



2014-15

SOCIOLOGY

By **Vikash Ranjan**
(Author & IAS Mentor)

Beginners Guide

www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

www.iasmentors.org

#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473

11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi #8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473

Note: Content not to be republished in any form without permission of author

Vikash Ranjan

Beginner's Guide

What Is Sociology?

Page | 2

Sociology, in the broadest sense, is the study of society. Sociology is a discipline that examines how humans interact with each other and how human behavior is shaped by social structures (groups, communities, organizations), social categories (age, sex, class, race, etc.), and social institutions (politics, religion, education, etc.). ***The basic foundation of sociology is the belief that a person's attitudes, actions, and opportunities are shaped by all of these aspects of society. The sociological perspective is fourfold: Individuals belong to groups; groups influence our behavior; groups take on characteristics that are independent of their members (i.e. the whole is greater than the sum of its parts); and sociologists focus on behavior patterns of groups, such as differences based on sex, race, age, class, etc.***

- Sociology does not claim to be a potentially all-inclusive and all-sufficing science of society which might absorb the more specialized social sciences. The late origin of sociology does not mean that its standing as compared with other social sciences is very weak. Its scope has been clearly demarcated right from the early days. Its concepts, terms, typologies and generalizations leading to theories, emerged from the very beginning. Moreover, there are striking similarities between sociology and other social sciences: man as a principal ingredient of their subject matters, applications of some methodological tools like observation, comparative method, casual explanations, testing and modification of hypothesis etc.
- When so much is common to sociology on the one hand and the other social sciences it is understandable that there is some amount of commonness in the studies as well as mutual borrowings in the form of data, methods, approaches, concepts and even vocabulary.
- In brief, sociology is a distinct social science, but it is not an isolated social science as the current trends indicate that every social science is depending more and more on inter-disciplinary approach, that is, historians and sociologists, for example, might even work together in curricular and search projects which would have been scarcely conceivable prior to about 1945, when each social science tendered to follow the course that emerged in the 19th century; to be confined to a single, distinguishable, though artificial, area of social reality.
- Ever since the beginning of sociology, sociologists have shown a great concern in man and in the dynamics of society. It is quite natural that sociologists have developed different approaches from time to time in their attempts to enrich its study.
- The main concern of sociology is sociological analysis. It means the sociology seeks to provide an analysis of human society and culture with a sociological perspective. He evinces his interest in the evolution of society and tries to reconstruct the major stages in the evolutionary process. An attempt is also made to analyze the factors and forces underlying historical transformation of society.
- Sociology has given sufficient attention to the study of primary units of social life. In this area it is concerned with social acts and social relationships, individual personality, groups of all varieties, communities, associations, organization and population.
- Sociology has been concerned with the development, structure and function of a wide variety of basic social institutions such as the family and kinship, religion and property, economic, political, legal, educational and scientific, recreational and welfare, aesthetic and expressive institutions.
- Sociologists are concerned with the task of formulating concepts, propositions and theories. Sociology has placed high premium on the method of research also. Contemporary sociology has tended to become more and more rational and empirical rather than philosophical and idealistic.
- The fundamental social processes such as cooperation and competition, accommodation and assimilation, social conflict including war and revolution, communication including opinion, formation, expression and change, social control and deviance including crime, suicide, social integration and social change assume prominence in sociological studies. Many specialized studies such as sociology of knowledge, sociology of medicine, sociology of law etc have emerged.

Vikash Ranjan

- Sociology focuses on human interaction on the mutual and reciprocal influencing by two or more people of each other's feelings, attitudes and actions. Sociology does not so much focus on what occurs within people as it does on what transpires between people. Hence the focus of sociological inquiry is on people as social beings- their activities in relation to one another. Sociologists are interested in the way people structure their relationships the manner in which their social ties with others are formed, sustained and changed.

Page | 3

Impact Of Revolutions On Sociology

- The beginning of tradition of social sciences has been one of the major developments of the 19th century. It is often said that social sciences are mostly understood as responses to the problem of order that was created in men's minds by the weakening of the old order under the blows of French Revolution and Industrial Revolution. The European society was hard hit by these revolutions. The old order that rested on kinship, land, social class, religion, local community and monarchy became very shaky. Thinkers were more concerned about finding ways and means of reconsolidating these elements of social order. Hence the history of 19th century politics, industry and trade is basically about the practical efforts of human beings to reconsolidate these elements. The history of 19th century meant new contents and meaning to the doctrine of sociology. A new wave of intellectual and philosophical thoughts was let loose in Europe.
- Intellectual currents in the form of socio-political ideologies were also witnessed. The ideologies of individualism, socialism, utilitarianism, and utopianism took birth. Thinkers and intellectuals floated new ideologies and spread novel ideas.

The Bearings of World Revolutions on Origin and Growth of Sociology:

- Thus it is inevitable to establish interconnectivity between American War of Independence and growth of sociology.
- French revolution has important bearings on growth and development of sociology. When social history looks into the reasons behind French Revolution, ideological support the revolution received from the intellectuals, middle class and lower clergy and the consequence of French revolution to its contrast, sociology looks for the ideology glorified during the revolution period offering an intellectual foundation to the growth of sociology. French revolution and Rousseau are synonymous to each other. Rousseau was a liberal and radical as well who believed that man is rational therefore he has capacity of establishing interlink age between individual will and collective will from out of which develops general will establishing organic interlink ages between individual and society. He further believes that man when driven by self-love there is a possibility of emergence of crisis in society. Therefore his self-love will be so designed that it corresponds with sympathy giving rise to harmonic union between individual and society.
- This argument of Rousseau is foundation to sociology of Comte and exclusively sociology of Durkheim. Hence it can be concluded that Rousseau's theory of general will, his explanation of equality, liberty and man as a moral savage living happily in the state of nature and inequalities as social evils directly influenced the writings of Karl Marx and Durkheim who are two founding pillars of sociology. Hence French Revolution offered an ideological support for the origin and development of sociology.
- Industrial Revolution was greatly instrumental in transforming the structural character of a small community focused pre-literate simple society into a diversified, technologically complex occupationally divergent highly populous modern society. Social change was driven by economic growth and industry gave rise to mass production, appropriation of surplus, profitability, class structure, growth of markets, impersonal relations between people, growing importance on laws and comprehensive change in social relationships, economic structure and interpersonal relationships between individuals. A shift from simple to complex society was considered as a disaster by the conservatives who believed that future is dark; there is no source for solace in modern society, decline of religion has given rise to moral crisis therefore purpose of life is lost. For eternal happiness man must have to get back to past. This argument developed by Mastaire and Bonald is still having profound appeal in contemporary sociology.

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 4

- However this conservative reaction is dismissed by rational scholars like J.S Mills who advocates that man is rational enough to distinguish between quantitative and qualitative happiness. Using their rational mind collectivity can decide in which direction the society must have to move. They give importance on liberal education, free thinking, scientific temper, the notion of collective justice and importance of law to regulate human action driving him in the direction of progress and development. Freedom to man and to his action is also emphasized by Classical Economists who advocated that man and society work together in a rational manner for the economic development of society and individuals.
- **American war of Independence** gave way to establishment of democracy in American society. Tocquaville in his book *Democracy in America* advocated that the growth of democracy was instrumental for the development of capitalism in America. C Wright Mills advocated that democracy is different from socialism because it reproduces the elements of an open society whereas socialism develops closed features. democracy in America was considered as an ideal form of governance system. Thus different notions of the world abandoning their traditional system of administration went for democracy, bureaucracy contributing for complete transformation in their structural character. The American War of Independence enormously contributed to the social changes a major area of interest of sociology.
- sociology is able to establish a balance between theories and facts successfully using scientific methods to study social actions, its outcomes such as social institutions and social groups which are subjected to both continuity and change. The sociologists are using different theoretical paradigms and ideological support they have been receiving from world revolutions and renaissance. Thus it will be impossible to think about the origin of sociology in isolation to economic changes, political transformation and ideological changes that western European societies witnessed from 14th to 19th centuries. Sociology no doubt emerged as a reaction to various revolutions such as technological, social, cultural, moral, spiritual and ideological.
- **The early sociologists were greatly influenced by the changes in a pattern of life** which they saw going on around them as industrialization proceeded, and they were often deeply disturbed by what they saw. It is important to stress at this point that *these early sociologists were not intensely 'radical' individuals, but rather could frequently be more accurately labeled as 'conservatives' made uneasy by the changes they were observing in the society.* Nevertheless, they were greatly **concerned with the idea of obtaining exact knowledge of the workings of society, and, living**. There was profound impact of Scientific revolution on these early sociologists. They thought the **natural science methods to the study of society** might produce similar advances in understanding of society. Thus, from the very beginning, there was a great emphasise on the need to analyse social life scientifically. **Auguste Comte, the 'founder' of Sociology, stressed the adoption of a scientific method** of analyzing society so that we might improve society through a thorough understanding of it. He summed up his approach in his famous phrase **'To know, to predict, to control.'** This early emphasis on the 'scientific' analysis of social life was to have (and still has) considerable implications for the subsequent development of the discipline. The credit for having established sociology into an independent and a separate science and to obtain for sociology a respectable position in the family of social sciences goes to Comte and Spencer. Both of them championed the cause of sociology. In addition to Comte and Spencer, other thinkers such as Durkheim, Marx and Weber also took a leading role in making sociology as science. Hence these five thinkers are often called the **"pioneers" or "founding fathers of sociology"**.

Early European Sociology:

The works of several nineteenth-century scholars provided the foundation for contemporary sociology. One of the first was Auguste Comte, often credited with being the founder of sociology.

Auguste Comte [1798 - 1857]

- Auguste Comte, the French Philosopher, is traditionally considered the *"Father of Sociology"*. Comte who invented the term "Sociology" ***was the first man to distinguish the subject-matter of***

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 5

sociology from all the other sciences. He worked out in a series of books, a general approach to the study of society. Comte is regarded as the "**Father of sociology**" not because of any significant contributions to the science as such, but because of the great influence he had upon it.

- Comte introduced the word "**sociology**" for the first time in his famous work "*Positive Philosophy*" at about 1839. The term "Sociology" is derived from the Latin word **Socius**, meaning companion or associate, and the Greek word **logos**, meaning *study* or *science*. Thus, the etymological meaning of sociology is the *science of society*. He defined sociology as the science of social phenomena "*subject to natural and invariable laws, the discovery of which is the object investigation.*"
- Comte devoted his main efforts to **an inquiry into the nature of human knowledge** and *tried to classify all knowledge* and to analyse the methods of achieving it. He concentrated his efforts to **determine the nature of human society and the laws and principles underlying its growth and development.** He also laboured to establish the methods to be employed in studying social phenomena.
- **Comte believed that the sciences follow one another in a definite and logical order and that all inquiry goes through certain stages (namely, the theological, the metaphysical and the 'positive or scientific or empirical').** Finally, they arrive at the last or scientific stage or as he called the positive stage. **In the positive stage, objective observation is substituted for speculation.** **Social phenomena** like physical phenomena, he maintained, can be studied objectively by making use of the positive method. **He thought that it was time for inquiries into social problems and social phenomena to enter into this last stage.** So, he recommended that the **study of society be called the science of society.** i.e. 'sociology'.
- Comte proposed sociology to be studied in two main parts: **the social statics and the social dynamics.** These two concepts represent a **basic division in the subject-matter of sociology.** The 'social statics' deals with the major institutions of society such as family, economy or polity. **Sociology** is conceived of as the **study of inter-relations between such institutions.** In the words of Comte, "*the statistical study of sociology consists, the investigations of laws of action and reaction of different parts of the social system*". He argued that the parts of a society cannot be studied separately, "as if they had an independent existence".
- '**Social dynamic's** focuses on *whole societies as the unit of analysis and reveals how they developed and changed through time.* "We must remember that the laws of social dynamics are most recognisable when they relate to the largest societies", he said. Comte was convinced that all societies moved through certain fixed stages of development and that progressed towards ever increasing perfection. He felt that **the comparative study of societies as "wholes" was major subject for sociological analysis.**

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

- ✓ Comte gave to '**sociology**' its name and laid its foundation so that it could develop into an independent and a separate science.
- ✓ Comte's insistence on '**positive approach, objectivity and scientific attitude**' contributed to the progress of social sciences in general.
- ✓ Comte, through his "**Law of Three Stages**" clearly established the close association between '**intellectual evolution and social progress**'.
- ✓ Comte's '**classification of sciences**' drives home the fact that '**sociology depends heavily on the achievements of other sciences**'. The 'interdisciplinary approach' of the modern times is in tune with the Comteian view.
- ✓ Comte gave maximum '**importance to the scientific method**'. He criticized the attitude of the armchair social philosophers and stressed the need to follow the method of science.
- ✓ Comte divided the study of sociology into two broad areas: '**social statics**' and "**social dynamics**". Present day sociologists have retained them in the form of '**social structure and function**' and '**social change and progress**'.
- ✓ Comte had argued that sociology was not just a "**pure**" science, but an '**applied**' science also. He believed that sociology should help to solve the problems of society. This insistence on the practical aspect of sociology led to the development of various applied fields of sociology such as "**social work**", "**social welfare**", etc.

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

- ✓ Comte also contributed to the **development of theoretical sociology**.
- ✓ Comte upheld the '**moral order**' in the society. The importance which he attached to morality highly impressed, the later writers such, as *Arnold Toynbee* and *Pitrim A. Sorokin*.
- ✓ Comte's famous books '*Positive Philosophy*' and, "*Positive Polity*" are memorable contributions to the development of sociological literature.

Page | 6 **Harriet Martineau (1802–1876):**

- Harriet Martineau grew up in England. In 1853, she translated Comte's six-volume *Positive Philosophy* into English and condensed it into two volumes, thus introducing sociology to England. Martineau made her own contribution to sociology with *Society in America*, one of the first and most thorough sociological treatises on American social life and one of the first to compare the system of social stratification in Europe to that in America. She took sociology from the realm of ideas to the arena of practice in *How to Observe Manners and Morals*, published in 1838 and one of the first books to focus on sociological research methods.
- Although Martineau introduced sociology to England, it was Herbert Spencer's controversial application of sociology that gained attention and support from wealthy industrialists and government officials in England and throughout Europe.

Herbert Spencer [1820 - 1903]

- Observing the negative aspects of the Industrial Revolution in England—the struggle, competition, and violence—Herbert Spencer developed a theoretical approach to understanding society that relied on evolutionary doctrine.
- To explain both social structure and social changes, he used an *organic analogy* that compared society to a living organism made up of interdependent parts— ideas that ultimately contributed to the structural functionalist perspective in sociology. Using the phrase “survival of the fittest” even before Charles Darwin's landmark *On the Origin of Species* ([1859] 1964) was published, Spencer's *social Darwinism* concluded that the evolution of society and the survival of those within it were directly linked to their ability to adapt to changing conditions.
- According to Spencer, a free and competitive marketplace without governmental interference was essential so that the best and the brightest would succeed and, in turn, help build a stronger economy and society.
- Spencer opposed welfare or any other means of helping the weak or the poor, believing that such efforts would weaken society in the long term by helping the “unfit” to survive. These ideas appealed to wealthy industrialists and government officials, who used Spencer's theory to scientifically support policies and practices that helped them maintain their wealth, power, and prestige at the expense of those less fortunate.
- His three volumes of "*Principles of Sociology*", published in 1877 were **the first systematic study devoted mainly to the sociological analysis**. He was much more precise than Comte in specifying the topics or special fields of sociology.
- According to Spencer, **the fields of sociology are: the family, politics, religion, social control and industry or work**. He also mentioned the sociological study of as associations, communities, the division of labour, social differentiation, and stratification, the sociology of knowledge and of science, and the study of arts and aesthetics.
- Spencer stressed the obligation of sociology to deal with the inter-reactions between the different elements of society, to give an account of **how the parts influence the whole and are in turn reacted upon**. He insisted that sociology should take the whole society as its unit for analysis. He maintained that the parts of society were not arranged unsystematically. The parts bore some constant relation and this made society as such a **meaningful 'entity'**, a fit subject for scientific inquiry.

KARL MARX (1818 - 1883)

- *Marx was trained in history, economics, and philosophy, but his ideas reflect sociological thinking. Observing the same social conditions as Spencer, he drew very different conclusions about their origins.*

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

Marx declared that the unequal distribution of wealth, power, and other limited resources in society was not the result of “natural laws,” but was caused by social forces—specifically, the exploitation of one social class by another. He insisted that social structure and the political and economic institutions that people took for granted were not the result of natural evolution or social consensus but reflected the opposed interests of different social Classes.

