can drastically affect performance - such as minors, deep - sea fisherman or sports players - indulge in small superstitious rituals or carry particular items in times of stress. An example might be a tennis player who insists on wearing a particular ring during big matches. Astrological beliefs, which have been inherited from magical ideas - in pre modern societies, still command a following, although probably most people do not take them to seriously.

11.4 FORMS OF RELIGION

In traditional societies, religion usually plays a central part in social life. Religious symbols and rituals are often integrated with the material and artistic culture of the society - music, painting or carving, dance, story - telling and literature. In small culture, there is no professional priesthood, but there are always certain individuals who specialize in knowledge of religious practices. Although there are various sorts of such specialists, one common type is the Shaman. A Shaman is an individual believed to be able to direct spirits or non - natural forces through ritual means. Shaman's are sometimes essentially magician rather than religious leaders however, and are often consulted by individuals dissatisfied with what is offered in the religious rituals of the community.

11.4.1 TOTEMISM AND ANIMISM:

Two forms of religion found frequently in smaller cultures are totemism and animism. The word 'totem' originated among North American Indian tribes, but has been widely use to refer to species of animals or plants believe to have super natural powers. Usually each kinship group or clan within a society has its own particular totem, with which various ritual activity are associated. Totemic beliefs might seem alien to those living in industrialized societies, yet is certain relatively minor contexts, symbol similar to those of totemism or familiar -as when a sports team as an animal or plant for its emblem.

The killing and / or eating of the totemic species may be taboo, but may be permissible on ceremonial occasions. The death of a totemic animal may be ceremonially mourned. The totemic animal may be looked upon as a sort of guardian - angel of the totemite.

Animism is a belief in spirits or ghosts, thought to populate the same world as human beings. Such spirits may be seen as either benign or the malevolent and many influence human behaviour in numerous respects. In some cultures for example spirits are believed to cause illness or madness and may also posses or take over individuals in such a way as to control their behaviour. Animistic beliefs are not confined to small cultures, but are found to some degree in many religious settings. In medieval Europe, those believed to be possessed by evil spirits were frequently persecuted as sorcerers or witches.

Small, seemingly, simple societies frequently have complex systems of religious belief Totemism and animism are more common in these societies than in'larger ones, but some small societies have far more complex religions.

11.4.2 JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM:

The three most influential monotheistic religions in world history are Judaism, Christianity and Islam. All originated in the Middle East and each has influenced the others.

Judaism: Judaism is the oldest of the three religions, dating from 1,000 B.C. The early Hebrews were nomads, in living in and around ancient Egypt. Their prophets or religious leaders partly drew their ideas from existing religious beliefs in the region, but difference in their commitment to a single, almighty God. Most of their neighbours were polytheistic. The Hebrews believed that God demands obedience to strict moral codes and insisted on their claim to a monopoly of truth, seeing their beliefs as the only true religion. Many Judaic views were taken over and incorporated as part of Christianity began as a sect of Judaism ; it is not clear that Jesus wished to found a distinctive religion. His disciples come to think of him as a Messiah - a Hebrew word meaning the anointed, the Greek term for which was Christ - awaited by the Jews Paul, a Greek speaking Roman citizen, was a major initiator of the spread of Christianity, preaching extensively in Asia Minor and Greek. Although the Christians were at first savagely persecuted, the Emperor Constantine eventually adopted Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire. Christianity today commands a greater number of adherents and is more generally spread across the world, than any other religion.

Islam : the origins of Islam today the second largest religion in the world, overlap with those of Christianity. Islam derives from the teachings of prophet Muhammad in the 7th century A.D. The single god of Islam, Allah, is believed to hold sway over all human and natural life. The pillars of Islam are the five essential religious duties of Muslims (as believers in Islam are called). The first is the recitation of Islamic creed, there is no god but Allah, and Muhammad is the apostle of Allah'. The second is the saying of formal prayers five times each day, preceded by ceremonial washing. The worshipper at these prayers must always face towards the holy city of Mecca in Saudi Arabia, no matter how far away that is.

The third pillar is the observance of Ramdan/Ramzan, a month of fasting during which no food or drink may taken during daylight. The fourth is the giving of alms (money to the poors), set out is Islamic law, which often has been used as a source of taxation by the State. Finally, there is the exception that every believer will attempt, at least once, to make a pilgrimage to Mecca.

Muslims believe that Allah spoke through earlier prophets–including Moses and Jesus–before Muhammad, whose teachings most directly express his will. Islam has come to be very widespread, having some 1000 million adherents throughout the world. The majority is concentrated in North and East Africa, the Middle East and Pakistan.

11.4.3 HINDUISM

There are major contracts between Judaism, Christianity and Islam and the religions of the far East. The oldest of all the great religions still prominent in the world today is Hinduism, the core beliefs of which date back some six thousand years. Hinduism is a polytheistic religion. It is so internally diverse that some scholars have suggested that it should be regarded as a cluster of related religions rather than a single religious orientation ; many local cults and religious practices are linked by a few generally held beliefs.

Most Hindus accept the doctrine of the cycle of reincarnation–the belief that all living beings are part of an eternal process of birth, death and rebirth. A second key feature is the caste system based on the belief that individual born into a

particular position in a social and ritual hierarchy, according to the nature of their activities in previous incarnations. A different set of duties and rituals exist for each caste, and one's fate in the next life is governed mainly by how well these duties are performed. Hinduism accepts the possibility of numerous different religious standpoints, not drawing a clear line between believers and nonbelievers. There are over 750 million Hindus, virtually all living in the Indian Sub-continent. Hinduism does not seek to convert others into 'true believers', unlike Christianity and Islam.

11.4.4 BUDDHISM, CONFUCIANISM, TAOISM :

The ethical religions of the east encompass Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism. These religions have no Gods. Rather, they emphasize ethical ideals that relate the believer to the natural cohesion and unity of the universe.

Buddhism derives from the teachings of Siddharth Gautama, the Buddha, who was a Hindu prince in a small Kingdom in South Nepal in the sixth century B. C. According to the Buddha human beings can escape the reincarnation cycle by the renunciation–discipline and meditation, separated from the tasks of the mundane world. The overall objective of Buddhism is the attainment of Nirvana, complete spiritual fulfillment. The Buddha Hindu ritual and the authority of the castes. Like Hinduism, Buddhism tolerates many local variations, including belief in local deities, not insisting on a single view. Buddhism today is a major influence in several states in the Far East, including Thailand, Burma, Srilanka, China, Japan and Korea.

11.5 THEORIES OF RELIGION :

Sociological approaches to religions are still strongly influenced by the ideas of the three 'classical' sociological theorists : Marx, Durkheim, and Weber. None of the three was himself religious and all thought that the significance of religion would decrease in modern times. Each believed that religion is in a fundamental sense an illusion. The advocates of different faiths may be wholly persuaded of the validity of the beliefs they hold and the rituals in which they participate.

Yet the very diversity of vs and their obvious connection to different types

of society, the three thinkers held, make these claims inherently implausible. An individual born into an Australian society of Hunters and gatherers would plainly have different religious beliefs from someone born into the caste system of India or the catholic church of Medieval Europe.

Marxian Perspectives

In spite of his influence on the subject, Karl Marx never studied religion in any detail. His ideas mostly derived from the writings of several early 19th century theological and philosophical authors. One of these was Ludwing Feurback, who wrote a famous work called – "The Essence of Christianity". According to feverbach, religion consists of ideas and values produced by human beings in the course of their cultural development, but mistakenly projected into divine forces or gods. Because human beings do not fully understood their own history, they tend to attribute socially created values and norms to the activities of gods. Feurback uses the term alienation to refer to the establishing of gods or divine forces distinct from human beings. Humanly created values and ideas come to seen as the product of alien or separate beings–religious forces and god. While the effects of alienation have in the past been negative, the understanding of religion as alienation, according to Feurback, promises great hope for the future. Once human beings realize that the values projected on to religion are really their own, those values become capable of realization on this earth, rather than being deferred to an after-life.

Marx declared, in a famous phrase, that religion has been the 'opium of the people'. Religion defers happiness and rewards to the after-life, teaching the resigned acceptance of existing conditions in his life. Attention is thus diverted away from inequalities and injustices in this world by the promise of what is to come in the next. Religion has a strong ideological element : religious beliefs and values often provide justifications of in equalities of wealth and power.

Functionalist Perspective :

Evolutionists such as Tylor and Muller attempted to explain religion in terms of human needs, Muller saw it as a means for satisfying man's emotional needs. The functionalist's perspective changes the emphasis from human needs.

Functionalists 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, e.g. its contribution to social society.

Emile Durkheim :

In 'The Elementary Forms of Religious Life', first published in 1912, Emile Durkheim presented what is probably the most influential interpretation of religion from a functional perspective.

Durkheim argues that the all societies divide the world into two categories, 'The Sacred and the profane, or more simply, the sacred and the nonsacred. 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 realise 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, apiece of wood, a house in a world 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.

Durkhein uses the religion of various groups of Australian aborigines to develop his argument. He sees their religion, which he call totemism, as the simplest and most basic form of religion. A borigene society is divided into several clans. A clan is like a large extended family with its members sharing certain duties and obligations. E.g. 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. Durkheim argues that if the totem,

‘Is at once symbol of God and the society, 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.

How does man come to worship society ? Sacred things are ‘considered superior in dignity and power to profane things and particularly to men’. In relation to the sacred, man’s position is inferior and dependent. This relationship between man and sacred things is exactly the relationship between man and society & is more important and powerful than the individual. Durkheim argues that, ‘Primitive man comes to view society as something sacred because he is utterly dependent on it. But why does man not simply worship society itself ? Why does he invented a sacred symbol like a totem ? Because, Durkheim argues, it is easier from him to visualize and direct his feeling of awe toward a symbol than towards so complex a thing as a clan.

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, social 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 greater power to direct human action. The attitude of respect towards the sacred is the same attitude 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.

Durkheim’s ideas remain influential ; though they are not without criticism. Some anthropologists have argued that he is not justified in seeing totemism as a religion. Most sociologists’ believed that Durkheim has overstated his case. Whilst agreeing

that religion is important for promoting social solidarity and reinforcing social values, they would not support the view that religion is the worship of society. Dukheim's views on religion are more relevant to small, non-literate societies, where there is a close integration of culture and social institutions, where work, leisure, education and family life tend to merge, and where members share a common belief and value system. They are less relevant to modern societies, which have many subcultures, social and ethnic groups, specialized organization and a range of religious beliefs, practices and institutions.

Bronislaw Malinowski

Like Durkheim, Malinowski uses data from small scale non-literate socialities to develop his thesis on religion. Many of his examples are drawn from his fieldwork in the Trobirand Islands off the coast of New Guinea. Like Durkheim, Malinowski sees religion as reinforcing social norms and values and promoting social solidarity. Unlike Durkheim however, he does not see religion reflecting society itself. Malinowski identifies specific areas of social life with which religion is concerned, to which it is addressed. These are situations of emotional stress, which threaten social solidarity.

Anxiety and tension tend to disrupt social life. Situations which produce these emotions include 'crises of life' such as birth, puberty, marriage and death. Malinwski notes that in all societies these life crises are surrounded with religious ritual. He sees death as the most distruptive of these events and argues that, 'the existence of strong personal attachments 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 group unites to support the

bereaved. This expression of social solidarity re-integrates society.

A second category of events, undertakings which cannot be fully controlled or predicted by practical means, also produces tension and anxiety. From his observations in the Trobriand Islands, Malinwski noted that such events are surrounded by ritual. Fishing is an important subsistence practice in the Trobriands. Malinwski observed that in the calm waters of the lagoon, 'Fishing is done in an easy and absolutely reliable manner by the methods of poisoning, yielding abundant results without danger and uncertainty. A storm may result in loss of life. The catch is dependent on the presence of a shoal of fish, which cannot be predicted. In the lagoon, 'where man can rely completely on his knowledge and skill', there are no rituals to ensure a good catch and protect the fisherman. Although Malinwski refers to these rituals as magic, others argue it is reasonable to regard them as religious practices, Again we see ritual addressed to specific situations, which produce anxiety. Rituals reduce anxiety by providing confidence and a feeling of control. As with funeral ceremonies, fishing rituals are social events. The group unites to deal with situations of stress, and so the unity of the group is strengthened.

Malinwski'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 Parson

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 system of meaning. - The norms which direct action are not merely isolated standards for behaviour, they are integrated and patterned by the values and beliefs provided by the cultural system.

Religion provides general guidelines for conduct which are expressed in a variety of norms. By establishing general principles and moral beliefs, religion helps to provide the consensus which Parsons believes is necessary for order and stability in society.

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'. Like Malinowski, and for similar reasons, Parsons seems religion as a mechanism for adjustment to such events and as a means for restoring the normal pattern of life. 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.

As a part of the cultural system, religious beliefs give meaning to life ; they answer 'man's questions about himself and the world he lives in'. This function of religion is particularly important in relation to the frustration referred to the above, which threaten to shatter beliefs about the meaning of life and so make human existence meaningless. Why should a premature death occur ? It is not something man excepts to happen or feels ought to happen. Social life is full of contradictions, which threaten the meaning man places of life. Parsons argues that one of the major functions of religion is to 'make sense' of all experiences, no matter how meaningless or contradictions they appear. An example is the question of suffering. 'Why must men endure deprivation and pain so unequally and haphazardly, if needed at all ?' Religion provides a range of answers : Suffering is imposed by God to tests a person's faith ; it is a punishment for sins ; suffering with fortitude with brings its reward in Heaven. Suffering thus becomes meaningful. The problem of evil is common to all societies. It is particularly disconcerting when people profit through evil actions. Religion solves these contradictions by stating that evil receive its just deserts in afterlife. Parsons therefore sees a major function of religion, as the provision of meaning to events that man does not except or feels ought not to happen, events that are frustrating and contradictory. Religion 'make sense' of these events in terms of an integrated and consistent pattern of meaning. This allows intellectual and emotional adjustment. On a more general level, this adjustment promotes order and stability in society.

The functionalist perspective emphasizes the positive contributions of religion to society and tends to ignore its dysfunctional aspects. With its preoccupation with harmony, integration and solidarity, functionalism neglects the many instances where religion can be seen as a divisive and disruptive force.

Max Weber

From a Marxian perspective, religion, as a part of the superstructure of society, is shaped ultimately by the infrastructure. Thus, changes in the forces of production will be mirrored by changes in religious beliefs and practice. Max Weber rejects the view that religion is always shaped by economic factors. He does not deny that at certain times and in certain places, religious behaviour may be largely shaped by economic forces, but he maintains that this is not always the case. Under certain conditions the reverse can occur that is religious beliefs can be a major influence on economic behaviour.

Weber's social action theory argues that human actions is directed by meanings from this perspective, action can only be understood by appreciating the world view, the image or picture of the World held by members of the society. From their world view, individuals derive meanings, purposes and motives, which direct their actions. Religion is often an important component of a world view. In certain places and times, religious meaning and purposes direct action in a wide range of contexts. In particular, religious beliefs can direct economic action.

In his most famous work. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Weber examines the relationship between the rise of certain forms of Protestation and the development of Western industrial capitalism. He argues that the essence of capitalism is 'the pursuit of profit and forever renewed profit.' Capitalist's enterprises are organized on rational bureaucratic lines. Business transactions are conducted in a systematic and rational manner with costs and projected profits being carefully accessed. Weber argues that this 'spirit of capitalism' is not simply a way of making money, but a way of life which has ethics, duties and obligations. Weber's concern is to 'discover to what extent religious forces have taken part in the formation and expansion of that spirit over the world'.

Weber now turns to examine the rise of 'Protestantism', which he maintains, preceded the development of Western capitalism.

