

SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

M. A. Sociology First Year

Semester – II, Paper-I



Director, I/c

Prof. V.VENKATESWARLU

MA., M.P.S., M.S.W., M.Phil., Ph.D.

CENTRE FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION

ACHARAYANAGARJUNAUNIVERSITY

NAGARJUNANAGAR – 522510

Ph:0863-2346222,2346208,

0863-2346259(Study Material)

Website: www.anucde.info

e-mail:anucdedirector@gmail.com

SEMESTER - II

201SO21: SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Course Objectives: The main Objective of this paper is to throw light upon: To understand the Sociology as a Science, Society and Social System, Socialisation- Agencies and Theories

Course Out Comes: To prepare the students to gain knowledge about the concepts of emergence of Sociology, human society, Social Control – Types and Agencies, Anomie and Alienation

Unit I

1. Sociology as a science and its uses.
2. Concept of society and Social System.
3. Elements of Social Structure: Role, Status, Norms, Values, Power, Authority, Groups, Associations.

Unit II

1. Socialisation- Agencies and Theories
2. Social Control – Types and Agencies
3. Anomie and Alienation

Unit III

1. Associative Social Process: Co-operation,
2. Dissociative Social Process
3. Conformity and Deviance

Unit IV

1. Social Differentiation and Social Stratification
2. Class & Caste as a Dimension of Stratification
3. Theories of Social Stratification

Unit V

1. Social Change: Meaning, Nature and Characteristics
2. Factors of Social Change
3. Theories of Social Change
4. Social Evolution and Social Progress

Recommended books:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| 1. Koenig, Samuel | : Sociology – An Introduction |
| 2. Mac Iver and Page | : Society |
| 3. Bierstedt, Robert | : Social Order |
| 4. Davis, Kingsley | : Human Society |
| 5. Johnson, H,M | : Sociology, A Systematic Introduction |
| 6. Goode, William | : The Dynamics of Modern Society |
| 7. Ian Robertson | : Sociology |
| 8. Harlombos | : Sociology, Themes and Perspectives |

SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS – 201SO21

CONTENTS

L. NO.	TOPIC	PAGE NO.
1	SOCIOLOGY AS A SCIENCE AND ITS USES	1 - 9
2	CONCEPT OF SOCIETY AND SOCIAL SYSTEM	10–19
3	ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE	20 - 35
4	POWER, AUTHORITY, GROUPS, ASSOCIATIONS	36 – 55
5	THE AGENCIES OF SOCIALIZATION	56 - 65
6	THEORIES OF SOCIALIZATION	66- 71
7	SOCIAL CONTROL – TYPES AND AGENCIES	72 -88
8	ALIENATION	89- 102
9	ANOMIE	103– 112
10	SOCIAL PROCESS-ASSOCIATIVE SOCIAL PROCESS	113 - 129
11	DISSOCIATIVE SOCIAL PROCESS	130 - 143
12	SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION	144 – 153
13	SOCIAL STRATIFICATION : THEORIES	154– 165
14	SOCIAL CHANGE FACTORS AND THEORIES	167 – 182
15	CASTE AS A DIMENSION OF STRATIFICATION	183 – 189

Lesson 1

SOCIOLOGY AS A SCIENCE AND ITS USES

1.0 Objective:

The main objective of this lesson is to understand the Origin and development of society, Need of a Science of Sociology and emergence of sociology.

Contents:

- 1.1 Origin and Development of Society
- 1.2 What is Sociology?
- 1.3 Need of a Science of Sociology
- 1.4 Definition of Sociology
- 1.5 Emergence of Sociology
- 1.6 Development of Sociology in Europe and America:
- 1.7 Development of Sociology in England:
- 1.8 Development of Sociology in America:
- 1.9 Development of Sociology in the 20th Century:
- 1.10 Contribution of George Simmel to the field of Sociology:
- 1.11 Max Weber and his contribution to the field of sociology:
- 1.12 Toynbee and the development of sociology:
- 1.13 Development of Sociology in India
- 1.14 Future trends and the development of sociology:
- 1.15 Summary
- 1.16 Key Words
- 1.17 Questions

1.1 Origin and Development of Society

The term Sociology was coined by Auguste Comte, a French philosopher, in 1839. The teaching of sociology as a separate discipline started in 1876 in the United States, in 1889 in France, in 1907 in Great Britain, after World War I in Poland and India, in 1925 in Egypt and Mexico, and in 1947 in Sweden.

1.2 What is Sociology?

Sociology is the youngest of all the Social Sciences. The word Sociology is derived from the Latin word 'societus' meaning 'society' and the Greek word 'logos' meaning 'study or science'. The etymological meaning of 'sociology' is thus the 'science of society'. Prof. Ginsberg accordingly defines it "as the study of society that is of the web or tissue of human inter-actions and inter-relations." In other words, Sociology is the study of man's behaviour in groups or of the inter-action among human beings, of social relationships and the processes by which human group activity takes place.

1.3 Need of a Science of Sociology

The most distinctive feature of human life is its social character. All human beings have to interact with other human beings in order to survive. Aristotle, the great Greek philosopher, remarked that 'Man is a social animal.' Both nature and necessity impel man to live in society. Man's behaviour in society is determined mainly by two forces—physical and social which he has been trying to understand and control from time immemorial. It was quite natural that his attempts to comprehend and control the natural phenomena had started earlier and met with greater success than his attempts to understand the social phenomena because it was easier for him to understand the physical phenomena by virtue of the fact that they were more concrete and hence more observable with a greater degree of detachment.

1.4 Definition of Sociology

To understand more fully what Sociology is about it shall be in the fitness of things to study some of the definitions given by some important sociologists, and then to conclude

about the subject matter of this science, as agreed upon by most of them. Some of the definitions of Sociology are as follows:

1. 'Sociology is the science of society or of social phenomena....' - L.F. Ward.
2. 'The subject-matter of Sociology is the inter-action of human minds'. L.T. Hobhouse.
3. 'Sociology is the study of human inter-action and inter-relation, their conditions and consequences'. M. Ginsberg.
4. 'Sociology is the science that deals with social groups; their internal forms or modes of organisation, the processes that tend to maintain or change these forms of organisation and relations between groups'. - H.M. Johnson.

A perusal of the above definitions shows that sociologists differ in their opinions about the subject-matter of Sociology. We find the following views.

- a) Sociology is a science of society.
- b) Sociology is a science of social relationships.
- c) Sociology is the study of social life.
- d) Sociology is the study of human behaviour in groups.
- e) Sociology is the study of social action.
- f) Sociology is the study of forms of social relationships.
- g) Sociology is the study of social groups or social systems.

However, the common idea underlying them all is that Sociology is concerned with human relationships. Its emphasis is on the 'social' aspect of these relationships. MacIver has clarified that whatever topic may be included in the subject-matter of sociology, its real subject-matter is social relationships. The basis of social inter-action or social processes is social relationships. It is on account of such relationships that there is human inter-action. Therefore, if we include social processes or any other matter within the subject-matter of sociology, their study can be carried only in the context of social relationships. Man becomes a social animal only when he enters into social relationships. The different aspects of social life, viz., political or economic are but the expressions of social relationships. Therefore in

studying sociology we are in fact studying social relationships in one form or the other. Its subject-matter is society rather than the individual though the individual cannot be left utterly out of account.

1.5 Emergence of Sociology

18th century is very important from the point of view of the growth and development of social sciences. The credit for all this goes to various thinkers who accepted that man is a social being. The occidental thinker's viz. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle alluded to the various aspects of human society. Their efforts were cursory because they never aimed to develop a distinct discipline of society. The credit goes to the French scholar- Auguste Comte (1798-1857) who tried to develop a naturalistic science of society. To this new science, Comte first named as 'social physics'. But later on he gave it up and coined the hybrid term 'Sociology'. Thus Comte gave it a name and made its development possible.

Ladder of Social Sciences – Auguste Comte constructed his ladder of the social sciences and placed Sociology at the top. In regard to Sociology he has made the following observations:

1. Sociology is the comprehensive science.
2. Its co-ordination of various social sciences.
3. Sociology should be used for social reconstruction.

It was Auguste Comte who for the first time attempted at the scientific study of society. The result of this study was sociology, that is why is called father of Sociology. Comte urged that no science could be effectively studied without competent knowledge of all the sciences but to study each of them in order. This is Comte's dictum to the students of sociology.

Classification of Sociology according to Comte—Comte has classified Sociology under the following two heads:

1. Social statics,
2. Social dynamics.

1. **Social Statics:** This branch of sociology includes all those things for its study that are responsible for the stability and organisation in the society.
2. **Social Dynamics:** Society is not only static but also dynamic. It moves forward. All those factors that are responsible for the progress, development and marching ahead of society are included for study and the branch of the sociology is called “Social Dynamics”. In other words Social Dynamics defines all those factors causes that are responsible for social change and social disorganisation.

Sociology as a Science of Social Reconstruction: One of the causes for Sociology being given the highest place in the series of the Social Sciences by Auguste Comte was that it was a science that could be used for social reconstruction. It could be used usefully for social reconstruction and that is why Comte gave it the importance that he has put down in his works.

1.6 Development of Sociology in Europe and America:

After its birth in France, Sociology saw its development in Europe as well as in America. In the 19th century, European countries like England and Germany were the centres of knowledge and study. On the other hand, in those days America was coming to its own. It had won its freedom from British Empire. Thoughts of the French Revolution had influenced American people very much and they were very much anxious to bring about development of their country, As a result of all this Sociology developed in European as well as in American countries. It would be worthwhile to study the development of sociology in different countries of Europe and America.

1.7 Development of Sociology in England:

England in the 19th century represented the knowledge, the thinking and the progress of Europe. Several new branches of knowledge and Sciences were born in that country. It was Herbert Spencer who brought about the birth and the development of Sociology in England. He gave this branch of knowledge a scientific form and shape and made it a perfect science. It was Herbert Spencer who put forward three important theories in regard to the society;

1. Organismic theory
2. Evolutionary theory
3. Social Darwinism theory

1.8 Development of Sociology in America:

Today sociology is studied in a very scientific manner in America. It cannot be denied that Sociology as a branch of knowledge has developed a lot in that country as well. But it was Lester F. Ward who brought about the birth of Sociology. He was very much influenced by Herbert Spencer and adapted his thinking to American conditions. Although he accepted the basic principles of Herbert Spencer, he introduced new things to it. He laid great stress on the fact that the development that took place in the animals is totally based on nature. They do not have intelligence and therefore they depend on nature for their development. From this point of view Ward's propounded theory; there is distinction between the development of animals and also society. Human development is not totally based on nature. He applies his own intelligence in this regard.

1.9 Development of Sociology in the 20th Century:

In the 20th century, sociology and sociological principles saw the development in a very specific and particular direction. Now, social institutions and social process came to be studied under the subject matter of sociology. Thinkers like A. Small, C.J. Galpin, and others made very valuable contribution in this direction. Cooley was the first to propound the theory of primary and secondary groups.

Park and Burgess made a study of the demographic and formal institutions of the organ arise. Similarly G. Trade and P.A. Ross made a study of the imitative aspect of social

life. Thomas-Nancy made study of the tendencies and values in the field of sociology. In short they set a new place of the study which gave more scientific shape to sociology.

1.10 Contribution of George Simmel to the field of Sociology:

George Simmel is one of those persons, who tried to get sociology as independent place as a science. He and his followers are the chief exponents of “formal sociology.”

1.11 Max Weber and his contribution to the field of sociology:

Max Weber was of the view that methodology of social sciences cannot be applied to natural sciences. It is not possible to discuss study and analysis of the social phenomena on a logical and scientific basis, unless the social events are classified under certain categories on the basis of certain principles of classifications. He did not agree with the view that there was a specialized field of sociology. On the other hand he said individual or man and society, and the social interactions in general are the subject matter of the study of sociology. The theory of social-actions propounded by Max Weber has been supported and further analysis by Parsons Murdock etc.

1.12 Toynbee and the development of sociology:

Professor A.J. Toynbee tried to analyse the civilization and culture in the background of his development around 1947 and put forward the theory of preparing a man to face the challenges posed by geographical, biological and social circumstances. According to Toynbee these changes are helpful in maintaining one half against the adverse circumstances and civilization and culture are the results of these challenges and effort, the man to face these challenges. According to present sociologists, Pitrim Sorokin's theories of social and culture dynamics has made a very valid and valuable contribution to the development of sociology.

1.13 Development of Sociology in India

We have already seen sociology is to be found in the earliest works of this country. In fact even the earliest Indian thinkers have started analysing the social phenomena and that is why the studies of sociology are to be found even in the earliest works of this country. The present day sociology or the sociology as we see today developed after the 19th century and studies of that sociology in India started very late. For the first time it was given a place as a subject of study but that too as subsidiary or subject of secondary importance in the Bombay University. In 1923 Andhra University gave sociology a place in its curriculum. After India achieved freedom that has gained its due and it found a place as an independent subject in the curriculum in the University of Bombay, Lucknow, Agra, Gujarat, Karnatak, Mysore, Nagpur, Osmania, Patna, Delhi, Gorakhpur and Kanpur etc. Now it is taught as an independent subject almost in all the universities of the country. Recently it has also been recognized as a subject for different competitive examinations.

We have already seen that sociology in its present form found place in India quite late. The credit for it goes to the growing trend of the western education in this country. Formal sociological studies were confined to the caste system, the family system or the joint family, panchayati system etc. Various Indian as well as foreign social thinkers made very valuable contribution in this field. Important names that needed to be mentioned in this context are those Dr. Radha Kamal Mukherji, Dr. D.P. Mukharji, Dr. B.S. Hakerwal, Dr. R.N. Saxena, Dr. D.N. Majumdar, Professor A.K. Saran, Huttan, Blunt, N.K. Dutta, Kapadia, Srinivas, P.N. Prabhu, A.R. Desai etc.