Page | 7

- **Marx believed that society consisted of two basic social classes:** the “haves” and the “have-nots.” According to Marx’s viewpoint, the *bourgeoisie* (haves), the powerful ruling class, had assumed power not because they were the “fittest,” but because they owned and controlled the means of production. He believed the bourgeoisie used deception, fraud, and violence to usurp the production of the *proletariat* (have-nots), or working class, whose labor created most of society’s goods—and hence, its profits.
- **Marx was not a detached social observer but an outspoken social critic. He concluded that a slow, natural evolutionary process would not bring about necessary social changes.** Rather, his analysis called for a major social revolution in which the proletariat would rise up, forcibly overthrow the bourgeoisie, and form a new, classless society.
- **In such a society, Marx wrote, everyone would contribute according to his or her abilities and receive from society based on need. Marx’s focus on social conflict was unsettling to many—especially those whom he described as the bourgeoisie.** They were relieved when Émile Durkheim’s more palatable social analysis emerged and shifted the focus of sociology back to a more conservative approach called *functionalism*.

EMILE DURKHEIM (1858-1917)

- **Unlike Marx, who focused on social conflict, French sociologist Émile Durkheim was primarily concerned with social order.** He believed that *social solidarity*, or the social bonds developed by individuals to their society, created social order. Durkheim believed that social solidarity could be categorized into two types: *mechanical solidarity*, the type found in simple rural societies based on tradition and unity, **and organic solidarity**, which was found in urban societies and was based more on a complex division of labor and formal organizations.
- **One of Durkheim’s most important contributions to sociology was his study *Suicide* ([1897] 1951), which demonstrated that abstract sociological theories can be applied to a very real social problem. More important, it showed that suicide, believed to be a private, individualized, and personal act, can best be explained from a sociological viewpoint.**
- **By looking at suicide rates instead of individual suicides, Durkheim linked suicide to social integration—the extent to which individuals feel they are a meaningful part of society.** Those with the strongest social bonds are less likely to commit suicide than those who are less meaningfully integrated and have weaker social bonds. **For example**, his data demonstrated that married people had lower suicide rates than those who were single or divorced; people in the workforce had lower rates than those who were unemployed; and church members had lower rates than non-members. Moreover, those religions that promote the strongest social bonds among their members (e.g., Catholicism and Judaism) had much lower suicide rates than less structured religions (e.g., Protestantism). Today, over a century later, these patterns in suicide, and others discerned by Durkheim’s early study, still persist.

MAX WEBER (1864-1920)

- **Max Weber, a contemporary of Durkheim, was concerned that many sociologists, especially his fellow German, Karl Marx, allowed their personal values to influence their theories and research.** Weber insisted that sociologists should be *value-free*—analyzing what society is, rather than what they think it should be. Weber did not advocate a cold, impersonal approach to sociology, however; he argued that understanding the meaning of social interaction requires *Verstehen*, an empathetic and introspective analysis of the interaction. In other words, Weber believed that researchers should avoid their personal biases and put themselves in the place of those they study, to understand better how they experience the world and society’s impact on them.
- **One of Weber’s most important contributions to sociology was his concept of the ideal type, a conceptual model or typology constructed from the direct observation of a number of specific cases and**

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 8

representing the essential qualities found in those cases. By ideal type, Weber was referring to a generalization based on many specific examples, not implying that something was necessarily desirable. For example, Weber used bureaucracy as an ideal type to analyze and explain the increasing rationalization and depersonalization that is part of formal organizations. Weber contended that to maximize efficiency, formal organizations, such as private businesses, educational institutions, and governmental agencies, had become and would continue to become increasingly bureaucratic. Although Weber contended that bureaucracy as an ideal type represented the most rational and efficient organizational strategy, he also warned of its depersonalizing and dehumanizing aspects.

Contributions of These Four Pioneers of Sociology in Common

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

- *Firstly*, all of them urged the **sociologists to study a wide range of institutions from the family to the state.**
- *Secondly*, they agreed that **a unique subject-matter for sociology is found in the interrelations among different institutions.**
- *Thirdly*, they came to the common consensus on the opinion that **society as a whole can be taken as a distinctive unit of sociological analysis.** They assigned sociology the task of explaining wherein and why societies are alike or different.

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

Story of Spread and Popularity of Sociology

- *Although we have located the beginnings of Sociology in Western Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century, its development and acceptance as an academic discipline was not a uniform process. The early classical works in Sociology of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were produced in France and Germany, with Emile Durkheim in France and Karl Marx and Max Weber in Germany as the outstanding figures.* The works of these 'classical' sociologists still occupy a position of profound importance in contemporary theoretical debates. ***Sociology developed markedly in the USA too, and received more wide spread acceptance there than in Britain.*** In many ways of USA till early in this century was ideal sociological material – a rapidly expanding and industrializing, cosmopolitan, immigrant-based society that was experiencing a wide range of social changes. Transplanted to U.S. soil, sociology first took root at the University of Kansas in 1890, at the University of Chicago in 1892, and at Atlanta University (then an all-black school) in 1897. From there, sociology spread rapidly throughout North America, jumping from four instructors offering courses in 1880 to 225 instructors and 59 sociology departments just 20 years later.
- **The University of Chicago** initially dominated North American sociology. Albion Small (1854–1926), who founded this department, also launched the *American Journal of Sociology* and was its editor from 1895 to 1925.
- As in Europe, the onset of rapid industrialization and urbanization, and accompanying social problems, gave impetus to the development of sociology in the United States. American sociologists built on and expanded the theories and ideas of the European founders of sociology.
- **Lester F. Ward (1841–1913)** Lester Ward is often considered the first systematic American sociologist. He attempted to synthesize the major theoretical ideas of Comte and Spencer and differentiated between what he called **pure sociology**—*the study of society in an effort to understand and explain the natural laws that govern its evolution*— and **applied sociology**, which uses *sociological principles, social ideals, and ethical considerations to improve society*. The distinctions between these two areas of sociology are still made today.
- **Jane Addams:** Of the many early sociologists who combined the role of sociologist with that of social reformer, none was as successful as Jane Addams (1860–1935), who was a member of the American Sociological Society from its founding in 1895. Like Harriet Martineau, Addams, too, came

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi #8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 9

from a background of wealth and privilege. She attended the Women's Medical College of Philadelphia, but dropped out because of illness (Addams 1910/1981). On a trip to Europe, Addams saw the work being done to help London's poor. The memory wouldn't leave her, she said, and she decided to work for social justice. In 1889, Addams co-founded Hull-House with Ellen Gates Starr. Located in Chicago's notorious slums, Hull-House was open to people who needed refuge—to immigrants, the sick, the aged, the poor. Sociologists from the nearby University of Chicago were frequent visitors at Hull-House. With her piercing insights into the exploitation of workers and the adjustment of immigrants to city life, Addams strove to bridge the gap between the powerful and the powerless. She co-founded the American Civil Liberties Union and campaigned for the eight-hour work day and for laws against child labor. She wrote books on poverty, democracy, and peace. Adams' writings and efforts at social reform were so outstanding that in 1931, she was a co-winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace. She and Emily Greene Balch are the only sociologists to have won this coveted award.

- **Margaret Sanger (1883–1966):** Another notable social reformer, Margaret Sanger applied sociological theories to problems of population, health, and women's rights. After watching a poor working woman die from a self-induced abortion, she began publishing *Woman Rebel*, a journal aimed at raising the consciousness of working-class women. Her articles covered topics ranging from personal hygiene, venereal disease, and birth control to social revolution.
- **William E. B. Dubois (1868–1963):** E. B. Du Bois (1868–1963). After earning a bachelor's degree from Fisk University, Du Bois became the first African American to earn a doctorate at Harvard. He then studied at the University of Berlin, where he attended lectures by Max Weber. After teaching Greek and Latin at Wilberforce University, in 1897 Du Bois moved to Atlanta University to teach sociology and do research. He remained there for most of his career.
 - ✓ It is difficult to grasp how racist society was at this time. As Du Bois passed a butcher shop in Georgia one day, he saw the fingers of a lynching victim displayed in the window. When Du Bois went to national meetings of the American Sociological Society, restaurants and hotels would not allow him to eat or room with the white sociologists. How times have changed. Today, sociologists would not only boycott such establishments, but also refuse to hold meetings in that state. At that time, however, racism, like sexism, prevailed throughout society, rendering it mostly invisible to white sociologists. Du Bois eventually became such an outspoken critic of racism that the U.S. State Department, fearing he would criticize the United States, refused to issue him a passport (Du Bois 1968).
 - ✓ Each year between 1896 and 1914, Du Bois published a book on relations between African Americans and whites. Not content to collect and interpret objective data, Du Bois, along with Jane Addams and others from Hull-House was one of the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (Deegan 1988). Continuing to battle racism both as a sociologist and as a journalist, Du Bois eventually embraced revolutionary Marxism. At age 93, dismayed that so little improvement had been made in race relations, he moved to Ghana, where he is buried (Stark 1989).
 - ✓ In his writings, Du Bois pointed out that some successful African Americans were breaking their ties with other African Americans in order to win acceptance by whites. This, he said, weakened the African American community by depriving it of their influence. Taken from a 1903 book by Du Bois, the Down-to-Earth Sociology box on page 20 provides a picture of race relations following the Civil War.
- **Talcott Parsons and C. Wright Mills: Contrasting Views:** Like Du Bois and Addams, many early North American sociologists saw society or parts of it, as corrupt and in need of reform. During the 1920s and 1930s, for example, Robert Park and Ernest Burgess (1921) not only studied crime, drug addiction, juvenile delinquency, and prostitution but also offered suggestions for how to alleviate these social problems. As the emphasis shifted from social reform to objective analyses, the abstract models of society developed by sociologist Talcott Parsons (1902–1979) influenced a generation of sociologists. These models of how the parts of society work together harmoniously did nothing to stimulate social activism.

Vikash Ranjan

Another sociologist, C. Wright Mills (1916–1962), deplored such theoretical abstractions. Trying to push the pendulum the other way, he urged sociologists to get back to social reform. In his writings, he warned that the nation faced an imminent threat to freedom—the coalescing of interests of a *power elite*, the top leaders of business, politics, and the military. The precedent-shaking 1960s and 1970s that followed Mills' death sparked interest in social activism among a new generation of sociologists.

Page | 10

Pure and Applied Sociology

- A distinction between pure and applied science is drawn in every scientific field. Pure science is a search for knowledge, without primary concern for its practical use. Applied science is the search for ways of using scientific knowledge to solve practical problems. A sociologist making a study of the social structure of a slum neighbourhood is working as a pure scientist if this is followed by a study of how to prevent delinquency in a slum neighbourhood this is applied science.
- Practical applications of sociological knowledge have become quite common. Sociologists are employed by corporations, government bureaus and social agencies often in evaluation research but sometimes in administration. Sociologists are often consulted by legislative committees in preparing new legislation. While the political clout of opposing interest groups may be the prime determinant of social policy decisions, the policy recommendations of social scientists are a significant factor in the legislative process.

Branches of Sociology:

- Sociology is broadly defined as the study of human society. Society is vast and complex phenomenon and therefore it is generally debatable that which part of society should be studied by sociology. There is a great degree of difference of opinion regarding the definitions, scope and subject matter of sociology.
- According to Durkheim sociology has broadly three principal divisions which he terms as social morphology, social physiology and general sociology. Social morphology covers the geographical settings, the density of population and other preliminary data which is likely to influence the social aspects. Social physiology is concerned with such dynamics processes as religion, morals, law, economic and political aspects, each of which may be the subject matter of a special discipline. General sociology is an attempt to discover the general social laws which may be derived from the specialized social processes. This is considered by Durkheim as the philosophical part of sociology.
- Max Weber combines two schools of thought – ie historical and systematic and he adds something more. His analysis with regard to relations between economics and religion enables him to use both historical as well as systematic method. The sociologies of law, economics and religion are the special sociologies which are part of both systematic and historical methods of study.
- According to Sorokin, Sociology can be divided into two branches- General Sociology and special sociology. General sociology studies the properties and uniformities common to all social and cultural phenomena in their structural and dynamic aspects. The inter-relationships between the socio-cultural and biological phenomena. In the structural aspect sociology studies various types of groups and institutions as well as their inter-relations to one another. In the dynamic aspect sociology studies various social processes like social contact, interaction, socialization, conflict, domination, subordination etc. Special sociologies study a specific socio-cultural phenomenon which is selected for detailed study. According to Sorokin, some of the most developed sociologies are Sociology of population, rural sociology, sociology of law, sociology of religion, sociology of knowledge, sociology of fine arts and many others.
- Ginsberg has listed the problems of sociology under four aspects- social morphology, social control, social processes and social pathology. Social morphology includes investigation of the quantity and quality of population, the study of social structure or the description and classification of the principal types of social groups and institutions. Social control includes the study of law, morals, religion, conventions, fashions and other sustaining and regulating agencies. Social processes refer to the study of various modes of interactions between individuals or groups including cooperation and

SOCIOLOGY by **Vikash Ranjan** 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

conflict, social differentiation and integration, development and decay. Social pathology refers to the study of social maladjustments and disturbances.

- Raymond Aron has mentioned six schools in sociology. These are historical, formal, society and community, phenomenological, universalistic and general.
- Sorokin has referred to the main currents of recent sociological thoughts in the following four branches of sociology-cosmo-sociology, bio-sociology, general sociology and special sociologies.
- Sociology of Religion studies the church as a social institution inquiring into its origin, development and forms as well as into changes in its structure and function.
- Sociology of Education studies the objectives of the school as a social institution, its curriculum and extracurricular activities and its relationship to the community and its other institutions.
- Political sociology studies the social implications of various types of political movements and ideologies and the origin, development and functions of the government and the state.
- Sociology of law concerns itself with formalized social control or with the processes whereby members of a group achieve uniformity in their behavior through the rules and regulations imposed upon them by society. It inquires into the factors that bring about the formation of regulatory systems as well as into the reasons for their adequacies and inadequacies as a means of control.
- Social psychology seeks to understand human motivation and behavior as they are determined by society and its values. It studies the socialization process of the individual how he becomes a member of society- it also studies the public, crowd, the mob and various other social groupings and movements. Analysis of mass persuasion or propaganda and of public opinion has been one of its major interests.
- Social psychiatry deals with the relationships between social and personal disorganization, its general hypothesis being that society through its excessive and conflicting demands upon the individual is to a large extent responsible for personal maladjustments such as various types of mental disorder and antisocial behavior. In its applied aspects it is concerned with remedying this situation.
- Social disorganization deals with the problems of maladjustment and malfunctioning, including problems of crime and delinquency, poverty and dependency, population movements, physical and mental disease and vice. Of these sub-divisions crime and delinquency have received perhaps the greatest attention and have developed into the distinct fields of criminology.
- Group relations is concerned with studying the problems arising out of the co-existence in a community of diverse racial and ethnic groups. New areas and sub-areas of sociology are continuously evolving over the period of time.

Importance Of Sociology:

- **Sociology makes a scientific study of society:** Prior to the emergence of sociology the study of society was carried on in an unscientific manner and society had never been the central concern of any science. It is through the study of sociology that the truly scientific study of the society has been possible. Sociology because of its bearing upon many of the problems of the present world has assumed such a great importance that it is considered to be the best approach to all the social sciences.
- **Sociology studies role of the institutions in the development of the individuals:** It is through sociology that scientific study of the great social institutions and the relation of the individual to each is being made. The home and family ,the school and education,the church and religion, the state and government ,industry and work ,the community and association, these are institutions through which society functions. Sociology studies these institutions and their role in the development of the individual and suggests suitable measures for restrengthening them with a view to enable them to serve the individual better.
- **Study of sociology is indispensable for understanding and planning of society:** Society is a complex phenomenon with a multitude of intricacies. It is impossible to understand and solve its numerous problems without support of sociology. It is rightly said that we cannot understand and mend society without any knowledge of its mechanism and construction. Without the investigation carried out by sociology no real effective social planning would be possible. It helps us to determine

Vikash Ranjan

the most efficient means for reaching the goals agreed upon. A certain amount of knowledge about society is necessary before any social policies can be carried out.