The Protestants attacked time wasting, laziness, idle gossip and more sleep than was necessary–six to eight hours a day at the most. They forward on sexual pleasures–sexual intercourse should remain within marriage and then only for the procreation of children. Sport and recreation were accepted only for improving fitness and health, and condemned if pursued for entertainment. The impulsive fund and enjoyment of the pub, dance hall, theatre and gaming house were prohibited to ascetic Protestants. In fact anything, which might divert or distract a man from his calling was condemned. Living life in terms of these guidelines was an indication that the individual had jot lost grace and favour in the sight of God.

Weber claims that ascetic Protestantism was a vital influence in the creation and development of the spirit and practice of capitalism. A methodical and single-minded pursuit of a calling encourages rational capitalism. Weber writes. 'Restless, continuous, systematic work in a worldly calling must have been the most powerful conceivable level for the expansion of the spirit of capitalism'. Making money became both a religious and business ethic. The Protestant 'interpretation of profit making justified the activities of the businessman'. Weber argues that two major features of capitalist industry, standardization of production and the specialized division of labour, were encouraged by Protestantism. The Protestant 'uniformity of life immensely aids the capitalist in the standardization of production'. The emphasis on the importance of a fixed calling provided an ethical justification for this modern specialized division of labour'. Finally, Weber notes the importance of the creation of wealth and the restrictions on spending it, which encouraged saving and reinvestment, when the limitation of consumption is combined with this release of acquisitive activity, the inevitable result is obvious : accumulation of capital through an ascetic compulsion to save. The restraints which were imposed on the consumption of wealthy naturally served to increase it, by making possible the productive investment of capital'.

Weber argues that ascetic Protestantism preceded the growth of the Western capitalism. He maintains that the protestant ethic, a religiously based moral orientation to world, was an important factor in the development of the spirit of capitalism. In turn, the spirit of capitalism directed the practice of capitalism.

Weber does not claim that ascetic Protestantism caused capitalism. He argues that many other factors were involved. However, Weber does maintain that ascetic Protestantism had an important influence on the origin and development of capitalism in Western Europe.

Weber's views on the relationship between religion and capitalism have generated a large body of research. Historians such as Tawney and Trevor-Roper have produced modifications of an alternative to Weber's thesis. Sociologists such as Kautsky have defended the Marxian view of the relationship between religion and social change. Kautsky argues that early capitalism proceeded and largely determined Protestantism. He sees Calvinism developing in cities where commerce and early forms of industrialization were already established. In his view Protestantism is the ideology of capitalists to legitimate their position. Space precludes a summary of research on the relationship between the rise of Protestantism and the emergence of capitalism.

11.6 SUM UP

1. Sociology uses the scientific method to study religion, in contrast to religion itself, which explores reality beyond what can be known empirically.
2. The sociology of religion has been strongly influenced by the theoretical contributions of Marx, who stressed the compensatory role of religion in the face of economic deprivation; Durkheim, who emphasized both the social origin of religion and its important social cohesive function; and Weber, who gave considerable attention to the relationship between ideas and behaviour.
3. Religion can be denned as a system of meaning that uses a supernatural referent to interpret the world. Humanist perspectives make no such use of the supernatural realm, attempting instead to make life meaningful.
4. Personal religious commitment has increasingly come to be seen as having many facets or dimensions, with four being commonly noted: belief, practice, experience, and knowledge.
5. The key source of religious commitment that emerges in an industrializing Canada is socialization. Due to the highly secular milieuin which religious socialization efforts

must take place, such efforts are decreasing in both incidence and impact.
6. Religion appears to be at best one of many paths leading to valued characteristics such as personal happiness and compassion.
7. While religion sometimes has a disruptive impact, it more commonly seems to contribute
to social solidarity, frequently mirroring the characteristics of groups and societies.
8. Historically, observers of religion have been divided on its future, asserting both secularization and persistence hypotheses. Internationally, the secularization argument appears to have substantial support.

11.7 ASK YOURSELF

Q. 1. Define Religion and give the functionalist perspective of Religion ?

Q. 2. Give the different forms of religion in Indian Society ?

11.8 KEY WORDS

American Civil Religion. Tendency for nationalistic emphases in the United States to have many characteristics similar to religions; established Judeo-Christian tradition is drawn upon selectively.
Church-sect typology. Framework, dating back to Weber and historian Ernst Troeltsch (1931), that examines religious organizations in terms of ideal-type, church, and sect characteristics.
Collective conscience. Durkheim's term for the awareness that the group is more than the sum of its individual members; norms, for example, appear to exist on a level beyond the consciences of individual group members.
Collective religiosity. Religious commitment as manifested in and through religious groups; key to the creation and sustenance of personal religiosity.
Denominationalism. Tendency for a wide variety of Protestant religious groups to come into being, seemingly reflecting variations not only in theology but also and perhaps primarily in social characteristics.
Dimensions of religiosity. Various facets of religious commitment; Clock and Stark, for example, identify four — belief, experience, practice, and knowledge.
Humanist perspectives. Systems of meaning used to interpret the world without a

supernatural referent (for example, communism, scientism).

Industrial world-view. Outlook associated with industrialization and characterized by empiricism (me limiting of reality to what .can be known through the senses) and materialism (the commitment of one's life to the pursuit of empirical reality).

Persistence argument. Assertion that religion will continue to have a significant place in the modem world, arguing either that it has never actually declined, or mat people can absorb only so much rationality and materialism.

Personal religiosity. Religious commitment at the level of the individual.

Privatization. Parsons's term for people's alleged tendency to work out their own religious beliefs and as sodanons in an individualistic, autonomous manner

Profane and the sacred. Two categories into which Durkheim claimed all things are classified by human beings; the sacred represents those things viewed a warranting profound respect, the profane encompass everything else.

Protestant Ethic. Term (associated with Weber) that refers to the emphasis placed by Calvin, Luther, and the leaders of the Protestant Reformation- on the importance of work performed well as an indication of living one's life "to the glory of God"; key characteristics is dude diligence, frugality, and rational use of time.

Religions. Systems of meaning used to interpret the world that have a supernatural referent (for example Christianity, Hinduism, astrology).

Secularization argument. Assertion that religion as has been traditionally known is declining continuous and irreversibly.

COURSE: SOC-C-101 **LESSON NO. 12**

UNIT-IV **SOCIAL STRUCTURE** **SEMESTER-I**

Introduction : The twin concepts of *'Structure'* and *'Function'* have assumed tremendous significance in the modern sociological literature. They are complementary concepts and the full understanding of either depends upon an understanding of the other.

These concepts of *'Structure'* and 'Function' as applied in sociological studies draw their original inspiration from the works of *Herbert Spencer* and *Emile Durkheim*. Spencer compared societies to living organisms. Any organism has a *'Structure'*- that is, it consists of a number of interrelated parts, such as a head, limbs, a heart, and so on Each of these parts has *'function'* to play in the life of the total organism. It the same way, Spencer argued, a society has a structure-it also consists of interrelated parts, such as the family, religion, the state and so on. Ideally, each of these components also has a function that contributes to the overall stability of the social system. Modern sociologists do not, of course, much press the analogy between a society and an organism. But they have retained the same general idea of society as a system of interrelated systems, each having its structure and function. This idea has been stresed much by the sociologists who are called *"functionalists"*.

1. SOCIAL STRUCTURE

A number of sciences deal with the phenomenon of *'structure'* in their own way mainly to discover the characteristics of "structure" of their interest. For example, *atomic physics* deals with the structure of atoms, *chemistry* with the structure of molecules, *crystallography* and *colloidal chemistry* with the structure of crystals and colloids, and *anatomy* and *physiology* with the structures of organisms. In sociological and social anthropological studies also the term 'social structure' is relevant because,

the main task here is to discover the general characteristics of those 'social structures' the component parts of which are human beings.

'Social Structure' is one of the basic concepts of sociology. But it has not been used consistently or unambiguously. In the decade following the Second World War the concept 'Social Structure' became extremely fashionable in social anthropological studies. It became so general that it could be applied to almost any ordered arrangement of social phenomena.

- The word *'Structure'* in its original English meaning refers to *"building construction"* or *"arrangement of parts"* or *"manner of organisation"*. But by the 16th century it was used to refer to the interrelations between the component parts of any whole. It was in this sense widely used in anatomical studies. The term became relatively popular in sociological studies with the works of *Herbert Spencer*, that is, after 1850, Spencer who was very much fascinated by his biological analogies (organic structure and evolution) applied the term 'structure' to his analysis of society and spoke of 'social structure'. Even Durkheim, Morgan, Marx and others gave their own interpretations to it.

At modern times, *George Murdock* in America. *A.R. Radcliffe-Brown* and his followers in Britain and *Claude Levi-Strauss* in France used profusely this concept and popularised it. The usages of other writers are mostly the modified versions of these writers.

Murdock's use of term *'Structure'* implies either a building analogy or a dead organic model dissected for demonstration. *Radcliffe-Brown* presumes that society may be compared to a living organism or a working mechanism. For Brown, society has a life of its own. Society is not an object but it is very much like a creature. Hence, the study of structure, that is, the inter-dependence of the component parts of the system is invariably linked with the study of function. It means one has to study how the component parts of the system *'work'* in relation to each other and to the whole.

Definitions of Social Structure

The concept of social structure has been defined in different ways by different

thinkers. We may consider some of these definitions.

1. *Radcliffe-Brown* defines social structure as "an arrangement of persons in institutionally controlled or defined relationships, (such as the relationship of King and subject, or that of husband and wife.)"

2. In the *British social anthropological circles* the term social structure is used to refer to "a body of principles underlying social relations, rather than their actual content.

3. *Morris Ginsberg* regards social structure as "the complex of principal groups and institutions which constitute societies".

4. In current sociological usage the concept of social structure is applied to small groups as well as larger associations, communities and societies. Thus, *Ogburn and Nimkoff* are of the opinion that "In society, the organisation of a group of persons is the social structure. What the group does is the function." They use the terms 'Social organisation' and social structure' almost interchange-ably.

5. In a loose manner, the term 'social structure' is used to refer to any recurring pattern of social behaviour.

6. Many sociologists have used the term 'social structure' to refer to "the enduring, orderly and patterned relationships between elements of a society." (But there is disagreement as to what would count as an "element". For example, according to *A.R. Brown,* general and regular kinds of relationships that exist between people, constitute the elements. For *S.F. Nadel*, the elements are roles. For most of the sociologists who are called 'functionalists', the elements of social structures are 'social institutions'. They consider these elements (that is, social institutions) as necessary because they are "functional pre-requisites". Without these institutions no society can survive.

2. ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE

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

1. Sub-groups of Various Tupes. Society can be understood as a big group which consists of people. This big-group or larger system consists of various sub-groups. Various political, economic, relgious, educational, familial and other groups and associations represent such sub-groups. People who enact roles are organised in these sub-groups within the larger system. Some of these sub-groups persist longer than any particular members. *Example:* A particular family may continue to stay even after the death of the husband or wife. Many other sub-groups persist as 'types' longer than any particular example of the type. *Example :* a family may perish due to the collapse of building in which its members lived, families as such are not going to perish. Social norms define roles and the obligations of sub-groups.

2. Social structure consists of roles of various types : Social Structure consists of not only sub-groups but also roles. Roles are found within the larger system and also within the sub-groups. The concepts of role and sub-group imply interrelationship. Role occupants are expected to fulfil obligations to other people (who are also role-occupants). *For example*, in family, the husband has obligations towards his wife and children; in the college teacher has obligations towards students, principal and the management and vice versa. Further, the number of sub-groups that are there are not only interrelated but also subject to social norms. The political, economic, educational and other groups, *for example,* are interrelated through social norms.

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

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

Some other norms *specify the limit of permissible action.* A role-occupant of a sub-group in this case, *'must'* do certain things, *'may'* do certain things, and *'must not'* do still others. They are called *"regulative norms"* They do not differentiate between roles and between sub-groups. *For example,* in our society, regardless of

one's role, one must not seek to influence others by threats of violence or by violence itself.

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

Any one of these element-a sub-group, a role, a social norm, or a value-may be called a *"partial structure"*.

3. SOCIAL STRUCTURE : AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

In the field of social science social anthropology can be considered as a special science of structures and function of society. Anthropology is the science of small societies and hence it is comparatively easier to study the structure and function of primitive society. A number of thinkers and writers have enriched the fields of social anthropology and social structure by means of their studies and writings. We shall now confine ourselves to Radcliffe -Brown's conception of social structure.

A. R. Brown's Conception of Social Structure

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

As Brown says, "social structures are just as real as are individual organisms". The physiological and psychological phenomena that we observe in the organisms

are very much the result of the structure (made up of cells and interstitial fluids) in which they are united. Similarly, the social phenomena that are observed in human society are the result of social structure by which they are united.

Brown has made it clear that the study of social structures is not equivalent to the study of social relations as such. A particular relation between Tom and Ram, or Rekha and Ruth, is not studied here. But a wide network of social relations involving many other persons is the object of study.

Parts of Social Structure

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

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 13
UNIT-II	STATUS AND ROLE	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

13.1 Introduction
13.2 Meaning of Status
13.3 Essential Elements of status
13.4 Types of Status
13.5 Meaning and definition of role
13.6 Characteristics of role
13.7 Inter-relation between role and status
13.8 Types of roles
13.9 Conclusion

13.1 INTRODUCTION

The behaviour of individuals in social world is characterized by predictable patterns of social interactions. Sociologists use the term social interaction to refer to the ways in which people respond to one another. These interactions need not be face to face ; friends talking over the telephone and co-workers communicating over a computer are engaged in social interaction. Social structure refers to the way in which a society is organized into predictable relationship. These concepts are central to sociological study ; they focus on how different aspects of behaviour are related to one another. In culture are found the elements of a society, while social structure constrains the ways and processes by which these elements are organized. Sociologists observe patterns of behaviour closely

in order to understand and accurately describe the social interactions of a community or society and the social structure of which this behaviour is a part. Social interaction shapes the way we view the world around us. Interactions involve negotiation, which results in every changing form of social organization. Thus, predictable social relationships can be examined in terms of four elements : Statuses, Social roles, Groups, and Social institutions. These elements make up social structure just as a foundation, walls, ceilings, and furnishings make up a building's structure. We know that furnishing can very widely from those of an office building to the elaborate furnishings of a palace. Similarly, the element of a society's social structure can very dramatically.

13.2 MEANING AND NATURE OF STATUS

Social status is the position occupied by a person, family, or kinship group in a social system relative to others. This determines rights, duties and other behaviours including the nature and extent of the relationships with persons of other statuses. To sociologists, a status is any particular position that an individual holds in a social structure. The term, therefore, may refers to a wide range of positions and situations. Examples of statuses include such categorizations as student, mother, parent, farmer, husband, wife, male, female, physician and patient.

Social status has a hierarchical distribution in which a few persons occupy the highest positions. The simplest theoretical model of the status would be a distribution in which position was determined competitively by the possession of abilities relative to the demand for abilities in the society. The institution of private property, inheritance, differential taxation and social services all modify the form of the distribution of statuses.

The child is placed in society by its family and kinship group. They determine its education, its initial endowment of wealth and the esteem of the family in which it was born is transmitted to the child. This may include elements of class, caste, or estate. From this position the child may lose, maintain, or improve its status by its achievements in competition with others.

Social status is determined by education, income, possessions, and the social valuation of occupation and of other activities in society. All modern societies

have a number of honours systems which introduce the elements of social worth in a system which is primarily based on economic competition. The process of status determination operates through the invidious comparison of the style of life determined by the factors given above. Attempts are made to achieve high status by some persons who concentrate their resources upon the purchase of certain visible items of the style of life of a higher group : these are popularly called status symbols.

Occupying a status over a sustained period of time can have a pronounced psychological effect on an individual. He or she comes to develop a particular world view-a sense of self, particular attitudes, values and beliefs–which may result from experiences is occupying the status. None of these may be explicit role expectations associated with a particular status. Nevertheless, they may become like expectations in that individuals interact with others who occupy the same status ; in so doing, they come to acquire shared views and beliefs, all of which are consonant with the demands placed on those in their status.