1.14 Future trends and the development of sociology:

It is never wise and proper to make prephases about the future trends of the development of a social science. Such conjectures and prophesies are more based on imagination than anything else. Sociology is concerned not only with external form but also with the internal form of the social institutions. The development has to be made broad and that is why the present factual and analytical trend shall have to be moulded towards synthetic trends. What is needed is to establish co-relationship between synthetic and analytical methods according to Sorokin ultimately follow the path of synthesis. Through this method only it is possible to bring about further addition and development of knowledge.

1.15 Summary

Sociology is the youngest of all the Social Sciences. The word Sociology is derived from the Latin word 'societus' meaning 'society' and the Greek word 'logos' meaning 'study or science'. The etymological meaning of 'sociology' is thus the 'science of society'. Prof. Ginsberg accordingly defines it "as the study of society that is of the web or tissue of human inter-actions and inter-relations."

1.16 Key Words

Emergence

Development

Bureaucracy

1.17 Questions

1. Explain origin and development of Sociology?
2. Discuss the contribution of Max Weber to the field of sociology?

Writer:

Dr. V. Venkateswarlu

Asst. Professor & Co-ordinator,

Dept. of Sociology & Social Work

Acharya Nagarjuna University.

Guntur – 522 510

Editor:

Dr. V. Venkateswarlu

Asst. Professor & Co-ordinator,

Dept. of Sociology & Social Work,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Guntur – 522 510

Lesson 2

Concept of Society and Social System

2.0 Objective:

The main objective of this lesson is to understand Characteristics, functions and differences between human society and animal society.

Contents:

2.1 Introduction:

2.2 Definition:

2.3 Characteristics of Society

2.4 Functions of Society

2.5 Difference Between Human and Animal Societies

2.6 Summary

2.7 Key Words

2.8 Model Questions

2.9 References

2.1 Introduction:

The term “Society” is the most fundamental one in sociology. But still it is one of the most vague and general concepts in the sociologist’s vocabulary. We speak of – The Co-operative Society, The Agricultural Society, The Friendly Society, The Society of Jesus, The Theosophical Society, etc., In these examples, “Society” means no more than an association. Sometimes, we may say, ‘ I enjoy his society’, ‘I like the society of artists’, ‘ I move in high society’. These three uses of the word ‘Society’ here indicate company or fellowship. The term society is also used to mean an urban society, or a rural society, a modern industrial society or a primitive society, an open society or a closed society and so on. Then what do we mean by society ?

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

2.2 Definition:

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

2.3 Characteristics of Society:

The basic characteristics of society are as follows:

1. **Society consists of people:** Society is composed of people. Without the students and the teachers there can be no college and no university. Similarly, without people there can be no society, no social relationships, and no social life at all.
2. **Mutual Interaction and Mutual Awareness:** Society is a group of people in continuous interaction with each other. It refers to the reciprocal contact between two or more persons. It is 'a process whereby men interpenetrate the minds of each other'. An individual is a member of society so long as he engages in

relationship with other members of society. It means that individuals are in continuous interaction with other individuals of society. The limits of society are marked by the limits of social interactions.

Social interaction is made possible because of mutual awareness. Society is understood as a network of social relationships. But not all relations are social relations. Social relationships exist only when the members are aware of each other. Society exists only where social beings 'behave' towards one another in ways determined by their recognition of one another. Without this awareness there can be no society. A social relationship, thus implies mutual awareness.

3. **Society depends on Likeness:** The principle of likeness is essential for society. It exists among those who resemble one another in some degree, in body and in mind. Likeness refers to the similarities. People have similarities with regards to their needs, works, aims, ideals, values, outlook towards life, and so on. Just as the 'birds of the same feather flock together', men belonging to the same species called 'Homo sapiens', have many things in common.

Society, hence rests on what F.H. Giddings calls consciousness of kind. "Comradeship, intimacy, association of any kind or degree would be impossible without some understanding of each by the other and that understanding depends on the likeness which each apprehends in the other". Society in brief, exists among like beings and likeminded.

4. **Society Rests on Difference Too:** Society also implies difference. A society based entirely on likeness and uniformities is bound to be loose in socialities. If men are exactly alike, their social relationships would be very much limited. There would be little give-and-take, little reciprocity. They would contribute very little to one another. More than that, life becomes boring, monotonous and uninteresting, if differences are not there.

Hence, we find difference in society. Family for example, rests on the biological difference between the sexes. People differ from one another in their looks, personality, ability, talent, attitude, interest, taste, intelligence, faith and so

on. People pursue different activities because of these differences. Thus we find farmers, labourers, teachers, soldiers, businessmen, bankers, engineers, doctors, advocates, writers, artists, scientists, musicians, actors, politicians, bureaucrats and others working in different capacities, in different fields in society. However difference alone cannot create society. It is subordinate to likeness.

5. **Co-operation and Division of Labour:** Primarily likeness and secondarily difference create the division of labour. Division of labour involves the assignment to each unit or group a specific share of a common task. For example, the common task of producing cotton clothes is shared by a number of people like the farmers who grow cotton, the spinners, and weavers, the dyers, and the merchants. Similarly, at home work is divided and shared by the father, mother and children. Division of labour leads to specialization. Division of labour and specialization are the hallmarks of modern complex society.

Division of labour is possible because of co-operation. Society is based on co-operation. It is the very basis of our social life. As C.H.Colley says, 'co-operation arises when men realize that they have common interests'. It refers to the mutual working together for the attainment of a common goal. Men satisfy many of their desires and fulfil interests through joint efforts. People may have direct or indirect co-operation among them. Thus co-operation and division of labour have made possible social solidarity or social cohesion.

6. **Society Implies Interdependence Also:** Social relationships are characterized by interdependence. Family, the most basic social group, for example, is based upon the interdependence of man and woman. One depends upon the other for the satisfaction of one's needs. As society advances, the area of interdependence also grows. Today, not only individuals are interdependent upon one another, but even, communities, social groups, societies and nations are also interdependent.
7. **Society is Dynamic:** Society is not static; it is dynamic. Change is ever present in society. Changeability is an inherent quality of human society. No society can

ever remain constant for any length of time. Society is like water in a stream or river that for ever flows. It is always in flux. Old men die and new ones are born. New associations and institutions and groups may come into being and old ones may die a natural death. The existing ones may undergo changes to suit the demands of time or they may give birth to the new ones. Changes may take place slowly and gradually or suddenly and abruptly.

8. **Social Control:** Society has its own ways and means of controlling the behaviour of its members. Co-operation, no doubt exists in society. But, side by side, competitions, conflicts, tensions, revolts, rebellions and suppressions are also there. They appear and re-appear off and on. Clash of economic or political or religious interests is not uncommon. Left to themselves, they may damage the very fabric of society. They are to be controlled. The behaviour or the activities of people are to be regulated. Society has various formal as well as informal means of social control. It means, society has customs, traditions, conventions and folkways, mores, manners, etiquettes and the informal means of social control. Also it has law, legislation, constitution, police, court, army and other formal means of social control. Also it has law, legislation, constitution, police, court, army and other formal means of social control to regulate the behaviour of its members.
9. **Culture:** Each society is distinct from the other. Every society is unique because it has its own way of life, called culture. Culture refers to, as Linton says, the social heritage of man. It includes the whole range of our life. It includes our attitudes, judgements, morals, values, beliefs, ideas, ideologies and our institutions: political, legal, economic; our sciences and philosophies. Culture is the expression of human nature in our ways of living and thinking, in behaving, and acting as members of society.

Culture and society go together. What distinguishes one society from the other is culture. Culture is a thing which only human being possess. It is not found at the level of animals. Culture is not society, but an element of society. As Gillin

and Gillin say, “Culture is the cement binding together into a society its component individuals;..... human society is people interacting; culture is the patterning of their behaviour”.

10. There is yet another attribute on which society depends. It is the gregarious nature of man. Aristotle said that “man is a social animal”. Psychologists like McDougall, say that man is social because of the basic human instinct called the gregarious instinct. Gregariousness refers to the tendency of man to live in groups. Man always lives amidst men. He cannot live without it. This internal nature of man has forced him to establish social groups and societies and to live in them.

Human life and society almost go together. Man is born in society and bred up in society, nourished and nurtured in society. From childhood to adolescence, from adolescence to youth, from youth to maturity, from maturity to old age, from old age up to death, man lives in society. He depends on society for protection and comfort, for nurture and education. Participation in society is necessary for the development of personality. Various cases show that man can become man only among men.

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

2.4 Functions of Society:

In an organized society certain conditions must exist or otherwise the society cannot survive. Important of them are:

1. **System of Member Replacement:** The members who die are replaced by new born through reproduction. Thus the members are dieing and are replaced by reproduction continuously there by the balance in population size is maintained. Some times new members are obtained from other societies through voluntary immigration and through conquest.
2. **Satisfaction of Physical needs:** Every society has some mechanism to protect its members from diseases, and to protest the hostile forces both internal and external which threatens its stability apart from supplying basic requirements of the members life food, clothing and shelter.
3. **Every society should have a shared set of goals:** Unlike the animal society, a progressive human society must have sufficient attention to keep its members with a sense of meaning, purposeful and set of goals. Without it, the social motivation of persons will wither away. Each society will have an ideology which explains to its member why its way of life has significance.
4. **Man is not born with an inbuilt knowledge of coping with the many different situations that he encounter in life:** Such knowledge is acquired through experience and experimentation in successive generations.
5. **Provision of adequate means of communication:** The human society is to provide ready made and adequate facilities of communication transportation for its members for the daily social life and coordination of the social system.
6. **Human societies function on the basis of specialized work patterns:** In the society, the socially assigned tasks of individuals differ basing on their age and sex. A society can function smoothly and efficiently only when there is a provision of role differentiation and role assignment to different individuals and groups.

7. **Socialization function is another important function of society:** An individual who is a biological organism at birth learns the ways of social life by the process of socialization.
8. **Provision of effective social control is another function of society:** Through the social control the behaviour of the individuals.
9. **Production function:** No society can function without a system to satisfy the needs of its individual members. The production capacity of society depends upon its individual member's needs and desires as well as upon their efficiency and efforts.
10. **Production system is associated with the distribution of material goods:** The production and distribution system depend upon the structure of the societies. In primitive societies, the producers and consumers are one and the same. But, in modern societies, the producers are different and consumers are different. Further, special provisions are made to look after the consumption needs of various groups of individuals like children, diseased and disabled who cannot produce themselves their consumption goods.

2.5 Difference Between Human and Animal Societies:

The established society is found in both the human and animals but they differ in the following ways:

Human society is with civilized and culture being. It has a unique culture of its own human beings, maintain material and spiritual social life and are civilized. The members behave according to the established norms of the society and as determined by the laws of the land.

The needs of the animals are mostly physical and are met by inherited mechanism. They do not have any social consciousness, purposive and norm directed social life. But have well constructed mechanism of social organization. Ex. In ant and

bee society, there is well established division of labour which is not learned, it is based on biological specialization.

In animal and non-human societies, there is no practice of cultures by its members. Though the trained parrot speaks a few broken language words, it cannot transmit it to its younger one.

The animal society is based upon instincts, physiological differences and direct imitations (Ex. Of pottot) of action where human society is based on reason and traditional behaviour.

Well-established symbolic communication system is present in human society which is learned and is capable of transmitting from one generation to the other.

There are no rights, and duties in animals' society. They live on physical power. But individuals in human society have duties, rights, and obligations with a system of law and order.

Most animals are solitary, only a few are social. Almost all the human beings are social. Basically, human society is a complex society and well constructed mechanism of social organization which are flexible and adaptable, whereas the animal society is simple and are the sole result of biological evolution. It is relatively rigid and fixed.

2.6 Summary:

The term 'society' is derived from the Latin word 'socius', which means companionship or friendship. Companionship means sociability. As George Simmel pointed out, it is this element of sociability which defines the true essence of society. Human life and society almost go together. Man is born in society and bred up in society, nourished and nurtured in society. From childhood to adolescence, from adolescence to youth, from youth to maturity, from maturity to old age, from old age up to death, man lives in society. Human society is with civilized and culture being. It has a unique culture of its own human beings, maintain material and spiritual social life and are

civilized. The members behave according to the established norms of the society and as determined by the laws of the land.

2.7 Key Words:

Social Interaction

Social Control

Division of Labour

Co-operation

2.8 Model Questions:

- 1. Define Human Society? Discuss the characteristic and functions of Human Society?**
- 2. Explain the differences between Human Society and Animal Society?**

2.9 References:

1. Johns,H.M. Sociology,P.110
2. HortonandHunt,Sociology,p.98
3. CharlesH.Cooley,IntroductorySociology,p.117
4. Gillinand Gillin; An Introduction toSociologyp.575.

Lesson 3

ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Role, status, Norms, Values, Customs

3.0 Objective:

The main objective of this lesson is to understand the concepts of Status, Role, Customs, Values and Norms.

Contents:

- 3.1 Social Status- Introduction:**
- 3.2 Determinations of Status**
- 3.3 Kinds of Status**
- 3.4 Role - Introduction**
- 3.5 Importance of Status and Role**
- 3.6 Customs -Introduction**
- 3.7 Nature of Customs**
- 3.8 Values - Introduction**
- 3.9 Functions of Values**
- 3.10 Norms - Introduction**
- 3.11 Conformity of Norms:**
- 3.12 Summary**
- 3.13 Key Words**
- 3.14 Model Questions**
- 3.15 References**

3.1 Social Status- Introduction:

By social status, we mean the position of person in social relations. In our general talks, we often say that the social status of a particular person is high and of some other

person is low or inferior. It means the position of persons in a groups or society. In every society, there is a system of division of roles with which each person connected. A special type of prestige is connected with each type of role. We know the status of a person according to the prestige and power of that person in society.