- **Sociology is of great importance in the solution of social problems:** The present world is suffering from many problems which can be solved through scientific study of the society. It is the task of sociology to study the social problems through the methods of scientific research and to find out solution to them. The scientific study of human affairs will ultimately provide the body of knowledge and principles that will enable us to control the conditions of social life and improve them.
- **Sociology has drawn our attention to the intrinsic worth and dignity of man:** Sociology has been instrumental in changing our attitude towards human beings. In a specialized society we are all limited as to the amount of the whole organization and culture that we can experience directly. We can hardly know the people of other areas intimately. In order to have insight into and appreciation of the motives by which others live and the conditions under which they exist a knowledge of sociology is essential.
- **Sociology has changed our outlook with regard to the problems of crime etc:** It is through the study of sociology that our whole outlook on various aspects of crime has change. The criminals are now treated as human beings suffering from mental deficiencies and efforts are accordingly made to rehabilitate them as useful members of the society.
- **Sociology has made great contribution to enrich human culture:** Human culture has been made richer by the contribution of sociology. The social phenomenon is now understood in the light of scientific knowledge and enquiry. According to Lowie most of us harbor the comfortable delusion that our way of doing things is the only sensible if not only possible one. Sociology has given us training to have rational approach to questions concerning oneself, one's religion, customs, morals and institutions. It has further taught us to be objective, critical and dispassionate. It enables man to have better understanding both of himself and of others. By comparative study of societies and groups other than his existence ,his life becomes richer and fuller than it would otherwise be. Sociology also impresses upon us the necessity of overcoming narrow personal prejudices, ambitions and class hatred.
- **Sociology is of great importance in the solution of international problems:** The progress made by physical sciences has brought the nations of the world nearer to each other. But in the social field the world has been left behind by the revolutionary progress of the science. The world is divided politically giving rise to stress and conflict.

Page | 12

MAJOR PERSPECTIVES IN SOCIOLOGY

- *A theory is a set of ideas which claims to explain how something works. Theoretical strands of research methodology are different sets of ideas which claim to explain how society or aspects of society work.*

MAJOR THEORETICAL STRANDS (PERSPECTIVES) OF SOCIOLOGY

Facts never interpret themselves. To make sense out of life, we use our common sense. That is, to understand our experiences (our "facts"), we place them into a framework of more-or-less related ideas. Sociologists do this, too, but they place their observations into a conceptual framework called a theory. A **theory** is a general statement about how some parts of the world fit together and how they work. It is an explanation of how two or more "facts" are related to one another.

FUNCTIONALISM

- The central idea of **functional analysis** is that society is a whole unit, made up of interrelated parts that work together. Functional analysis (also known as *functionalism* and *structural functionalism*) is

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

rooted in the origins of sociology. Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer viewed society as a kind of living organism. Just as a person or animal has organs that function together, they wrote, so does society. And like an organism, if society is to function smoothly, its parts must work together in harmony.

- Emile Durkheim also viewed society as being composed of many parts, each with its own function. When all the parts of society fulfill their functions, society is in a “normal” state. If they do not fulfill their functions, society is in an “abnormal” or “pathological” state. To understand society, then, functionalists say that we need to look at both *structure* (how the parts of a society fit together to make the whole) and *function* (what each part does, how it contributes to society).
- **Robert Merton and Functionalism.** Robert Merton (1910–2003) dismissed the organic analogy, but he did maintain the essence of functionalism—the image of society as a whole composed of parts that work together. Merton used the term *functions* to refer to the beneficial consequences of people’s actions: Functions help keep a group (society, social system) in balance. In contrast, *dysfunctions* are consequences that harm a society: They undermine a system’s equilibrium.
- Functions can be either manifest or latent. If an action is *intended* to help some part of a system, it is a *manifest function*. For example, suppose that government officials become concerned about our low rate of childbirth. Congress offers a \$10,000 bonus for every child born to a married couple. The intention, or manifest function, of the bonus is to increase childbearing within the family unit. Merton pointed out that people’s actions can also have *latent functions*; that is, they can have *unintended* consequences that help a system adjust. Let’s suppose that the bonus works. As the birth rate jumps, so does the sale of diapers and baby furniture. Because the benefits to these businesses were not the intended consequences, they are latent functions of the bonus.
- Of course, human actions can also hurt a system. Because such consequences usually are unintended, Merton called them *latent dysfunctions*. Let’s assume that the government has failed to specify a “stopping point” with regard to its bonus system. To collect more bonuses, some people keep on having children. The more children they have, however, the more they need the next bonus to survive. Large families become common, and poverty increases. Welfare is reinstated, taxes jump, and the nation erupts in protest. Because these results were not intended and because they harmed the social system, they would be latent dysfunctions of the bonus program.
- **In Sum:** From the perspective of functional analysis, society is a functioning unit, with each part related to the whole. Whenever we examine a smaller part, we need to look for its functions and dysfunctions to see how it is related to the larger unit. This basic approach can be applied to any social group, whether an entire society, a college, or even a group as small as a family.

Criticisms of Functionalism

- *The conflict theorists regard the functionalist approach as Utopian in nature and emphasize the need to study conflict in systems of stratification as a universal, all pervasive and an omnipresent phenomena.*
- *The conflict theorists say that all societies are characterized by some degree of constraint, disagreement, uncertainty, control dysfunctional and coercions that can’t be ignored.*
- *However, unlike the functionalists, the conflict theorists do say that, conflict leads to stability and consensus in society.*
- *It becomes important to study also the nature of consensus and equilibrium in a given system with conflict.*

MARXISM (CONFLICT PERSPECTIVES)

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 14

- The **conflict perspective** *views society as composed of diverse groups with conflicting values and interests*. In any society, these groups have differential access to wealth, power, and prestige. The most important aspects of the conflict perspective are the Marxian approach, which focuses on economic determinism and the importance of social class, and the neoconflict approach, which focuses on differential power and authority.
- **The Marxian Approach to Conflict:** The theoretical roots of the conflict perspective can be traced to Karl Marx. Often, the values and interests of different groups conflict with one another. According to Marx, these conflicts are determined by economics and are based on social class, and the struggle between the different values and interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is inevitable. When these battles occur, the dominant group attempts to force its values and ideology on less powerful groups. The result is the domination and exploitation of the masses (the proletariat) by the rich and powerful members of society (the bourgeoisie). The conflict perspective is not solely Marxist sociology, however; today conflict theorists often take a neoconflict approach.
- **The Neoconflict Approach:** Social conflict can be viewed as a necessary and even functional social process. From this perspective, conflict necessitates negotiation and compromise; hence it can produce order and a reaffirmation of the social structure. In a diverse nation like the United States, conflict between racial, ethnic, religious, age, gender, and political groups is inevitable but not necessarily destructive. For example, attempts to balance the national budget have typically been thwarted by bickering over what areas of the budget should be increased and which should be cut.
- Those dependent on Medicare and Social Security resist cuts to those programs and would rather see cuts in, for example, the defence budget or federal aid to tobacco growers. Meanwhile, Pentagon officials and cigarette manufacturers are not about to sit back and allow legislators to balance the budget at their expense. Both sides employ powerful lobbyists to persuade legislators to vote for their relative interests. These political and ideological quarrels are marked by compromises or tradeoffs that may not satisfy either group but also do not allow one interest to totally dominate the other. When society is confronted by an external threat, these internal conflicts may decrease, for, as is often said, nothing unites a group like a common enemy. From this perspective, conflict is dysfunctional only if it threatens one or more of society's core values.
- Neoconflict theorists also contend that class conflict in industrialized countries is not so much a struggle over the means of production (as Marx argued) but rather a result of the unequal distribution of authority. For example, the differing power and prestige of college professors and students sometimes lead to tension and conflict between the two groups that has nothing to do with the ownership of property or the means of production. This version of the conflict perspective focuses on differences in power and authority and the exploitation of some groups by other, more powerful groups. A good example of this approach can be seen in the work of C.Wright Mills.
- **C. Wright Mills and the "Power Elite"** C.Wright Mills promoted the conflict perspective for analyzing the distribution of power and authority in the United States. In *The Power Elite* (1956), he contended that post-World War II U.S. society was dominated by a powerful military, industrial, and political elite that shaped foreign and domestic policy for the benefit of the wealthy and powerful class. His approach focused on historical and structural analyses of class conflict and the uses of ideology for domination.

SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM (INTERACTIONISM)

The **symbolic interactionist perspective** *views social meaning as arising through the process of social interaction*. Contemporary symbolic interactionism rests on three basic premises:

- ✓ *Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that they attach to them.*
- ✓ *These meanings are derived from, or arise out of, social interaction with others.*
- ✓ *These meanings may be changed or modified through the processes of interaction and interpretation.*
- **Symbols in Everyday Life.** Without symbols, our social life would be no more sophisticated than that of animals. For example, without symbols we would have no aunts or uncles, employers or

Vikash Ranjan

teachers—or even brothers and sisters. This sounds strange, but it is symbols that define our relationships. There would still be reproduction, of course, but no symbols to tell us how we are related to whom. We would not know to whom we owe respect and obligations, or from whom we can expect privileges—the essence of human relationships.

- Look at it like this: If you think of someone as your aunt or uncle, you behave one way, but if you think of that person as a boyfriend or girlfriend, you behave quite differently. It is the symbol that tells you how you are related to others—and how you should act toward them.
- Let's make this a little less abstract. Consider this example:

Suppose that you have fallen head over heels in love. Finally, after what seems forever, it is the night before your wedding. As you are contemplating tomorrow's bliss, your mother comes to you in tears. Sobbing, she tells you that she had a child before she married your father, a child that she gave up for adoption. Breaking down, she says that she has just discovered that the person you are going to marry is this child.

You can see how the symbol will change overnight—and your behavior, too! It is not only relationships that depend on symbols to exist, but even society itself. Without symbols, we could not coordinate our actions with those of others. We could not make plans for a future day, time, and place. Unable to specify times, materials, sizes, or goals, we could not build bridges and highways. Without symbols, there would be no movies or musical instruments. We would have no hospitals, no government, no religion.

- Proponents of this perspective, often referred to as the *interactionist perspective*, engage in **microlevel analysis**, which *focuses on the day-to-day interactions of individuals and groups in specific social situations*. Three major concepts important for understanding this theoretical approach include meaningful symbols, the definition of the situation, and the looking-glass self. In addition, two important types of theoretical analysis fit within the interactionist perspective: dramaturgical analysis and the labelling approach.
- **Meaningful Symbols:** George H. Mead (1863–1931) insisted that the ongoing process of social interaction and the creating, defining, and redefining of meaningful symbols make society possible. *Meaningful symbols* are sounds, objects, colors, and events that represent something other than themselves and are critical for understanding social interaction. Language is one of the most important and powerful meaningful symbols humans have created, because it allows us to communicate through the shared meaning of words.
- **Definition of the Situation:** *Definition of the situation* refers to the idea that “if [people] define situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (Thomas and Thomas, 1928:572). Simply put, people define social reality through a process of give and- take interaction. Once a definition is established, it shapes all further interactions. For example, have you ever decided that you were “in love” with someone? If so, how did that change the way you interacted with that person? Conversely, what happens when a married couple decides they are no longer in love? If they define their marriage as meaningless or decide they have irreconcilable differences, how does that affect their relationship? Is a marriage likely to survive if both partners have defined it as “over”?
- **The Looking-Glass Self :** The *looking-glass self* refers to the idea that an individual's self-concept is largely a reflection of how he or she is perceived by other members of society (Cooley, [1902] 1922). Society is used as a mirror to reflect a feeling of selfpride, self-doubt, self-worth, or self-loathing. These important elements of symbolic interactionism contribute to socialization and the process of becoming human as we establish our personal and social identities.
- **Dramaturgical Analysis:** A useful theoretical framework within symbolic interactionism, **dramaturgical analysis**, *uses the analogy of the theatre to analyze social behavior*. In this approach, people are viewed as actors occupying roles as they play out life's drama. In real life, people do not passively accept others' definitions of the situation nor the social identities assigned to them. Rather, they take an active part in the drama, manipulating the interaction to present themselves in the most positive

Vikash Ranjan

light. Thus, people often use *impression management* to communicate favorable impressions of themselves (Goffman, 1959).

- **The Labeling Approach:** Another theoretical viewpoint within symbolic interactionism is the **labeling approach**, which contends that people attach various labels to certain behaviors, individuals, and groups that become part of their social identity and shape others' attitudes about and responses to them. For example, in *Outsiders*, Howard Becker (1963) explored the fascinating world of jazz musicians and how their non-traditional music, penchant for marijuana, and open racial integration during the 1950s led mainstream Americans to label them "deviant." The influence of the Chicago School and symbolic interactionism waned in the late 1950s, when a faction of sociologists argued that its approach was too dependent on ethnographic studies, personal observations, interviews, and subjective interpretations. Insisting that sociology must be more scientific, or at least, as Comte had envisioned, more positivistic, this group believed that sociology should rely more heavily on quantifiable data, facts, figures, and statistics. This led to the development of the Iowa School of symbolic interaction and also fueled a revival of structural functionalism.
- **The Iowa School of Symbolic Interaction:** Manford H. Kuhn argued that the theoretical assumptions of symbolic interactionism can be operationalized and applied in more positivistic scientific ways. Although sharing the theoretical assumptions of the Chicago School, the Iowa School sought to lend more scientific credibility to symbolic interaction and its research methods. Meanwhile, the desire to make sociology return to its positivistic roots provided the impetus for Talcott Parsons and others at Harvard University to revive the structural functionalist perspective of early European sociologists.

Critique:

- Interactionists have often been accused of **examining human interaction in a vacuum**. They have tended to focus on **small-scale face to face interaction with little concern for its historical or social settings** (Marxian Criticism).
- *They have concentrated on particular situations and encounters with little reference to the historical events which led up to them or the wider social framework in which they occur.* Since these factors influence the particular interaction situation, the scant attention they have received has been regarded as a serious omission.
- While symbolic interactionism provides a **corrective to the excesses of societal determinism**, many critics have argued that it has gone too far in this direction. Though they claim that action is not determined by structural norms, interactionists do admit the presence of such norms. However, they tend to take them as given rather than explaining their origin.
- As **William Skidmore** comments, the interactionists largely fail to explain '*why people consistently choose to act in given ways in certain situations, instead of in all the other ways they might possibly have acted*'. In stressing the flexibility and freedom of human action the interactionists tend to downplay the constraints on action. In **Skidmore's view** this is due to the fact that '**interactionism consistently fails to give an account of social structure**'. In other words it fails to adequately explain how standardized normative behaviour comes about and why members of society are motivated to act in terms of social norms.
- Similar criticism has been made with reference to what many see as the failure of interactionists to explain the source of the meanings to which they attach such importance. **Critics argue that such meanings are not spontaneously created in interaction situations. Instead they are systematically generated by the social structure.**
- **Marxists** have argued that the **meanings which operate in face to face interaction situations are largely the product of class relationships**. From this viewpoint, *interactionists have failed to explain the most significant thing about meanings: the source of their origin.*
- **Interactionism** is a distinctly American branch of sociology and to some this partly explains its shortcomings. Thus **Leon Shaskolsky** has argued that **interactionism is largely a reflection of**

Vikash Ranjan

the cultural ideals of American society. He claims that 'interactionism has its roots deeply imbedded in the cultural environment of American life, and its interpretation of society is, in a sense, a "looking glass" image of what that society purports to be'. Thus the emphasis on liberty, freedom and individuality in interactionism can be seen in part as a reflection of America's view of itself.

PHENOMENOLOGY

Page | 17

Phenomenological perspectives in sociology argue that the subject matter of the social and natural sciences is fundamentally different. As a result the methods and assumptions of the natural sciences are inappropriate to the study of man.

The natural sciences deal with matter. To understand and explain the behaviour of matter it is sufficient to observe it from the outside. Atoms and molecules do not have consciousness. They do not have meanings and purposes which direct their behaviour. Matter simply reacts 'unconsciously' to external stimuli; in scientific language it behaves. As a result the natural scientist is able to observe, measure, and impose an external logic on that behaviour in order to explain it. He has no need to explore the internal logic of the consciousness of matter simply because it does not exist.

- **Unlike matter, man has consciousness-thoughts, feelings, meanings, intentions and an awareness of being.** Because of this, his actions are meaningful; he defines situations and gives meaning to his actions and those of others. As a result, he does not merely react to external stimuli, he does not simply behave, he acts. **For Example, imagine the response of early man to fire caused by volcanoes or spontaneous combustion.** He did not simply react in a uniform manner to the experience of heat. He attached a range of meanings to it and these meanings directed his actions. For example he defined fire as a means of warmth and used it to heat his dwellings; as a means of defence and used it to ward off wild animals; and as a means of transforming substances and employed it for cooking and hardening the points of wooden spears. Man does not just react to fire; he acts upon it in terms of the meanings he gives to it.
- **If action stems from subjective meanings, it follows that the sociologist must discover those meanings in order to understand action.** He cannot simply observe action from the outside and impose an external logic upon it. He must interpret the internal logic which directs the actions of the actor.
- **Max Weber was one of the first sociologists to outline this perspective in detail.** He argued that sociological explanations of action should begin with '**the observation and theoretical interpretation of the subjective "states of minds" of actors**'.