The Oxford English Dictionary states that the first known use of the word "status" which comes from the Latin word meaning "to stand", was in 1693. The first use of "role" was in 1606, and it comes from the French word meaning "the part played by an actor". An early body of work that provided a setting for the emergency of the concepts of status and role was research focusing on norms, folkways, and mores. These phenomenon, discussed in Human Society (1952) by Kingslay Davis and in Folkways (1906) by William Graham Summer, can be seen as role expectations associated with the status of citizen of a society.

The contemporary usage of status and role are thought to have come from Ralph Linton's use of the terms in "The Study of Man" (1963). To Linton, status is a collection of rights and duties ; role is the "dynamic aspect of status". It is what an individual does when occupying a status. As other have done since, Linton distinguishes between ascribed statuses and achieved statuses.

According to Duncan Mitchell, social status refers to "the position occupied by a person, family or kinship group in a social system relative to others behaviours, including the nature and extent if the relationships with persons of other statuses".

According to Ralph Linton "status is the place in a particular system, which a certain individual occupies at a particular time".

Whether the social status is high or law depends on several factors. According to Second and Buckman, there are three basis which determined social status of a person : Firstly what is the capacity of a person to reward those who care in contact with him. Secondly, extent to which he is receiving reward and thirdly, the type of costs which he incurs.

In every good society those who have brilliance and insight normally get higher status than the others. Similarly, in society those who receive more awards are considered higher as compared to others who do not get such awards. Status is something which is not permanent. It changes from place to place and situation to situation as well as position which one occupies. A person can hold a high office in rural society, but same persons may not hold position of greater significance and importance in the urban society. Infact status is something which is relative and not absolute. A person who holds high status at one point of time may lose that at another point of time due to his misdoings, misbehaviour, etc.

NATURE OF THE STATUS :

1. **External symbols to identify the status :** As Kingslay Davis has said, a person's identity in a social situation reveals his status. Though not always certain external symbols help the identification of one's statuses in society. The style of dress is one such indicator, soldiers and army offices, nurses, doctors, advocates, policeman, religious missionaries, priests wear different dresses. Their statuses could be understood by means of their dresses.
2. **Every status has its own rights, duties and obligations :** The nature of these rights and duties is decided by the normative system of society. A right is a legitimate expectation that one can entertain as an occupant of a status in relation to the behaviour of a person in another position. From the view point of another person their claim represents only an obligation.

3. **Social Statuses are governed by norms :** These norms vary with persons, situations and statuses even though they are believed to be common at all. Example : the norms like 'be honest', 'be truthful', etc. are believed to be common to all. But in practice we know that a doctor cannot always tell the truth to the patient regarding the state of his disease. Secondly, a merchant cannot practice honestly in his trade. Thus norms are always related to situations. Which norms apply in a given case depends upon the relations between the status of the interacting person and the situations in which they interact.

4. **One individual may have several statuses :** Since society can be understood as the network of ves it is quite natural that in every society, we find a large number of groups which have many statuses. Every individual occupies many such statuses. This status will differ with the type of group. In a modern complex society each individual during the course of a single day may find himself in a large number of statuses. E. g. a college student is a student, a customer, a depositor to his banker, a passenger to a bus driver, a son to his father and mother and so on.

Status brings social order and stability in the society, it exercise an influence upon the careers of individuals. It differs with their degree of importance and has a hierarchical distribution.

13.3 ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF STATUS :

The term status has a physical as well as psychological situation. This situations forms certain elements and characteristics which can be enumerated below :

1. The status is determined by the cultural situation of the particular society.
2. The status is determined only in relevance to the other members of the society.
3. Every individual has to play certain role in accordance with the status.
4. Status is only a part of the whole of the society or the society as a whole.
5. As a result, the society is divided into various types.

6. Every status carries with it some prestige.

7. According to status, people may be divided into various categories. These categories or statuses are not imposed from above. Some of these statuses are not imposed from above, they are earned or achieved while others are ascribed.

13.4 TYPES OF STATUS

Ascribed Status :

Ascribed status is that which is inherited, such as sex, race or ethnicity and is crucial in defining the basic patterns of people's lives. At the beginning stages of socialization itself, the new born individual derives ascribed statuses. Virtually these statuses definitely "determine" and limited the range of statuses "which he subsequently achieve or try to achieve. Thus ascribed status is "assigned" to a person by society without regard for the person's unique talents and characteristics. Generally this assignment takes place at birth ; thus, a person's racial background, gender, and age are all considered ascribed statuses. These characteristics are biological in origin but are significant mainly because of the social meanings that they have in our culture. Conflict theorists are especially interested in ascribed statuses, since these statuses often confer privileges or reflect a person's membership in a subordinate group. In most cases, there is little that people can do to change an ascribed status. We must adapt to any constraints that such status holds for us–although we can attempt to change the way in which society views, an ascribed status does not necessarily have the same social meaning in every society. In a cross-cultural study, sociologists Gary Huang (1988) confirmed the Long–hold view that respect for the elderly is an important cultural norm in China. In many cases, the prefix "old" will be used respectfully, calling someone "old teacher" or "old person" has a similar meaning to calling an American judge "your honour". Huang points out that positive age–seniority distinctions in language are absent in the United States ; consequently, the term "old man" is viewed as more of an insult than as celebration of seniority and wisdom.

Achieved Status :

Achieved status is acquired through personal effort or change, possibly from occupational or educational attainment. The person has some choice about this type of status, however, much or little. All societies have some achieved statuses and no society depends completely on ascribed one. Hence, it is attained by a person largely through his or her own effect. Both "bank president" and "burgle" are achieved statuses, as are "lawyer", "pianist", "advertising executive", and "social worker". One must do something to acquire an achieved status–go to school, learn a skill, establish a friendship, or invent a new product.

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. In civilized society, a tendency towards commerce, an extreme division of labour, urban correlated with an emphasis on achievement.

In the traditional societies, the statuses are essentially ascribed, on the contrary, in the industrial societies it is achieved which becomes the rule. Both ascriptive and achieved statuses are found in every society. Each, though opposite in principle, is complementary in function and hence essential to society.

Distinction Between The Ascribed And Achieved Status :

Ascribed Status	Achieved Status
1. Ascribed status is the gift from the society to the individual member.	1. Achieved status is the result of the efforts which he acquires through his personal capacity, efficiency and ability.
2. There are no preconditions for getting the ascribed status.	2. For an achieved status certain preconditions are attached namely ability, efficiency, economic status, etc.
3. Generally ascribed status is based on age, sex, race, caste, kinship etc.	3. Achieved status is based on characteristics, capabilities and abilities etc.

4. Ascribed status is more stable and rigid. Its basis does not changes easily.	4. Achieved status has an unstable basis and so it is itself changeable.
5. Ascribed status occupies a place of respect in a traditional society.	5. In open and modern societies it is the achieved status which is given importance.
6. In regard to the ascribed status the role of the authority and actions that flow from them are unpredictable.	6. In regard to achieved status the role or the action is more or less predictable because it is based on reasons.
7. In ascribed status there is a co-relationship between status and role.	7. In relevance to the achieved status it cannot be said that there shall be co-relationship between the achieved status and role.
8. The ascribed status has a vital relationship with the internal aspects of the personality. It provides satisfaction to sentiments, emotions, etc.	8. Achieved status is the result of one's personal accomplish-ments.
9. Ascribed status can be helpful to a person for achieving certain things or acquiring status.	9. Achieved status is helpful in acquiring ascribed status.
10. Achieved status has greater relationships with the customs, traditions and other existing factors of the society. In other words ascribed status is more traditional.	10. Achieved status is the result of the personal accomplishment and has no relation with customs and traditions.
11. Ascribed status is helpful in removing the difficulties and disabilities of the achieved status.	11. Similarly achieved status is also helpful to remove the disabilities of the ascribed status.

Achieved and ascribed status are only the forms of the status. The distinction and relationship between the two may be studied in the following manner :

How positions are filled :

Sociological Significance of the Distinction :

From sociological point of view, the distinction between ascribed and achieved status is important. Since merit norms or achievement values are superseded in traditional societies by more dominant values of ascription, the possibility for economic, policy and other forms of sociocultural development is very much restricted in such societies. Modernisation of these societies can begin only after appropriate cultural environment is created.

Further more, ascribed status influences, to a large extent, one's achievements in life. An individual might be born with in born talents, but if his ascribed status is such as to prevent him from utilizing his talents fully, he may not succeed. On the other hand, a man with a mediocre caliber may be having favourable circumstances because of his birth. So it, may be wrong to assume that ascription and achievement are two distinct categories.

Kinsley Davis had added a new dimension. In his view, the problem of a simple society, with its emphasis on ascribed status, is its lack of adaptability to changing conditions. The complex, unstable and specialized society, with its emphasis on achieved status, on the other hand, "run the risk of uncontrolled individualism with consequent loss of social cohesion".

He emphasis that both ascription and achievements are indispensable for the health of the society 'in which ascribed status helps to provide the constancy, achieved status provides the change'. Ascribed status help in integrating individual personality.

How Positions Are Filled : Ascription And Achievement :

The processes by which the statuses in a society are constantly being filled by the infiltration of new personnel to take the place of the old is sometimes called, by organic analogy, social Metabolism. Such metabolism is fully as important

to a society as digestion is to an organism. In both cases raw material are being absorbed and made to furnish the energy that gives life to the whole structure. In the case of the organism it is food substances that are taken in, where as in the case of society it is new individuals.

Faced with a constant stream of raw material in the form of new babies, which it must so process and so distribute that the variegated system of interlocking adult statuses will be filled and the business of group living accomplished, every society is caught on what Linton regards as the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, as well known, the formation of the individual's habits and attitudes beings at birth ; consequently the earlier his training for specific statuses can begin, the more complete will be his eventual adjustment. For this reason there arises a tendency to ascribe the individual's status at birth and to begin filling him at once for the duties that will subsequently be his. On the other hand, we know that no two individuals (not even identical twins) are inherently the same at birth. Their capacities differ from one to another and there is as yet no way of telling, short of subsequent experience, what their peculiar capacities are. For this reasons there arises a tendency to postpone the determination of adult statuses until each individual has shown which statuses he is peculiarly filled for.

Here, then are two opposite possibilities–the ascription of status independently of individual qualities or the achievement of status according to individual accomplishment–each with societal advantages and disadvantages on its side. Every society is confronted with the necessity of making an unconscious but difficult choice between the two. It is possible to imagine one type of society in which status is exclusively ascribed and to deduce the qualities that such a society would have. In fact, there are some societies that go far in this direction. It is equally possible to imagine another type of society in which status is exclusively achieved and to deduce the qualities that it would have. But the truth is that no human society seizes either form of the dilemma completely. Every known society makes some use of both principles. The question really boils down, then, to what is the degree of ascription and achievement in any given case, and also what types of statuses lend themselves to one or the other kind of recruitment.

Status Set

Status set is a social position which is occupied by an individual. As a single person, we can have multiple of statues. It can also be defined as a social class which depends upon the social evaluation whereby the community regard certain attributes. These attributes may relate to value and neck shared by a small group or by whole society. The contribution of attributes to status may differ from group to group. Statuses may be of different types such as occupational status, family status, gender status, ascribed and achieved status. These statuses are of great importance. An individual wins respect in society by virtue of his status. The status of a person is high if the role he is playing is considered important by the group.

An individual can perform multiple member of statuses. Various stage that an individual can perform together are called status set. This statuses was given by Merton.

Every status has role set. It is complement of distinctive status of a person distinctive statuses held by a person is in different settings. Eq. A women can however be social workers. All these statuses taken together comprise status performed by individual as status set plainly provide in institution and subsystem of a society. The same person are engaged in directed so systems just the group and societies different comprising part of their structure. So, individual people cliffs in the number and complexity of structure comparing set. The status in the status set are randomly assorted they are also in fully and tightly integrated.

13.5 MEANING AND DEFINITION OF ROLE

Role is a key concept in sociological theory. It highlights the social expectations attached to particular statuses or social positions and analyses the workings of such expectations. Role theory was particularly popular during the mid-furnish century, both after sustained criticism caree to be seen as flowed, and substantially fell out of use. However the concept of role remains a basic tool for sociologist understanding.

Social anthropology of Ralph Linton gives a structural account of roles situated with in the social system. Here, roles become institutionalized clusters of normative rights and obligation. The structural account of roles locates a status

in society, such as that of a teacher, and then tries to describe the standard bundle of rights and duties associated with an ideal type of this position. These expectations, which are socially based, constitute the role.

When people occupy social positions their behaviour is determined mainly by what is expected of their position rather than by their own individual characteristics. Roles are bundles of socially defined attributes and expectations associated with social positions.

Definition of Role :

The concept of role was first introduced by Pareto in 1916 who was the first to recognize the sociological significance of the labels such as Lawyers, Physicians, artists, etc. which indicate their role. Some of the definitions of role are given below :

- According to Lundberg, "A social role is a pattern of behaviour expected of an individual in certain group or situations".
- According to Ogburn and Nimkoff, "Role is a set of socially expected and approved patterns consisting of both duties and privileges, associated with a particular position in a group".
- According to Kingslay Davis, "Roles is the manner in which a person actually carries out the requirement of his position".
- According to Linton, "The term social role is used to designate the sum-total of the cultural patterns 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 ovest 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".

All these definitions go to show 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 within a group of social situation. A person's role in any situation is defined by one set of expectations for his behaviour held by others and by the person

himself. Thus as in the words of Linton, role is the dynamic aspect of status, a role is the totality of all the cultural patterns associated with a particular status.

13.6 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ROLE :

1. ***Action Aspect of Status :*** The role is in fact the action aspect of status. It involves various types of actions that a person has to perform in accordance with the expectations of the society. The role is, as already stated is the sum total of the pattern of the actions that are performed for the fulfillment of the expectations of other members of the society. These actions are dependent not on the individual will but on the social sanctions. That is why it is said that every social role has a cultural basis. Because of this fact the roles not are performed against the social values and ideas are not tolerated.
2. ***Changing Concept of Role :*** Social Roles as already stated, are in accordance 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. For example, marriage by a young women to a man of her choice may be justifiable today but 20 years earlier it was not justified.
3. ***Limited Field of Operation :*** Every role has a limited area of operation and the role has to be confined within that. For examples an officer has a role to play in the office but when he reaches his family, that role cases. If the officer continues to perform that role in his family, also he shall not be able to carry on his work outside the limited field.
4. ***Role are not performed 100% for the fulfillment of the expectations :*** It is not possible for any one to perform his role fully in accordance with the expectations of the society. 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 generalised form of action. Actual performance of the role may be slightly different from the generalised form.

5. ***Difference in the Importance of Role :*** From the socio-cultural point of view all the roles are not equally important some of the roles are more important while the others are less. The roles that are most important are called 'key roles' while the roles that are of general importance, are called general roles. Key roles are important for the organisation of the society while general roles are helpful in the fulfillment of day to day activities.

6. ***Two Approaches to Social Role :*** There are broadly two approaches to the theory of social role, which can be briefly explained as below :

1. G. H. MEAD'S APPROACH TO SOCIAL ROLE :

The first systematic use of the concept of social role was done by G. H. Mead (1934), a forerunner of symbolic interactionism. This usage, roles are depicted as the outcome of a process of interaction that is tentative and creative. Meadian social psychology was primarily concerned with how children learn about society and develop their own social beings by role taking, that is 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 role involves interaction with other roles. The interaction process means that people is roles are always testing their conceptions of other roles and the responses of the people in other roles reinforces or requestions such conceptions. This, in turn leads people to maintain or change their own role behaviour.

Role Making 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 interactionalist tend to avoid the extreme relativism 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 consistent patterns of behaviour which can be identified with various types of social actors.