Definition of Social Status:

In order to clarify the meaning of ‘ Social Status ‘ it is necessary to refer to some definitions of “ Social Status “. Following are some of the definitions given by prominent scholars:-

Ogburn and Nimkoff: According to Ogburn and Nimkoof “A person’s status is his group standing or ranking in relation to others.”

Lapierre: In the words of Lapierre “Social status is commonly thought of as the position which an individual has in society.”

K. Young: In view of K. Young “In every society and every group each member has some function with which he is associated and which carries with it some degree of power and prestige. The degree of prestige or power we refer to his status.”

Thus, by social status, we mean a definite power and social respect which a person occupying a social position commands in society or groups. In other words, the position of a person under social system at a definite time is called his social status.

3.2 Determinations of Status:

It is clear from the above discussion that status is a relative word. Through it, we know the prestige and power of a person in group or society. If a person’s social status is high, his social position will also be high. But besides prestige, the status of a person is often determined on the basis of his character. If the character of person is high in the eyes of society and if he possesses some special virtues, then his status is also high in the society. Likewise, dress, living conduct and behaviour of a person also influence his status in the society.

In different societies, different categories of social statuses are found. Linton has emphasized the following factors in the determination of states:

1. Age and Sex;
2. Occupation'
3. Prestige;
4. Family and
5. Association Group.

The above factors of status are found generally in each society. In family, brother, sister, son etc., indicate this status. The sons of the same father have different statuses on the basis of their age. Likewise, the status of brother-sister husband-wife etc., are different on the basis of their sex. Likewise, the statuses is also determined on the basis of occupation. The persons who sell things in their shops are called shop-keepers. Those who teach students are called teachers.

In the status of each, there is some or the other type of association of his occupation. It is necessary for the person concerned to perform his functions. There is difference in the importance of each type of work. Accordingly, the status of each person is also different. There is also difference in the importance of the status of each person.

3.3 Kinds of Status:

The determination of the status is hereditary on the one hand and on the other hand, it is made by the society. Some persons acquire their status by birth, for example, the son of a King. On the other hand, mostly persons have to achieve or earn their status. Any person can have high post through competitive examinations. The status so acquired is said to have been achieved. In matter of status, importance of birth is given only in traditional societies. Keeping in view the differences of statuses, Hiller has mentioned following three types of statuses;

1. Ascribed Status
2. Assumed Status
3. Achieved Status

1. **Ascribed Status:** It means that status which is granted by a person to others. The consent of the person is not necessary for this type of status. The society has a great hand in determining this type of status.
2. **Assumed Status:** It means that status which the persons assume themselves. Persons willingly perform the functions connected or associated with it.
3. **Achieved Status:** This type of status is associated with the desire of persons. Man himself endeavours to achieve this type of status. To be a candidate for the membership of the Parliament is an example of achieved status.

3.4 Role - Introduction:

It is clear from the above discussion that each person in society has a definite role. Some or the other type of role is also connected with this status. The status of a person is more or less important according to the importance of his role. Thus, status of a person in society is always associated with his role. In the view of famous scholar, Linton, we call the active part of status as role.

Definition of Role:

Following are some of the definitions of 'Role' attempted by prominent scholars.

K.Young: According to K.Young "What the individual does or performs we call his role."

Sargent: In the words of Sargent "A person's role is a pattern or type of social behaviour which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectation of those in the group."

It is obvious from the above-mentioned definitions that what a man does or performs associated with his status, is his role. These works are also reciprocal. For example, the roles of husband-wife, father-son etc, indicate a special type of status. The person concerned has to perform his role according to the situations and status which he achieves.

3.5 Importance of Status and Role:

According to Ogburn and Nimkoff society takes more interest in his status than the person himself. This fact confirmed in the practical life. In the modern world, as a matter of fact, we give importance to the person according to his status. We give importance to a person so long as he occupies some post, but the moment he vacates the post, we give less importance to that persons. Moreover, the stratification of the modern society is based on status and role. Society is divided into different classes on the basis of economic strata or condition. Indian society is divided into different castes or races on the hereditary basis. This system of status and role makes its impact on social conduct or behaviour.

As we have seen earlier, in society, with the status of each person, some power and prestige are associated, Hence Linton calls prestige as the extension of the need of status. The desire to have prestige is a social feature. The desire to acquire power and prestige encourages man to work.

In society, each person want to achieve a high status and as much prestige as possible. Hence man does or performs even hard and difficult works in order to gain power and prestige. Thus, on the one hand, the system of role and status makes the stratification of society easier and on the other hand, it encourages persons to achieve maximum success.

3.6 Customs -Introduction:

Like folkways and mores, 'customs' also represent one of the types of informal means of social control. They are as universal and pervasive as those of folkways and mores. Customs are the socially accepted ways in which people do things together in personal contacts.

As Maclver and Page have pointed out, groups, institutions and associations sustain their formal order by means of an intricate complex of usages or practices. Such

accepted procedures or practices of eating, conversing, meeting people, training the young, caring for the aged, playing, working, etc., can be called customs.

Definition:

1. According to Maclver and Page: “The socially accredited ways of acting are the customs of society”.
2. According to Kingsley Davis: “Customs refers primary to practices that have often been repeated by a multitude of generations, practices that tend to be followed simply because that they have been followed in the past”.
3. Duncan Mitchell in his ‘Dictionary of Sociology’ writes: “The term ‘customs’ refers to established modes of thought and action.”
4. Lundberg says that customs are those “folkways that persist over relatively long periods of time so as to attain a degree of formal recognition and so as to be passed down from one generation to another”.
5. In simple words, customs are the long established habits and usages of the people.

3.7 Nature of Customs:

1. **Custom is a Social Phenomenon:** Customs are the oft-repeated practices of the people, They represent the routine acts of daily life of the people. Customs are created by the groups, associations, communities and institutions. Customs are considered to be conducive to the good of the society. They enjoy the social sanction.
2. **Customs are followed by people mostly unconsciously:** As Maclver and Page have pointed out, “We conform to the customs of our own society, in a sense, ‘unconsciously’.” Because they are a strongly imbedded part of our group life. We are trained from our infancy itself to behave in a customary way. Human infants learn the customs by imitation or by direct instruction. In course of time, they become a part of the personality of the children.

3. **Customs are varied in nature:** Though customs are universal in nature they differ from community to community and society to society. Examples: The customary dressing at occasions such as marriage and funeral ceremonies differs from group to group. Similarly, eating behaviour, worshipping behaviour, etc., differ a lot. Among the Hindus the husband ties the 'tali' around the neck of the wife at the time of marriage. Among the Maoreies of New Zealand people rub each other's nose in order to express their love and affection.
4. **The origin of custom is obscure:** It is difficult to ascertain the exact way in which customs emerged. As McDougall writes, "The ends and purposes of many customs are lost in the midst of antiquity". No single theory or explanation can be offered about the origin of custom. Numerous customs have arisen in different ways to satisfy the varied needs of man.
5. **Customs are relatively durable:** In comparison with the folkways, fashions and fads, customs are more durable. Customs evolve gradually and hence they are obeyed mostly in a spontaneous manner. When once the customs are established they gain grounds to become firm. They are implicitly obeyed with least resistance by the majority of the people. The sole justification for following the custom is that it has been in existence since a long time.
6. **All customs are not irrational:** It is wrong to assume that all customs are irrational and meaningless. Still a good number of customs are found to be illogical, meaningless, non-utilitarian and unethical in character. In modern times, much stress is laid on following the rational, useful and meaningful customs.

Customs and Habits:

Customs and habits are very closely related. "Habit means an acquired facility to act in a certain manner without resort to deliberation and thought"—MacIver and Page. Persons tend to react in the manner to which they have become accustomed. Example: smoking, drinking coffee or tea regularly, reading newspaper daily, drinking liquors, morning exercises, shaving daily in the morning etc.,

Habit is a "second nature" with us. When once they are developed they tend to become permanent. Then it becomes difficult for us to act in a way different from the

habitual ways. It is the strongly established and deeply rooted mode of response. As MacIver and Page have pointed out “habit is the instrument of life, it economizes energy, reduces drudgery and saves the needless expenditure of thought”. Willian James has pointed out habit is “the enormous fly-wheel of society, and its most precious conservative agent”.

Differences:

- (i) Custom is a social phenomenon whereas habit is an individual phenomenon.
- (ii) Custom is socially recognized. Habit does not require such recognition.
- (iii) Custom is normative in nature. It has the sanction of the society. Habit is not normative and requires no external sanction.
- (iv) Custom contributes to the stability of social order. Hence it is of great social importance. Habit can only facilitate individual activity. It has prominence only for the individual who is accustomed to it.
- (v) Customs are socially inherited, whereas habits are learnt individually.

Social Importance of Customs:

- (i) **Customs Regulate our Social Life:** Customs act as the effective means of social control. Individuals can hardly escape their grip. They are the self-accepted rules of social life. They bind people together, assimilate their actions to the accepted standards and control their purely egoistic impulses. They are found among the preliterate as well as the literate people. They are the strongest ties in building up a social order.
- (ii) **Customs Constitute the Treasury of Our Social Heritage:** Customs preserve our culture and transmit it to the succeeding generations. They have added stability and certainty to our social life. They bring people together and develop social relationships among them. They provide for a feeling of security in human society. People normally obey them for their violation is always condemned and resisted. The children learn the language spoken, and

the occupation followed by their parents through the customs. The imprint of custom can be found on various activities of the members of society.

- (iii) **Customs are Basic to Our Collective Life:** Customs are found in all the communities of the world. They are more influential and dominant in the primitive society than in the modern industrial society. Still no society can do without them. Customs are mercilessly imposed on the people in the primitive societies. As Malinowski writes in the context of the study of Trobriand Islanders that “a strict adherence to customs... is the main rule of conduct among our natives...”. In the traditional societies customs are like sacred objects and their violation cannot be thought of.

Customs are so dominant and powerful that they can be called the “king of man”. Shakespeare called it a “tyrant”. Bacon considered it “the principal magistrate of man’s life”. People follow customs not just because they are traditionally enforced but very much because they are mixed with people’s sentiments, feelings and personal obligations.

- (iv) **Customs Support Law:** Customs also provide the solid ground for the formulation and establishment of law. Customs become laws when the state enforces them as rules binding on citizens. Law divorced from custom is bound to become artificial. Such laws may often end in failures, as it has happened in the case of ‘prohibition’ in U.S.A. Customs consolidate law and facilitate its practice. If the laws are not supported by customs, they cannot succeed. It is to be noted that in the modern complex society customs are not enough to control the behaviour of the people. Hence they are supplemented with various formal means of social control.

3.8 Values - Introduction:

The society at times appears to be chaotic, as when a mobriots, or when there is a hysterical rush from an impending crisis: but soon order is restored and the society gets going. Indeed order rather than disorder is the rule of the world. Social order as it is called, is obtained through regulation of human behaviour according to certain standards.

All societies provide for these standards specifying appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. The standards which regulate behaviour have been termed social norms. The concept of norms is a central one in sociology. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the concept of norms, their formation and importance.

Meaning of Values:

In sociology our concern is with social values. Social values are cultural standards that indicate the general good deemed desirable for organized social life. These are assumptions of what is right and important for society. They provide the ultimate meaning and legitimacy for social arrangements and social behaviour. They are the abstract sentiments or ideals. An example of an important social value is, “equality of opportunity”. It is widely considered to be a desirable end in itself. The importance of such a value in social life can hardly be exaggerated. A social value differs from individual value. An individual value is enjoyed or sought by the individual which a man seeks for himself. Even though these values are commonly shared, they do not become social values. As distinct from individual values, a social value contains a concern for others’ welfare. Social values are organized within the personality of the individuals. They regulate his thinking and behaving. The process of socialization aims to include these values in his personality, the ethos or fundamental characteristics of any culture are a dominated by a belief in material progress, the Indian culture is marked by spiritualism, the forgetting of self, abandonment of personal desire and elimination of the ambition. The “Indian way” is different from the “American way”.

The differences in social values result in divergent social structures and patterns of expected behaviour.

Definition:

1. According to G.R. Leslie, R.F. Larson, H.L. Gorman, “Values are group conceptions of the relative desirability of things”
2. According to H.M. Johnson “Values are general standards and may be regarded as higher order norms.”
3. In simple words, values may be defined as measure of goodness or desirability.

3.9 Functions of Values:

1. As it is already made clear, values provide goals or ends for the members to aim for.
2. Values provide for stabilities and uniformities in group interaction. They hold the society together because they are shared in common. Some sociologists argue that shared values form the basis for social unity or social solidarity. Since they share the same values with others, the members of a society are likely to see others as “people like themselves”. They will, therefore, have a sense of belonging to a social group. They will feel a part of the wider society.
3. Values bring legitimacy to the rules that govern specific activities. The rules are accepted as rules and followed mainly because they embody the values that most people accept. The Americans for example, believe that the capitalist organization is the best one because it allows people to seek success in life.
4. Values help to bring about some kind of adjustment between different sets of rules. The people seek the same kinds of ends or goals in different fields of their life. Hence it is possible for them to modify the rules to help the pursuit of this end.