Analysis

As the previous section indicated, interactionism adopts a similar approach with particular emphasis on the process of interaction. While positivists emphasize facts and cause and effect relationships, interactionists emphasize insight and understanding. *Since it is not possible to get inside the heads of actors, the discovery of meaning must be based on interpretation and intuition. For this reason objective measurement is not possible and the exactitude of the natural sciences cannot be duplicated. Since meanings are constantly negotiated in ongoing interaction processes it is not possible to establish simple cause and effect relationships.* Thus some sociologist argues that **sociology is limited to an interpretation of social action and phenomenological approaches are sometimes referred to as 'interpretive sociology'**.

A number of sociologists have argued that the positivist approach has produced a distorted picture of social life. They see it as tending to portray man as a passive responder to external stimuli rather than an

Vikash Ranjan

active creator of his own society. Man is pictured as reacting to various forces and pressures to economic infrastructures and the requirements of social systems.

Peter Berger argues that society has often been viewed as a puppet theatre with its members portrayed as 'little puppets jumping about on the ends of their invisible strings, cheerfully acting out the parts that have been assigned to them'. Society instills values, norms and roles, and men dutifully respond like puppets on a string. **However, from a phenomenological perspective man does not merely react and respond to an external society, he is not simply acted upon, he acts. In his interaction with others he creates his own meanings and constructs his own reality and therefore directs his own actions.**

ETHNOMETHODOLOGY

- **Roughly translated, ethnomethodology means the study of the methods used by people. It is concerned with examining the methods and procedures employed by members of society to construct, account for and give meaning to their social world.**
- **Ethnomethodologists draw heavily on the European tradition of phenomenological philosophy and in particular acknowledge a debt to the ideas of the philosopher-sociologist Alfred Schutz.**
- **Many Ethnomethodologists begin with the assumption that society exists only in so far as members perceive its existence. With this emphasis on member's views of social reality, ethnomethodology is generally regarded as a phenomenological approach. Ethnomethodology is a developing perspective which contains a diversity of viewpoints.**
- One of the major concerns of sociology is the explanation of social order. From the results of numerous investigations it appears that social life is ordered and regular and that social action is systematic and patterned. Typically the sociologist has assumed that social order has an objective reality. **Ethnomethodologists either suspend or abandon the belief that an actual or objective social order exists. Instead they proceed from the assumption that social life appears orderly to members of society.**
- Thus in the eyes of members their everyday activities seem ordered and systematic but this order is not necessarily due to the intrinsic nature or inherent qualities of the social world. In other words it may not actually exist. **Rather it may simply appear to exist because of the way members perceive and interpret social reality.** Social order therefore becomes a convenient fiction, an appearance of order constructed by members of society. This appearance allows the social world to be described and explained and so made knowable, reasonable, understandable and 'accountable' to its members.
- The methods and accounting procedures used by members for creating a sense of order form the subject matter of ethnomethodological enquiry. **Zimmerman and Wieder state that the ethnomethodologist is 'concerned with how members of society go about the task of seeing, describing and explaining order in the world in which they live'.** Ethnomethodologists are highly critical of other branches of sociology. They argue that 'conventional' sociologists have misunderstood the nature of social reality. They have treated the social world as if it had an objective reality which is independent of members' accounts and interpretations. Thus they have regarded aspects of the social world such as suicide and crime as facts with an existence of their own. They have then attempted to provide explanations for these 'facts'. By contrast, **ethnomethodologist argues that the social world consists of nothing more than the constructs, interpretations and accounts of its members. The job of the sociologist is therefore to explain the methods and**

Vikash Ranjan

accounting procedures which members employ to construct their social world. According to Ethnomethodologists, this is the very job that mainstream sociology has failed to do.

- *Ethnomethodologist sees little difference between conventional sociologists and the man in the street. They argue that the methods employed by sociologists in their research are basically similar to those used by members of society in their everyday lives. Members employing the documentary method are constantly theorizing, drawing relationships between activities and making the social world appear orderly and systematic. They then treat the social world as if it had an objective reality separate from themselves. Ethnomethodologists argue that the procedures of conventional sociologists are essentially similar. They employ the documentary method, theorize and draw relationships and construct a picture of an orderly and systematic social system. They operate reflexively like any other member of society. Thus when a functionalist sees behaviour as an expression of an underlying pattern of shared values, he also used instances of that behaviour as evidence for the existence of the pattern. By means of their accounting procedures members construct a picture of society. In this sense the man in the street is his own sociologist. Ethnomethodologists see little to choose between the pictures of society which he creates and those provided by conventional sociologists.*

Critique to Ethnomethodology:

Ethnomethodology has labeled as conventional or 'folk' sociology. **Its critics have argued that the members who populate the kind of society portrayed by Ethnomethodologists appear to lack any motives and goals.**

As **Anthony Giddens** remarks, there is little reference to 'the pursuance of practical goals or interests'. *There is little indication in the writings of Ethnomethodologists as to why people want to behave or are made to behave in particular ways. Nor is there much consideration of the nature of power in the social world and the possible effects of differences in power on members behaviour.*

As **Gouldner** notes, 'The process by which social reality becomes defined and established is not viewed by **Garfinkel** as entailing a process of struggle among competing groups' definitions of reality, and the outcome, the common sense conception of the world, is not seen as having been shaped by institutionally protected power differences'.

Critics have argued that Ethnomethodologists have failed to give due consideration to the fact that members' accounting procedures are conducted within a system of social relationships involving differences in power. Many Ethnomethodologists appear to dismiss everything which is not recognized and accounted for by members of society. They imply that if members do not recognize the existence of objects and events, they are unaffected by them. But as John H. **Goldthorpe** pointedly remarks in his criticism of ethnomethodology, **'If for instance, it is bombs and napalm that are zooming down, members do not have to be oriented towards them in any particular way, or at all, in order to be killed by them'**. Clearly members do not have to recognize certain constraints in order for their behaviour to be affected by them. As **Goldthorpe** notes, with reference to the above example, death 'limits interaction in a fairly decisive way'. Finally, the Ethnomethodologists' criticism of mainstream sociology can be redirected to themselves.

As **Giddens** remarks, 'any ethnomethodological account must display the same characteristics as it claims to discern in the accounts of lay actors'. Ethnomethodologists' accounting procedures therefore become a topic for study like those of conventional sociologists or any other member of society. In theory the process of accounting for accounts is never ending. Carried to its extreme, the ethnomethodological position implies that nothing is every knowable. Whatever its shortcomings, however, ethnomethodology asks interesting questions.

Vikash Ranjan

POSITIVISM AND ITS CRITIQUE

Many of the founding fathers of sociology believed that it would be possible to create a science of society based on the same principles and procedures as the natural sciences such as chemistry and biology. *This approach is known as positivism. Auguste Comte (1798-1857), who is credited with inventing the term sociology and regarded as one of the founders of the discipline, maintained that the application of the methods and assumptions of the natural sciences would produce a 'positive science of society'. He believed that this would reveal that the evolution of society followed 'invariable laws'. It would show that the behaviour of man was governed by principles of cause and effect which were just as invariable as the behaviour of matter, the subject of the natural sciences.*

The positivist approach makes the following assumptions:

- **The behaviour of man, like the behaviour of matter, can be objectively measured.** Just as the behaviour of matter can be quantified by measures such as weight, temperature and pressure, methods of "objective measurement" can be devised for human behaviour. Such measurement is essential to explain behaviour. For example, in order to explain the reaction of a particular chemical to heat, it is necessary to provide exact measurements of temperature, weight and so on.
- **With the aid of such measurements it will be possible to accurately observe the behaviour of matter and produce a statement of cause and effect.** This statement might read $A+B=C$ where A is a quantity of matter, B a degree of heat and C a volume of gas. Once it has been shown that the matter in question always reacts in the same way under fixed conditions, a theory can be devised to explain its behaviour.
- **From a positivist viewpoint** such methods and assumptions are applicable to human behaviour. Observations of behaviour based on objective measurement will make it possible to produce statements of cause and effect. Theories may then be devised to explain observed behaviour.

The positivist approach in sociology places particular emphasis on behaviour that can be directly observed. It argues that factors which are not directly observable, such as meanings, feelings and purposes, are not particularly important and can be misleading. **For example if the majority of adult members of society enter into marriage and produce children, these facts can be observed and quantified. They therefore form reliable data. However, the range of meanings that members of society give to these activities, their purposes for marriage and procreation are not directly observable. Even if they could be accurately measured, they may well divert attention from the real cause of behaviour. One individual may believe he entered marriage because he was lonely, another because he was in love, a third because it was the 'thing to do' and a fourth because he wished to produce offspring.** Reliance on this type of data for explanation assumes that individuals know the reasons for marriage. This can obscure the real cause of their behaviour.

The positivists' emphasis on observable 'facts' is due largely to the belief that human behaviour can be explained in much the same way as the behaviour of matter. Natural scientists do not inquire into the meanings and purposes of matter for the obvious reason of their absence. Atoms and molecules do not act in terms of meanings; they simply react to external stimuli. Thus if heat, an external stimulus, is applied to matter, that matter will react. The job of the natural scientist is to observe, measure, and then explain that reaction. The positivist approach to human social behaviour applies a similar logic. Men react to external stimuli and their behaviour can be explained in terms of this reaction. **For example *Man and Women enter into marriage and produce children in response to the demands of***

Vikash Ranjan

society. Society requires such behaviour for its survival and its members simply respond to this requirement. The meanings and purposes they attach to this behaviour are largely inconsequential.

Systems theory in sociology adopts a positivist approach. Once behaviour is seen as a response to some external stimulus, such as economic forces or the requirements of the social system, the methods and assumptions of the natural sciences appear appropriate to the study of man.

Page | 21

Marxism has often been regarded as a positivist approach since it can be argued that it sees human behaviour as a reaction to the stimulus of the economic infrastructure.

Functionalism has been viewed in a similar light. The behaviour of members of society are seen as a response to the functional prerequisites of the social system.

The study of society and social phenomena till the middle of the nineteenth century was made mostly on the basis of speculation, logic, theological thinking and rational analysis. August Comte, a French philosopher, described these methods inadequate and insufficient in the study of social life. In 1848, he proposed positive method in the field of social research. **He maintained that social phenomena should be studied not through logic or theological principles or metaphysical theories but rather in society itself and in the structure of social relations.** For example, he explained poverty in terms of the social forces that dominate society. He described this method of study as scientific. **Comte considered scientific method, called positivism, as the most appropriate tool of social research.** This new methodology rejected speculation and philosophical approach and focused on gathering of empirical data and became positivistic methodology, using similar methods as employed by natural sciences. By the 1930s, positivism came to flourish in the USA and gradually other countries also followed the trend.

Neo positivism (For Short Question)

Positivistic pistemology: Neo positivism rejects a priori definitions of the essential nature of society, culture, social structure and institutions and insists on operational definition of concrete phenomena. The sequence of observable consequences that form a cluster of sense impressions is treated as the proper subject matter of sociology.

Operationalism: Neo positivist are not satisfied with the vague definitions of theoretical constructs and concepts. Each term must be defined precisely and translated in measurable variables. For Neopositivists sociological theory is a systematic collection of concepts useful in the interpretation of statistical findings.

Quantitavism: Statistical analysis which incorporates enumeration and measurement is basic to neo positivism. Due to the advances in computer technology a variety of methods and techniques are available. Hence the need is to put together the pieces of information pertaining to units of social structure into formal and mathematical system so that the relationship between different variables may be attained.

Empiricism: Whether it is survey research or experimental observation, the empirical work falls into a standard pattern. Place a problem that can be investigated by a fact finding inquiry. Formulation of a set of hypothesis that can be tested on the basis of individual responses to a set of questions. Collection of answers on an interview schedule, structured questionnaire .

Behaviourism: Because of the emphasis on operationalism and quantitavism, neo positivist tend to study observable behaviour pattern. They concentrate on specific instances of interaction, sometimes counting the frequency and patterns of repetition. Substantive problems of social structure and the history of institutions and ideas are often ignored, concrete behaviour of individuals become the focus of sociological inquiry. Neo positivist develop non subjective and non voluntaristic theories of action and interaction. Based on mechanistic and field theoretical conceptions, extreme variants of neo-positivism may border behavioural determinism.

Mathematical theory construction: Neo positivist have commitment for formal theory construction. They claim that the strong symbolic representation of a theory in terms of the formal logic of mathematics necessarily increases the precision of theoretical propositions. The system of formal logic in mathematics enables substantive propositions to be couched in terms of exactly defined concepts and to state them with logical coherence. Formal theory construction appears in two different contexts first there is the formalization of well developed substantive theories. Second specific findings of particular empirical research are codified in mathematical terms and then organized into a formal theoretical system which established the mathematical relationship between variable in symbolic terms. Most of the empirical studies undertaken by sociologists fall in this category. However impact of mathematical sociology has been limited to few areas

Critique to Positivism:

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

Comte's positivism was criticized both from within and outside the positivist domain. Within positivism, a branch called logical positivism was developed in early twentieth century which claimed that science is both logical and also based on observable facts and that the truth of any statement lies in its verification through sensory experience.

Out side positivism developed schools of thought like **symbolic interactionism, phenomenology and ethnomethodology, etc.** These schools questioned the positivist methodology and its perception of social reality.

But Positivism came to be accepted more in the 1950s and 1960s onwards by the academics. Today some **writers refer to the emergence of a new stage of research, the post-empiricist research marked by the notion that the scientific method is not the only source of knowledge, truth and validity.** Thus, today, sociological methodology is no longer based on positivist methodology as in the past but it has become a body of diverse methods and techniques, all of which are perceived as valid and legitimate in social research.

THE GROWTH OF SOCIOLOGY IN INDIA

Colonialism was an essential part of modern capitalism and industrialization. The writings of Western sociologists on capitalism and other aspects of modern society are therefore relevant for understanding social change in India. Yet as we saw with reference to urbanisation, colonialism implied that the impact of industrialization in India was not necessarily the same as in the west. **Karl Marx's comments on the impact of the East India Company brings out the contrast...** *India, the great workshop of cotton manufacture for the world, since immemorial times, now became inundated with English twists and cotton stuffs. After its own produce had been excluded from England, or only admitted on the most cruel terms, British manufactures were poured into it at a small and merely nominal duty, to the ruin of the native cotton fabrics once so celebrated (Marx 1853 cited in Desai 1975).*

Sociology in India also had to deal with western writings and ideas about Indian society that were not always correct. These ideas were expressed both in the accounts of colonial officials as well western scholars. For many of them Indian society was a contrast to western society. We take just one example here, the way the Indian village was understood and portrayed as unchanging.

In keeping with contemporary- Victorian-evolutionary ideas, western writers saw in the Indian village a remnant or survival from what was called 'the infancy of society'. They saw in nineteenth-century India the past of the European society.

Yet another evidence of the colonial heritage of countries like India is the distinction often made between sociology and social anthropology. **A standard western textbook definition of sociology is the study of human groups and societies, giving particular emphasis to the analysis of the industrialized world. (Giddens 2001: 699). A standard western definition of social anthropology would be the study of simple societies of non-western and therefore 'other' cultures.** In India the story is quite different. **M.N. Srinivas** maps the trajectory: *In a country such as India, with its size and diversity, regional, linguistic, religious, sectarian, ethnic (including caste), and between rural and urban areas, there are a myriad .others.... In a culture and society such as India.s, .the other. can be encountered literally next door... (Srinivas 1966:205).*

Furthermore social anthropology in India moved gradually from a preoccupation with the study of ,primitive people. to the study of peasants, ethnic groups, social classes, aspects and features of ancient civilizations, and modern industrial societies. No rigid divide exists between sociology and social anthropology in India, a characteristic feature of the two subjects in many western countries. Perhaps the very diversity of the modern and traditional, of the village and the metropolitan in India accounts for this.

Basic Concepts

Society

The term society is most fundamental to sociology. It is derived from the Latin word socius which means companionship or friendship. Companionship means sociability. According to George Simmel it is this element of sociability which defines the true essence of society. It indicates that man always lives in the company of other people. Man is a social animal said Aristotle centuries ago. Man needs society for his living, working and enjoying life. Society has become an essential condition for human life to continue. We can define society as a group of people who share a common culture, occupy a particular territorial area and feel themselves to constitute a unified and distinct entity. It is the mutual interactions and interrelations of individuals and groups.