2. R. Linton's Approach to Social Roles : Second approach to role theory derives 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 outcome, and sees roles as essentially prescribed and static expectations of behaviour. These prescriptions derive 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'.

Investigation of action roles after demonstrate a considerable in deter minacy of expected behaviours associated with social positions, which is what symbolic interactionism postulates. Nevertheless, indeterminacy can also be explained from within the cultural prescription approach ; the cultural norms which guide the behaviour may be vague, individual roles may be subject to incompatible expectations from other roles to which they relate.

13.7 INTER-RELATION BETWEEN ROLE AND STATUS :

1. ***Action Aspect of Status :*** A status is simply a position in society and role is the behavioural aspect of status. Statuses are occupied and roles are played. A role is the manner in which a given individual fulfills the obligations of a status and enjoys the privileges and prerogatives. A position or status is simply the means of identifying a particular social role. The two terms are often used inter-changeably Eg. : the position of 'advocate' identifies a particular body of expected behaviour or the role of advocate.

2. ***Role is a relational term :*** An individual plays a role vis-a-vis another person's role which is attached to a 'counter-position'. Eg., an advocate plays his role as advocate in relation to client's role. Role concept is relevant at the level of individual when he is in interaction.

3. ***Role and status in a way point out the divergent interest of the two sciences social psychology and sociology :*** Status is a sociological concept but role is a concept and phenomenon of social psychology.

   Individual differences in personality, ability, talents and behaviour can alone explain as to why different individuals play different roles in the same

status. Eg., though the status of P. M. has been the same for Pandit Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri, etc. they have played different roles in that status.

4. ***Both are dynamic and constantly changing :*** Hence role changes with new incumbent in a status. The status changes as the norms attached to it are altered. It is quite likely that in course of time, new obligations and new responsibilities may be added to a status or old over may be removed.

5. ***Though statuses and roles are correlative phenomenon, it is possible to have one without the other :*** The status without a role may simply denote an unfilled position is an association. Eg., when the vice chancellor of a university resigns it may take sometime to find a suitable successor for the post. During this time gap, the duties of vice-chancellor may be looked into by some of his assistant. These assistants can never enjoy privileges of the status of vice chancellor.

In the same manner, roles are often played without occupying a status. Eg. a mother plays the role of nurse when a member of her family is ill. Nurse is a status in hospital, but in home it may be a role.

The relationship between status and role is rather inevitable. The elements of the two which also indicate their relationship may be studied under the following heads :

Status	**Role**
1. Status is determined by socio-culture values.	1. Role is also determined by socio-cultural values.
2. Status is determined in relation to other members of the society.	2. Roll is also determined in relation to the roles of the society. Role is also influenced by situation of the society and other members of the society.
3. Status in almost all the societies are similar and same. The status of a father in every society is more or less the same.	3. In respect of similarity and senceness of the statuses the roles are expressed indifferent forms.

4. Status can be properly under stood in the background of social aspirations and ambitions.	4. Role can be understood in the background of the social aspirations and the ambitions and requirements of the society.
5. Status represents only a part of the entire social set, up to which the individual member belongs. He has different statuses.	5. Different statuses carry out different roles. It means that different individual perform different roles.
6. According to the status and the role the whole society is divided into different groups and each group according to status is called a particular group. Those belonging to one status/group have similarity of outlook.	6. There may be similarity of outlook among the members of a particular status/groups but it is not necessary that it may express itself in the same manner. Different persons discharge their roles in a different manner.
7. The cultural or the social background to which a person belongs attached a value which is also known as the prestige.	7. Role is discharged in relations to the prestige of status or the value attached.
8. Status as already statee is determined by socio-cultural values and is influenced and justified by them.	8. It is necessary that all the person discharge the role attached to their status properly. For example the status of a father shall be justified, and correct in all the societies but it is not necessary that all the fathers may discharge their functions and roles properly.
9. Members of different status/ group are divided into various categories and rank may be vertically or horizontally. For example, a society that divides	9. It is not necessary that the roles may also be differentiated or divided into hierarchical order according to division of society among groups.

itself into different castes, creates vertical, heretical groups and the difference that exists between various brothers in the family is an example of horizontal different.

10. It is not possible for the members of a family to achieve or ascribe status in the natural or traditional manner. In other words, purely ascribed or achieved statuses are lacking. Different statuses have elements of both these types.

10. Roles are discharged according to statuses and therefore, they have all the elements of status.

13.8 TYPES OF ROLES

It is the task which is performed by an individual. It also specifies the part a person is supposed to play in the activities of his group. Role refers to the obligations which an individual has towards his groups. There are different kind of role which an individual has to perform while living in the society. Multiple number of roles are performed by on individual having different positions. Multiple roles refers to the complex of roles associated not with a single status but with the various statuses in different institutional spheres which individual find themselves such as multiple roles performed by a women as teacher, as a mother, social workers, and so on. Or one person might have diverse status of husband, father, teachers, physician an association member and so on.

Every role will be performed by a single individual but attaining different positions. Each role will be performed simultaneously by an individual. Each role will be performed differently i.e. in different ways.

Role Set :

The individual differ not only in attributes such in sex, colour, height age, but also differ in their roles acc to their occupations when people occupy social position their behaviour is determined mainly by what is expected of that position rather than

by their bundles of socially defined attributes and expectations associated with social position. A role is the expected behaviour associated with specific social status.

Linton has referred role as dynamic aspect of status a role in the totality of all the cultural patterns associated with particular status. Role as a concept of social science cannot be compared to an elementary particle in physics the concept of role was first introduced by pareto in 1916. Each individual has many status position within a society and, therefore, he perform a variety of roles.

A social role as defined by Lundberg : in a pattern of individual in a certain group or situation. It specifies the part a person is supported to play in the activities of his group as community.

Ogburn and Nimkoff : a role is a set of society expected and approved behaviour pattern.

Ginsberg defined : Role in the manner in which the position in supposed to be filled.

By Linton : role is the behavioural exacting of the pattern expectations attributed to that position. Linton went on to observe that each person is society in exitably occupies multiple statues & there is an associated role. This is the believe characteristic of social structure. This facts of structure can be registered by distinctive term role set.

In a role set, we are having different roles but with only one status out of one status, we have to perform different type of rules. This can be expect by means of example. Such as a simple status of medical student in role to his teacher, but also an array of the role relating the account of their status to other students, nurses, physicians social worker, medical technicians we can take another example of a school teacher. Status of public school teacher has its directive role set, relating the teacher to pupils, to colleagous, the school Principle and Superintendent, the bound of role and on frequent occasion to local patriotic organisation, to professional organisation of teacher.

The concept of role set is structure and refer to the part of social structure at particular line for operating social structure these sets and sequence of status

and role must be so managed that appreciable degree of social order is maintained.

Role Conflict

Role conflict is theorized to develop when an individual experiences conceptions within or among his or her social positions and their corresponding expectations. Role stain is the general then experienced when the demands of one or more roles are inappropriate, unfair, or unrealistic. Stress conflict within social groups and personal relationship may be explained in terms of role conflict or role strain. Thus, role conflict is stress created when roles are ambiguous, unrealistic, or inappropriate.

A role is a set of norms (obligations or expectations) attached to an individual in social position, occupation, or relationship status. People are Motivated to adhere to norms and perform roles in order to win approval, avoid social penalties, and develop self esteem. Role conflict is the psychological stress created when persons do not fit their roles (person-role conflict), when relevant others disagree with the individual about his or her role (intra role conflict), or when several different roles makes mutually exclusive demands on an individual (inter role conflict).

If a group member's talent do not fit an assigned role, he or she experiences person role conflict. For example, most work groups involve two sets of duties : task oriented roles and relations oriented roles. A task oriented person who is assigned to perform a relations oriented role, such as improving group morale, may find such an activity uncomfortable and difficult. Many person role conflicts stem from individual's uncertainty about what is expected of them or how they should achieve it. Thus some role conflicts are based in role ambiguity. Person-role conflict may also result from temporary stresses. For example, an individual with serious personal problems may be unable to act as the good listener to his friends have come to expect, so that at least temporarily be experience person role conflict in his relationship with others.

Perhaps the most common form of role conflict is inter role conflict, the stress experienced when one person attempts to fulfill two or more competing roles. For example, an employee who is also a student may find that, as an employee, he is expected to work additional hours on occasion, but as a student, he should not let

changes in his work schedule disrupt his class attendance. In order to perform one role well, he must disappoint expectations in the other. Inter role conflict can also cause problems in personal relationships. For example, a woman typing to care for her ailing mother may be unable to spend enough time with her own children because of the inter role conflict between her duties as daughter and mother.

A subtle but no less stressful problems is created by intra role conflict, experienced when one's role is perceived differently by different groups or individuals. For example, a newly elected employee representative will experience role conflict on learning that her co-workers expect her to represent their interests to management, while her supervisors expect her to represent management's point of view to her fellow employees. In order to meet one groups expectations, she must disappoint the other group, and vice-versa. The individual is caught between different, even contradictory, interpretations of the same role.

Intra-role conflict can challenge personal relationship as well. For example, if a man thinks that he can fulfill the role of "good husband" merely by financially supporting his family, his self-perception is challenged when his wife argues that, in his view, a "good husband" must also meet the family member's social and emotional needs.

Members of industrial societies routinely juggle a host of responsibilities demanded by their various statuses and roles. As most mother can testify, pronating as well as working outside the homes taxes both physical and emotional strength. Sociologists thus recognize role conflict as incompatibility among roles corresponding to two or more statuses.

We experience role conflict when we find ourselves pulled in various directions while teyping to respond to the many statuses we hold some politicians, for example, decide not to run for national office because the demands of a campaign would impoverish family life; in other cases, ambition people defer having children or choose to remain children in order to stay on the "fast track" for career success.

The main sources of role conflict are as follows :—

(1) Cultural heterogeneity and complexity and the social system.

(2) Different roles of an individual in different groups.

(3) The possibility of confusion over the appropriateness of a case.

(4) When two or more persons are authorised to perform some functions.

(5) When the functions are below the status of an individual.

(6) Difference in the expected behaviour from the person assigned a role.

(7) Difference in the perception of one's duties and responsibilities.

Role in the modern society are numerous, complex, highly diversified and sometimes in conflict. In periods of rapid social change, the nervous strain of conflicting role is greater because the requirements of each role and the expectations of the community regarding them are uncertain. To one extent the rights and duties inherent in each role, the social system will run smoothly and with a minimum of strain on the individual personality.

13.9 CONCLUSION

The concepts of status and role are central to sociological study. These along with two other elements groups and social institutions make up social structure just as foundation walls, ceilings, furnishings make up a buildings structure. Man's all social actions and interactions are analysed in terms of status and role.

13.10 ASK YOURSELF

Q. 1. Define Status and Explain its types ?

Q. 2. Give the meaning and Charactersitcs of Role ?

Q. 3. Explain the inter-relation between Role and Status ?

13.11 KEY WORDS

Status : Culturally defined position in society, consisting of ideas about rights and obligations.

———

COURSE: SOC-C-101		LESSON NO. 14
UNIT-IV	SOCIALIZATION	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

14.0 Introduction

14.1 Forms of Socialization

14.2 Agencies of Socialization

14.3 Theories of Socialization

14.4 Stages of Socialization

14.5 Sum up

14.6 References

14.7 Key Words

14.0 INTRODUCTION

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

The process of socialisation is conditioned by culture. Since every society has its own culture the ways of the process of socialisation also differ from society to society. Further. The same culture and the same ways of socialisation may have diverse effects on the development of the personality of the members of the same society. Thus a culture need not necessarily produce stereotype personalities. There is scope for individuality in the process of socialisation. But the fact the culture puts limitatins on the development of personality cannot be ignored. The mutual interplay of culture and socialisation in conditioning human

personality with special emphasis on the phenomenon of socialisation, is briefly examined in this Chapter.

Concept of Socialisation

Little of man's behaviour is instinctive. Rather, man's behaviour is *'learnt'* behaviour. The human child comes into the world as a biological organism with animal needs. He is gradually moulded in society into a social being and learns social ways of acting and feeling. The continued existence of society becomes impossible without the process. No individual could become the person and no culture could exist without it. This process of moulding and shaping the personailty of the human infant is called *'socialisation'*.

Man is Not Born Social

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

Man is man because he shares with others a common culture. Culture includes not only its living members but also members of past generations and those as yet unborn. Sociologists have given more importance to socialisation because man is a cultural being. Socialisation is often referred to as the *'transmission of culture',* the process whereby men learn the rules and practices of social groups. Socialisation is an aspect of all activity within all human societies. Just as we learn a game by playing it, so we learn life by engaging in it. We are socialised in the course of the activities themselves. For example, if we do not know correct manners, we learn them through the mistakes that we make and the disapproval that other exhibit. We may learn the way of behaviour through imitation and purposeful training. Education - purposeful instruction - is thus only a *part* of the socialisation process. It is not, and can never be, the whole of that process.

Definition

(i) Bogardus : Socialisation is the "process of working together, of developing group responsibility, or being guided by the welfare needs of others".

(ii) W.F. Ogburn : "Socialisation is the process by which the individual learns to conform to the norms of the group".

(iii) Peter Worsley explains socialisation as the process of "transmission of cultue, the process whereby men learn the rules and practices of social groups".

(iv) Harry M. Johnson understands socialisation as "learning that enables the learner to perform social roles". He further says that it is a "process by which individuals acquire the already existing culture of groups they come into".

(v) Lundberg says that socialisation consists of the "complex processes of interaction through which the individual learns the habits, beliefs, skills and standards of judgement that are necessary for his effective participation in social groups and communities".

14.1 FORM OF SOCIALISATION

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

(i) Primary Socialisation. This is the most essential and basic type of socialisation. It takes place in the early years of life of the newborn individual. It concentrates on the teaching of language and cognitive skills, the internalisation of cultural norms and values, establishment of emotional ties, and the appreciation of other roles and perspectives.

'Internalisation of norms' is the most important aspect of primary socialisation. Internalisation of norms refers to the process in which the norms of society become a part of the personality of the individual. The human child does not have a sense of right and wrong, desirable and undesirable, moral and immoral. By trial and error, by direct and indirect observation, and experience, the child gradually learns the norms

relating to right and wrong behaviour. The socialising agents reinforce the child's learning by rewards and punishments or by means of approval and disapproval.

(ii) Anticipatory Socialisation. Men not only learn the culture of the group of which they are immediate members. They may also learn the culture of groups to which they do not belong. Such a process whereby men socialise themsleves into the culture of a group with the anticipation of joining that group, is referred to by socialogists like Merton as *'anticipatory socialisation'*. A person who intends to join the army may start doing physical exercises to toughen his body and learning the manners of army personnel to become one with them later. People may be socialised into groups of which they are already members or into groups to which they wish to become attached. Socialisation is not a process that takes place merely in early childhood. On the other hand, it takes place at different times and places throughout life.

(ii) Developmental Socialisation. This kind of learning is based on the achievements of primary socialisation. "It builds on already acquired skills and knowledge as the adult progresses through new situations such as marriage or new jobs. These require new expectations, obligations, and roles. New learning is added to and blended with old in a relatively smooth and continuous process of development".- *Ian Robertson.*

(iv) Re-Socialisation. Not only do individuals change roles within groups, but they also change membership-groups. In some instances, 'resocialisation'- "the stripping away of learned patterns and substitution of new one for them"-must occur. Such re-socialisation takes place mostly when a social role is radically changed. It may also happen in periods of rapid social mobility. For example, a newly wedded housewife may be forced to become a prostitue in a brothel. In this instance the social role of the individual got changed radically.

14.2 AGENCIES OF SOCIALIZATION

The family

The family gets the baby first. Hence the process of socialisation begins in the family. A child is born with some basic abilities that are genetically transmitted through germ plasm. These abilities and capacities are shaped in ways determined

by culture. The mother with whom the relation of the child is the most intimate plays a significant role in the process of moulding the child in the initial stages. Subsequently, father and older siblings transmit to the child many other values, knowledge and skill that children are expected to acquire in that particular society.