3.10 Norms - Introduction:

Norms are standards of group behaviour: An essential characteristic of group life is that it is possessed of a set of values which regulate the behaviour of individual members. As we have seen already, groups do not drop out of the blue with stabilized relationships among members. Groups are the products of interaction among individuals. When a number of individuals interact, a set of standards develop that regulate their relationships and modes of behaviour. These standards of group behaviour are called social norms. That brothers and sisters should not have sexual relations; a child should defer to his parents and an uncle should not joke with his nephews and nieces are the illustrations of norms which govern relationships among kinsmen.

Norms incorporate value judgements: Secord and Buckman say “ A norm is a standard of behavioural expectation shared by group members against which the validity of perceptions is judged and the appropriateness of feeling and behaviour is evaluated.” Members of a group exhibit certain regularities in their behaviour. This behaviour is considered desirable by the group. Such regularities in behaviour have been explained in terms of social norms. Norm, in popular usage, means a standard. In sociology our concern is with social norms, that is, norms accepted in a group. They represent “standardized generalizations” concerning expected modes of behaviour. As standardized generalizations they are concepts which have been evaluated by the group and incorporate value judgements. Thus it may be said that norms are based on social values which are justified by moral standards or aesthetic judgment. A norm is a pattern setting limits on individual behaviour. As defined by Broom and Selznick, “The norms are blueprints for behaviour setting limits within which individuals may seek alternate ways to achieve their goals”. Norms do not refer to an average or central tendency of human beings. They denote expected behaviour, or even ideal behaviour. Moral values are attached to them. They are model practices. They set out the normative order of the group.

Norms are related to factual world: It may not, however, be presumed that norms are abstract representing imaginary construct. Sociologists are interested mainly in “operative” norms, that is, norms that are sanctioned in such a way that violators suffer penalties in the group. For example, most of the norms of the Sermon on the Mount, although often referred to as norms, are not sanctioned; one is not punished socially for refusing to ‘turn the other cheek’. Norms in order to be effective must represent correctly the relations between real events. They must take into account the factual situation. A rule requiring all men to have two wives would be valueless if the sex ratio did not permit. Therefore, the normative system, since it is meant to achieve results in the factual world, should be related to the events in the real world.

Definition of Norms:

1. According to Young and Mack, 'norms' refer to the "group-shared expectations".
2. Norms refer to "the rules that guide behaviour in everyday situations and are derived from the value"---Donald Light Jr. and Suzanne Keller.
3. According to H.M. Johnson, "A norm is an abstract pattern held in the mind, that sets certain limits for behaviour".

Importance of Norms:

1. **A normless society is an impossibility:** Norms are of great importance to society. It is impossible to imagine a normless society, because without norms behaviour would be unpredictable. The standards of behaviour contained in the norms give order to social relations interaction goes smoothly if the individuals follow the group norms. The normative order makes the factual order of human society possible. If there were no normative order there could be no human society. Man needs a normative order there could be no human society. Man needs a normative order to live in society because human organism is not sufficiently comprehensive or integrated to give automatic responses that are functionally adequate for society. Man is incapable of existing alone. His dependence on society is not derived from fixed innate responses to mechanical social stimuli but rather from learned responses to meaningful stimuli. Hence his dependence on society is ultimately a dependence upon a normative order.
2. **Norms give Cohesion to Society:** We can hardly think of a human group apart from norms. A group without norms would be to use the words of Hobbes, "Solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." The human organism in order to maintain itself must live in a normatively regulated social system. The normative system gives to society a cohesion without which social life is not possible. Those groups which cannot evolve a normative order and maintain normative control over their members fail to survive because of the lack of internal co-operation.
3. **Norms influence Individual's attitudes:** Norms influence an individual's attitudes and his motives. They impinge directly upon a person's self-conception. They are specific demands to act made by his group. They are much more stable.

They have the power to silence any previously accepted abstract sentiment which they may oppose. They take precedence over abstract sentiments. Becoming a member of a group implies forming attitudes in relation to group norms. The individual becomes a good member to the extent he abides by the norms. The norms determine and guide his intuitive judgments of others and his intuitive judgments of himself. They lead to the phenomena of conscience, of guilt feelings, of elation and depression. They are deeper than consciousness. Becoming a member of a group consists of internalizing the norms of the group. Through internalization they become a part of himself automatically expressed in his behaviour.

4. **Norms help the maintenance of Social order:** The social order is developed and maintained through social norms. Groups are able to function because human behaviour is generally predictable. If this were not so chaos would result. Thus, a classroom would be chaotic in which teachers and students fail to establish a set of rules for conducting lessons. Drivers of vehicles are bound to meet with accidents if they fail to conform to traffic rules in a busy street.

3.11 Conformity of Norms:

Norms are not formed by all groups in relation to every kind of behaviour and every possible situation. They are formed in matters of consequence to a particular group. What matters are of consequence to a group depends upon the main purposes and goals of the group, the relationship of that group to other groups, and other conditions in which it operates. Likewise, the scope of behaviour regulated by norms varies considerably in different groups. For example, the norms of some groups may pertain chiefly to ethical matters, while the norms of other groups may cover a broader area of life including dress, forms of entertainment, education and so on.

Further, a social norm operative in one social system may not be operative in another. Thus, Mohammedan societies permit polygyny, but Christian ones do not. Likewise norms do not apply equally to all members of a society or to all situations. They are adjusted to the position people hold in the society and to the occupations they

practice. Thus what is proper for a doctor may not be proper for a man, or what is proper for a doctor may not be proper for a teacher. Thus conformity to norms is always qualified in view of the socially defined situations in which they apply.

A norm by definition implies a sense of obligation. It lays down a standard of behaviour which one ought to follow. Many of the problems of personality as well as society are mostly the problems of non-conformity to norms. Conformity to norms is normal. The individual having internalized the norms, feels something like a need to conform. His conscience would bother him if he did not. Further people would disapprove his action if he violates the norm. Thus both internalized need and external sanctions play an effective role in bringing about conformity to norms.

The violators of norms suffer the following kinds of sanctions:

Violators of norms suffer loss of prestige:

Violators are subjected to ridicule, fines, imprisonment.

3.12 Summary:

If a person's social status is high, his social position will also be high. But besides prestige, the status of a person is often determined on the basis of his character. Hiller has mentioned following three types of statuses; Ascribed Status, Assumed Status and Achieved Status. According to Ogburn and Nimkoff society takes more interest in his status than the person himself. This fact confirmed in the practical life. In the modern world, as a matter of fact, we give importance to the person according to his status. We give importance to a person so long as he occupies some post, but the moment he vacates the post, we give less importance to that persons. Like folkways and mores, 'customs' also represent one of the types of informal means of social control. They are as universal and pervasive as those of folkways and mores. Customs are the socially accepted ways in which people do things together in personal contacts. Social values are cultural standards that indicate the general good deemed desirable for organized social life. These are assumptions of what is right and important for society. They provide the ultimate meaning and legitimacy for social arrangements and social behaviour. Norms

are not formed by all groups in relation to every kind of behaviour and every possible situation. They are formed in matters of consequence to a particular group. What matters are of consequence to a group depends upon the main purposes and goals of the group, the relationship of that group to other groups, and other conditions in which it operates.

3.13 Key Words:

Social Heritage

Social Phenomenon

Ascribed Status

Achieved Status

Social Sanctions

3.14 Model Questions:

1. Define Role and Status? Discuss the importance of Role and Status?
2. Write an essay on the concepts of Norms, Values and Customs with suitable examples?

3.15 References:

1. Johns,H.M. Sociology,P.110
2. HortonandHunt,Sociology,p.98
3. CharlesH.Cooley,IntroductorySociology,p.117
4. Gillinand Gillin; An Introduction toSociologyp.575.

Lesson - 4

Power, Authority, Groups, Associations

4.0. Objective:

The main objective of this lesson is to understand the concepts of Power, Authority, Groups and Associations.

Contents:

- 4.1 Power – Introduction
- 4.2 Kinds of Power
- 4.3 Authority – Definition
- 4.4 Types of Authority
- 4.5 Characteristics of Authority
- 4.6 Groups And Associations
- 4.7 Characteristics of Social Groups:
- 4.8 State – Meaning:
- 4.9 Origin of the State
- 4.10 Difference between State and Society
- 4.11 Meaning of Nation
- 4.12 Nation ---State
- 4.13 Forms of Nationality Sentiment
- 4.14 Difference between Nation and State
- 4.15 Summary
- 4.16 Key Words
- 4.17 Model Questions
- 4.18 References

4.1 Power – Introduction:

Social power is a universal aspect of social interaction. It plays an important part in shaping relations among the members of a group. In groups, some members are more

powerful than others and this fact has important consequences for group functioning. Further, all forms of social interaction involve differences in the relative power of the participants to influence one another. Thus power differences enter into determining the relations between father and child. Employer and employee, politician and voter and teacher and student.

Definition of Power:

1. Accordingly Kingsley Davis defines power as “the determination of the behaviour of others in accordance with one’s own ends”.
2. Max. Weber defined power as “the probability that one actor (individual or group) within a social relationship is in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests”.
3. Accordingly to N.J. Demerath III and Gerald Marwell, “power may be defined as the capacity to get things done despite obstacles and resistance.

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

Social power has been identified in different ways with prestige, influence, eminence, competence, dominance, rights, strength, force, and authority.

1. **Knowledge, eminence, skill, and competence-all:** contribute to prestige, but they need not necessarily accompany power. If at all power is accompanied by these factors then the association is only incidental
2. **Power and Prestige are closely linked:** As Ross said, “The class that has the most prestige will have the most power”. It can be said that the powerful groups tend to be prestigious and prestigious groups powerful
3. **Power and influence are more intimately connected:** Still they are different. Influence is persuasive whereas power is coercive. We submit voluntarily to

influence but power requires our submission. They are, so as to say, independent variables. Influence does not require power and power may dispense with influence.

4. **Power and dominance are also to be distinguished:** Power is a sociological and dominance a psychological phenomenon. The locus of power is in both persons and groups, and in important cases it is in the latter. But dominance is a function of personality or of temperament. It is a personal trait. It is also possible to find dominant individuals playing roles in powerless groups and submissive individuals playing roles in powerful ones. Power is one thing and dominance quite another.
5. **Power, Force and Authority:** Power is not force and power is not authority, but it is related to both. As Robert Bierstedt said, "Power is latent force; force is manifest power, and authority is institutionalized power." Power is the prior capacity that makes the use of force possible. Only groups that have power can threaten to use force and the threat itself is power. Power is the ability to employ force, not its actual employment. Power is always successful; when it is not successful, it ceases to be power. Power thus symbolizes the force that may be applied in any social situation and supports the authority that is applied. "Power is thus neither force nor authority but it makes both force and authority possible"
6. **Power and Rights:** Rights are more closely associated with privileges and with authority than they are with power. A right is one of the prerequisites of power and not power itself. One may have a right without the power to exercise it. The man who has the power rarely waits for the right to use it. A right always requires some support in the social structure. No individual can successfully claim a right that is unrecognized in the law and non-existent in the mores. Rights in general, like privileges, duties, obligations, responsibilities, etc., are attached to the statuses. Whereas, power does not necessarily require the backing of the status.

4.2 Kinds of Power:

1. **According to Lundberg:** Lundberg and others have mentioned three kinds of power. (i) coercive power, (ii) utilitarian power and (iii) identitive power

1. **Coercive Power:** The coercive power is that power which uses or threatens the use of physical means to obtain compliance.
2. **Utilitarian power:** The utilitarian power uses material rewards.
3. **Identitive power:** The identitive power uses symbols that are not physical threats nor material rewards but which influence people to identify with the organization, viewing its interests as their own.

2. On the basis of influence: Power has also been classified on the basis of influence into three types i.e. (i) force, (ii) domination and (iii) manipulation.

1. **Force:** Under force the person influences the behaviour of others through physical force e.g. the force of a wrestler.
2. **Domination:** When power is exercised through order or advice it is of domination type e.g. the power of the parents over the children or of the teacher over the students.
3. **Manipulation:** When a person influences the behaviour of others without telling his own intentions, it is known as manipulation. E.g. propaganda or advertisement.

3. From the legal point of view: From the legal point of view power has been classified into (i) legitimate and (ii) illegitimate

1. **Legitimate Power:** Legitimate power may be of three kinds. i.e. legal power traditional power and charismatic power. Legal power is the power given by the law and the constitution of the country. For example, the power of the army or the police. The sources of traditional powers are the customs and traditions of the society. E.g. the power of the parents or the teachers. The sources of charismatic power lies in some peculiar quality. Eg. The power of religious 'guru' like Sai Baba over his followers.
2. **Illegitimate Power:** Illegitimate power is one not recognized by the society, eg. The power of dacoits.

4.3 Authority – Definition:

The concept of authority is closely linked with the concept of power. The exercise of authority is a constant and pervasive phenomenon in the human society. Human society maintains itself because of 'order' and it is the authority that serves as the foundation of social order. It is wrong to assume that 'authority' is purely a political phenomenon. In fact, in all kinds of organizations, political as well as non-political, authority appears. Every association in society whether it is temporary or permanent, small or big has its own structure of authority.

1. Max Weber used the term authority to refer to legitimate power.
2. According to Fredrick "Authority is the capacity to justify by a process of reasoning what is desired from the point of view of man
3. Robert A. Dahi "Legitimate power is often called authority".
4. Encyclopedia of Social Sciences "Authority is the capacity innate or acquired for exercising ascendancy over a group. It is manifestation of power and implies obedience to it."

4.4 Types of Authority:

According to Max Weber, there are three types of legitimate authority: which also correspond to three types of dominance or leadership. Weber spoke of traditional authority, legal-rational authority, charismatic authority.