Definitions of Society

August Comte the father of sociology saw society as a social organism possessing a harmony of structure and function..Emile Durkheim the founding father of the modern sociology treated society as a reality in its own right. According to Talcott Parsons Society is a total complex of human relationships in so far as they grow out of the action in terms of means-end relationship intrinsic or symbolic. G.H Mead conceived society as an exchange of gestures which involves the use of symbols. Morris Ginsberg defines society as a collection of individuals united by certain relations or mode of behavior which mark them off from others who do not enter into these relations or who differ from them in behavior. Cole sees Society as the complex of organized associations and institutions with a community. According to Maclver and Page society is a system of usages and procedures of authority and mutual aid of many groupings and divisions, of controls of human behavior and liberties. This ever changing complex system which is called society is a web of social relationships.

Types of Societies

Writers have classified societies into various categories Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft of Tonnies, mechanical and organic solidarities of Durkheim, status and contract of Maine, and militant and industrial societies of Spencer. All these thinkers have broadly divided society into pre-industrial and post-industrial societies. Sociologists like Comte based their classification of societies on intellectual development. Most of them concede the evolutionary nature of society- one type leading to the other. One more way of dividing societies is that of Marx. His classification of society is based on the institutional framework of society as determined by a group of people who control the means of production. Marx distinguishes five principal types of societies: primitive, Asiatic, ancient, feudal and capitalist.

Following these classifications, sociologists often refer to societies as primitive or modern non-literate or literate. A more recent kind of classification which is also used while distinguishing societies into types is the one between open and closed societies. A closed society is the one which is a traditional and simple society or a totalitarian State tends to resist change, while an open society admits change.

None of these classifications is accurate; for every major type have number of sub-types. One type like the capitalist can be of various kinds like carboniferous type, finance capital, and the modern neo-colonial or multi-national type. Further, it is to be borne in mind that the chief task of a sociologist is not that of identifying societies but finding out whether a particular kind of society has the potential to nurture, defend and survive. Such a study alone can reveal the sociological aspects of societies and thereby facilitating understanding of societies as they are, and, if need be, activate the required changes. In other words, sociology based on values relies on objective analysis of societies.

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 24

However, in recent years there have been several studies of what are variously called irrigation civilization or hydraulic societies. These studies have been related to the general study of bureaucracy, but little has yet been done in the way of large scale comparative work of various complex organized societies. It is not enough, however, to characterize pre-British India as an irrigation civilization with a centralized bureaucracy and a village system of production. The unity and stability of Indian society depended also upon two other factors, caste and religion. There, the aspect of caste to be emphasized is not so much its rigid hierarchical character and the way in which it divided groups from each other, as its integrating function, closely connected with religion.

M.N. Srinivas, in a discussion of Indian social structure, observes that caste guarantees autonomy to a community into relation with numerous other communities all going to form a hierarchy. The importance of such an institution is obvious in a vast country like India which has been the meeting place of many different cultures in the past and which has always had considerable regional diversity. While the autonomy of a sub-caste was preserved it was also brought into relation with others and the hierarchy was also a scale of generally agreed values.

The work of K. Wittfogel suggests that many important similarities can be found, in ancient Egypt, in Byzantium and elsewhere especially in the social functions of the priests and in the elements and caste revealed in detailed regulation of the division of labor. Each human group develops its own social and political structure in terms of its own culture and history. There broad types of social structures may be distinguished. First, the tribal society represented by the social structures of African tribes second, the agrarian social structure represented by the traditional Indian society. And the third, the industrial social structure represented by the industrially advanced countries Europe and U.S.A. Sociologists also speak of yet another type, called post industrial society, which is emerging out of the industrial society.

Community

The term community is one of the most elusive and vague in sociology and is by now largely without specific meaning. At the minimum it refers to a collection of people in a geographical area. Three other elements may also be present in any usage. (1) Communities may be thought of as collections of people with a particular social structure; there are, therefore, collections which are not communities. Such a notion often equates community with rural or pre-industrial society and may, in addition, treat urban or industrial society as positively destructive. (2) A sense of belonging or community spirit. (3) All the daily activities of a community, work and non work, take place within the geographical area, which is self contained. Different accounts of community will contain any or all of these additional elements.

We can list out the characteristics of a community as follows:

1. Territory
2. Close and informal relationships
3. Mutuality
4. Common values and beliefs
5. Organized interaction
6. Strong group feeling
7. Cultural similarity

Talcott Parsons defined community as collectivity the members of which share a common territorial area as their base of operation for daily activities. According to Tonnies community is defined as an organic natural kind of social group whose members are bound together by the sense of belonging, created out of everyday contacts covering the whole range of human activities. He has presented ideal-typical pictures of the forms of social associations contrasting the solidarity nature of the social relations in the community with the large scale and impersonal relations thought to characterize industrializing societies. Kingsley Davis defined it as the smallest territorial group that can embrace all aspects of social life. For Karl Mannheim community is any circle of people who live together and belong together in such a way that they do not share this or that particular interest only but a whole set of interests

Cultural Relativism

SOCIOLOGY by **Vikash Ranjan** 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 25

This is a method whereby different societies or cultures are analyzed objectively without using the values of one culture to judge the worth of another. We cannot possibly understand the actions of other groups if we analyze them in terms of our motives and values. We must interpret their behavior in the light of their motives, habits and values if we are to understand them. Cultural relativism means that the function and meaning of a trait are relative to its cultural setting. A trait is neither good nor bad in itself. It is good or bad only with reference to the culture in which it is to function. Fur clothing is good in the Arctic but not in the tropics. In some hunting societies which occasionally face long periods of hunger to be fat is good; it has real survival value and fat people are admired. In our society to be fat is not only unnecessary but is known to be unhealthful and fat people are not admired.

The concept of cultural relativism does not mean that all customs are equally valuable, nor does it imply that no customs are harmful. Some patterns of behavior may be injurious everywhere, but even such patterns serve some purpose in the culture and the society will suffer unless a substitute is provided. The central point in cultural relativism is that in a particular cultural setting certain traits are right because they work well in that setting while other traits are wrong because they would clash painfully with parts of that culture.

Association

Men have diverse needs, desires and interests which demand satisfaction. There are three ways of fulfilling these needs. Firstly they may act independently each in his own way without caring for others. This is unsocial with limitations. Secondly men may seek their ends through conflicts with one another. Finally men may try to fulfill their ends through cooperation and mutual assistance. This cooperation has a reference to association.

When a group or collection of individuals organize themselves expressly for the purpose of pursuing certain of its interests together on a cooperative pursuit an association is said to be born. According to Morris Ginsberg an association is a group of social beings related to one another by the fact that they possess or have instituted in common an organization with a view to securing a specific end or specific ends. The associations may be found in different fields. No single association can satisfy all the interests of the individual or individuals. Since Man has many interests, he organizes various associations for the purpose of fulfilling varied interests. He may belong to more than one organization.

Main characteristics of Association:

Association: An association is formed or created by people. It is a social group. Without people there can be no association. It is an organized group. An unorganized group like crowd or mob cannot be an association.

Common interest: An association is not merely a collection of individuals. It consists of those individuals who have more or less the same interests. Accordingly those who have political interests may join political association and those who have religious interests may join religious associations and so on.

Cooperative spirit: An association is based on the cooperative spirit of its members. People work together to achieve some definite purposes. For example a political party has to work together as a united group on the basis of cooperation in order to fulfill its objective of coming to power.

Organization: Association denotes some kind of organization. An association is known essentially as an organized group. Organization gives stability and proper shape to an association. Organization refers to the way in which the statuses and roles are distributed among the members.

Regulation of relations: Every association has its own ways and means of regulating the relation of its members. Organization depends on this element of regulation. They may assume written or unwritten forms.

Culture

As Homo sapiens, evolved, several biological characteristics particularly favorable to the development of culture appeared in the species. These included erect posture; a favorable brain structure; stereoscopic vision; the structure of the hand, a flexible shoulder; and year round sexual receptivity on the part of the female. None of these biological characteristics alone, of course, accounts for the development of culture.

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

Even in combination, all they guarantee is that human beings would be the most gifted members of the animal kingdom.

The distinctive human way of life that we call culture did not have a single definite beginning in time any more than human beings suddenly appearing on earth. Culture evolved slowly just as some anthropoids gradually took on more human form. Unmistakably, tools existed half a million years ago and might be considerably older. If, for convenience, we say that culture is 500,000 years old, it is still difficult day has appeared very recently.

The concept of culture was rigorously defined by E.B. Taylor in 1860s. According to him culture is the sum total of ideas, beliefs, values, material cultural equipments and non-material aspects which man makes as a member of society. Taylor's theme that culture is a result of human collectivity has been accepted by most anthropologists. Tylarian idea can be discerned in a modern definition of culture - culture is the man-made part of environment (M.J. Herskovits).

From this, it follows that culture and society are separable only at the analytical level: at the actual existential level, they can be understood as the two sides of the same coin. Culture, on one hand, is an outcome of society and, on the other hand, society is able to survive and perpetuate itself because of the existence of culture. Culture is an ally of man in the sense that it enhances man's adaptability to nature. It is because of the adaptive value of culture that Herskovits states that culture is a screen between man and nature. Culture is an instrument by which man exploits the environment and shapes it accordingly.

Development of Culture

The distinctive human way of life that we call culture did not have a single definite beginning. This is to say that human beings did not suddenly appear on earth. Culture evolved slowly just as anthropoids gradually took on more human form. The earliest tools cannot be dated precisely. Australopithecus may have used stones as weapons as long as five million years ago. Stones that have been used as weapon do not differ systematically from other stones, however, and there is no way to tell for sure. The first stones that show reliable evidence of having been shaped as tools trace back some 500,000 to 600,000 years. The use of fire can be dated from 200,000 to 300,000 years ago. Tools of bone had come into existence by 100,000 B.C. the age of Neanderthals. The Neanderthals also apparently had some form of languages and buried their dead with an elaborateness that indicates the possibility of religious ceremonies. Cro-Magnon, dating from 35,000 years ago, was a superior biological specimen and had a correspondingly more elaborate culture. Their cave paintings have been found. They also made jewellery of shells and teeth, and carved statuettes of women that emphasized pregnancy and fertility. They made weapons of bone, horn, and ivory, and used needle in the fabrication of garments.

Cultural Diffusion

In spite of the fact that invention occupied a dominant place in culture growth over such a long period of time, most of the content of modern cultures appears to have been gained through diffusion. The term diffusion refers to the borrowing of cultural elements from other societies in contrast to their independent invention within a host society.

In order for diffusion to operate on a substantial scale, there must be separate societies that have existed long enough to have elaborated distinctive ways of life. Moreover, those societies must be in contact with one another so that substantial borrowing is possible. These conditions probably developed late in the evolutionary process. Once begun, however, culture borrowing became so pervasive that most of the elements of most modern cultures, including our own, originated with other people.

Culture has grown, then, through a combination of invention and diffusion. It grew slowly at first, mostly as the result of invention. As the culture base expanded and societies became differentiated, the large -scale diffusion of traits become possible and the rate of growth speeded up. In modern times, and particularly in the Western world, the rate of culture growth has become overwhelming.

Cultural Lag

The role played by material inventions, that is, by technology, in social change probably received most emphasis in the work of William F. Ogburn. It was Ogburn, also, who was chiefly responsible for the idea that the rate of invention within society is a function of the size of the existing culture base. He saw the

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 27

rate of material invention as increasing with the passage of time. Ogburn believed that material and non-material cultures change in different ways. Change in material culture is believed to have a marked directional or progressive character. This is because there are agreed-upon standards of efficiency that are used to evaluate material inventions. To use air-planes, as an example, we keep working to develop planes that will fly, higher and faster, and carry more payloads on a lower unit cost. Because airplanes can be measured against these standards, inventions in this area appear rapidly and predictably. In the area of non-material culture, on the other hand there often are no such generally accepted standards. Whether one prefers a Hussain, a Picasso, or a Gainsborough, for example, is a matter of taste, and styles of painting fluctuate unevenly. Similarly, in institutions such as government and the economic system there are competing forms of styles, Governments may be dictatorships, oligarchies, republics or democracies.

Economic system includes communist, socialist, feudal, and capitalist ones. As far as can be told, there is no regular progression from one form of government or economic system to another. The obvious directional character of change in material culture is lacking in many areas of non-material culture. In addition to the difference in the directional character of change, Ogburn and others believe that material culture tends to change faster than non-material culture. Certainly one of the imperative aspects of modern American life is the tremendous development of technology. Within this century, life has been transformed by invention of the radio, TV, automobiles, airplanes, rockets, transistors, and computers and so on. While this has been happening in material culture, change in government, economic system, family life, education, and religion seems to have been much slower. This difference in rates of cultural change led Ogburn to formulate the concept of culture lag. Material inventions, he believed bring changes that require adjustments in various areas of non-material culture. Invention of the automobile, for instance, freed young people from direct parental observation, made it possible for them to work at distances from their homes, and, among other things, facilitated crime by making escape easier. Half a century earlier, families still were structured as they were in the era of the family farm when young people were under continuous observation and worked right on the homestead.

Culture lag is defined as the time between the appearance of a new material invention and the making of appropriate adjustments in corresponding area of non-material culture. This time is often long. It was over fifty years, for example, after the typewriter was invented before it was used systematically in offices. Even today, we may have a family system better adapted to a farm economy than to an urban industrial one, and nuclear weapons exist in a diplomatic atmosphere attuned to the nineteenth century. As the discussion implies, the concept of culture lag is associated with the definition of social problems. Scholars envision some balance or adjustment existing between material and non-material cultures. That balance is upset by the appearance of raw material objects. The resulting imbalance is defined as a social problem until non-material culture changes in adjustment to the new technology.

Cultural Relativism

This is a method whereby different societies or cultures are analyzed objectively without using the values of one culture to judge the worth of another. We cannot possibly understand the actions of other groups if we analyze them in terms of our motives and values. We must interpret their behavior in the light of their motives, habits and values if we are to understand them. Cultural relativism means that the function and meaning of a trait are relative to its cultural setting. A trait is neither good nor bad in itself. It is good or bad only with reference to the culture in which it is to function. Fur clothing is good in the Arctic but not in the tropics. In some hunting societies which occasionally face long periods of hunger to be fat is good; it has real survival value and fat people are admired. In our society to be fat is not only unnecessary but is known to be unhealthful and fat people are not admired.

The concept of cultural relativism does not mean that all customs are equally valuable, nor does it imply that no customs are harmful. Some patterns of behavior may be injurious everywhere, but even such patterns serve some purpose in the culture and the society will suffer unless a substitute is provided. The central point in cultural relativism is that in a particular cultural setting certain traits are right because they work well in that setting while other traits are wrong because they would clash painfully with parts of that culture.

Ethnocentrism

SOCIOLOGY by **Vikash Ranjan** 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 28

Closely related to the concept of cultural relativity is the concept of ethnocentrism. The word ethno comes from Greek and refers to a people, nation, or cultural grouping, while centric comes from Latin and refers, of course to the centre. The term ethnocentrism then refers to the tendency for each society to place its own culture patterns at the centre of things. Ethnocentrism is the practice of comparing other cultural practices with those of one's own and automatically finding those other cultural practices to be inferior. It is the habit of each group taking for granted the superiority of its culture. It makes our culture into a yardstick with which to measure all other cultures as good or bad, high or low, right or queer in proportion as they resemble ours.

Ethnocentrism is a universal human reaction found in all known societies, in all groups and in practically all individuals. Everyone learns ethnocentrism while growing up. The possessiveness of the small child quickly translates "into my toys are better than your toys" Parents; unless they are quite crude, outwardly discourage their children from verbalizing such beliefs. But in private, they may reassure their offspring that their possessions are indeed very nice. Much of the learning of ethnocentrism is indirect and unintended, but some of it is deliberate. History for example, is often taught to glorify the achievements of one's own nation, and religious, civic and other groups disparage their competitors openly. Among adults, ethnocentrism is simply a fact of life.

Once one becomes conscious of ethnocentrism, the temptation is strong to evaluate it in moral terms; to label it with epithets such as bigoted chauvinistic, and so on, and to imply that one who has not discovered and compensated for his or her ethnocentric biases is not worthy. This incidentally, is another form of ethnocentrism. The important point, however, is that ethnocentrism is one of the features of culture and, like the rest of culture, it needs to be evaluated in terms of its contribution to the maintenance of social order and the promotion of social change.

The functions of ethnocentrism in maintaining order are more apparent than those which promote social change. First, ethnocentrism encourages the solidarity of the group. Believing that one's own ways are the best, encourages a "we" feeling with associates and strengthens the idea that loyalty to comrades and preservation of the basis for superiority are important values. Positively, ethnocentrism promotes continuance of the status quo negatively, it discourages change.