The Peer Group

As the child grows older, his contemporaries begin to influence him. He spends most of his spare hours outside his work and study schedule with his peers in the playground and places outside his home. The attraction of peers is virtually irresistible to him. He learns from them and they also learn from him. With the passage of time the peer group influence surpasses that of parents significantly. It is not surprising that teenage is the age of parent-child misunderstanding.

In the socialisation of the child, the members of the family, particularly those who exercise authority over him, and the members of his peer group exercise two different kinds of influence upon him. Both authoritarian relationships (typified by the former) and equalitarian relationships {typified by the latter) are equally significant to him. He acquires the virtues of respect, constraint and obedience from the first type of relationships, and the virtues of co-operation based on trust and mutual understanding from the second.

The importance of authoritarian element in the socialisation process may be explained thus. First, the pattern of behaviour-expected of a child in a society does not usually or in all cases correspond to the innate inclinations of the child. On the contrary, on many occasions he is taught to act contrary to biological inclinations and follow the prescriptions as well as the proscriptions of society. Those who are mature and can command his respect and attention are obviously the proper persons to initiate the process of socialisation. Secondly, many cultural elements—both prescriptive and proscriptive—are not always amenable to reason. The child will naturally resent being asked to behave in a manner contrary to what his natural inclinations prompt him to do. In cases like this, the authority of those who are responsible for reproducing and maintaining a child are in a unique position to make him accept their instructions without questioning the logic and the necessity of the

contents of those instructions. He has to accept these simply because his superiors lay them down for him.

The importance of equalitarian element in socialisation process rests on altogether different grounds There is free and spontaneous interaction instead of coercion among those who have equalitarian relationships. They view "the world through the same eyes", share the same subjective attitudes and consequently have perfect "understanding" of one another. This applies to age mates, sex mates and class mates. They learn form one another "small folkways, shades of meaning, fads and crazes, secret modes of gratification, and forbidden knowledge." Some such knowledge is "often socially useful and yet socially tabooed." Kingsley Davis has given the example of knowledge of sex which "is supposed to remain a closed book until marriage". If this were followed, the problems of maladjustment and aberration of many kinds would not have been infrequent. Fortunately, such knowledge is transmitted as a pan of the lore that passes from child to child".

The School

When the child comes to the school, his formal indoctrination into the culture of the society begins. He is exposed to a wider background than hitherto known to him. He is formally introduced to the lore and the learning, the arts and the sciences, the values and the beliefs, the customs and taboos of the society from a wider circle, his teachers play a very significant role. The child may admire, respect and love some of his teachers. The impression which they make during this impressionable age lasts almost throughout his life.

The books

In literate societies another important agency of socialisation is the printed word in books and magazines. Our cultural world-experiences and knowledge, values and beliefs, superstitions and prejudices—is expressed in words. "Words rush at us in torrent and cascade; they leap into our vision as in newspaper, magazine and textbook. 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 socialisation process".

The mass media

Apart from newspapers which carry printed words, the two other mass media, viz., the radio and television, exercise tremendous influence in the socialisation process. They "assault our ears" and communicate directly their messages and these messages also "contain in capsule form the premises of our culture, its attitudes and ideologies". The role of television, in particular, is very significant. It communicates directly to both our ears and eyes and thus leaves a strong impression.

In individual cases, of course, the importance of these influences varies. Different people react to the same suggestion differently. Responses vary in terms of their natural predilections. "Some of us respect tradition; others fear the opinion of their peers; and still others prefer to listen to the 'thousand tongues' of conscience". David Riesman has characterised the first group as 'tradition directed', the second as 'other directed and the third as 'inner-directed. While discussing the nature and impact of socialisation process, one cannot afford to ignore these innate characteristics of human nature.

14.3 THEORIES OF SOCIALIZATION

Socialisation and the self

The 'self may be viewed from two angles: the self as subject and the self as object. The nature of the self, as seen by oneself from inside, is something which transcends all scientific investigations. It is a mystery which language, fails to describe. Every person has a consciousness of self. Such consciousness finds expression in the use of the pronoun"!". This is the subjective self.

G. H. Mead pointed out that an essential characteristic of the self is its "reflexive character". By this he means that the self can be both subject and object to itself. Thus, when we say "the nature of the self, we reflect upon self and become self-conscious. We make self an object and when we do so the subjective self disappears.

In sociology, we are concerned with the objective self. "The heart of socialisation", says Kingsley Davis, "is the emergence and gradual development of the self or ego. It is in terms of the self that personality takes shape and the mind comes to function". The objective self, therefore, becomes an object of inquiry.

Where does this self arise ? Are we born with it ? Is it something the individual brings with him as he confronts society ? Or, is it something that he receives from society as a gift of the confrontation ? In seeking in answer to these questions, we may explore the theories developed by Charles Horton Cooley, George Herbert Mead and Sigmund Freud. Though these three eminent scholars differ among themselves, yet all of them, having pursued the subject on the lines of their specialisation, come to the conclusion that the self is social and that self-consciousness arises only in and through interaction with others.

Learning Theory

Very little human behaviour is directly determined by the individual's genetic makeup. For this reason, the precise mechanisms involved in learning are well worth knowing.

Three Main Types of Learning. We are concerned here with three main types of learning: classical conditioning, operant conditioning, and observation. In the first two types, learning occurs as a result of practice or the repetition of association (Yussen and Santrock 1978). However, since much of what children learn is through observation rather than extensive practice, the last type is the most important for socialization.

Classical conditioning was first discovered by Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov in his famous experiments with a salivating dog. The basic idea is quite simple (Deutsch and Krauss 1965). Meat powder, an "unconditioned stimulus" (UCS), is placed in a dog's mouth, automatically eliciting salivation, an "unconditioned response" (UCR). A neutral stimulus, that does not elicit salivation, such as the sound of a bell, is presented just before the presentation of the food. The neutral stimulus is called a "conditioned stimulus" (CS). Soon the CS by itself elicits the flow of saliva without the meat or ucs. This learned response to the bell is the "conditioned response" (CR).

The classical conditioning paradigm explains some learning children do that is unintended by their parents. For example, a child may munch cookies while watching "Sesame Street." Before long, television becomes a signal to eat. This type of learning also represents one established source of phobias, or irrational fears. Many social attitudes are acquired in exactly the same fashion. If, for example, a little boy has an unpleasant experience with a red-haired girl, he may (unlike Charlie Brown) go through life disliking red-haired .

Operant conditioning. a second type of learning, is associated with American

psychologists E.L. Thomdike (1898, 1913) and B.F. Skinner (1953). In this case, the organism must first make a specific response. If that response is followed by a reward
or a punishment, it then becomes a conditioned, or learned, response. In a typical experiment, a hungry pigeon is placed in a cage equipped with four differently coloured keys. It goes through a trial-and-error procedure of pecking at the keys, eventually pecking the red key. The red key, when depressed, releases food. Because this particular response was rewarded, the pigeon will, after a few trials, go directly to the red key when hungry. In avoidance learning, an animal would be exposed to a noxious stimulus, such as an electric shock. In that case, it would learn to prevent punishment by pressing a certain key. In general, though, punishment is not a very reliable way of shaping future behaviour. It stops unwanted behaviour for the moment, but for various reasons its effects on future behaviour tend to be somewhat uncertain.

Children learn many of their socialization lessons through operant conditioning. Parents positively reinforce desired verbal responses, such as "please" and "thank you." Parents punish unwanted behaviour, such as rude talk, selfishness, or taking candy from stores without paying for it. One sociologist (Cahill 1987) observed what happens when a small boy attempts to recycle a wad of gum:

While a woman is inspecting cans on a supermarket shelf, an approximately four-year-old, boy leaves her side, walks over to a shelf on the opposite side of the aisle, picks up a piece of previously used chewing gum, and starts to put it in his mouth. The woman glances over her shoulder and loudly commands the boy to "STOP." Still holding the gum in his hand, the boy points to the shelf from which he removed the gum and objects that "it was there." The woman responds: "I dont care where you found it. It's been in someone else's mouth."

Although children do learn by operant' conditioning, complications inevitably arise whenever results from pigeon and rat experiments are extrapolated to human beings. For one thing, experimenters consciously decide what they want the animals to learn; much human learning, however, is accidental. In addition, human beings find broken cups. The other boy. Henry, had been forbidden by his mother to eat jam. When his mother left the room. Henry climbed up to the cupboard in search of the jam and knocked a cup to the floor.

Children under seven years, in the moral realism stage, believed that John should be punished more severely. After all, John had broken fifteen cups while Henry had broken only one. However, the older children, the moral autonomists, were more concerned with the fictitious boys' reasons for acting than with the consequences of the acts. These older children felt that Henry deserved the greater punishment, because his offence had been committed while disobeying his mother's order. John's offence, on the other hand, had been accidental.

The moral realist believes that all rules are sacred and unchangeable absolutes. Rules are handed down by adult authority, and not the slightest deviation from them should be tolerated. The moral " autonomist, in contrast, views rules as somewhat arbitrary social conventions. Older children involved in a game agree that certain rules are appropriate or inappropriate to that particular game situation. When the players consent to change, new rules can be adopted.

For example, the moral realist would agree that the child able to knock the most marbles out of a circle drawn in the dirt should have the first turn. Asked why, the moral realist would answer, "That's the rule. That's the way things are done." The moral autonomist would also agree that turns are derided by this preliminary trial. However, the older child would explain the procedure this way: "Well, the first turn has to be derided somehow. There are probably other ways to do it, but we derided to do it this way, and it works fine."

Piaget believes that maturation of cognitive capacities is the primary determinant of moral thought. This cognitive development results from the interaction of genetic capacities and social experiences. According to Piaget, it is the child's interaction with peers, rather than with parents, that provides the serial experiences crucial for the development of morality. For one thing, freewheeling games with other children show that rules are conventional products that arise out of co-operation. Parents, on the other hand, are often reluctant to debate the reasons for their rules and regulations. This authoritarian stance promotes the younger child's view of rules as arbitrary and immutable. That, briefly, is Piaget's approach. Many studies have borne him out, showing that children from different cultures and serial class backgrounds do go through a stage of moral realism before they reach moral autonomy.

Lawrence Kohlberg (1976) continued to study moral development in the Piaget tradition. In his procedure, those being interviewed were asked to respond to moral

dilemmas such as the following:

In Europe, a woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered, a much broader range of responses rewarding or punishing than do animals. Imagine this scene. A mother and her three-year-old daughter are in the kitchen. The child is bored and wants attention. Because the mother is busy, she is ignoring the child's chatter. Eventually, the little girl repeats the word she heard her father say that morning when he cut himself shaving. The mother, shocked by the profanity, scolds the child — un wittingly reinforcing the vulgar response by giving the bored child attention. Guess what the little girl learns that day?

Observational learning, the third type of learning, was discovered through research on the social behaviour of human beings. Bandura and Walters (1963) have shown that children can learn novel response patterns through observing another's behaviour. No reinforcement or reward is required for such learning to occur. Observational learning does not involve the gradual building up of responses required by operant conditioning.

Language appears to be learned mainly through observation. If children had to learn speech through operant conditioning, they would be senior citizens before they mastered their native language. Each sound, syllable, word, and sentence would have to be uttered spontaneously, then systematically reinforced by the caretakers. Instead, children copy the language behaviour of their adult models (and learn the meaning behind the language forms), just as they imitate other forms of behaviour. Children are especially likely to imitate adult models who are warm, nurturant, and powerful. In families that are functioning effectively, the child's parents provide extremely influential models. Models are also provided when trial-and-error learning is likely to have dangerous consequences; parents show their children how to cross streets and how to drive automobiles. During adolescence, the peer group is influential as a model in the use of verbal expressions, hair styles, clothing, and entertainment preferences (Muuss 1988).

Unintentional learning often occurs through observation, as well as through classical and operant conditioning. Although a father may deliberately demonstrate to his son the movements involved in tying shoelaces, he does not set out to teach the boy his vocal inflections or fadal expressions. Similarly, parents often tell children one thing and model quite another. For example, parents may preach that reading books is worth while but never read books themselves. Their chik is more likely to copy parental deeds than paren

tal words.

Piaget's Cognitive Developmental Approach to Moral Thought

The career of Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget b gan early. At age ten, he published an article a rare albino sparrow in a natural history joum; Four years later, he was considered for a positi as a curator in a Geneva museum. When this a ative child's age was discovered, the offer w hastily withdrawn (Hetherington and Parke 197

Piaget's general theory (1928) considers children think, reason, and remember. The dvelopment of moral thought — a sense of and wrong, an understanding of societal vali — is a particularly important dimension of theory (Piaget 1932). Piaget observed child playing marbles and asked them to explain game to him. He in turn talked to them ab such ethical concepts as stealing, cheating, justice. In many respects, childhood games small scale analogs of society. When children about the rules of the game, they are learning their level, about the norms of society. Simil when they leam to play game roles, they are learning something about playing societal re

From his observations and discussions concluded that two stages of ftoral thought Children from four to seven years old displa more primitive level of morality, moral real The second stage, moral autonomy, devi around the age of eight. Several characterist associated with each stage.

The moral realist judges wrongdoing in of the outcome of the act. Extenuating di stances and the intentions of the wrongdo disregarded. For example, Piaget told his su stories about two boys, John and Henry, and them to decide which boy deserved the me vere punishment. John was summoned dinner table. He came immediately. As he the dining room, he knocked over a teacar unknown to him, had been left behind the John's collision with the teacart resulted in The druggist was charging $2,000. ten times what the drug cost him to make. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No." The husband got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should the husband ham done that? (Kohlberg, 1969)

From his analysis of boys' responses to these dilemmas, Kohlberg concluded that moral thought develops through six stages rather than the two hypothesized by Piaget.

Gilligan (1982) discovered that both Piaget and Kohlberg had based their ideas about moral development on research conducted almost exclusively with male samples. From her own observations of people of both sexes, Gilligan maintains that females and males speak with different "moral voices." The male justice orientation is concerned with preserving rights, upholding principles, and obeying rules, while the female care orientation speaks of concern for, connectedness with, and sensitivity to other people. For example, 11-year-old Jake was clear that Heinz should steal the drug. Jake saw the moral dilemma as "sort of a math problem with humans." He reasoned that while laws are necessary to maintain social order, a judge would give Heinz the lightest possible sentence. By contrast, Amy, also a sixth-grader, argued that Heinz should not steal the drug. Her reasoning was grounded not in law but rather on the effect that the theft would have on the relationship between Heinz and his wife.

If he stole the drug. he might save his wife then, but if he did, he might have to go to jail, and then his wife might get sicker again, and he couldn't get more of the drug. ... So, they should really just talk it out and find some other way to make the money.
(Gilligan 1982)

C.H. Cooley

One of the earliest scholars to tackle this problem was C.H. Cooley. In his book. Social Organisation, he writes that "self and society are twin-born", that "we know one as immediately as we know the other", and further that "the notion of a separate and independent ego is an illusion". In other words, self-consciousness can arise only in society and it is inseparable from social consciousness. The self, in short, is social. In this connection, we may refer to Cooley's famous "looking glass" conception of the self. The basic idea of this conception is as follows: "the way we imagine ourselves to appear to another person is an essential element in our conception of ourselves. Thus, I am not what I think I am and I am not what you think I am. 1 am what I think you think I am". To Cooley, the proof of this view may be found in our experience that "we are ashamed to seem evasive in the presence of a straight-forward man, cowardly in the presence of a brave one, gross in the presence of a refined one...."?

It follows, therefore, that we make a conscious attempt to show a different self in the presence of different social groups. Two corollaries follow from this inference : (i) that we are different in different groups, and (ii) that we depend upon the presence of other people and group for our conception of ourselves. Having made such a step-by-step analysis, Cooley concludes that the self is social and that it is not possible to develop self-consciousness in the absence of society.