1. **Traditional Authority:** When a continuous use of political power or its exercise on the basis of customs and traditions leads to emergence of right to rule it is known as traditional authority. Traditional authority tends to be more common in organizations which stress upon continuity with the past and the upholding of widely shared values and beliefs. Example: Established Churches, The higher reaches of government, and the courts and familial organizations based on kinship ties.
2. **Rational Legal Authority:** When the right to rule emerges from the constitutional rules, it is termed as legal rational authority. Legal rational authority stresses a "government of laws, not of peoples", . Officials here can exercise power only within legally defined limits that have been formally set in advance. This kind of authority is commonly found in most of the political systems of modern societies.

3. **Charismatic Authority:** When the right to rule springs from the dynamism of a political leader, it is termed as charismatic authority. Human history provides classical examples of such leaders with that quality of “Charisma”. Example: Jesus Christ, M.K. Gandhi, Hitler, Napoleon, Mao, Castro, Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Churchill, and so on. The Charismatic leader is seen as a person of density who is inspired by unusual vision, by lofty principles or even by God. The charisma of these leaders is itself sufficient to make their authority seem legitimate to their followers”.

4.5 **Characteristics of Authority:** The characteristics of the authority are

1. Legitimacy
 2. Dominance
 3. informality
 4. rationality and
 5. accountability.
-
1. **Legitimacy:** It determines the effectiveness of authority. Hence it is the hall mark of the concept of authority. According to Robert Dahl “A commands B and B feels A has perfect right to do so and to which he has complete obligation to obey. Power of this kind is often said to be legitimate..... Legitimate power is often called authority”.
 2. **Dominance:** Authority is capacity of the individual to command others. An individual or a group which possesses authority exercise dominance over other individuals. Authority is a command of superior to an inferior.
 3. **Informality:** It is not a formal power as it lacks characteristics which are the main features of power. According to Fredric “ Authority is not a power but something that accompanies power.” It is the quality in men and things which adds to their power, something which creates power but it is not itself power.
 4. **Rationality:** This is the main characteristic of authority. In the words of Fredric, “The man who has authority possesses something that I would describe as the capacity for reasoned elaboration for giving convincing reasons for what he does

or proposes to have others to do.” Evidently the basis of authority is logic or reason.

5. **Accountability:** The individual or a group of individuals who possess authority are responsible to some higher authority. In a democratic system accountability is the most significant characteristic of authority.

4.6 Groups And Associations

‘Group’ is one of those terms which in common usage lack exactness. We use the word ‘group’ to mean such groups as family group, kin group, racial group, church group, religious group, occupational group, age group, sex group, vast community group, abstract group, statistical group, collectivity and so on. Even in sociology the word group is not always consistently used by the sociologists. The word ‘group’ is very loosely used. Sometimes, the word ‘group’ is used to refer to entire human group. Sometimes, it is used to mean a small group consists of two (dyad) or more individuals. The term ‘group’ is not used with any specifications. Hence, it is difficult to give a single satisfactory definition to the concept of group.

Definition:

1. Harry M. Johnson says that ‘A social group is a system of social interaction.’
2. Marshal Jones is of the opinion that a social group is ‘two or more people between whom there is an established pattern of interaction.’
3. R.M. Maclver and Page define social group as ‘any collection of human beings who are brought into human relationships with one another.’
4. Ogburn and Nimkoff: “Whenever two or more individuals come together and influence one another, they may be said to constitute a social group.”
5. Emory S. Bogardus defines social group as ‘a number of persons, two or more, who have common objects of attention, who are stimulating to each other, who have common loyalty and participate in similar activities.

4.7 Characteristics of Social Groups:

The main characteristics of social groups are as follows:

1. **Collection of Individuals:** Social group consists of people. Without individuals there can be no group. Just as we cannot have a college or a university without students and teachers we cannot have a group in the absence of people.
2. **Interaction Among Members:** Social interaction is the very basis of group life. Hence mere collection of individuals does not make a group. The members must have interaction. A social group, is in fact a system of social interaction. The limits of social groups are marked by the limits of social interaction.
3. **Mutual Awareness:** Group life involves mutual awareness. Group members are aware of one another and their behaviour is determined by this mutual recognition. This may be due to what Giddings calls 'the consciousness of kind'.
4. **'We-feeling':** 'We-feeling' refers to the tendency on the part of the members to identify themselves with the groups. It represents group unity. 'We-feeling' creates sympathy in and fosters co-operation among members. It helps group members to defend their interests collectively.
5. **Group Unity and Solidarity:** Group members are tied by a sense of unity. The solidarity of integration of a group is largely dependent upon the frequency, the variety, and the emotional quality of the interactions of its members. A family or a friends' group, or a religious group is highly united and integrated, because its members are related by several common interests and have frequent social contacts with one another and express a high degree of morale and of loyalty. Unity is maintained more often by conscious effort.
6. **Common Interests:** The interests and ideals of group are common. Groups are mostly formed or established for the fulfillment of certain interests. In fact, men not only join groups but also form group for the realization of their objectives or interests. Form of the groups differs depending upon the common interests of the group. Hence, there are political groups, religious groups, economic groups, educational groups, racial groups, national groups and so on.
7. **Similar Behaviour:** The members of group behave in more or less similar way for the pursuit of common interests. Social groups represent collective behaviour.
8. **Group Norms:** Every group has its own rules or norms which the members are supposed to follow. These norms may be in the form of customs, folkways, mores, traditions, conventions, laws, etc., They may be written or unwritten

norms of standards. Every group has its own ways and means of punishing or correcting those who go against the rules. The continued group-life of man practically becomes impossible without some norms.

9. **Size of the Group:** Every group involves an idea of size. Social groups vary in size. A group may be as small as that of dyad (two members' group e.g., husband-and-wife- family) or as big as that of a political party having lakhs of members. Size will have its own impact on the character of the group.
10. **Groups are Dynamic:** Social groups are not static but dynamic. They are subject to changes whether slow or rapid. Old members die and new members are born. Whether due to internal or external pressures or forces, groups undergo changes.
11. **Stability:** Groups are stable or unstable; permanent or temporary in character. Some groups like, the crowd, mob, audience, spectators' group etc., are temporary and unstable. But many groups are relatively permanent and stable in character.
12. **Influence on Personality:** Social groups directly or indirectly shape the personality of their members. They also provide opportunities for the expression of individuality.

4.8 State – Meaning:

State is the most powerful political organization which regulates the social relationship of man and is the overall control institution of society, therefore its study becomes important for a student of sociology. State has been defined variously by political thinkers. Some of the definitions are the following:

Wilson point of view “ State is a people organized for law within a definite territory”.

According to Max Weber “The state is an association that claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of violence.”

According to Aristotle “State is a union of families and villages having for its end a perfect and self-sufficing life by which we mean a happy and honorable life.”

4.9 Origin of the State:

The origin of state is shrouded in utter mystery. It is difficult to say when the first state came into being. The modern sciences of sociology, ethnology and anthropology are unable to give us an insight into the primary origin of the state. As Gilchrist remarks “Of the circumstances surrounding the dawn of political consciousness from history we know little or nothing: Lacking positive historical proof concerning primitive political institutions only certain inferences and generalizations can be drawn regarding the origin of the state.

The political writers have propounded various theories concerning the prehistoric origin of the state. The theories are

1. The Divine Origin Theory
2. The Social Contract Theory
3. The Force Theory
4. The Patriarchal Theory
5. The Matriarchal Theory

4.10 Difference between State and Society

Society includes every kind of willed relationship of man to man. Here to understand the state it may be distinguished from society. The father of political science, Aristotle, and other early Greek thinkers did not make any distinction between state and society. This was due to the peculiar circumstances prevailing in the Greek city-states. The city state being a small and compact body included the activities of the whole life of man. The citizens knew one another personally and met together in common assemblies to pass laws and choose magistrates. The problems facing them were simple in character. The city to them was the state, the church and the school, all in one. Today, however, no such identification is possible because in the words of MacIver “to identify the social with the political is to be guilty of the grossest of all confusions, which completely bars

any understanding of either state or society.” The state exists within the society but it is not even the form of society. Interpreted strictly the state is a political organization. It is society politically organized. It is different from society both structurally and functionally.

The following points of difference between state and society are worth remembering:

1. In point of time, society is prior to the state. The people lived in society much before the state emerged.
2. State is organized: Society may be organized or unorganized. The primitive society was unorganized, but the state is always organized.
3. Society exercises authority largely through customs and persuasion. The state exercises authority through laws and coercion. The state alone can legitimately use force.
4. State is a territorial organization while a society does not occupy any definite territory. A society may extend to the whole world. It may be international like the Red Cross Society.
5. The membership of the state is compulsory but not so of the society. Man like Robinson Crusoe may, if he so likes, live outside the society.

4.11 Meaning of Nation:

In modern times the nation is the largest effective community. Though there are today several international associations like the United Nations, yet there is no effective international community. Nation at present is the largest group which is permeated by a common consciousness of a common kind.

We find a good deal of looseness about the use of the term ‘nation’. Some writers simply equate it with statehood and opine that the people of a state are a nation. More careful writers have, however, avoided such a facile generalization. Among the writers who have recognized that the nation is distinctly a historical phenomenon are Hans Kohn.

Ernest Renan, Frederick Hertz, F.L. Schuman, Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, V.K. Lenin and J.V. Stalin. Dr. Tara Chand in his History of the Freedom Movement of India, Vol. 1, 1951, has also adopted this approach. All these writers and thinkers agree that the nation is an historical and sociological phenomenon, and that the nation evolved out of the sociological phenomenon, and that the nation evolved out of the amalgam of various racial and kinship groups after the break-up of the slave-owning and feudal societies. There is also a general consensus that the nation is a territorial community as distinct from a racial, tribal or religious group of people.

4.12 Nation ---State:

H.T. Mazundar is of the opinion that the nation state was born of competition and conflict. He writes, "The Hundred Years War (1337-1453) gave rise to two rival groups across the English channel, each feeling a "consciousness of kind" the English and French. The War of the Roses (1453-1485) gave rise to a united English nation under the Tudor dictatorship. Rivalry in discovery and piracy on the high seas cemented national solidarity among the participants—the English, the French, the Portuguese, the Spaniards. The American Nation was born of conflict (1776-83). Napoleon of the French Revolution of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity overran most of Europe (1798-1815) and thereby sowed the seeds of national consciousness among defeated countries. The kingdom of Prussia was one of the notable products of Napoleonic wars. The German Nation was born of conflict of war with France (1870-71). The Italian Nation, under Mazzini and Garibaldi, came into being as a resurgent movement in protest against Austrian domination (1859-70). The Hindu Nation came into being in 1885 as a protest against British exploitation... Either competition or conflict, or possibly a combination of both, has given rise to political nationalism."

Growth of Democratic Nation—State:

The idea of democratic nation state is of recent growth. Politically, the first step was the unification of all authority in the hands of powerful centralized independent monarchies which took the place of ineffective and petty feudal authorities. After innumerable conflicts and vicissitudes the principle of state absolutism became supreme

in Europe. All the great reformers of Protestant Reformation enjoined on their followers passive obedience to the state and taught “that the powers that be are ordained of God.” They held that the rulers to whom obedience was due ruled by divine right. In England their teaching paved the way for Tudor and Stuart despotism. In France, Louis XIV said ‘I am the state’. The general tendency of Reformation was to strengthen despotism in the political sovereign. It was both a nationalistic and a religious movement.

4.13 Forms of Nationality Sentiment:

We have seen above that nationality is based upon the sense of common sentiment. This sentiment may assume two forms:

1. Patriotism
2. Nationalism.

Patriotism: Patriotism is love for one’s motherland or fatherland. It is altruistic devotion to the country, a deep communal feeling capable of inspiring the most devoted and disinterested service. But sometimes patriotism, “unwittingly contributes to national egotism. Some times it denies the full obligation of the nation to other nations. Sometimes it creates chauvinism, hate and depredations against the other nations. Sometimes, it defeats internationalism.”

Nationalism: Nationalism is a ‘state of mind’ that seeks to make the nation an effective unity and the object of man’s supreme loyalty. It has developed remarkably in the western world and is today growing in the African world. It has prepared the way for modern democratic national states. It has extended the area of national liberty and individual freedom.

But nationalism sometimes leads to many evils. Hayes finds that nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been unable to give a creditable account of itself. In the words of Shillito it has become ‘man’s other religion.’ It is ‘sentimental, emotional, and inspirational, Rabindranath Tagore called it as an ‘organised self-interest of a whole people’. ‘self idolatory’, the organization of politics and commerce for

selfish ends'; 'an organized power for exploitation. Nationalism no doubt serves as a source of integration within the state, but it is dangerous when it denies the common interest that binds nation to nation. Then it becomes ethnocentrism or chauvinism, which is intolerant and boastful, or imperialism, which seeks territorial expansion and political domination. When nationalism cuts one people from international relations and sows the seeds of international rivalry and wars. In its pure form, nationalism may be a beautiful ideal, but in its narrow form it becomes a cause of serious division between man and man.

4.14 Difference between Nation and State:

As remarked in the beginning, there is a great looseness in the use of words Nation, Nationality and State. Some writers use the word nation in the sense of nationality, while others identify it with the state. Above we have explained both the terms nation and nationality. The term state has been explained in an earlier chapter. According to Bryce, a nation is a nationality which has organised itself into a political body either independent or desiring to be independent. "The state is a territorially organised people. Thus the points of difference between nation, state and nationality are:

- (i) Nationality is a group of people who feel their uniqueness and oneness which they are keen to maintain; if this group of people happen to organize themselves on a particular territory and desire independence or are independent, they form a nation state. The members of a state may belong to different nationalities.
- (ii) Nationality is subjective, Statehood is objective.
- (iii) Nationality is psychological, Statehood is political.
- (iv) Nationality is a condition of mind, Statehood is a condition in law.
- (v) Nationality is a spiritual possession, Statehood is an enforceable obligation.