Second, ethnocentrism hinders the understanding of the cooperation with other groups. If the ways of one's own group are best, there is little incentive to interact with inferior groups. In fact, attitudes of suspicion, disdain and hostility are likely to be engendered. Extreme ethnocentrism is likely to promote conflict, as the records of past wars, and religious and racial conflicts reveal.

Conflict, of course often leads to social change and in that sense ethnocentrism becomes a vehicle for the promotion of social change. It does so, however, through encouragement of its peaceful evolution. There is little doubt that most social scientists are biased in favor of peaceful social change and are opposed to conflict. Consequently, they tend even if subtly, to denigrate ethnocentrism and to imply that students must rid themselves of it if they are to learn effectively. In so doing, sociologists operate implicitly from a combination of evolutionary and functionalist models. Recent years have seen this stance called into question. The revolutionary efforts of groups who see themselves as downtrodden blacks, the poor, women, and young people have included deliberate efforts to foster ethnocentrism as a means of strengthening themselves. Slogans such as "black power" conflict model of society from which they operate.

Values

The term 'value' has a meaning in sociology that is both similar to and yet distinct from the meaning assigned to it in everyday speech. In sociological usage, values are group conceptions of the relative desirability of things. Sometimes 'value' means 'price'. But the sociological concept of value is far broader than here neither of the objects being compared can be assigned a price.

What is the value, for illustration, of the right of every human being to dignity in comparison to the need to improve the technical aspects of education? This issue is directly involved in the desegregation of the

SOCIOLOGY by **Vikash Ranjan** 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

public schools and has been debated bitterly. Some attempts have been made to estimate the dollar costs of the old system of segregated schools and, more recently, estimates have been made of the costs of using both black and white children to end segregation. Most of the social costs of the two systems, however, defy statement in monetary terms and most people take their stand on the issue in terms of deeply held convictions about what is important in life.

Page | 29

The idea of deeply held convictions is more illustrative of the sociological concept of value than is the concept of price. In addition, there are four other aspects of the sociological concept of value. They are: (1) values exist at different levels of generality or abstraction; (2) values tend to be hierarchically arranged (3) values are explicit and implicit in varying degrees; and (4) values often are in conflict with one another.

General and Specific Values

Such values as democracy, freedom, and the right to dissent are stated at a very broad level of generality. Each of them pervades many aspects of life and each is anything but situationally specific. If a comprehensive list of values were prepared, a large proportion of them would be found to be very general and abstract. Values are, however, also stated in fairly specific terms. Thus, we may define values as physical health or affluence. On more specific levels yet, we may value between symphonies or powerful automobiles. We may also value silk rather than nylon or the writing of a particular novelist rather than that of another.

Means Values, ends values, and ultimate values

Values tend to be hierarchically arranged. This may be shown through use of the concepts of means values and ends values. As the words themselves imply, means values are instrumental values in that they are sought as part of the effort to achieve other values. Ends values are both more general and more important in the eyes of the groups who are doing the valuing. Thus, if health is an American value, then the maintenance of good nutrition, the securing of proper rest and the avoidance of carcinogenic and mind-destroying substances all become means to that end.

The distinction between means values and ends values is a matter of logic and relates to the context of a particular discussion. When the context shifts, so also may change the definition of particular values as means values or ends values. To a narcotics agent, the avoidance of hallucinogenic substances might be defined as an end in itself requiring no further justification. To a religious person, health might not be an end in itself but only a means to the continued worship of the deity. One additional distinction may be useful that implied in the concept of ultimate values. The concept of ultimate value is arrived at by following the same logical procedures used in distinguishing between means values and end values, and continuing the process until it can be pursued no further. If good nutrition is sought as a means to health, health as a means to longevity, and long life to permit one to be of service to God, is there any higher or more ultimate value than service to the deity? Regardless of which way the question is answered, it is obvious that one is about to arrive at an ultimate value that can no longer be justified in terms of other values.

Values conflict with one another

The examples of the right to dissent, conformity, and respect for authority as American values illustrate the point that values frequently are in conflict with one another. At least in complex societies, there is generally not just one value system but multiple, overlapping, and sometimes opposing ones. In America, for example, the problem is not that they value religions working over personal gratification or vice versa, but that they value them both at the same time; along with the achievement of status, the accumulation of wealth, and a host of other values. These potentially conflicting values are so pervasive that it is virtually impossible to pursue some of them without violating others. Societies probably differ in the extent to which their value systems are internally consistent and in small homogeneous societies than in large heterogeneous ones. American society has long had the reputation of embracing many and deep value conflicts.

Social Norms

Social norms grow out of social value and both serve to differentiate human social behavior from that of other species. The significance of learning in behavior varies from species to species and is closely linked to processes of communication. Only human beings are capable of elaborate symbolic communication

Vikash Ranjan

and of structuring their behavior in terms of abstract preferences that we have called values. Norms are the means through which values are expressed in behavior.

Norms generally are the rules and regulations that groups live by. Or perhaps because the words, rules and regulations, call to mind some kind of formal listing, we might refer to norms as the standards of behavior of a group. For while some of the appropriate standards of behavior in most societies are written down, many of them are not that formal. Many are learned, informally, in interaction with other people and are passed "that way from generation to generation.

The term "norms" covers an exceedingly wide range of behaviour. So that the whole range of that behaviour may be included. Sociologists have offered the following definition. Social norms are rules developed by a group of people that specify how people must, should, may, should not, and must not behave in various situations.

Some norms are defined by individual and societies as crucial to the society. For example, all members of the group are required to wear clothing and to bury their dead. Such "musts" are often labeled "mores", a term coined by the American sociologist William Graham Sumner.

Many social norms are concerned with "should "; that is, there is some pressure on the individual to conform but there is some leeway permitted also. The 'should behaviors' are what Sumner called "folkways"; that is, conventional ways of doing things that are not defined as crucial to the survival of either the individual or the society. The 'should behaviors' in our own society include the prescriptions that people's clothes should be clean, and that death should be recognized with public funerals. A complete list of the should behaviors in a complex society would be virtually without end.

The word "May" in the definition of norms indicates that, in most groups, there is a wide range of behaviors in which the individual is given considerable choice. To continue the illustration, in Western countries girls may select to wear dresses or halters and jeans. Diets may be done through trainers at the gym or through the benefit of Medifast coupons, some people may even prefer diets advertised on tv. Funerals may be held with or without flowers, with the casket open or closed, with or without religious participation, and so on. We have confined our examples to just three areas, but students should be able to construct their own examples from all areas of life.

The remainder of the definition, including the 'should-not' and the 'must-not' behaviours, probably does not require lengthy illustration because such examples are implicit in what has already been said. One should not belch in public, dump garbage in the street, run stop signs, or tell lies. One must not kill another person or have sexual intercourse with one's sister or brother.

Social norms cover almost every conceivable situation, and they vary from standards where almost complete conformity is demanded to those where there is great freedom of choice. Norms also vary in the kinds of sanctions that are attached to violation of the norms. Since norms derive from values, and since complex societies have multiple and conflicting value systems, it follows that norms frequently are in conflict also.

Taking the illustration of American sex norms, two proscriptive norms prohibit premarital intercourse and extramarital intercourse. But many boys also have been taught that sex is good and that they should seek to "score" with girls whenever possible. Somewhat similarly, girls have been taught that promiscuous intercourse before marriage is bad; but they have also been taught that sex is acceptable within true love relationships. Members of both sexes, then, find themselves faced with conflicting demands for participation in sex and for abstinence from it. They also discover that there are sanctions associated with either course of action.

Normative conflict is also deeply involved in social change. As statistical norms come to differ too blatantly from existing prescriptive norms, new prescriptive norms give sanction to formerly prohibited behaviour and even extend it. Recent changes in the sex norms of teenage and young adult groups provide examples. The change is more apparent in communal living groups where sometimes there is an explicit ideology of sexual freedom and the assumption that sexual activities will be shared with all members of the group. In less dramatic fashion, the change is evident among couples who simply begin to live together without the formality of a marriage ceremony.

Institutions

SOCIOLOGY by **Vikash Ranjan** 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

A social institution is a complex, integrated set of social norms organized around the preservation of a basic societal value. Obviously, the sociologist does not define institutions in the same way as does the person on the street. Lay persons are likely to use the term "institution" very loosely, for churches, hospitals, jails, and many other things as institutions.

Sociologists often reserve the term "institution" to describe normative systems that operate in five basic areas of life, which may be designated as the primary institutions. (1) In determining Kinship; (2) in providing for the legitimate use of power; (3) in regulating the distribution of goods and services; (4) in transmitting knowledge from one generation to the next; and (5) in regulating our relation to the supernatural. In shorthand form, or as concepts, these five basic institutions are called the family, government, economy, education and religion.

The five primary institutions are found among all human groups. They are not always as highly elaborated or as distinct from one another as into the United States, but, in rudimentary form at last, they exist everywhere. Their universality indicates that they are deeply rooted in human nature and that they are essential in the development and maintenance of orders. Sociologists operating in terms of the functionalist model society have provided the clearest explanation of the functions served by social institutions. Apparently there are certain minimum tasks that must be performed in all human groups. Unless these tasks are performed adequately, the group will cease to exist. An analogy may help to make the point. We might hypothesize that cost accounting department is essential to the operation of a large corporation. A company might procure a superior product and distribute it then at the price which is assigned to it, the company will soon go out of business. Perhaps the only way to avoid this is to have a careful accounting of the cost of each step in the production and distribution process.

Cooperation

Cooperation involves individuals or groups working together for the achievement of their individual or collective goals. In its simplest form, cooperation may involve only two people who work together towards a common goal. Two college students working together to complete a laboratory experiment, or two inter-city youths working together to protect their 'turf' from violation by outsiders are examples. In these cases, solidarity between the collaborators is encouraged and they share jointly the reward of their cooperation. Again at the level of two-person interactions, the goals towards which the cooperation parties work may be consistent with each other, but they may not be identical or shared. From the college experience again, student and professor may cooperate towards the student's mastery of professor's discipline, but the student may be working to make a good grade while the professor is working to establish or reinforce his/her reputation as a good teacher. If some of their rewards are shared, some also are individual but attainable only through joint effort. The cooperating parties in this case may be either neutral or kindly disposed towards one another but their relationship is not likely to have lasting solidarity.

Man can't associate without cooperating, without working together in the pursuit of like to common interests. It can be divided into five principal types.

1. Direct Cooperation:

Those activities in which people do like things together play together, worship together, labor together in myriad ways. The essential character is that people do in company, the things which they can also do separately or in isolation. They do them together because it brings social satisfaction.

2. Indirect Cooperation:

Those activities in which people do definitely unlike tasks toward a single end. Here the famous principle of the 'division of labour' is introduced, a principle that is imbedded in the nature of social revealed wherever people combine their difference for mutual satisfaction or for a common end.

Competition

Just as cooperation exists as a universal form of social interaction, so is competition found in all societies. Competition grows out of the fact that human needs and desires appears to be insatiable and the goods, prestige, and perquisites that are the rewards for successful competition always are in short supply.

Vikash Ranjan

People everywhere compete for dwelling space, for mates, for elaborate clothing and other bodily ornaments, and for wealth whether defined in terms of land, animals, money or even cockle shells.

Although all societies acknowledge and support the value of competition in some areas of life, they differ in the relative emphasis that they place on competition and cooperation, cooperation and competition always exist as reciprocal aspects of the same general experience. European capitalist society, generally, has accepted the view that the collective interest further by individual and group competition spurs people on to accomplish more than can be managed under other circumstances. This stands in marked contrast to the beliefs of some other societies; to that of the Zuni Indians of the American South west. The Zunis discouraged the accumulation of wealth and they minimize status differences among themselves.

They also regard overt competitiveness as a matter of taste in their children. There is some justification for this reaction to competition. Competition, however, is an ideal type. An ideal type is a form of concept that is constructed by taking one or more characteristics of a phenomenon and accentuating those characteristics to their logical maximum or reducing them to their logical minimum. The type thus constructed does not represent reality because the very process of its construction involves exaggeration. Ideal types, nevertheless, are very useful as logical standards by which reality can be measured. This often is done by making a pair of ideal types and letting them represent the ends of a continuum or scale. Because the ends of the scale are defined in terms of logical extremes, no existing case falls at either end of the continuum, but all cases may be ranged somewhere along the continuum between the two end points.

Nature and characteristics of Competition

1. Scarcity as a condition of competition: Wherever there are commonly desired goods and services, there is competition. Infact economics starts with its fundamental proposition that while human wants are unlimited the resources that can satisfy these wants are strictly limited. Hence people compete for the possession of these limited resources. As Hamilton has pointed out competition is necessitated by a population of insatiable wants and a world of stubborn and inadequate resources.

2. Competition is continuous: it is found virtually in every area of social activity and social interaction- particularly, competition for status, wealth and fame is always present in almost all societies.

3. Competition is a cause of social change: Competition is a cause of social change in that; it causes persons to adopt new forms of behavior in order to attain desired ends. New forms of behavior involve inventions and innovations which naturally bring about social change.

4. Competition may be personal or impersonal: Competition is normally directed towards a goal and not against any individual. Some times, it takes place without the actual knowledge of other's existence. It is impersonal as in the case of civil service examination in which the contestants are not even aware of one another's identity. Competition may also be personal as when two individuals contest for election to an office. As competition becomes more personal it leads to rivalry and shades into conflict. Competition in the social world is largely impersonal.

5. Competition is always governed by norms: Competition is not limitless nor is it un- regulated. There is no such thing as unrestricted competition. Such a phrase is contradiction in terms. Moral norms or legal rules always govern and control competition. Competitors are expected to use fair tactics and not cut throat devices.

Some sociologists have also spoken of cultural competition. It may take place between two or more cultural groups. Human history provides examples of such a competition for example; there has always been a keen competition between the culture of the native and that of the invaders. Like cooperation, competition occurs at personal, group, and organizational levels. People competing for affection, a promotion, or public office all are examples of personal competition. The competitors are likely to know one another and to regard others defeat as essential to the attainment of their own goals.

Conflict

Conflict is goal-oriented, just as cooperation and competition are, but, there is a difference, in conflict, one seeks deliberately to harm and/ or destroy one's antagonists. The rules of competition always include restrictions upon the injury that may be done to a foe. But in conflict these rules break down; one seeks to

Vikash Ranjan

win at any cost. In talking about conflict, the notion of a continuum or scale is again useful. It is useful in at least two ways: in differentiating conflict from competition; and in differentiating personal from group and organizational conflict. If we have the data with which to do it, all rival situations probably could be ranged along a continuum defined at one end by pure competition and at the other end by pure conflict.

There might be a few situations that would be located near to each end of the continuum, but many would prove to be mixed types and would cluster near the centre. Conflict also tends to be more or less personal, just as is the case with cooperation and competition. First, fights and 'shoot-out' illustrate highly personal conflicts. The conflicts within football games generally are a little less personal, and the conflict between students and campus police at a sit-in or rally is personal. Yet, when two labor unions or two corporations set out to destroy each other, personal conflict may be almost completely submerged in organizational struggle. Perhaps the most impersonal of all conflicts is war between nations, where the enemy is perceived to be almost faceless. Again, rather than being discrete types of personal and impersonal conflicts, conflicts probably range almost imperceptibly along a continuum from the purely personal to the completely impersonal.

Probably the most striking thing about conflict is its destructive potential. The word 'conflict' itself often conjures up images of heads being broken, of buildings burning, and of deaths and destruction. Moreover, the destructiveness that accompanies conflicts quickly cumulates. In a confrontation between police and students, for example, things may be orderly until the first blow is struck. Once that happens, however, a frenzy of skull cracking, shootings, burning, and destroying may follow. Because the immediate results of conflict often are so horrible, there is a tendency to see it, not as a normal and universal process of social interaction, but as pathological process. It is very difficult for the unsophisticated not to imply value judgments in discussing these social processes because our society as a whole tends to do so. Cooperation and competition are more often perceived to be socially useful; but conflict, to be harmful.

The situation, however, it is not that simple. Few would defend the cooperation of a group of men in the rape of a woman. And the school drop-out problem is hardly a beneficial effect of competition. Thus, competition and cooperation, which otherwise receive a good deal of social approval, also have untoward effects. So it is, also with conflict. Conflict is an abnormal and universal form of social interaction as are any of the others. Analysis of conflict needs to describe both the ways in which it is harmful and destructive and the way in which it is useful and socially integrative

Harmful Effects of Conflict

The harmful effects probably are easier to see. We have already indicated that conflict tends to cumulate rapidly. This snowballing tendency may lead to complete breakdown before the self-limiting features of most inter-personal exchanges have a chance to operate. Before people can decide that the pain is not worth it, people may have been killed and property destroyed. Establishments may be closed or they may find themselves in chaos. Similarly, a company of soldiers may shoot down women and children in an orgy of destruction. A second negative feature of conflict, closely related to the first, is that it is often extremely costly. War probably provides the best example, for nothing else in human experience exacts such a toll.