G.H. Mead

G.H. Mead (1863-1931), the philosopher and psychologist, agreed wholeheartedly with Cooley that it is absurd to look at the self or the mind from the viewpoint of an individual organism. Although it may have its focus in the organism, it is undoubtedly a social product and a social phenomenon. The chain of arguments which Mead advances in support of this conclusion and also in support of his theory of "Me" and "I" may be briefly summarised.

The self arises in interaction with the social and non-social environment. The social environment is particularly important. The following example may be cited. The baby cries and mother responds by giving milk or something good. If the mother continues to respond with care and love, the baby will eventually learn to distinguish between the state of affairs when the mother is present and the state of affairs when the mother is absent. The mother will be 'internalised' as an object. Primitive symbolic communication-will be established. Thus, when the baby cries, it will mean "I want mother". The mother's behaviour will convey to him the meaning that 'mother is pleased with me' or that 'mother loves me'. Here we have the beginning of the consciousness of self. The formation of the self thus involves 'taking the role of other', seeing oneself, in imagination, as an object seen by someone else. The child, putting himself in the place of another, not only forms' a concept of himself but also evaluates that concept and invests it with feeling and warmth.

Just as the child teams to develop an attitude towards objects in the environment, so he learns to take the same attitude toward himself that others take toward him. When the mother tells the child that he has done something good or bad, she is not only trying to teach the child what the words mean. She treats the child as an object

toward which she takes a certain attitude and tries to get the child to do the same. He is encouraged to take himself as an object. He evaluates and controls himself the same way he evaluates and controls other object and he does so from the standpoint of someone else, in short, the child is taught to make appropriate responses to his own behaviour as well as to other objects in his environment. This process is characterised by Mead in terms of the I and the 'Me' - the 'Me' being that group of organised attitudes to which the individual responds as an 'I'. He called the acting self the I. The 'Me', on the other hand, is that part of the self which consists of the internalised attitudes of other.

The following illustration given by Mead will be instructive: "Consider a politician or a statesman putting through some project in which he has the attitude of the community in himself. He knows how the community reacts to this proposal. He reacts to this expression of the community in his own experience—he feels with it. He has a sei of organised attitudes which are those of the community. His own contribution, the 'I' in this case, is a project of re-organisation, a project which he brings forward to the community as it is reflected in himself. He himself changes, of course, in so far as he brings, this project forward and makes it a political issue. There has now arisen a new social situation as a result of the project which he is presenting. The whole procedure takes place in his own experience as well as in the general experience of the community. He is successful to the degree that the final 'me' reflects the attitudes of all the community".

Psychoanalytic Theory

Psychoanalytic theory, as formulated by the ennese physician Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), is both a theory of personality and a system of therapy (see Brill 1938). In practice, Freud was not an orthodox Freudian. He insisted that his choanalytic disdples be passive listeners and respond emotionally to their patients. Hovvi Freud himself gossiped, cracked jokes, offeree vice, and often surprised his patients by han them photographs of himself (Time, March 8)

Freud's theory views socialization as soci attempt to tame the child's inborn animal-likt ture. He believed that the roots of human be iour lie in the mind's irrational, uncons dimensions. He assumed that the adult per ality is the product of the child's early experie within the family.

Freud saw the personality as composed of energy systems: the Id, the Ego, and the ego. The Id is the biological basis of person the Ego is the psychological basis of person and the Super-ego is the social basis of person (Shaw and Costanzo 1970).

The Id is the reservoir of inborn, biologic stincts. This "seething cauldron of sex and tility" is wholly unconscious. It seeks imme gratification: it operates according to the pie principle. The selfish, impulsive Id is not in co with the reality of the external world.

Unlike the Id, the Ego develops out of the learning experiences with the environment. the Id's desires were gratified, the Ego would emerge. The Ego encompasses the cognitive tions of thinking, perceiving, and memory. contains the defence mechanisms (such as alization, repression, projection) that have enu from the Ego's previous encounters with re Part of the Ego is conscious and part is ui sdous. The Ego's primary purpose is to dire personality toward realistic goals: it is orit toward the reality principle. Therefore, the Eg diates among the demands of the Id, the Si ego, and the external world.

The Super-ego, or conscience, emerges as suit of the child's identification with her c parents. Through reward, punishment, an ample, the parents communicate society's to the child. When these social values an havioural standards have been "introjec (adopted as the child's own standards), the S ego censors the Id's impulses. This intern; thority also guides the Ego's activities.

Sigmund Freud

If Mead used two components of the self, '1' and .'Me', Freud used three — the *id*, the *ego* and the *super-ego.* The id represents our appetites, those inborn drives that prompt us to act, the impulse to do what we want to do. It seeks pleasure and avoids pain, reminiscent of the famous saying of Jeremy Bentham that "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters. Pain and Pleasure."

We are not, however, permitted to do what we want to do. As social beings we are obliged lo adjust our desires and impulses, so that no social disharmony takes place. The second mechanism of the mind, the ego helps us to do this.

It mediates between the natural impulses of the id and the demands of the society in which we live. The ego thus acts as the manager of the self and facilitates the adjustment of the individual to society.

Apart from social restraint, there is another restraint upon the unfettered play of the impulses. This is the moral restraint. The third mechanism of the mind, the super-ego tells us what is morally right and what is morally wrong. It tells us what ought to be done and what ought to be avoided. The super-ego imposes the moral imperatives of society.

If we take the three components of mind together, it appears that the id and the super-ego stand in two opposite poles. Complications may develop as a result of such opposition. It is understandable that all our impulses cannot be satisfied in the social context. At the same time, all our impulses cannot be restrained either without doing harm to emotional stability of the individual. It is the task of the ego, the manager of the self, to act as an umpire in the perennial conflict between the in-born impulses and drives on the one hand and the 'thousand tongues' of conscience on the other.

The conflict, referred to above, is an internal conflict, the self in conflict with itself. Consciousness of self arises out of this conflict. "It is in the repression of impulse that we become conscious of the fact that there is something else in-the universe than ourselves and it is this consciousness that gives us also the sense of self'.

We have considered the views of three scholars who belong to three distinct disciplines. In spite of their different intellectual orientations, however, they arrive at a conception of the 'self- that required society.

14.4 STAGES OF SOCIALISATION

Socialisation is, in essence, nothing but learning to participate in social roles. The most important things to be internalised are the social roles themselves. But in order to be able to play one particular social role adequately, one must be familiar with the social roles of other persons in the same social system.

In other Words, a child need not only to learn the social roles he himself is expected to play but also the social roles of other persons with whom he will-interact. It is particularly to be noted that internalisation of social roles that a child is required to play vis-a-vis social roles of other persons with whom he comes in contact and interacts is the same thing as the growth of personality. With growing years, a child internalises varied roles which he himself plays as also the roles of other persons. Obviously, at each stage of socialisation, the child internalises a system of roles, and not just one role.

Wa may discuss briefly four stages of socialisation :-

The first stage or the oral stage

In the womb the foetus is warm and comfortable. At birth, the baby faces his first crisis: he must breathe, he must exert himself to be fed, he is susceptible to cold, wet and other discomforts. He cries a good deal in order lo attract attention. During the first stage of socialisation, he seeks to establish what is called oral dependency. By his cries he is able to build up fairly definite expectations about feeding time and 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 and his mother. If the father of anyone else in the family performs the role of the mother in caring for the baby, no role differentiation is made. That person will also be performing the role of 'mother'. At this stage, the baby does not seem to internalise 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 upto the third year. This period is called anal stage because toilet training is the main focus of attention of the socialising agent, particularly mother. During this stage, the child internalises 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 member of the family as a whole. He identifies 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 identifies with a social role, that is, one not only internalises the role but adopts it as one's own. (ii) One identifies with a social group. That is, one internalises 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 that 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.

14.5 SUM UP

1. Through socialization, individuals develop selfhood and acquire the knowledge, skills, and motivations required for them to participate in social life. This symbiotic learning process is functional for both the individual and the society. From the individual's point of view, intense interaction with adult caretakers allows the infant to realize its human potentialities. Later socialization equips the person to handle societal roles. In addition, socialization ensures that commitment to the social order is maintained over time.

2. Sociologists have distinguished four types of socialization. "Primary socialization" refers to the learning that occurs in childhood. It lays the foundation for all later learning. "Adult socialization" describes the socialization that takes place beyond the childhood years. "Antidpatory socialization" is the role-learning that occurs in advance of the actual playing of roles. "ResodaUzation" occurs when a new role orsituation requires that a person replace established patterns of behaviour with new patterns.

3. Since the turn of the century, social scentists have been perplexed about the relative contributions of biology and environment to human development. More recently, however, evidence that both factors interact to transform the infant into a functioning member of society has resulted in the abandonment of the overly simplistic nature/ nurture debate.

4. There are four major theoretical approaches to childhood socialization: learning theory, the cognitive developmental approach, psychoanalytic theory, and symbolic interaction. Learning theory explains the predse mechanisms involved in socialization. Piaget's work focuses on the development of morality. The psychoan"ytic approach analyzes the development of personality structure. The symbolic interactionists emphasize the child's acquisition of language and self. These approaches are complementary, rather than competing, systems of thought.

5. There are four major agents of childhood socialization: the family, the school, the peer group, and the mass media. Because society has given the family and the school a mandate to socialize youngsters, both these agents deliberately attempt to equip their charges with the knowledge and values required to fit into adult society. The influence of the peer group and the media is, for the most part, unintentional.

6. Socialization is a lifelong process. Primary socialization cannot possibly equip

individuals for all the roles and situations they will encounter throughout their lives. Compared to primary socialization, adult socialization tends to concentrate on overt behaviour (as opposed to values and motives). It tends to be realistic, rather than idealistic; to be more specific in content; and to occur in formal organizations, rather than informal contexts. In addition, the relationship between socializer and socialize in the adult situation is marked by lower levels of feeling and power than in the childhood situation.

7. The "oversocialized conception of human beings" is a viewpoint that exaggerates the effectiveness of the socialization process. Socialization does not mold members of society into identical products. Fortunately, there is considerable room for spontaneity and individuality.

14.6 References

1. Kingsley Davis: Human Society, pages 217-218
2. Biersledt: The Social Order, pages 201-208
3. *Ibid,* page 202
4. David Ricsman: The Lonely Crowd.
5. K. Davis: Human Society, page 208
6. C.H. Cooley: Human Nature and the Social Order, page 184 Quoted by Bierstedt
8. G.H, Mead: Mind as the Individual Importation of the Social Process. This article has been incorporated in Readings in Sociology, edited by Alfred McClung Lee, page 86.

14.7 Key Words

Adult socialization. Socialization that takes place after childhood to prepare people for adult roles (for example, husband, mother, computer technician).

Altercasting. Casting the other person in a role we choose for him or her in order to manipulate the situation. Anticipatory socialization. Role-learning that occurs in advance of the actual playing of roles.

Care orientation. Gilligan's feminine orientation to morality, which emphasizes

concern for and connectedness with others.

Classical conditioning. Type of learning that involves the near-simultaneous presentation of an unconditioned stimulus (UCS) and a conditioned stimulus (CS) to an organism in a drive state (that is, a state during which needs such as hunger or thirst require satisfaction). After several trials, the previously neutral stimulus (CS) alone produces the response normally associated with the ucs.

Ego. The director of the Freudian personality. The Ego attempts to mediate among the demands of the Id, the Super-ego, and the external world. The Ego, which encompasses the cognitive functions and the defence mechanisms, is governed by the reality principle.

Generalized other. Mead's "organized community or social group [that] gives to the individual his unity of self." Although the equivalence of terms- is not exact, "reference group" is the more modem way of referring to this notion of the organized attitudes of social groups.

I. The dimension of Mead's notion of self that is active, spontaneous, creative, and unpredictable. The "1" is a component of a process, not a concrete entity.

Id. The reservoir of inborn, biological propensities in the Freudian personality structure. The selfish, impulsive Id operates according to the pleasure principle.

Justice orientation. Gilligan's masculine orientation to morality, which emphasizes preserving rights and upholding principles.

Looking-glass self. Cooley's formulation of the self as the interpreted reflection of others' attitudes- It consists of "the imagination of our appearance to the other person, the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification."

Me. The dimension of Mead's notion of self that represents internalized societal attitudes and expectations. The "Me" is an aspect of a process, not a concrete entity.

Moral autonomy. Piaget's later stage of moral thought, in which children over age eight judge wrongdoing in terms of intentions and extenuating circumstances, as well as consequences, and view rules as social conventions that can be changed.

Moral realism. Piaget's early stage of moral development, in which children from

four to seven years old judge wrongdoing strictly in terms of its consequences, and believe all rules are immutable absolutes.

Observational learning. No reinforcement or reward is required for the initial learning to occur. However, reinforcements do influence where and when learned responses that are in the individual's repertoire (for example, swearing) will be performed.

Operant conditioning. Type of learning whereby the organism gives a number of trial-and-error responses. Those responses followed by reward (positive reinforcement) tend to be repeated on future occasions. Those responses followed by negative reinforcement, or by no reinforcement, tend to be extinguished.

Primary socialization. Socialization that occurs during childhood.

Resocialization. Replacement of established attitudes and behaviour patterns.

Significant other. The particular individuals whose standpoint the child adopts in responding to himself or herself during Mead's play stage.

Socialization. Complex learning process through which individuals develop selfhood and acquire the knowledge, skills and motivations required to participate in social life.

Super-ego. The Freudian conscience, or internalization of societal values and behavioural standards.

COURSE: SOC-C-101	SOCIAL STRATIFICATION	LESSON NO.15
UNIT-IV	AND SOCIAL MOBILITY	SEMESTER-I

STRUCTURE

15.1 Meaning and characteristics

15.2 Origin of stratification

15.3 Forms of Stratification

15.4 Introduction

15.5 Meaning of Social Mobility

15.6 Types of Social Mobility

15.7 Open and Closed Class System

15.8 Factors Affecting Social Mobility

15.9 Consequences of Social Mobility: Functions and Dysfunctions

15.10 Social Stratification and Social Mobility in India

15.11 Modern Trends in Social Stratification and Social Differentiation in India

15.12 Conclusion

15.1 MEANING AND CHARACTERISTICS

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 evaluations, 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.*

Definition

1. *Ogburn and Nimkoff:* "The process by which individuals and groups are ranked in a more or less enduring hierarchy of status is known as stratification."

2. *Gisbert:* "Social stratification is the division of society into permanent groups of categories linked with by the relationship of superiority and subordination."

3. *Melvin M. Tumin:* Social stratification refers to "arrangement of any social group or society ill to a hierarchy of positions that are unequal with regard to power, property, social evaluation, and orpsychic gratification."

4. *Lundberg:* "A stratified society is one marked by inequality, by differences among people that 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".

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 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 " any more than any other society, escape the necessity of ranking people according to their functions. The criterion of rank have changed along with values of society. *P.A. Sorokin* wrote in his *'Social Mobility'* that' *Unstratified society with real equality of its members, is a myth which has never been 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 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.

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 bis 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 qualities.

Further, as *Tumin* has pointed out, the stratification system is - (i) governed by social norms and sanctions, (ii) is likely to be unstable because it may be disturbed by different factors, and (iii) is inlrmately 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' is evident everywhere. Even in the 'nonliterate', 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 plebeians, the *ancient.*

Aryan society into four Varnas: the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and the Shudras, the *ancient Greek Society* into freemen and slaves; the *ancienl Chinese society* into the mandarins, merchants, farmers and the soldiers and so on. Class, caste and estate seem to be the general forms of stratification to be found in the modem 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-chalices'* 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.

15.2 ORIGIN OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

There are two 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 contacting 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. Sorokin 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 consciously filled by the most qualified persons.