Sovereignty, it may again be emphasized is an essential element of state but not of nation. Nation signifies consciousness of unity prompted by psychological and spiritual

feelings which may or may not be sovereign. The physical element of sovereignty is not as important as the psychological element of the feeling of oneness.

Objective Factors:

It is fairly common among writers on the subject to speak of some objective factors whose presence, it is pointed out, has been helpful in evolving the nation. It is at the same time asserted that the presence of each or any of them is not absolutely indispensable. The more important of such factors are: the community of language, geographical contiguity, common economic ties and common history and traditions. But there is no unanimity even in respect of them. As Professor MacIver has pointed out, there are scarcely any two nations which “find their positive support in the same objective factors.”

- a. **Race and kinship:** While it may be readily conceded that a belief in the unity of race and kinship helps in cementing a people together, to argue that such unity is an indispensable objective factor is another matter. As Renan observes, the truth is “that no race is pure.” Frederick L. Schuman points out however if “pure races” ever existed, they have long since disappeared as a result of migrations, wars, conquests, travels, intermarriages on the grandest scale over thousands of years. All modern nations have been formed out of peoples of diverse racial and tribal groups.
- b. **Community of Religion:** While admitting that unity of religion has been and can be a great cementing force and has played a significant role in the past in consolidating nations, it cannot be regarded as an indispensable objective factor. As already pointed out, the modern nation is a territorial community. By its very definition, it includes and embraces all persons, of whatever ethnic stock and religious faith, residing on a permanent basis on the same territory and, therefore also participants in the history and traditions of the land. In this age of democracy and secularism to advance religion as an objective factor indispensable for the formation of a nation is to encourage religious bigotry and persecution and thereby to undermine the very foundations of secular democracy.

- c. **Community of Language:** The existence of a common language is considered by many writers and thinkers to be indispensable for the existence of a nation. Herdes and Fichte (1762-1814) were almost the first to emphasize its significance. According to Ernest Barker, "There is the closest of affinities between nation and language. Language is not mere words. Every word is charged with associations that touch feeling and evoke thought. You cannot share these feelings and thoughts unless you can unlock their associations by having the key of language." Frederick Schuman also points out how language is "the best index of an individual's cultural environment" and significantly adds that "most of the nations of the earth are nations, not because they are politically independent and socially unified, but because their people use a common speech which differs from that of other nations." Other writers who have emphasized the great importance of common language for the nation are Ramsay Muir, Hans Kohn, Stalin, etc. Those who disagree with this view often cite the examples of the United Kingdom and Switzerland, and assert that despite the existence of several languages, the peoples of these states are nations. On the contrary, there are writers who maintain that Switzerland, like the extinct USSR, is a multinational state. Still others have tried to resolve the difficulty by suggesting that the Swiss French, the Swiss Germans and the Swiss Italians constitute three distinct nationalities of the Swiss nation. In spite of a common language, the people speaking a common language may not constitute a nation. For example, there are many nations among the English speaking peoples like the British, the Canadians, the Americans, the Australians, the New Zealanders, and so on. A nation is formed as the result of fairly lengthy and systematic intercourse for generations, which would not be possible without the possession of a common territory.
- d. **Geographical Contiguity:** Contiguous geographical area has been, for some time, assumed to be indispensable for the rise and existence of a nation. Even in the case of Jews, leaving apart the question whether before the establishment of Israel they did or did not constitute a nation, it may be pointed out that their sentiments and feelings were also related to definite homeland. Living together on the same geographically contiguous area, conversing in the same language,

- having the same historical experiences, people are apt to develop common sentiments and outlook, as well as strong attachment to the common soil. This sentiment for one's motherland is just another name for patriotism.
- e. **Community of Economic Ties:** This point was first emphasized by Marx. Since then its significance has been growingly realized. When it was conceded that the nation was a historical and a sociological phenomenon, attention began to be paid to conditions under which nations arise. A little investigation made it clear that the nation as a territorial community could not exist in the ancient period or in the ages of slavery and feudal particularism. The nation arises out of the fusion of clans, tribes and ethnic groups. According to Lenin, it is the growth of exchange between regions, and the creation of a home market which leads to the creation of nationalities. A people do not become fully consolidated into a nation so long as they are not united by common economic ties, which the developing capitalist mode of production creates.
 - f. **Common History of Traditions:** The possession of a common language, geographical contiguity and common economic ties are bonds which make the people living together share same experiences and develop a certain amount of common outlook and also have common aspirations. Usually, they are people who have lived together, suffered together, worked together and felt much in the same way. This creates among them what may be called a common "psychological make-up" or character.

It is not implied here that a people have a static or fixed national character. The character of a people is, in the main, a reflection of the conditions of life they have lived and led together. Therefore it may be, and usually is, modified in course of time as the conditions of life undergo change. Secondly, the reference to national character does not negate the existence of individual variations. At best, it underlines a tendency among a certain people.

A consideration of the objective factors shows that not all of them are indispensable.

Nationality is in fact a psychological disposition or sentiment. A.E. Zimmern writes. "Nationality, like religion, is subjective: psychological; a condition of mind; a spiritual possession; a way of feeling, thinking and living." Nationality is an instinct. J.H. Rose defines it as "a union of hearts once made, never unmade." Nationality is primarily a cultural concept. According to Prof. Hole Combe, "It is a corporate sentiment, a kind of fellow-feeling or mutual sympathy relating to a definite home country. It springs from a heritage of memories, whether of great achievement and glory, of disaster and suffering." Renon and Mill write, "There must be a consciousness of a heroic past, true glory experiences and sacrifices, feelings of pride and shame, joy and grief, connected with the past." MacIver defines "as a type of community sentiment, created by historical circumstances and supported by common psychological factors to such an extent and so strong that those who feel it desire to have a common government peculiarly or exclusively their own."

4.15 Summary:

Power may exercised blatantly or subtly, legally or illegally, justly or unjustly. It may derive from many sources, such as wealth, status, prestige, numbers or organizational efficiency. Its ultimate basis, however, is the ability to compel obedience, if necessary through the threat or use of force. Social power has been identified in different ways with prestige, influence, eminence, competence, dominance, rights, strength, force, and authority. According to Max Weber, there are three types of legitimate authority: which also correspond to three types of dominance or leadership. Weber spoke of traditional authority, legal-rational authority, charismatic authority. In modern times the nation is the largest effective community. Though there are today several international associations like the United Nations, yet there is no effective international community. Nation at present is the largest group which is permeated by a common consciousness of a common kind.

4.16 Key Words:

Nationality

Sovereignty

Patriotism

Nationalism

Charismatic Authority

4.17 Model Questions:

1. Define Power and Authority? Describe its types and characteristics?
2. Define Nation, State and Society and analyze their differences?

4.18 References:

1. Alex Thio Inkeles, Ales: Sociology, What is Sociology? Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
2. Bottomore T.B: Sociology, A guide to Problems and Literature, Blackie & Son (India) Ltd., S. Chand & Co. Ltd., New Delhi
3. Davis, Kingsley: Human Society: The Macmillan Company, 1960.
4. Haralmbos M, with R.M. Heald: Sociology Themes & Perspectives Oxford University Press, Delhi.
5. Jayaram N: Introductory Sociology, Macmillan India Limited.
6. Johnson, H.M.: Sociology, Allied Publishers, Bombay, 1960
7. Majumdar, D.N. and Madan, T.N.: An Introduction to Social Anthropology, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1956.
8. Maciver, R.M.: Society: A text book of Sociology, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1945.
9. Ogburn, W.F. : Social Change, Calverton, B.V. edit. The Making of Society, New York, The Modern Library, 1937.
10. Peter Worsley (Ed): Introducing Sociology, Penguin Books.
11. Shankara Rao C.N.: Sociology , Primary Principles, S Chand & Co. Ltd., New-Delhi.

Writer:

Dr. V. Venkateswarlu

Asst. Professor & Co-ordinator,

Editor:

Dr. V. Venkateswarlu

Asst. Professor & Co-ordinator,

Dept. of Sociology & Social Work
Acharya Nagarjuna University.
Guntur – 522 510

Dept. of Sociology & Social Work,
Acharya Nagarjuna University,
Guntur – 522 510

Lesson - 5

THE AGENCIES OF SOCIALIZATION

5.0 Objective: -

This lesson explains about different agencies contributing for socialization.

Contents

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Meaning of Socialization
- 5.3 Concept of Socialization
- 5.4 Man is not Born Social
- 5.5 Definition of Socialization
- 5.6 Process of Socialization
- 5.7 Process through Authoritarian Modes
- 5.8 Agencies of Socialization
- 5.9 Summary
- 5.10 Technical Terms
- 5.11 Self Assessment Questions
- 5.12 Reference Books

5.1 Introduction

Human society, as is evident from the discussion in this chapter, is not an external phenomenon but exists solely in the minds of its members. The human infant comes into the world as biological organism with animal needs. He is gradually moulded into a social being and he learns social ways of acting and feeling without this process of moulding, the society individual become itself, nor could culture exist, nor could the individual become a person. This process of moulding is called 'Socialization'.

5.2 Meaning of Socialization

Socialization, according to Maciver, "is the process by which social beings establish wider and profounder relationships with one another, in which they become more bound up with,

and more perceptive of the personality of themselves and of others and build up the complex structure of nearer and wider association. Kimball Young writes. "Socialization will mean the process of inducting the individual into the social and cultural world; of making him a particular member in society and its various groups and inducting him to accept the norms and values of that society...Socialization is definitely a matter of learning and not of biological heritage. It is through the process of socialization that the new born individual is moulded into a social being and men find their fulfillment within society. Man becomes what he is by socialization. Bogardus defines socialization as the "process of working together, of developing group responsibility, of being guided by the welfare needs of others. According Ogburn, "Socialization is the process by which the individual learns to conform to the norms of the group." Ross defined socialization as "the development of the we feeling in associates and their growth in capacity and will to act together." Through the process of socialization the individual becomes a social person and attains personality. Gillin and Gillin write, "By the term 'socialization' we mean the process by which individual develops into a functioning member of the group according to its standards, conforming to its modes, observing its traditions and adjusting himself to the social situations." Socialization is the process whereby the individual acquires the conventional patterns of human behaviours. According to Lundberg, socialization consists of the "complex processes of interaction through which the individual learns the habits, skills, beliefs and standards of judgment that are necessary for his effective participation in social group and communities." Socialization is a learning that enables the learner to perform social roles." According to Green, "Socialization is the process by which the child acquires a cultural content, along with selfhood and personality. According to Horton and Hunt, "Socialization is the process whereby one internalizes the norms of his groups, so that a distinct "self" emerges, unique to this individual. H.T. nature is transformed into human nature and the individual into person." Every man tries to adjust himself to the condition and environment predominantly determined by the society of which he is a member. If he fails to do so, he becomes a social deviant and is brought back into line by the efforts so the group of which he is a member. This process of adjustment may be termed socialization. It is the opposite of individualization. It is a process of the expansion of the self. It develops in him the community feeling.

Socialization may be differentiated from sociality and socialism. Sociality is a quality, socialization is a process. Sociality may mean the capacity to mix with others, to enter into relations with them easily and comfortably. Man is a socialized animal, though he may not possess of socialization one comes to acquire the quality of sociality.

Socialism. Socialism is a theory, not a quality or process. It is a theory of future structure

of society. So much vagueness surrounds this word 'socialism' that it is very difficult to define it in exact terms. Every person and party brand themselves as socialist. Very appropriately Joad had compared socialism to a hat which has lost its shape because everyone wears it. In a stricter sense socialism is the theory that the means of production, exchange and distribution should be owned and controlled either by the state or by other associations directly responsible to community. Such ownership will result in a more equitable distribution of wealth, security for the people against poverty, disease and ignorance. In any case socialism concerns itself with what ought to be.

Socialization may also be distinguished from '*maturation*.' Maturation refers primarily to the physical and chemical processes of development over which man has comparatively little control. It is the growing up and gradual changing of the organism. Socialization is a process of learning through which he acquires the habits and patterned behaviour. It designates all of the social processes and pressures by which the norms and standards of a group or community are inculcated in the beliefs and behaviours of the individuals members.

5.3 Concept of Socialization

Little of man's behaviour is instinctive. Rather, man's behaviour is 'learnt' behaviour. The human child comes into the world as a biological organism with animal needs. He is gradually moulded in society into a social being and learns social ways of acting and feeling. The continued existence of society becomes impossible without this process. No individual could become the person and no culture could exist without it. This process of moulding and shaping the personality of the human infant is called 'socialization'.

5.4 Man is Not Born Social

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

Man is man because he shares with others a common culture. Culture includes not only its living members but also members of past generations and those as yet unborn. Sociologists have given more importance to socialization because man is a cultural being. Socialization is often referred to as the 'transmission of culture', the process whereby men learn the rules and practices of social group. Socialization is an aspect of all activity within all human societies. Just as we learn a game by playing it, so we learn life by engaging in it. We are socialized in the course of the activities themselves. For example, if we do not know correct manners, we learn them through the mistakes that we make and the disapproval that others exhibit. We may learn the ways of behaviour through imitation and purposeful training. Education -purposeful instruction – is thus only a part of the socialization process. It is not, and can never be, the whole of that process.

5.5 Definition of Socialisation

- (i) Bogardus: Socialisation is the "process of working together, of developing group responsibility, or being guided by the welfare needs of others".
- (ii) W.F. Ogburn: "Socialisation is the process by which the individual learns to conform to the norms of the group".
- (iii) Peter Worsley explains socialization as the process of "transmission of culture,

the process whereby men learn the rules and practices of social groups”.