The third negative feature has to do with social costs. Conflict is inherently divisive. It sets person against person and group against group in ways that threaten to destroy organized social life. United States has seen conflict so widespread as to raise questions whether anarchy might prevail. Youth against the establishment, blacks against whites, the poor against the affluent, and Jews against Arabs represent something of the range of conflicts. In such situations, the question becomes not simply how many people will be killed, how much property destroyed, or who will win; it becomes one of the societal survival. Can race wars be avoided? Can the police maintain order? Can universities operate? And can presidents keep the support of the populace? Whatever else they may be, these are real questions. And the answers are by no means obvious. Conflict threatens the existence of society itself.

Useful Functions of Conflict

The explosiveness, the outward costs, and the divisiveness of conflict are so great that it is often difficult to see the ways in which conflict fulfils socially useful functions. Yet it does at least the following three things. First, it promotes loyalty within the group. Second, it signals the needs for and helps promote

Vikash Ranjan

short-run social change. And third, it appears intimately involved in moving societies towards new levels of social integration.

If conflict pits groups and organizations against one another, it also tends to promote unity within each of the conflicting groups. The necessity to work together against a common foe submerges rivalries within the group and people, who otherwise are competitors, to work together in harmony. Competing football halfbacks flock for each other, rival student leaders work together to win concessions from the administration, and union leaders join forces against management. Nations that are torn by dissent in peacetime rally together when they are attacked by other countries. Thus, conflict is not simply divisive, it works to unify groups.

A second positive function of conflict is that it serves to notify the society that serious problems exist that is not being handled by the traditional social organization. It forces the recognition of those problems and encourages the development of new solutions to them.

The third general positive function of conflict is closely related to the second. And it is much more problematic. One view of human history tends to focus upon conflict particularly upon war - as a primary mechanism through which nations have developed. In other words, war was the mechanism that permitted the consolidation of scattered, weak societies into large, powerful ones. Similar arguments have been advanced that war was necessary during the early modern period in Europe to permit the formation of nations as

Accommodation

The term 'accommodation' refers to several sorts of working agreements between rival groups that permit at least limited cooperation between them even though the issues dividing them remain unsettled. It does not technically end the conflict, but holds it in abeyance. The accommodation may last for only a short time and may be for the purpose of allowing the conflicting parties to consolidate their positions and to prepare for further conflict. Or, as is more often the case, the initial accommodation agreed upon by the parties may be part of the process of seeking solutions to the issues that divide them. If those solutions are not found, the accommodation itself may become permanent.

1. The famous psychologist J.M. Baldwin was the first to use the concept of accommodation. According to him, the term denotes acquired changes in the behaviour of individuals which help them to adjust to their environment.
2. Mac Iver says that the term accommodation refers particularly to the process in which man attains a sense of harmony with his environment.
3. Lundberg is of the opinion that the word accommodation has been used to designate the adjustments which people in groups make to relieve the fatigue and tensions of competition and conflict.
4. According to Ogburn and Nimkoff Accommodation is a term used by the sociologists to describe the adjustment of hostile individuals or groups.

Assimilation

The term 'assimilation' again is in general use, being applied most often to the process whereby large numbers of migrants from Europe were absorbed into the American population during the 19th and the early part of the 20th century. The assimilation of immigrants was a dramatic and highly visible set of events and illustrates the process well. There are other types of assimilation, however, and there are aspects of the assimilation of European migrants that might be put in propositional form. First, assimilation is a two-way process. Second, assimilation of groups as well as individuals takes place. Third some assimilation probably occurs in all lasting interpersonal situations. Fourth, assimilation is often incomplete and creates adjustment problems for individuals. And, fifth, assimilation does not proceed equally rapidly and equally effectively in all inter-group situations.

Definitions:

1. According to Young and Mack, Assimilation is the fusion or blending of two previously distinct groups into one.
2. For Bogardus Assimilation is the social process whereby attitudes of many persons are united and thus develop into a united group.

Vikash Ranjan

3. Biesanz describes Assimilation is the social process whereby individuals or groups come to share the same sentiments and goals.
4. For Ogburn and Nimkoff; Assimilation is the process whereby individuals or groups once dissimilar become similar and identified in their interest and outlook.

Assimilation is a slow and a gradual process. It takes time. For example, immigrants take time to get assimilated with majority group. Assimilation is concerned with the absorption and incorporation of the culture by another.

Acculturation

This term is used to describe both the process of contacts between different cultures and also the customs of such contacts. As the process of contact between cultures, acculturation may involve either direct social interaction or exposure to other cultures by means of the mass media of communication. As the outcome of such contact, acculturation refers to the assimilation by one group of the culture of another which modifies the existing culture and so changes group identity. There may be a tension between old and new cultures which leads to the adapting of the new as well as the old.

Social Groups

A social group consists of two or more people who interact with one another and who recognize themselves as a distinct social unit. The definition is simple enough, but it has significant implications. Frequent interaction leads people to share values and beliefs. This similarity and the interaction cause them to identify with one another. Identification and attachment, in turn, stimulate more frequent and intense interaction. Each group maintains solidarity with all to other groups and other types of social systems.

Groups are among the most stable and enduring of social units. They are important both to their members and to the society at large. Through encouraging regular and predictable behavior, groups form the foundation upon which society rests. Thus, a family, a village, a political party a trade union is all social groups. These, it should be noted are different from social classes, status groups or crowds, which not only lack structure but whose members are less aware or even unaware of the existence of the group. These have been called quasi-groups or groupings. Nevertheless, the distinction between social groups and quasi-groups is fluid and variable since quasi-groups very often give rise to social groups, as for example, social classes give rise to political parties.

Primary Groups

If all groups are important to their members and to society, some groups are more important than others. Early in the twentieth century, Charles H. Cooley gave the name, primary groups, to those groups that he said are characterized by intimate face-to-face association and those are fundamental in the development and continued adjustment of their members. He identified three basic primary groups, the family, the child's play group, and the neighborhoods or community among adults. These groups, he said, are almost universal in all societies; they give to people their earliest and most complete experiences of social unity; they are instrumental in the development of the social life; and they promote the integration of their members in the larger society. Since Cooley wrote, over 65 years ago, life in the United States has become much more urban, complex, and impersonal, and the family play group and neighborhood have become less dominant features of the social order.

Secondary groups, characterized by anonymous, impersonal, and instrumental relationships, have become much more numerous. People move frequently, often from one section of the country to another and they change from established relationships and promoting widespread loneliness. Young people, particularly, turn to drugs, seek communal living groups and adopt deviant lifestyles in attempts to find meaningful primary-group relationships. The social context has changed so much so that primary group relationship today is not as simple as they were in Cooley's time.

Secondary Groups

An understanding of the modern industrial society requires an understanding of the secondary groups. The social groups other than those of primary groups may be termed as secondary groups. They are a residual category. They are often called special interest groups. Maclver and Page refers to them as great

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 36

associations. They are of the opinion that secondary groups have become almost inevitable today. Their appearance is mainly due to the growing cultural complexity. Primary groups are found predominantly 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. Interests become differentiated. The services of experts are required. The new range of the interests demands a complex organization. Especially selected persons act on behalf of all and hence arises a hierarchy of officials called bureaucracy. These features characterize the rise of the modern state, the great corporation, the factory, the labor union, a university or a nationwide political party and so on. These are secondary groups. Ogburn and Nimkoff defines secondary groups as groups which provide experience lacking in intimacy. Frank D. Watson writes that the secondary group is larger and more formal, is specialized and direct in its contacts and relies more for unity and continuance upon the stability of its social organization than does the primary group.

Characteristics of secondary group:

Dominance of secondary relations: Secondary groups are characterized by indirect, impersonal, contractual and non-inclusive relations. Relations are indirect because secondary groups are bigger in size and members may not stay together. Relations are contractual in the sense they are oriented towards certain interests

Largeness of the size: Secondary groups are relatively larger in size. City, nation, political parties, trade unions and corporations, international associations are bigger in size. They may have thousands and lakhs of members. There may not be any limit to the membership in the case of some secondary groups.

Membership: Membership in the case of secondary groups is mainly voluntary. Individuals are at liberty to join or to go away from the groups. However there are some secondary groups like the state whose membership is almost involuntary.

No physical basis: Secondary groups are not characterized by physical proximity. Many secondary groups are not limited to any definite area. There are some secondary groups like the Rotary Club and Lions Club which are international in character. The members of such groups are scattered over a vast area.

Specific ends or interest: Secondary groups are formed for the realization of some specific interests or ends. They are called special interest groups. Members are interested in the groups because they have specific ends to aim at. Indirect communication: Contacts and communications in the case of secondary groups are mostly indirect. Mass media of communication such as radio, telephone, television, newspaper, movies, magazines and post and telegraph are resorted to by the members to have communication.

Communication may not be quick and effective even. Impersonal nature of social relationships in secondary groups is both the cause and the effect of indirect communication.

Nature of group control: Informal means of social control are less effective in regulating the relations of members. Moral control is only secondary. Formal means of social control such as law, legislation, police, court etc are made of to control the behavior of members. The behavior of the people is largely influenced and controlled by public opinion, propaganda, rule of law and political ideologies. Group structure: The secondary group has a formal structure. A formal authority is set up with designated powers and a clear-cut division of labor in which the function of each is specified in relation to the function of all. Secondary groups are mostly organized groups. Different statuses and roles that the members assume are specified. Distinctions based on caste, colour, religion, class, language etc are less rigid and there is greater tolerance towards other people or groups.

Limited influence on personality: Secondary groups are specialized in character. People involvement in them is also of limited significance. Members's attachment to them is also very much limited. Further people spend most of their time in primary groups than in secondary groups. Hence secondary groups have very limited influence on the personality of the members.

Reference Groups

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

According to Merton reference groups are those groups which are the referring points of the individuals, towards which he is oriented and which influences his opinion, tendency and behaviour. The individual is surrounded by countless reference groups. Both the memberships and inner groups and non memberships and outer groups may be reference groups.

Social Systems

Page | 37

A social system basically consists of two or more individuals interacting directly or indirectly in a bounded situation. There may be physical or territorial boundaries, but the fundamental sociological point of reference is that the individuals are oriented, in a whole sense, to a common focus or inter-related foci. Thus it is appropriate to regard such diverse sets of relationships as small groups, political parties and whole societies as social systems. Social systems are open systems, exchanging information with, frequently acting with reference to other systems. Modern conceptions of the term can be traced to the leading social analysts of the nineteenth century, notably Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim; each of whom elaborated in some form or other conceptions of the major units of social systems (mainly societies) and the relationships between such units- even though the expression social system was not a key one. Thus, in Marx's theory, the major units or components of the capitalist societies with which he was principally concerned were socio-economic classes, and the major relationships between classes involved economic and political power.

The most influential conceptualization of the term has been that of Talcott Parsons. Parsons' devotion to this issue has two main aspects. First, what is called the problem of social order; i.e. the nature of the forces giving rise to relatively stable forms of social interaction and organization, and promoting orderly change. Parsons took Thomas Hobbes Leviathan, 1651, as his point of departure in this part of his analysis. Hobbes had maintained that man's fundamental motivation was the craving for power and that men were always basically in conflict with each other. Thus order could only exist in strong government. To counter this Parsons invoked the work of Max Weber and, in particular, Durkheim, who had placed considerable emphasis on the functions of normative, factors in social life, such as ideals and values. Factors of this kind came to constitute the mainspring in Parsons Delineation of a social system. Thus in his major theoretical work, The Social system, 1951, he defines a social system as consisting in a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors, who are motivated in terms of a tendency to the optimization of gratification and whose relations to their situations, including each other, is defined and mediated in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols.

The major units of a social system are said to be collectivities and roles (i.e. not individuals as such); and the major patterns or relationships linking these units are values (ends or broad guides to action) and norms (rules governing role performance in the context of system values). Parsons second major interest has been to make sociology more scientific and systematic, by developing abstract conceptions of the social system; one of this points being that even though Weber placed much emphasis upon normative factors as guiding action, there was in Weber's sociology no elaboration of a theoretically integrated total system of action. Hence the attempt to combine in one framework both a conception of actors in social situations and an overall, highly abstract, outside view of the major factors involved in a social system as a going concern. Various points in Parsons' formulation have been criticized. Notably, objections have been made to the emphasis upon normative regulation, and it has been alleged that Parsons neglected social conflict under the pressure of his systematic perspective; i.e. pre-occupation with system ness and analytical elegance which blinds the sociologist to disconsensus in real life and spurs him to stress integrative phenomena in his analyses. However, it is widely agreed that sociologists should operate with some clearly defined conception of what constitutes a social system. Thus, for many sociologists the term social system is not by any means restricted to those situations where there is binding normative regulation; but in order to qualify as social system it must involve a common focus, or set of foci, or orientations and a shared mode of communication among a majority of actors. Thus, on this basis there can be a system of conflict.

Status and Role

The term has two sociological uses:

SOCIOLOGY by Vikash Ranjan 11A/10, Old Rajender Nagar, Near Bikaner Sweet, Delhi
#8586861046/#7840888102/011-25812473 www.facebook.com/sociologyforias/

Vikash Ranjan

1. R. Linton (1936) defined status simply as a position in a social system, such as child or parent. Status refers to what a person is, whereas the closely linked notion of role refers to the behaviour expected of people in a status.

2. Status is also used as a synonym for honor or prestige, when social status denotes the relative position of a person on a publicly recognized scale or hierarchy of social worth. (See 'Social Stratification').

It is the first meaning of the term status, status as position, which we are going to refer to in the following paragraphs. Status as honour or prestige is a part of the study of social stratification.

A status is simply a rank or position that one holds in a group. One occupies the status of son or daughter, playmate, pupil, radical, militant and so on. Eventually one occupies the statuses of husband, mother bread-winner, cricket fan, and so on, one has as many statuses as there are groups of which one is a member. For analytical purposes, statuses are divided into two basic types:

Ascribed Statuses

Ascribed statuses are those which are fixed for an individual at birth. Ascribed statuses that exist in all societies include those based upon sex, age, race ethnic group and family background.

Similarly, power, prestige, privileges, and obligations always are differentially distributed in societies by the age of the participants. This has often been said about the youth culture in the U.S. because of the high value Americans attach to being young. Pre-modern China, by contrast, attached the highest value to old age and required extreme subordination of children. The perquisites and obligations accompany age change over the individual's lifetime, but the individual proceeds inexorably through these changes with no freedom of choice.

As the discussion implies, the number and rigidity of ascribed statuses vary from one society to another. Those societies in which many statuses are rigidly prescribed and relatively unchangeable are called caste societies, or at least, caste like. Among major nations, India is a caste society. In addition to the ascribed statuses already discussed, occupation and the choice of marriage partners in traditional India are strongly circumscribed by accident of birth. Such ascribed statuses stand in contrast to achieved statuses.

Achieved Statuses

Achieved statuses are those which the individual acquires during his or her lifetime as a result of the exercise of knowledge, ability, skill and/or perseverance. Occupation provides an example of status that may be either ascribed or achieved, and which serves to differentiate caste-like societies from modern ones. Societies vary in both the number of statuses that are ascribed and achieved and in the rigidity with which such definitions are held. Both ascribed and achieved statuses exist in all societies. However, an understanding of a specific society requires that the interplay among these be fully understood. For Weber class is a creation of the market situation. Class operates in society independently of any valuations. As Weber did not believe in the economic phenomena determining human ideals, he distinguishes status situation from class situation.

According to Linton, status is associated with distinctive beliefs about the expectations of those having status, as for example, the status of children. Other common bases for status are age, sex, birth, genealogy and other biological constitutional characteristics. However, status, according to Linton, is only a phenomenon, not the intrinsic characteristic of man but of social organization. What matters is not what you really are, but what people believe you to be. At times, some confuse the two terms, status and role. Status defines who a person is, as for example, he is a child or a Negro, or a doctor; whereas, role defines what such a person is expected to do, as for example, he is too young to work, he should care about parents etc

Socialization

Socialization is predominately an unconscious process by which a newborn child learns the values, beliefs, rules and regulations of society or internalizes the culture in which it is born. Socialization, in fact, includes learning of three important processes: (1) cognitive; (2) affective, and (3) evaluative. In other words, socialization includes the knowledge of how things are caused and the establishment of emotional links with the rest of the members of the society. Socialization, therefore, equips an individual in such a way that he can perform his duties in his society. Who are the agents of socialization? The agents of socialization vary from society to society. However, in most of the cases, it is the family which is a major socializing agent, that is, the nearest kinsmen are the first and the most important agents of socialization.