The *Conflict Theory of Marx* emphasises conflict between large and small 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.

15.3 FORMS OF STRATIFICATION

It has been that inequalities have been and. continue to exist in all the known societies all over the universe. Even in the societies where wealth, property, or other material means were absent the inequalities existed in terms of sex, age etc. With the growth and development of human society the inequalities have also been increasing and their basis have been under going transformation also. Whatever may have been the basis of inequality, the structuring and legitimization of these have resulted in the emergence of systems of stratification corresponding with particular form of system of inequalities. Social stratification has been defined by Anthony Giddens as "Structured inequalities between different groupings of people. These groupings exist in the forms of strata in a hierarchy. The systems of stratification identified all over the world are slavery, caste, estates and class. While the caste formed a distinct stratification system in the traditional Indian society and even

today continues to have influences on the social structure, social class forms a system of stratification in the modern industrial societies.

The origin of concept of class is traced back from the eighteenth century. This is what even the history of the concept of class suggests. Kolakowski makes mention of the existence of this world in the third book of ethics proposition XLVI. In this it is said "If some one is affected pleasurably or painfully, the fellow will develop love or hatred not towards the stranger who causes pleasure or pains but even to class or nation to which he belongs". In contrary to this the term estate and order has also been used to describe 'social structure'. In the encyclopedia estate refers to those groups which have legal existence - or groups which are organized in some way also represented classes. In Sweden, for example, there were four estates represented by nobility, priesthood, burglers, and peasants. All the four could also be identified with social classes, particularly in terms of Weber's analysis of life styles.

In 1776 Adam Smith in his work Wealth of Nations looked at social structure in terms of three different orders of people divided not on legal basis but on economic basis. The basis of distinction between the three is very crucial as this is the one that demarcates one system from another. The economic base of three orders has been depicted as those who live by rents, those who live by wages, and those who live by profits. These three distinct but basic orders are the expressions of society's division into 'classes'. These social orders constituting important dimension of the society in transition also tend to indicate how the transformation of the very foundation of society's organization takes place. The changing conceptions i.e. estate to class similarly suggest one very important development of the human society. The very foundation of the social structure undergoes transformation from a legal base to an economic base. This transformation is also reflected by the changes taking place in the social structure of the French society. After Adam Smith the term class has come to be used for basic groups in the society. For example, Madison in his work on "class structure in social consciousness" uses class as a scheme of gradation of social groups.

At this juncture it is also significant to refer to the differential usage of the term in the pre and post French revolutionary period. At the beginning of French revolution

the conflict in France was viewed as “struggle between the estates”. Baben however viewed French society, especially after the restoration as divided on the basis of “class antagonism”. Such a shift in the understanding of conflict and social structure of French society is indicative of the fact that though estates and classes could be used interchangeably yet both the terms conveyed different basis of their formation. In the case of former it was legal and for the latter it was economic base.

Ossowsski points out that the use of the term class by Adam Smith, Madison and others was made in an unspecified manner. The rationale of such a class was a possible synonym of group or estate available in colloquial speech (i.e. in day to day general conversation). How far this charge against Smith etc. is correct, it is very difficult to say. Whatever may be the charge against the usage of the term, it certainly reflects on the times prior to the development of capitalism. At the same time, it also exhibits another important dimension i.e. the usage of the term class reflected on the existence of a social order which was a legal rather than economic order.

The historical development of societies in general and the development which took place in the usage of the concept of class i.e. estate to social class, obviously suggest not only the changing nomenclature but also the changing order or social relationships in a society. The transformation in social relationships took place with the transformation in the basic criteria of determination of social position i.e. legal to economic. The change also suggests that the existing social formations and relationship between them may not have been purely class relationships yet one thing is certain that the kind of order which existed was not essentially a class based social order.

A question however arises if the estates were not classes, then what can be the point of departure from where the process of class formation began. In response to the question it is suggested that in the estate system (feudal) the work allocation was authoritarian i.e. a particular vocation followed was not in accordance with individual's WILL but as per allocation. However, with decline in the medieval order the feudal authority also declined resulting in relative freedom of the individuals. In the wake of emerging capitalism the individuals became relatively more free. The legally differentiated estates resulted in the division the society (estate system) into competitive labour market and leading to development of market linkages at various

levels. For instance from local consumable item production to production for expanded and extended market. The changes also followed in different spheres of social and economic spheres of life. The ties of fealty or bondage, with personalized kind of relationships changed into impersonalized relationships guided by market forces. The transformation came in the fused economic and political power by way of emergence of separate commerce and industry on the one hand and state on the other. The structure of economy changed from complete agrarian to urban economy.

Anthony Giddens therefore suggests two things: First, existence of social classes in the pre-class society. Second, the class has also been dynamic in nature with the class system exhibiting changes during the three major periods of time and space, namely Pre class, class, and classless society. This is quite evident from the conception of classes by the leading social philosophers and social scientists.

Karl Marx viewed social classes as the historical entities which have been there in all the hitherto existing societies. A social class in Marxist terms is not defined in terms of work functions, income or consumption patterns but by the relations it bears with the mode of production. He, therefore, argued that in all stratified societies there have always been two major groups. One owning the means of production and as a matter of their ownership control and rule the society. This constituted the bourgeoisie or the "Haves". The other class comprised of those who do not own the means of production but engage themselves in some economic activity i.e. working on the means of production owned by others for the fulfillment of their basic needs. Such a group constituted the proletariat called "Have Nots".

Marx in fact found the class system a dynamic process. Therefore he developed two models of social classes. The first two classes model as outlined in his early writings and has been popularly discussed as the model of social stratification. The second multiple class model, which he developed later and appeared in the third volume of Das capital. The first model, a theoretical position was based in Marx's early speculative philosophical understanding of social development. Although theoretical and speculative philosophy it is argued by many scholars that the analysis of social class, especially with reference to capitalism, cannot be adequate without referring to Karl Marx. Lipset argued "If we were to award the title of father of the study of social class to any individual, it would have to be Marx". It is further

asserted by Anderson "Marxism is a potent theoretical framework for the understanding of social class and for the entire field of political economy". There is considerable amount of social reality as Anderson made this argument while analysing the socio historical and economic foundations of Marx's concept. Another important dimension of Marxist theory of social stratification is that it does not restrict itself to just two classes of bourgeoisie and proletariat. The social classes and the structure of stratification also due to the operation of negation of negation principle are also subjected to change.

Marx's view on social classes as suggested by many was not monolithic but dialectical in nature. On ruling class he wrote "ruling class is never a homogenous group but consists of contradictory elements, the representatives of heavy industry, light industry, finance, capital etc. Their unity remains as long as their interests are held together. Similarly the issue of class-consciousness is vulnerable to causing splits between different groups. Certain workers groups may reflect ruling class ideas and thereby protect the interests of ruling class rather than that of the proletariat.

It is, therefore, suggested that the development of class-consciousness is dialectical and contradictory in structure. Marx himself states that working class consciousness is not a given datum but is created in struggle, struggle can take many forms, from trade union and strike activity to direct political confrontation between the (a) Ruling, and (b) Oppressed Class. There is ongoing struggle between these two classes that determines the relationship between men. In the initial stages the classes act in cooperation with each other. However with the beginning of struggle the process of unification of class begins which transform the character of the class. Subsequently there is emergence of two distinctive categories of classes: (i) Class in itself, (ii) Class for itself. What is meant by these two categories? A class in itself is one in which (a) various strata, although engaged in dissimilar work activities, (b) are united by their broad social and economic ties, (c) being united objectively form a class against capital, (d) but remains in non-conscious of the antagonistic relation with an oppressing class.

A class for itself means, a class in which the members have become (a) profoundly aware of their objective, conflictive connection with another class thus,

(b) develop the appropriate consciousness and (c) action necessary to defend its interests. (It may be noticed that it is not only proletariat but also bourgeousic onsgerisic which becomes class for itself)

These two distinctive forms of classes arise in the process of continuous engagement of the collectivity in the given mode of production. To Marx man's position in the production process provided the crucial life experience which eventually determines the beliefs and actions of the collectivity an aggregate there means group). The experience is gained necessarily in the process of making living with special relation to economic conflict.

It is associated with changing material conditions of life. What facilitates transformation of class in itself to class for itself. According to Marx there are a number of variables which facilitate the process in which class transforms from class in itself to class for itself. (i) Conflicts over the distribution of economic reward between the classes. (ii) Easy communication between the individuals in the same class position - helps in the dissemination of ideas and action programmes. (iii) Growth of class consciousness- members of the class have sense of solidarity. Understanding of their historic role in the production of material constitutions of life. (iv) Dissatisfaction of the lower class over its mobility to control the economic structure - which itself builds but gets exploited and becomes a victim of that i.e. the growing miseries. (v) Organization of class into a political party because of the economic structure, historical situation and maturation of consciousness. In this context Marx writes in the Poverty of Philosophy that an oppressed class is vital condition for every society founded on the antagonism of classes.

The two class model advocated by Marx in his earlier writings should not be takes as find because Marx himself in his later more scientific and historical work repudiates this too simplistic class model. In the historical study "The eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, Marx makes distinction between the number of groups. (i) financial bourgeoisie, (ii) industrial bourgeoisie, (iii) petit bourgeoisie, (iv) proletariat, (v) landlords and (vi) free farmers. In other studies of France and Germany he notes classes like: (i) Bourgeoisie, (ii) petit bourgeoisie, (iii) farmers, (iv) peasants, (v) serfs, (vi) agriculture workers, (vii) Lumpen proletariat, and (viii) feudal lords.

Max Weber argues that having property and lack of property are very significant in explaining class and social stratification as these two are basic basis and characteristics of all class situations. Associated with the property unambiguously is economic interest. These two factors are important in the emergence of class stratification in society. Weber further makes distinction between: (i) property classes; (ii) the working class whose labour is directly exploited by the capitalist; (iii) those who offer services; and (iv) acquisition classes - which expand due to the tendencies within capitalism. This class is composed of merchants, bankers, financers, entrepreneurs, professionals etc.

According to Weber there are three basis of identification of class as well as constitution of a class. First, when a group consisting of a number of individuals has in common specific causal component of their life i.e. "life chances', it implies that there is one common factor which determines the life chances for all the members of a group. The common factor is economic interests in the possession of goods and opportunities for income under the condition of commodity and labour market. The latter means class situation in which individuals are placed in terms of the chances they have in relation to the supply of goods, external living conditions and personal life experiences.

The chances are determined by the amount of power possessed by one to dispose of goods or skills in the economic order. Weber therefore explains class as "a group of people that is found in same class situation in the market situation".

The point Weber emphasises is that classes develop in market economies in which individuals compete for economic gains. Sharing a similar class situation also implies that by virtue of being placed in similar class position the individuals are able to gain similar rewards. The logic of Weber's concept of class in the form of a logical equation is: Similar class situation = Similar chances in market situation, hence similar life chances. A class which means a group of individuals also means that they occupy same class status i.e. a given state of one's being in relation to (i) provision or goods (ii) external conditions of life, and (iii) subjective frustration or satisfaction.

The description of social class by Max Weber in fact acquired significant popularity and his concepts- status group, status honour, reputation and prestige

were used for the empirical analysis of class stratification. W. Llyod Warner, an American sociologist developed an index of various characteristics such as education, residence, income, family background etc. in the study of class stratification. The assumption that Warner has is that in each there is ultimate structure which controls and dominates the thinking and actions of people, i.e. economic, and the value system which is ultimately linked with an economic order. He therefore argued that though the economic order was fundamental yet there was something else which determined one's ranking as high and low in the society. Following Max Weber's conception Warner also accords economic dimension a secondary place in the status determination. He argued that in the empirical situation the requirements of ranking of individuals are education, occupation, wealth, income, family background, speech mannerism, general outward behaviour etc. The status occupied by an individual was summation of all said measures that vouched the evaluation made by the respondents. A status of an individual further depended upon the reputation in his own community and the judgements made by him by others. Similarly, social classes constitute two or more orders of people who are believed to be and accordingly ranked by the members of community in socially superior and inferior positions. Therefore the class of an individual is identified on the basis of same criteria as is done in the case of status. In the process of locating individual in the class hierarchy Warner found that geographic space or the order of ecological settlement was very important.

The class structure developed by Warner indicated that there are minimum six classes in a society. These are: Upper upper, Lower upper, Upper middle, Lower middle, Upper lower and Lower lower. These to him were real social categories and not simply a result of his own fabrication. This was the result of his empirical findings. According to him the class structure of a society exist in a pyramid form. The top positions occupied by a small minority and the level of class comes down the number expands and ultimately results in a pyramid type structure.

In the Indian society most of the studies on social class conducted from non-Marxian perspective have been following Max Weber's approach and in the empirical context Lloyd Warner's empirical criteria of studying social stratification. Generally

the distribution of social classes is made in three distinct categories, namely Upper, Middle and the Lower.

To sum up the class system as a form of social stratification is both a social and historical phenomenon having its traces in the historical time and space. The emergence of social classes has been conditioned by development of society. In this process the role of economic forces has been very crucial. Apart from economic forces the social and political aspects of the society have also been suggested as the factors in the rise of social classes. The typologies of social classes indicate not one but multiple class models depending upon the criteria used by a specific scholar.

15.4 INTRODUCTION

The phenomena of social stratification and social mobility are closely related. A fundamental characteristic of systems of stratification is the extent to which they are open or rigid (closed). How much opportunity a person gets to move from one position to another in society? The study of such movement is the study of social mobility. It is clear that stratification matters, that class position quietly influences one's life chances. It can be important that people have the feeling that they can hold on to or even improve upon their class position in society. But how significant -how frequent, how dramatic- is mobility in a class society such as the United States? Ronald Regan's father was a barber, and Jimmy Carter began as a peasant farmer, yet each man eventually rose to achieve the most powerful and prestigious position in our country.

15.5 MEANING OF SOCIAL MOBILITY

The rise of a child from a poor background to the presidency- or to some other position of great prestige, power, or financial reward is an example of social mobility. The term social mobility refers to movement of individuals or groups from one position of a society's stratification system to another.

The term social mobility refers to movement of individuals or groups from one position of a society's stratification system to another. This is a situation where individuals or groups rise or fall from the stratum to which they have been assigned. The rise of a person from a very poor background to the presidency (e.g., A.P.J. Abdul Kalam, President of India) or to some other position of great prestige, power or financial reward is an example of social mobility. Mobility runs both ways- up and

down. Thus, it is a movement up or down in the social ladder or in social status. Some people fail to maintain their social ladder or in social class rank into which they are born because of loss of wealth or income, acceptance of a lower-status pattern of life. These are the symptoms and processes of downward mobility. In contrast to this, persons who gain in property, income, status or a change in the job of higher rank indicates upward mobility. Upset and Bendix (1960) defined social mobility as "a process by which individuals move from one position to another between such hierarchical arrangements that are to be found in each society".

Thus, "social mobility is a movement up or down the social class hierarchy" (Mike O'Donnell, 1997). It involves change of one's position in the social status hierarchy but does not necessarily involve any structural change in the hierarchy itself. According to Anthony Giddens (2000), "Social Mobility refers to the movement of individuals and groups between different socio-economic positions".

The amount of social mobility is often used as an indicator of the degree of openness and fluidity of a society. Stratification systems, which provide little opportunity for social mobility, is termed as 'closed' (caste system), whereas that with a relatively high rate of social mobility as 'open' (class system).

15.6 TYPES OF SOCIAL MOBILITY

Social mobility can be studied from many angles. It has many dimensions, viz., direction, time and place etc. From the point of view of direction, it can occur in anyone of the directions: from lower to higher (upward mobility), from higher to lower (downward mobility), or between two positions at the same level (horizontal mobility). In addition to the three directions in which movement can take place, there is dimension of time also. That is, changes can occur between generations (inter-generational mobility). Geographical movement involves moving from one place or location to another (neighbourbhood, towns or regions).This is known as lateral mobility..