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

5.6 Process of Socialization

The process of socialization is operative not only in childhood but throughout life. It is a process which begins at birth and continues unceasingly until the death of the individual. It is an incessant process. Formerly, the term Socialization had not been applied to adult learning experiences but had been restricted to children. More recently, however, the concept of socialization has been broadened to include aspects of adult behaviour as well. It is now thought of “as an interactional process whereby a person’s behaviour is modified to conform with expectations held by members of the groups to which he belongs. “Thinkers describe this process in reference to children only because therein such complicating factors as are introduced when the person becomes conscious of self and others are absent. When the person begins to read books, listen to stories and is enabled to have an imagination of ideal society, it becomes difficult to separate the subjective factors from the objective ones and assess their respective contribution in the socialization of the child.

Since socialization is an important matter for society it is but desirable that the child’s socialization should not be left to mere accident but should be controlled through institutional channels. What a child is going to be is more important than what he is. It is socialization which turns the child into a useful member of the society and gives him social maturity. Therefore, it is of paramount importance to know as to who socializes the child.

There are two sources of child’s socialization. The first includes those who have authority over him, the second are those who are equal in authority to him. The first category may include parents, teachers, elderly persons, and the state. The second one includes the playmates, the friends and the fellows in the club. His training varies in content and significance according as it acquired from one or the other source. In one category is the relationship of constraint, in the

other it is that of co-operation. The relationship of constraint is based on unilateral respect for persons in authority, while the relationship of co-operation is based on mutual understanding between equals. The rules of behaviour, under the first category are left as superior, absolute and external but rules in the second category have no superiority or absoluteness in themselves but simply are the working principles of association. Persons having authority over the child are generally older than he, while persons sharing equality with him are apt to be of similar age.

5.7 Process through Authoritarian Modes

There are reasons as to why socialization should proceed through authoritarian modes. The patterns of behaviour expected in the culture are not innate, sometimes these are even contrary to biological inclination. It is, therefore, but necessary that persons charged with socializing the child must be given only to older persons because when the process of socialization begins, the infant has no juniors and no capacity for associating with equals. The parents, therefore, are the first persons who socialize the child. They are not only closely related to him in the family system but physically also they are nearer to the child than others. The mother is the first of the parents who begins the process of socialization. It is from her that the earliest social stimuli to which a child is subjected, come. He responds to these stimuli by imitating them. With a age and experience gap separating the child from his parents, he cannot understand fully the logic and nature of all that they transmit to him. In case the child does not follow the rules, he may be coerced, because from the societal point of view the essential thing is not that the child be 'freed' from taboo in order to "express his personality", but that he may be taught folkways and mores and protected from himself during his period of childishness. Hence what the child absorbs at the first instance is largely a morality of restraint. The society transmits, taking no chances, the most valued parts of its heritage. Societal morality is thus not a matter of rational understanding but of felt obligation.

The child acquires something from his equals which he cannot acquire from persons in authority. From them he acquires the co-operative morality and some of the informal aspects of culture like small folkways, fads and crazes, secret modes of gratification and forbidden knowledge. The knowledge of such things is necessary from the social point of view. To take a society something undesirable for a youth until he gets married. If such knowledge is strictly banned until marriage, the performance of numerous functions of sex life may be difficult after marriage. So, sex knowledge is not excluded completely though formally it is considered

undesirable. This knowledge the child acquires from equalitarian group. Though the child cannot get as much knowledge from another child learns in the equalitarian group to understand the rules as part of aco-operative effort, in so far as he learns to stand up for his rights without the protection of authority or the abjectness of dependence, he acquires something that is very hard if not impossible to get in the authoritarian type of relationship.

Thus both the authoritarian and equalitarian relationships contribute to the socialization of the child. Things that involve discipline and responsibility in transmission are handed over to authoritarian relations, other things to equalitarian relations.

Briefly mentioned the chief agencies of socialization are the following:

5.8 Agencies of Socialization

Personalities do not come ready-made. They are moulded or shaped through the process of socialization. The process of socialization is operative not only in childhood but throughout life. It is a process which begins at birth and continue still the death of the individual. It is an endless process. From the societal point of view, the child is valued more for 'what he will be' than for 'what he is'. Socialization helps the child to become a useful member of the society. It gives him social maturity. Hence it is quite natural that the child's socialization has not been left to mere accident. Rather, it has been given an institutional framework and controlled through institutional channels. The following are the agencies that have been established by culture which socialize the new born child.

The Family

The parents or family are the first to socialize the child. They are not only closely related to the child but physically also they are nearer to him than others. From the parents he learns his speech and language. He is taught societal morality. He learns respect for persons in authority. In the family he learns a number of civic virtues. The family is rightly called the cradle of social virtues. The child gets his firs lessons in cooperation, tolerance, self sacrifice, love and affection in the family. The environment of a family influences the growth of a child. The psychologists have shown that a person is what he becomes in a family. In a bad family the child learns bad habits whereas in a good family he acquires good habits. An important cause of juvenile delinquency is bad family environment. At the time of mate choice the parents also try to find out the family history of the boy and girl in order to know their good and bad points. The relationship

between the parents and the child is one of constraint. The parents are older than he and have the power to command obedience. In case the child does not follow the rules, he may be coerced. Of the parents it is the mother who first begins the process of socialization. The family continues to exercise its influence throughout life. There is a vast literature on family to describe its role in society.

The School

The school is the second agency of socialization. In the school the child gets his education which moulds his ideas and attitudes. A good education can make the child a good citizen, while a bad education can turn him into a criminal. Education is of great importance in socialization. A well-planned system of education can produce socialized persons.

The Playmates or Friends

The playmates and friends also are an important agency of socialization. The relation between the child and his playmates is one of equality. It is based on cooperation and mutual understanding. They are mostly of similar age. As told above, the child acquires something from his friends and playmates which he cannot acquire from parents. From them he acquires cooperative morality and some of the informal aspects of culture like fashions, fads, crazes, modes of gratification and forbidden knowledge. The knowledge of such things is necessary from the social point of view. To take the example, the knowledge of sex relations is considered in our society something undesirable for a youth till he gets married. If such knowledge is banned strictly until marriage, the performance of numerous functions of sex life may be difficult after marriage. This knowledge the child acquires from his friends and playmates.

The Church, Temple

Religion has been an important factor in society. In the early society religion provided a bond of unity. Though in modern society the importance of religion has diminished, yet it continues to mould our beliefs and ways of life. In every family some or the other religious practices are observed on one or the other occasion. The child sees his parents going to the temple and performing religious ceremonies. He listens to religious sermons which may determine his course of life and shape his ideas.

The State

The state is an authoritarian agency. It makes laws for the people and lays down the modes of conduct expected of them. The people have compulsorily to obey these laws. If they fail to adjust their behaviour in accordance with the laws of the state, they may be punished for such

failure. Thus the state also moulds our behaviour.

One of the reasons for the increasing crime in society is the failure of the socializing agencies to properly and adequately socialize the child. The modern family faces a crisis today and suffers from parental maladjustment which adversely affects the process of socialization. The educational system is full of draw backs. The school is no longer a temple of education. It is a place where boys and girls learn more of drugs and alcohol and less of cultural heritage. The onslaught of urbanization has abolished the neighborhood system and snatched playmates from the child who now plays with electronic games than with the neighborhood children. Similarly religion has a lesser hold in an urban society and state authority is more disobeyed than obeyed.

It need not be said that in order to have socialized beings these agencies should function in an efficient manner. The modern society has to solve several problems of socialization and for that purpose it has to make these agencies more active and effective.

Literature and Mass Media of Communication

There is another source of socialization. This is, of course, found only in literate societies and that is the literature. The civilization that we share is constructed of words or literature. "Words rush at us in torrent and cascade; they leap into our vision, as in billboard and newspaper, magazine and textbook; and assault our ears, as in radio and television". The media of mass communication gave us their messages. These messages too contain in capsule form, the premises of our culture, its attitudes and ideologies. The words are always written by someone and these people too - authors and editors and advertisers - join the teachers, the peers and the parents in the socialization process. In individual cases, of course, some of these influences are more important than others. The responses can also differ. "Some of us respect tradition; others fear the opinions of their peers, and still other prefer to listen to the 'thousand tongues' of conscience'. But all three modes of socialization result in conformity of a kind and all three thus contribute to the transmission of a culture by some and its acquisition by others.

5.9 Summary

Since socialization is an important matter for society it is but desirable that the child's socialization should not be left to mere accident but should be controlled through institutional channels. There are two sources of Childs socialization. The first includes those who have authority over him; the second is those who are equal in authority to him. The first category may include parents, teachers, elderly persons, and the state. The second one includes the playmates,

the friends and the fellows in the club.

5.10 Technical Terms

Interaction

Institution

Maturity

Playmates

5.11 Self Assessment Questions

1. Explain the meaning and concept of socialization?
2. Discuss the process of socialization?
3. Elaborate and discuss on different agencies of socialization?

5.12 Reference Books

- Johns,H.M. Sociology,P.110
- HortonandHunt,Sociology,p.98
- CharlesH.Cooley,IntroductorySociology,p.117
- Gillinand Gillin; An Introduction toSociologyp.575.

Lesson Writer

Dr.Allu.GowriSankarRao

Asst.Professor Dept. of Sociology & Social Work
Acharya Nagarjuna University

Lesson - 6

THEORIES OF SOCIALIZATION

6.0 Objective:

The main objective of the lesson is to discuss development of the self and the theories contributing for socialization.

Structure:

- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Meaning of Socialization
- 6.3 Theories of Socialization
- 6.4 Cooley's Theory
- 6.5 Mead's Theory
- 6.6 Freud's Theory
- 6.7 W.I. Thomas Theory
- 6.8 Durkheim's Theory
- 6.9 Summary
- 6.10 Technical Terms
- 6.11 Self Assessment Questions
- 6.12 Reference Books

6.1 Introduction

Human society, as is evident from the discussion in this chapter, is not an external phenomenon but exists solely in the minds of its members. The human infant comes into the world as biological organism with animal needs. He is gradually molded into a social being and he learns social ways of acting and feeling without this process of moulding, the society individual become itself, nor could culture exist, nor could the individual become a person. This process of moulding is called 'Socialization'.

6.2 Meaning of Socialization

Socialization, according to Maciver, "is the process by which social beings establish wider and profounder relationships with one another, in which they become more bound up with, and more perceptive of the personality of themselves and of others and build up the complex structure of nearer and wider association. Kimball Young writes. "Socialization will mean the process of inducting the individual into the social and cultural world; of making him a particular member in society and its various groups and inducting him to accept the norms and values of that society... Socialization is definitely a matter of learning and not of biological inheritance. It is through the process of socialization that the new born individual is moulded into a social being and men find their fulfillment within society. Man becomes what he is by socialization. Bogardus defines socialization as the "process of working together, of developing group responsibility, of being guided by the welfare needs of others. According to Ogburn, "Socialization is the process by

which the individual learns to conform to the norms of the group.” Ross defined socialization as “the development of the we feeling in associates and their growth in capacity and will to act together.” Through the process of socialization the individual becomes a social person and attains personality. Gillin and Gillin write, “By the term ‘socialization’ we mean the process by which individual develops into a functioning member of the group according to its standards, conforming to its modes, observing its traditions and adjusting himself to the social situations.” Socialization is the process whereby the individual acquires the conventional patterns of human behaviour. According to Lundberg, socialization consists of the “complex processes of interaction through which the individual learns the habits, skills, beliefs and standards of judgment that are necessary for his effective participation in social group and communities.” Socialization is a learning that enables the learner to perform social roles.” According to Green, “Socialization is the process by which the child acquires a cultural content, along with selfhood and personality. According to Horton and Hunt, “Socialization is the process whereby one internalizes the norms of his groups, so that a distinct “self” emerges, unique to this individual.

H.T. nature is transformed into human nature and the individual into person.” Every man tries to adjust himself to the condition and environment predominantly determined by the society of which he is a member. If he fails to do so, he becomes a social deviant and is brought back into line by the efforts of the group of which he is a member. This process of adjustment may be termed socialization. It is the opposite of individualization. It is a process of the expansion of the self. It develops in him the community feeling.

Socialization may be differentiated from sociality and socialism. Sociality is a quality, socialization is a process. Sociality may mean the capacity to mix with others, to enter into relations with them easily and comfortably. Man is a socialized animal, though he may not possess of socialization one comes to acquire the quality of sociality.

Socialism. Socialism is a theory, not a quality or process. It is a theory of future structure of society. So much vagueness surrounds this word ‘socialism’ that it is very difficult to define it in exact terms. Every person and party brand themselves as socialist. Very appropriately Joad had compared socialism to a hat which has lost its shape because everyone wears it. In a stricter sense socialism is the theory that the means of production, exchange and distribution should be owned and controlled either by the state or by other associations directly responsible to community. Such ownership will result in a more equitable distribution of wealth, security for the people against poverty, disease and ignorance. In any case socialism concerns itself with what ought to be.

Socialization may also be distinguished from ‘*maturation.*’ Maturation refers primarily to the physical and chemical processes of development over which man has comparatively little control. It is the growing up and gradual changing of the organism. Socialization is a process of learning through which he acquires the habits and patterned behaviour. It designates all of the social processes and pressures by which the norms and standards of a group or community are inculcated in the beliefs and behaviour of the individuals members.