Vikash Ranjan

The other groups which are socializing units in a society vary according to the complexity. Thus, in modern complex society, the important socializing agents are educational institutions, while in primitive societies, clans and lineages play a more important role. Socialization is a slow process.

There is no fixed time regarding the beginning and the end of this process. However, some sociologists formulated different stages of socialization. These are (1) oral stage, (2) anal stage (3) oedipal stage, and (4) adolescence. In all these stages, especially in the first three, the main socializing agent is the family. The first stage is that of a new-born child when he is not involved in the family as a whole but only with his mother. He does not recognize anyone except his mother. The time at which the second stage begins is generally after first year and ends when the infant is around three. At this stage, the child separates the role of his mother and his own. Also during this time force is used on the child, that is, he is made to learn a few basic things. The third stage extends from about fourth year to 12th to 13th year, that is, till puberty. During this time, the child becomes a member of the family as a whole and identifies himself with the social role ascribed to him. The fourth stage begins at puberty when a child wants freedom from parental control. He has to choose a job and a partner for himself. He also learns about incest taboo.

Deviance

In everyday language to deviate means to stray from an accepted path. Many sociological definitions of deviance simply elaborate upon this idea. Thus deviance consists of those areas which do not follow the norms and expectations of a particular social group. Deviance may be positively sanctioned (rewarded), negatively sanctioned (punished), or simply accepted without reward or punishment. In terms of the above definition of deviance, the soldier on the battlefield who risks his life above and beyond the normal call of duty may be termed deviant, as the physicist who breaks the rules of his discipline and develops a new theory. Their deviance may be positively sanctioned; the soldier might be rewarded with a medal, the physicist with a Noble prize. In one sense, though, neither is deviant since both conform to the values of society, the soldier to the value of courage; the physicist to the value of academic progress.

By comparison, a murderer deviates not only from society's norms and expectations but also from its values, in particular the value placed on human life. His deviance generally results in widespread disapproval and punishment. A third form of deviance consists of acts which depart from the norms and expectations of a particular society but are generally tolerated and accepted. The little old lady with a house full of cats or the old gentleman with an obsession for collecting clocks would fall into this category. Usually their eccentricities are neither rewarded nor punished by others. They are simply defined as a 'bit odd' but harmless, and therefore tolerated. Deviance is relative. This means that there is no absolute way of defining a deviant act. Deviance can only be defined in relation to a particular standard, but no standards are fixed or absolute. As such deviance varies from time to time and place to place. In a particular society an act which is considered deviant today may be defined as normal in the future. An act defined as deviant in one society may be seen as perfectly normal in another. Put another way, deviance is culturally determined and cultures change over time and vary from society to society. The following examples will serve to illustrate the above points. Sometimes ago in Western society it had been considered deviant for women to smoke, use make-up and consume alcoholic drinks in public. Today this is no longer the case. In the same way, definitions of crime change over time. Homosexuality was formerly a criminal offence in Britain. Since 1969, however, homosexual acts conducted between consenting adults in private are no longer illegal. A comparison of modern Western culture with the traditional culture of the Teton Sioux Indians of the USA illustrates how deviance varies from society to society. As part of their religious rituals during the annual Sun Dance Ceremony Sioux Warriors mutilated their bodies, leather thongs were inserted through strips of flesh on the chest and attached to a central pole, and warriors had to break free by tearing their flesh and in return they were granted favors by the supernatural powers. Similar actions by members of Western society may well be viewed as masochism or madness. In the same way behaviour accepted as normal in Western society may be defined as deviant within primitive society. In the West the private ownership of property is an established norm; members of society strive to accumulate wealth and substantial property holding brings power and prestige. Such behaviour would have incurred strong disapproval amongst the Sioux and those who acted in terms of the above norms would be regarded as deviant. Generosity was a major value of Sioux culture and the distributed rather than accumulation of wealth was the route to power and prestige. Chiefs

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 40

were expected to distribute gifts of horses, beadwork and weapons to their followers. The norms of Sioux culture prevented the accumulation of Wealth. The Sioux had no conception of the individual ownership of land; the produce of the hunt was automatically shared by all members of the group. Emile Durkheim developed his view on deviance in his discussion of crime in *The Rules of Sociological Method*. He argues that crime is an inevitable and normal aspect of social life; it is an integral part of all healthy societies. It is inevitable because not every member of society can be equally committed to the 'collective sentiments, the shared values and beliefs of society. Since individuals are exposed to different influences and circumstances, it is impossible for all to be alike. Therefore, not everybody shares the same restraints about breaking the law.

Crime is not only inevitable, it can also be functional. Durkheim argues that it only becomes dysfunctional when its rate is unusually high. He argues that all social change begins with some form of deviance. In order for change to occur, Yesterday's deviance must become today's normality. Since a certain amount of change is healthy for society, so it can progress rather than stagnate. So for change to occur, the collective sentiments must not be too strong, or too hostile. Infact, they must have only moderate energy' because if they were to strong they would crush all originality both of the criminal and of the genius. Thus the collective sentiments must not be sufficiently powerful to block the expression of people like Jesus, William Wilberforce, Martin Luther King and Mother Teresa. Durkheim regarded some crime as and anticipation of the morality of the future. Thus heretics who were denounced by both the state and the established church may represent the collective sentiments of the future. In the same way terrorists of freedom fighters may represent a future established order .If crime is inevitable, what is the function of punishment. Durkheim argues that its function is not to remove crime in society. Rather it is to maintain the collective sentiments at their necessary level of strength. In Durkheim's words, punishment 'serves to heal the wounds done to the collective sentiments'. Without punishment the collective sentiments would lose their force to control behaviour and the crime rate would reach the point where it becomes dysfunctional. Thus in Durkheim's view, a healthy society requires both crime and punishment, both are inevitable, both are functional.

Following Durkheim, Merton argues that deviance results not from pathological personalities but from the culture and structure of society itself. He begins from the standard functionalist position of value consensus, that is, all members of society share the same values. However, since members of society are placed in different positions in the social structure, for example, they differ in terms of class position; they do not have the same opportunity of realizing the shared value. This situation can generate deviance. In Merton's words: 'The social and cultural structure generates pressure for socially deviant behaviour upon people variously located in that structure.

Using USA as an example, Merton outlines his theory as follows. Members of American Society share the major values of American culture. In particular they share the goal of success for which they all strive and which is largely measured in terms of wealth and material possessions. The 'American Dream' states that all members of society have an equal opportunity of achieving success, of owning a Cadillac, a Beverly Hills mansion and a substantial bank balance. In all societies there are institutionalized means of reaching culturally defined goals. In America the accepted ways of achieving success are through educational qualifications, talent, hard work, drive, determination and ambition. In a balanced society an equal emphasis is placed upon both cultural goals and institutionalized means, and members are satisfied with both. But in America great importance is attached to success and relatively less importance is given to the accepted ways of achieving success. As such, American society is unstable, unbalanced. There is a tendency to reject the 'rules of the game' and to strive for success by all available means. The situation becomes like a game of cards in which winning becomes so important that the rules are abandoned by some of the players. When rules cease to operate a situation of normlessness or 'anomie' results. In this situation of anything norms no longer direct behavior and deviance is encouraged. However, individuals will respond to a situation of anomie in different ways. In particular, their reaction will be shaped by their position in the social structure. Merton outlines five possible ways in which members of American society can respond to success goals. The first and most common response is conformity. Members of society conform both to success goals and the normative means of reaching them. A second response is 'innovation'. This response rejects normative means of achieving success and turns to deviant means,

Vikash Ranjan

crime in particular. Merton argues that members of the lower social strata are most likely to select this route to success.

Merton uses the term 'ritualism' to describe the third possible response. Those who select this alternative are deviant because they have largely abandoned the commonly held success goals. The pressure to adopt this alternative is greatest on members of the lower middle class. Their occupations provide less opportunity for success than those of other members of the middle class. However, compared to members of the working class, they have been strongly socialized to conform to social norms. This prevents them from turning to crime. Unable to innovate and with jobs that offer little opportunity for advancement, their only solution is to scale down or abandon their success goals. Merton terms the fourth and least common response, 'retreatism'. It applies to psychotics, artists, pariahs, drug addicts. They have strongly internalized both the cultural goals and the institutionalized means but is unable to achieve success. They resolve the conflict of their situation by abandoning both the goals and the means of reaching them. They are unable to cope with challenges and drop out of society defeated and resigned to their failure. They are deviant in two ways: they have rejected both the cultural goals and the institutionalized means. Merton does not relate retreatism to social class position. Rebellion forms the fifth and final response. It is a rejection of both the success goals and the institutionalized means and their replacement by different goals and means. Those who adopt this alternative want to create a new society. Thus urban guerillas in Western European capitalist societies adopt deviant means- terrorism- to reach deviant goals such as a communist society. Merton argues that it is typically members of a rising class rather than the most depressed strata who organize the resentful and rebellious into a revolutionary group. To summarize, Merton claims that his analysis shows how the culture and structure of society generates deviance.

Page | 41

Conformity

The genesis of the study of social conformity or stability is the assumption that there is order in nature and it can be discovered, described and understood. Applying this analogy to society what sociologists aim is to discover, describe and explain the order which characterizes the social life of man.

It is justifiable search because members of any large society perform millions and billions of social acts in the course of a single day. The outcome of such social activity is not chaos but rather a reasonable approximation of order. Sociology is concerned with an explanation of how this wonder comes about. In doing so, sociologists talk of social system which means that the coordination and integration of social structure which ends in order rather than in chaos. It is also to be borne in mind that when sociologists study social conformity, it is not their business to condemn or justify it. Logically, sociologists do study social stability in totalitarian societies too.

The means by which individuals or groups are induced and/or compelled to conform to certain norms and values are numerous. The most obvious and uniform manifestations of social control are found in social institutions. Some of the prominent ones are law, government, religion, marriage, family, education and social classes. Also, caste distinctions and classes provide effective control over the behavior of individuals. These work in two ways. These distinctions create patterns of behavior within limits which govern each class in its relation with other classes. The importance of these patterns largely depends on the social setting of a potent means of enforcing conformity, but it would be of little importance in enforcing conformity in the impersonal life of an American metropolis.

Law

In our times state is the sole upholder of social control and conformity, and the principal means at its disposal is law. Since law is enforced by State, force is present. Roscoe Pound explains law as social control through systematic application of the force of a politically organized society. In a lighter vein Bertrand Russell remarks that the good behaviour of even the most exemplary citizen owes much to the existence of a police force. Much earlier, Durkheim was the first sociologist to show that law is the means to enforce the collective conscience or collectivity which makes society an entity by itself, almost God.

Law is closely associated with morality and religion. Legislation always rests on social doctrines and ideals which have been derived from religion and morality, and judicial decisions always rely on the

Vikash Ranjan

Page | 42

fundamental moral ideas of society expressed as reason, natural law, natural justice, and equality and, in more recent times, as public policy or public interest litigation as in India. Law, therefore, rests upon moral sentiments derived from religion and is influenced by institutional arrangements of society; and it brings about, by its precision and sanction, such a degree of certainty in human behaviour that cannot be attained through other types of social control. On occasions, law enforces social attitudes and contracts which initially were those of a small minority of reformers. In Russia, law has established new morals of behaviour which were originally the aspirations of small group of revolutionaries. In democratic societies, too, social reformers played an important part in influencing social behaviour, later on approved by law.

One more characteristic of law is the changed outlook towards punishment. As societies are becoming more confident of their powers to maintain order as a result of rising material standards, declining class differences and spread of education and extension of rights, more and more stress is being laid on the willing cooperation of people with state and its law. This development has been further augmented by studies in sociology and psychology which have shown that crimes are projection of society rather than the results of individual violation. That is why the new discipline, called criminology, has developed as an applied branch of sociology.

Lastly, law as it is today, does not primarily deal with individuals alone. Very often it regulates conflicts between individuals and groups as well as between individuals and large organisations whether public or private. The role of property in social life has been modified by the changes that have accrued in the relations between the employer and the worker through the abolition of the crime of conspiracy, the recognition of collective bargaining, social security and direct limitations on the use of private property, all through legislation.

The law as it exists today partly contributes to social change. As already remarked above, the change in the role of property has led to a great social change in man's social behavior. Secondly, individual initiative is no longer on the premium in modern societies. Mammoth organizations and corporations undertake the vast socio-economic activities of modern times. Taking into account these changes, American sociologists have introduced expressions such as the 'Other-directed man' and the organization man. As the social complex of modern communities is transforming itself, law, too, is keeping pace with them in making the interaction between the other direct man and the mammoth organizations or the corporations to be smooth and efficient.

In developing societies the role of law in contributing to social change is much more. In all countries there is a continuous rationalization of the existing law by modification, introduction of foreign codes, and systematic legislation in relation to customary and traditional law. The Indian Constitution is an embodiment of such monumental change. The philosophy governing social changes, implied as well as explicitly stated in the Constitution, is governed by the principles stated in the Preamble which are entirely secular and which bear the imprint of the leading minds of the world like the 18th century French philosophers, liberal thinkers of the 19th century, the Fabian socialists of the 20th century, and individual thinkers like Thoreau, Tolstoy and Mahatma Gandhi.

Custom

Once a habit is established, it becomes a role or norm of action. Customs often involve binding reciprocal obligations. Also, custom supports law, without which it becomes meaningless. In the words of MacIver and Page, custom establishes a social order of its own so that conflict arising between custom and law is not a conflict between law and lawlessness, but between the orders of reflection (law) and the order of spontaneity (custom).

In general, customs regulate the whole social life of man. Law itself cannot cover the whole gamut of social behavior. It is the customary practices that contribute to the harmonious social interactions in a society which normal times of peace and tranquility. The influence of custom, at times, extends beyond one's own community. In certain communities custom determines the relations between two communities at war. The Bedouins of the African desert will never destroy a water-well of the enemy.

Some of the customs do not play any role in social control. They just exist because of their ancient nature just as all people bathing in an unhygienic tank or a lake just because of an established religious custom. Even the custom of performing Shradha in India has no meaning if people do not know how to respect

Vikash Ranjan

what the past has given us as well as accept our moral obligation to the future generations. However, in most of the traditional societies the customary practices are all emptied of their meaning.

In brief, although custom is regarded as one of the less formal types of control like public opinion, its influence on social life is very significant as it alone contributes to the textual part of social behavior.

Acculturation

Page | 43

This term is used to describe both the process of contacts between different cultures and also the customs of such contacts. As the process of contact between cultures, acculturation may involve either direct social interaction or exposure to other cultures by means of the mass media of communication. As the outcome of such contact, acculturation refers to the assimilation by one group of the culture of another which modifies the existing culture and so changes group identity. There may be a tension between old and new cultures which leads to the adapting of the new as well as the old

Integration

Integration is defined as a process of developing a society in which all the social groups share the socioeconomic and cultural life. The integration of the communities is facilitated by the factors that help assimilation. Alcott Parsons defined integration as a mode of relation of the units of the system by virtue of which on the one hand they act collectively to avoid disrupting the system and making it impossible to maintain the stability and on the other hand to cooperate to promote its functioning as a unity. He believed that the kinship group, family, profession, the state and religion are visible social structures and these perform the function of integration in various forms.

Social Distance

Bogardus developed the concept of social distance to measure the degree of closeness or acceptance we feel toward other groups. While most often used with reference to racial groups social distance refers to closeness between groups of all kinds. Social distance is measured either by direct observation of people interacting or more often by questionnaires in which people are asked what kind of people they would accept in particular relationships. In these questionnaires a number of groups may be listed and the informants asked to check whether they would accept a member of each group as a neighbor, as a fellow worker as a marriage partner and so on through a series of relationships. The social distance questionnaires may not accurately measure what people actually would do if a member of another group sought to become a friend or neighbour. The social distance scale is only an attempt to measure one's feeling of unwillingness to associate equally with a group. What a person will actually do in a situation also depends upon the circumstances of the situation.

SOCIOLOGY

by

Vikash Ranjan

Author "Fundamentals of Sociology" & "Applied Sociology"

- **Sociology (Regular course)**
- **Answer Writing Skill Training(Test series)**
- **Sociology Distance Learning Course.**

Sociology By Vikash Ranjan