1. Horizontal Mobility: It refers to the movement of a person from one social position to another of a different rank. "A man moving from one job to another but at much the same level of prestige or income is known as horizontal mobility" (Inkeless, 1965), In brief, moving from one job of equal rank is called horizontal mobility.

2. Vertical Mobility: It refers to the movement of a person from one social position to another of a different rank. It may involve moving upward job of lower rank or downward job of lower rank) in a society's stratification system. Each of these illustrates vertical mobility. According to Inkeles (1965), "movement from one stratum to another up or down anyone of the possible stratification hierarchies is called vertical mobility" .

Most sociological analyses focus on vertical rather than horizontal mobility. The amount of vertical mobility in a society is a major index of the degree of its 'openess', indicating how far talented individuals born into lower strata can move up in socio-economic ladder. Many researches have been conducted since the pioneering study of Pritim Sorokin (Social Mobility, 1927). To mention a few, the studies by David Glass (1949), Blau and Dunken (1967), Upset and Bendix (1960), Erikson and Goldthrope (1993) and Featherman and Hauser (1978) are well known in this field. In India, social mobility (especially mobility in caste structure) studies were initiated by M.N. Srinivas (1950) and later on many other scholars like A.R. Desai (1961), Yogendra Singh (1977), K.L. Sharma (1976) and Andre Beteille (1965) carried on such researches.

Vertical mobility can take three forms: (a) inter-generational, (b) intra-generational, and (c) structured.

(a) Inter-generational mobility: When changes occur from one generation to another, it is known as inter-generational mobility. This type of mobility involves changes in the social position of children relative to their parents. Thus, a bus conductor, whose father was an engineer, provides an example of downward inter-generational mobility. A film star, whose father was a farmer, illustrates upward inter-generational mobility.

(b) Intra-generational mobility: When mobility occurs within one generation, it is called intra-generational or career mobility. It involves changes in person's own social position within his or her adult life. Persons can move up or down the social scale in the course of their working life. A man who enters as a school teacher and eventually becomes an inspector of schools of a district is an ex-

ample of intra-generational upward mobility. Downward intra-generational mobility is not much common.

(c) **Structural/ Stratum mobility**: These terms refer to the vertical movement of a specific group, class or occupation relative to others in the stratification system. For example, modern information technology has made machines and computer technicians more important in society. They are receiving more respect previously reserved for lawyers and scientists. An influx of immigrants may alter class alignments, especially if the new arrivals are disproportionately highly skilled or unskilled. Even in the rigid caste system of India, we are witnessing this change through the process of sanskritisation (propogated by M.N. Srinivas), whereby a low-status group (the sub-caste) attempts to improve itself through structural mobility. Srinivas cited an example of Toddy tapper caste known .as Nadars (south India), who have tried to improve their social standing through emulating the customs, values and style of life of higher castes.

15.7 OPEN AND CLOSED CLASS SYSTEMS

A system in which people are ranked strictly according to individual ability and performance is known as an open class society. An open system implies that the position of each individual is influenced by the person's achieved status. In an open class system, competition among members of society is encouraged. In contrast to this, a system in which status is theoretically based strictly on heredity, is known as a closed class society. Caste provides an example of closed class society or stratification system. An individual automatically belongs to the caste of his parents and, except in rare instances, spends the rest of his life in that status (now some changes are occurring in this situation). By comparison with class system (which is known as open system of stratification), the rate of mobility in caste system is altogether absent. In such societies, social placement is based on ascribed characteristics, such as caste, race or family background, which cannot easily be changed.

No class system (or stratification system) is entirely open or closed. Modern industrial societies tend towards the open class system, while traditional agricultural societies often had caste or estate systems, which restricted social mobility. Negro - white relationships in America are often cited as a caste situation, although the class

differences within each caste make the caste-class concept and designation more useful because it can be used as a measuring stick to determine the freedom of movement in different societies.

15.8 FACTORS AFFECTING SOCIAL MOBILITY

Social mobility depends both on the individual and on the structure of the society in which he lives. Individual mobility is of little use when society allocates its rewards on the basis of ascribed status. On the other hand, an open society is of little help to the individual who does not want to face competitive struggle. In some societies the ambitious youth may find one or two possible channels of mobility open to him, while in many others there may be hundreds of possible routes to higher social status.

It would be incorrect to assume that the degree of social mobility and means of obtaining mobility are the same in all class systems. At many places mobility opportunities are affected by structural factors, such as labour market changes which lead to the rise or decline of an occupational group within social hierarchy. Continuous, immigration is also a significant factor in shaping a society's level of inter-generational and intra-generational mobility.

Education, occupation and income are the main factors that help in lifting one's class status. In brief, the following are some of the major factors which speed up the process of social mobility:" (1) increased technology and substantial change in occupational structure; (2) the growth of large industries and corporations; (3) an increased standard of living; (4) cultivating class-typed modes of behaviour; (5) manipulating associational membership; (6) growth of urban areas; (7) the maintenance of split labour market; (8) differential fertility; (9) open educational opportunities; (10) social and cultural factor's like developed sense of protestant (or secular) ethic; (11) intelligence and talent; and (12) a strategic (planned) marriage system.

15.9 CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL MOBILITY: FUNCTIONS AND DYSFUNCTIONS

It is generally held that social mobility is a sine qua non of modern democratic culture. We at many times say that a closed class society hinders the fulfillment of individual personality and deprives society of the contributions of many talented people.

Mobility brings new opportunities and greater outlets for potential ability but has its own penalties also. It brings emotional strains and threatens patterns of friendship, residence and family ties. It extracts its price from those who compete and aspire for upward social mobility in the following form:

1. Status insecurity: An open class system grants a person a chance to rise but changes him with the fear of failure. There is no guarantee that he will not fall down below his ancestral status. His obligation is not merely to maintain his status but to improve. In the process of improving, he falls pray to status anxiety. Nervous break-downs among such ambitious persons are not uncommon.

2. Strain of new role adjustments: Upward mobility requires the unlearning and re-learning (de-socialisation and re-socialisation) of a great many minor role adjustments. Learning new patterns of speech, etiquette, manners, dress pattern etc. according to new role puts a heavy strain on the mobility-oriented persons.

3. Distribution of primary group relationships: Social mobility often requires geographical mobility. Frequent movements means the disruption of established social relationship, neighbourhood relationships, family friends relationships, working place persons relationships etc. Even the marriage of the mobile couple is sometimes threatened. Upward mobility not only disrupts primary group relationships but this may sometimes lead to loneliness and isolation. Some sociological studies suggest that mental illness may sometimes be the price for either upward or downward social mobility.

The other side of the picture is more confusing. Is a high rate of social mobility worth of cost? If a complex, changing society does not permit upward mobility to the talented and ambitious young people, it runs the risk of turning them into rebels and revolutionaries (as we are witnessing in India these days). A high rate of mobility may tend to stabilize a social order by providing an encouraging outlet to talented persons who are dissatisfied with their social status. Such discontented individuals may turn their energies to seeking personal advancement rather than to social revolution. High mobility has certain other undesired consequences. For instance, it may tend to undermine established traditions and develop in the old people a cranky conservatism. It may lead to anomie for persons who move rapidly through a succession of statuses and roles (Tumin, 1957).

Marx believed that high rate of social mobility would tend to weaken class solidarity. Classes would become increasingly heterogeneous as their members ceased to share similar backgrounds. Class identification and loyalty would weaken since it would be difficult for mobile persons to feel a strong consciousness of kind with members of the class in which they found themselves. As a result, the intensity of class conflict and the potential class consciousness would be reduced. Ralf Dahrendorf (1959) believes that this situation has arrived in modern (western-American) societies. He argues that as a result of high rate of social mobility, the nature of conflict has changed: He remarked "the better the opportunities for mobility in a society, the lower the chance of class-like behaviour among its members". Concluding his ideas, he notes that "although mobility diminishes the coherence of groups as well as the intensity of class conflict, it does not eliminate either".

A number of sociologists have attempted to assess the effects of mobility on social order. For example, Frank Parkin (1968, 1972) has seen the relatively high rate of upward mobility as a 'political safety-valve'. It provides opportunities for many able and ambitious member s of working class to improve their situation. The upward mobile persons pose no threat to social stability. Similar conclusions have been drawn from studies of downward mobility (persons moving down into the working class) that the downward mobility did not lead skidders to reject the social order and so threaten the stability of society. Contrary to this assumption, an Indian sociologist K. L. Sharma (1997), while analyzing downward social mobility, notes, "downward mobility lends greater fluidity to the social structure than upward mobility".

Barriers to Social Mobility

The greatest barrier to social (class) mobility springs from the fact that social classes are sub-cultures which fit the child for participation in the class subculture to which he/she has been socialized. The average low-class child does not have the ambition and study habits needed for upward mobility because he has little chance to learn them in his sub-culture. The process of growing up in a class, thus, sets forces in motion which hrnd one in the same class position.

The followings are the main barriers which hamper or hinder channels of social mobility:

1. Birth and father's position.
2. Social discrimination.
3. Differential access to education, training and motivation.
4. Rigid educational requirements (educational degree of any kind).
5. Lack of development of the necessary qualities.
6. Lack of inherited wealth.

These and many other factors act as impediments in the free flow of persons into their most suitable and desired niches.

15.10 SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY IN INDIA

Social stratification found in India is identified as the caste system. It is associated chiefly with the traditional Hindu culture of the Indian sub-continent. Hindu society in traditional India was divided into four strata: four varnas and a fifth group, the outcaste, whose members were known as 'untouchables'. It is said that the castes or jatis are the outcome of ancient varna system. The varna consists of four categories (Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra), each ranked differently in terms of social honour. Below these four groupings are the 'untouchables'. They are excluded from the performance of 'rituals which confer religious purity. Each varna is sub-divided into castes Uatis) and sub-caste, which in total number were about three thousands. Jatis are occupational groups. They are ranked in terms of ritual purity. The Brahmins or priests, members of highest caste, personify purity, sanctity and holiness. They are the source of learning, wisdom and truth. Only they can perform the most important religious ceremonies. At the other extreme, untouchables are defined as unclean, inferior and impure, a status which affects all their social relationships. In general, the hierarchy of prestige based on notions of ritual purity is mirrored by the hierarchy of power....Inequalities of wealth were usually linked to those of prestige and power (Haralambos, 1981).

Let us briefly examine the chief characteristics of Indian caste system. Kingsley Davis (Human Society, 1967) lists seven features which distinguish Indian castes from other types of groups (social classes):

1. Hereditary caste membership.
2. Closed system of stratification (restricted social mobility).
3. Endogamy (marriage within one's own caste or sub-caste).
4. Commensal restrictions (feeding and social intercourse).
5. Common traditional occupation determined by one's birth.
6. Hierarchical arrangement of castes.
7. Caste ethnocentrism.

Almost similar features of caste system have been mentioned by J.H. Hutton (Caste in India, 1963) and G.S. Ghurye (Caste and Class in India, 1950). Caste determines one's status, identity, education and occupation and one must marry within his own caste (or sub-caste). Although individuals are debarred from moving between castes, caste as a whole can raise in status by changing its customs to imitate a higher caste. This process of change is termed as Sanskritisation by renowned Indian sociologist M.N. Srinivas. In the caste system there was no possibility of an individual moving up or going down in the hierarchy since he belonged to the group in which he was born. Any social mobility was only possible in terms of the group as a whole in one area. Such a mobility, though rare, did happen.

Many studies relating to the social mobility in India are centred on the mobility in caste structure. Srinivas who initiated such studies emphasized Sanskritisation and westernization as conceptual tools for understanding mobility in caste system. He holds that 'corporate mobility' still remains basic at the caste or jati level, as familial mobility does not obtain public recognisation. The concept of Sanskritisation is 'cultural bound', it covers only socio-cultural aspects of change and confines to 'group mobility' of a caste only. It does not take note of mobility that takes place" at the familial and individual levels and also the motives and factors that underlie such mobility. Therefore, the utility of the concept of Sanskritisation to understand social mobility in India is limited. This concept has been severely criticized by Indian and many western sociologists on different grounds. For example", Yogendra Singh (1973) notes: "I do not think that cultural mobility as visualized by Srinivas can bring about structural changes." K.L. Sharma (1980) argues: "These efforts to move up in caste hier-

archy without corresponding economic elevation have failed." Moreover, change within or between castes does not necessarily constitute mobility within the caste system (Lynch, 1968). K. L. Sharma (1980) suggested that mobility is to be analysed at three levels: individual, familial and group levels. These three levels of mobility encompass the entirely of mobility in caste structure. It would also help us to understand the social mobility at structural level.

15.11 MODERN TRENDS IN SOCIAL STRATIFICATION & SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION IN INDIA

There is a clear trend toward class decomposition in India. Mebers of social classes (and even castes) become less similar to one another. There is a progressive social differentiation, i.e., even people from the same backgrounds become increasingly dissimilar to one another. Members of bourgeoisie become divided between owner and managers; the working class becomes divided according to the region they live intheir level of skills and a growing diversity of lifestyles and consumption pattern. The middle class also becomes increasingly heterogeneous with divisios beers and those working in private industry. A Survey conducted between 1986 and 1995 by the National Council of APplied Economic Research (NCAER) in New Delhi had already found that India's consumers could be divided into five classes, not three : (1) the very rich, of six million (half the conventional estimate), (3) the 'climbers' (a lower-middle class of 275 million, (4) the 'aspirants' (another 275 million who in America or Europe would be classified as 'poor'), and finally (5) the destitute (210 million). Of course, the number have gone up by another (100 million) or so in the decade since the survey was conducted, but the relative balance amongstthese five classes, despite some progress in all of them, is unlikely to have changed dramatically. This change can be attributed to the economic transformation of India since liberalization and globalization after 1991. Shrinking jobs in public sector, and consequent privatization, has also affected class structure in India. All these changes have helped in swelling up in the ranks of middle class.

15. 12 CONCLUSION

Srinivas asserts that mobility characterstics of caste results only 'positional' changes of particular sections of a caste and did not lead to 'structural' changes in the system as a whole. He writes; "A low caste was able, in a generation or two, to rise to a higher position, in the hierarchy by adopting vegetarianism and teetotalism and by sanskritising its rital and pantheon. However, the mobility associated with Sanskritisation results only in positional changes in the system and does not lead to any structural change a caste moves up above its neighbours, and another comes down, but all this takes place in an essentially stable hierarchical order. The system itself does not change." For instance, Sudra continues to be a Sudra but because he3 has adopted vegetarianism etc., he may move up slightly in the scale of jatis within the tgiven varna.

———————

Directorate of Distance Education

UNIVERSITY OF JAMMU

JAMMU

Study Material

FOR

MDP SOCIOLOGY

SEMESTER - I

BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCIOLOGY

COURSE NO. SOC-C-101 **LESSON NO. 1 – 15**

COURSE CO-ORDINATOR
Prof. Abha Chauhan
H.O.D, Deptt. of Sociology
University of Jammu

Teacher Incharge
Dr. Neha Vij
P.G. Sociology
University of Jammu

http:/www.distanceeducationju.in
Printed & Published on behalf of the Directorate of Distance Education, University of Jammu by the Director, DDE, University of Jammu, Jammu.

COURSE NO. SOC-C-101

Course Contributors :

Prof. J.R. Panda
Prof. B.K. Nagla
Prof. Madhu Nagla
Prof. Paramjit Singh Judge
Prof. Gurpreet Bal
Prof. Abha Chauhan
Prof. Vishav Raksha
Dr. Neharica Subash
Dr. Nisha Sharma

© Directorate of Distance Education, University of Jammu, Jammu, 2020

- All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the DDE, University of Jammu.
- The script writer shall be responsible for the lesson/script submitted to the DDE and any plagiarism shall be his/her entire responsibility

Printed at :- Sudesh Printers/Aug. 2020/650 Books