6.3 Theories of Socialization

The heart of socialization is the development of the self. But what is meant by self? According to Cooley “By self is meant that which is designated in common speech by ‘I’, ‘me’, and ‘myself.’ Cooley’s definition of self is simple enough but it does not refer to any clear-cut entity such as one’s body. Therefore Gardner Murphy says that the self is “the individual as known to the individual”. The self of a person is what he consciously or unconsciously conceives himself to be. It is thus his “self-concept” the sum total of his perceptions of himself, and especially his attitudes toward himself. When a child is born, he has no self, i.e., he has no consciousness of himself or of others. He does not possess those behaviour mechanisms which

make an individual a part and a member of any group. He has no conception of where the social customs begin and end. In short, the child at birth is not conscious of any of the self and other relationship. These relationships the child learns through the process of socialization. It is the fulfillment of his potentialities for personal growth and development. It humanizes the biological organism and transforms it into a self having a sense of identity and endowed with ideals, values and ambitions. Self is a social product and socialization is the indispensable condition of individuality and awareness.

There are three important theories to explain the development of self. These theories have been propounded by Cooley, Mead and Freud. A brief description of these theories is given below.

6.4 Cooley's Theory

Cooley's concept of self development has been termed "looking-glass self concept. According to him, man develops the concept of self with the help of others. Man does not come to form opinions about himself unless and until he comes into contact with other people and knows their opinions about himself. He forms the concept of himself on the basis of opinions held by others about him. Thus when our associates call us intelligent or average, tall or short, fat or thin we react to their opinion and form the same opinion about ourselves as they have formed. In other words, just as the perception of others gives an image of the physical self, so the perception about ourselves comes to us from the reaction of other persons. These others comprise our social looking-glass through which we form the image of ourselves.

There are three principal elements of the looking-glass concept : (1) Our perception of how we look to others; (2) Our perception of their judgment of how we look; and (3) Our feelings about these judgments. Take an example. Suppose that whenever you enter a room and approach a small group of people conversing together, the members promptly leave the room with lame excuses. This has taken place several times. Would it not affect your feelings about yourself? or, if whenever you appear, a group quickly forms around you, how would this attention affect your self-feelings? Thus, we discover ourselves through the reactions of others about us. This self knowledge is first gained from parents and is modified later by the reactions of other individuals. It may also be referred that the reactions of the people about us are not similar or we may misjudge their reactions. An ego-boosting remark may be a mere flattery. Thus, the looking-glass self which the individual perceives may differ from the image others have actually formed. There is often a significant variation between the individual's perception of how others picture him and the views they actually hold.

6.5 Mead's Theory

G.H. Mead has given a sociological analysis of the process of socialization. According to him the self develops out of the child's communicative contact with others. The new-born infant has needs like those for food and clothing that press for satisfaction. The mother satisfies these needs and the child comes to depend upon her and 'identifies himself' with her emotionally. But in course of time the child differentiates himself from his mother and then he has to integrate himself and mother into a new social system, a two-person two-roles system, with the child taking a subordinate role to the superior role of the mother. Then the child repeats the process for his father. He differentiates his father from his mother and then integrates him into the social system. In this way the number of 'significant others' increases for the child; and the child internalizes the role of these others. He puts himself in the role of the others and then responds to his own words and acts in terms of the meaning they would convey to the other person. In

this way the self develops and grows. An essential characteristic of the self is its reflexive character. By this Mead, George H. means that the self can be both subject and object to itself. It can reflect upon itself, or in other words, it can be self-conscious. Man can do so only through assuming the role of other persons and looking at himself through their eyes. He learns to imagine how he appears to others and how do they judge this appearance. Then he reacts himself to this judgment as he imagines it. Thus by adopting towards himself the attitude that others take towards him, he comes to treat himself as an object as well as subject.

But acquiring the attitudes of others towards himself is not sufficient for the individual. He explores and finds out others' attitudes toward him. This is very necessary for him, otherwise he could not predict or control what happens to him. The child learns at an early age that one of the most important ways of controlling his destiny is to influence the feelings of others towards himself. The attitudes can be known only through the mechanism of symbolic communication. He must learn to utilize the symbols by which attitudes are communicated, so that he can conjure up the attitudes of others in his own imagination and in turn communicate his own reaction to others in the light of what he imagines to be their attitudes. Once he has acquired the attitude of others as part of himself, he can judge how another person will respond or how he himself responds to the words he utters. The individual thus speaks to himself. What he says or thinks, calls out a certain reply in himself. He takes the role of others. "No sharp line can be drawn between our own selves and the selves of others, since our own selves function in our experience only in so far as the selves of others function in our experience also." "The self is not something that exists first and then enters into relationship with others. It is something that develops out of social interaction and is constantly changing, constantly adjusting as new situations and conflicts arise. It assumes the prior existence of a social order and yet is the vessel in which and through which the order continues.

6.6 Freud's Theory

The theories of Cooley and Mead presume a basic harmony between the self and society. According to Cooley, society and individuals are not separate phenomena but are simply collective and distributive aspects of the same thing. Sigmund Freud, the father of psycho-analysis, does not agree with this concept of self and society. According to him, self and society are not identical. He has explained the process of socialization in terms of his concepts of Id, Ego and Super ego which constitute the three systems of mind. The id is the organ of untamed reason while the super ego acts with ideals and norms. There is found a conflict between id and ego. This id is usually repressed, but at times it breaks through in open defiance of the super ego. Sometimes it finds expression in disguised forms e.g. when a father relieves his aggression by beating the child. The ego in such a case is not aware of the basis of its actions.

Freud has compared the id with the horse and the ego with its rider. He says, "The function of the ego is that of the rider guiding the horse, which is the id. But like the rider, the ego sometimes is unable to guide the horse as it wishes and perforce must guide the id in the direction." ... It is out of this conflict between the ego and the id that psychosis develops.

6.7 W.I. Thomas Theory

The views of W.I. Thomas concerning the process of socialization can be understood by an analysis of his theory of "the definition of the situation". According to Thomas, the situation in which the child finds himself has already been defined for him. The rules according to which he must behave are determined by the group into which he is born. The child cannot behave according to his own whims and fancies. He must act according to the expectations of the group and compromise his wishes with those of the group. The wishes and the expectations of the

group always call for restraint, order, discipline and self-sacrifice in the child. A king of conflict may take place between the wishes of the child and those of the group. Though not always, the group usually wins out in such a conflict. Thomas has described this situation graphically in his "The Unadjusted Girl".

Thus, according to Thomas any deliberate action calls for an appraisal of the situation within which the person finds himself. Once the situation is defined for him, he can act appropriately in it in the normal course of life. His role also becomes apparent. Thomas has pointed out, that in infancy situations are defined for the infant by the mother and other members. The parents define the situation through speech and other signs and pressures. The parents may give instructions to their child to correct his behaviour. Thus they may instruct: "Be quite", "Sit up straight", "Blow your nose", "Wash you face", "Mind you mother", "Be king to sister", "Pray God", and so on. The child's wishes and activities are inhibited by these instructions or definitions. Thomas has argued that by definitions within the family, by playmates, in the school, by formal instruction, and by signs of approval and disapproval, the child, that is, the growing member, learns the norms of his society.

6.8 Durkheim's Theory

Durkheim's theory of 'Collective representations' throws some light on the study of the process of socialization. In his theory of socialization Durkheim has asserted that the individual becomes socialized by adopting the behaviour of his group. By 'collective representations' he meant the body of experiences, ideas and ideals of a group upon which the individual unconsciously depends for his ideas, attitudes and behaviour. To Durkheim, collective representations are objects or factors of social value. These objects are symbol-products and are mutually owned and mutually proclaimed.

Durkheim has stated that the 'collective representations' have a great force because they are collectively created and developed. It means, collective representations or social values are the product of collective action. Hence they are imperative and compulsive. For example, the flag is a political representation; sacred writings are religious representation and so on. Durkheim has said that these collective representations or social values directly or indirectly mould the character and the behaviour of the new born child.

According to Durkheim, the individual mends his ways in accordance with the group standards. The accumulated group experience provides the individuals the necessary guidance in learning the appropriate behaviour. It is in this respect Durkheim believed that the 'collective representations' have an autonomous existence, completely independent of individuals. He advocated a theory of "Collective Consciousness" and "Group mind", which he believed, exist independent of individual consciousness. This part of Durkheim's doctrine has been severely criticized and is, at present, rejected by many of the American sociologists.

6.9 Summary

Socialization may be differentiated from sociality and socialism. Sociality is a quality, socialization is a process. Sociality may mean the capacity to mix with others, to enter into relations with them easily and comfortably. Man is a socialized animal, though he may not possess of socialization one comes to acquire the quality of sociality. Self is a social product and socialization is the indispensable condition of individuality and awareness. There are three important theories to explain the development of self. These theories have been propounded by Cooley, Mead and Freud.

6.10 TechnicalTerms

PHENOMENON INHERITANCE
CONVENTIONAL
INTERNALIZE

6.11 SelfAssessmentQuestions:

- (1) ExplaintheMeaningandconceptof socialization?
- (2) WriteaboutselfandhowCooleyexplainedthedevelopmentofself?
- (3) Discussbrieflythetheoryof Mead'sonselfdevelopment?
- (4) HowFreudexplainedhis theoryonself?

6.12 ReferenceBooks

Maciver,ElementsofSocialScience,P. 144.
Young,Kimball,HandBookofsocialPsychology,P.89. Bogaydus;
Sociology, P. 233.
GillinandGillin,'CulturalSociology'P.112.
Mead,George,H.Mind,selfandsociety,P.140-175.

LessonWriter

Dr.Allu.GowriSankarRao

Asst.Professor Dept.

of Sociology & Social Work
AcharyaNagarjunaUniversity

Lesson No. 7

Social Control – Types and Agencies

7.0 Objective:

The main objective of this lesson is to understand the concept of social control and their agencies. .

Contents:

- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Social Control – Definition
- 7.3 Need of Social Control
- 7.4 Types of Social Control
- 7.5 Agencies of Social Control:
- 7.6 Summary
- 7.7 Key Words
- 7.8 Model Questions
- 7.9 References

7.1 Introduction:

The term social control refers to the social regulation of human behaviour. It may be regarded as referring to the aggregate of values and norms by means of which tensions and conflict between individuals and groups are resolved or mitigated in order to maintain the solidarity of some more inclusive group, and also to the arrangements through which these values and norms are communicated and installed. Rousseau's book 'Social Contract' begins with a famous sentence "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains". It is true that man cannot be absolutely free in society. The collective life of man is possible only in the context of social constraints. The sustained social experience of man has revealed to him that in his own interest and in the interest of others he must subject himself to some kind of control which is over and above him. Attainment of individual happiness is the main aim of social life. The happiness can be attained not with unbounded freedom for action but with restrained behaviour. Man has given to society the power of exercising its control over his behaviour. The control which the society exercises over the behaviour of its members through various mechanisms can be referred to as 'social control'.

Social control regulates the social behaviour. But regulation of social behaviour by values and norms is different with the regulation of social behaviour by force. These two modes of social control are involved in actual social life. Hence the phenomenon of social control are very complex.

7.2 Social Control – Definition:

When we use the term ‘control’ the idea which generally comes to our mind is one of policemen, law courts, prison and laws, of force and coercion. While these elements have a relevance in control, the term social control is used by sociologists in a broad sense.

1. **Mannheim:** Social Control is the sum of those methods by which a society tries to influence human behaviour to maintain a given order.”
2. **Maclver:** Social control has been defined by Maclver as “the way in which entire social order coheres and maintains itself—how it operates as a whole, as a changing equilibrium.”
3. **Ogburn and Nimkoff** “ The patterns of pressure which a society exerts to maintain order and established in rules is known as its system of social control”.
4. **Gillin and Gillin** “Social control is that system of measures, suggestions, persuasion—restraint and coercion by whatever means including physical force by which a society brings into conformity to the approved pattern of behaviour or sub-group or by which a group moulds into conformity its members.”
5. **E.A. Ross** “ Social Control refers to the “system of devices whereby society brings its members into conformity with the accepted standards of behaviour”.
6. **G. A. Lundberg** and others have said that social control designates “those social behaviours which influence individuals or groups toward conformity to established or desired norms”.

7.3 Need of Social Control:

Social solidarity is essential for the existence of society. No two persons are alike in their nature, ideas, attitudes and interests. Every individual is a separate personality. There are cultural differences among the individuals. Some worship an idol, others do not. Some eat meat others are vegetarians. Some are fashionable, others are simple. As a matter of fact, society is a heterogeneous organization. If every individual is allowed unrestricted freedom to act and behave, it may create social disorder. For an orderly social life social control is necessary. The aims of social control are to bring out conformity, solidarity and continuity of a particular group or society. Social control is necessary for the following reasons.

1. **To maintain the old order:** It is necessary for every society or group to maintain its social order and this is possible only when its members behave in accordance with that social order. An important objective of social control is to maintain the old order. Old order is necessary to maintain continuity and uniformity in society.
2. **To establish social unity:** Without social control social unity would be a mere dream. Social control regulates behaviour in accordance with established norms which brings uniformity of behaviour and leads to unity among the individuals. The family maintains its unity because its members behave in a similar manner in accordance with family norms.
3. **To regulate or control individual behaviour:** No two men are alike in their attitudes, ideas, interests and habits. Even the children of the same parents do not have the same attitudes, habits and interests. Men believe in different religions, dress differently, eat different food, marry in different ways and have different ideologies. There are so much differences in the ways of living of the people that at every moment there is the possibility of clash between them. In modern times this possibility has all the more increased because man has become too self-centered. Social control is necessary to protect social interests and satisfy common needs.
4. **To provide social sanction:** Social control provides social sanction to the social ways of behaviour. There are numerous folkways, modes and customs prevalent in society. Every individual has to follow them. If an individual violates the social norms, he is compelled through social control to observe them. Thus social control provides sanction to social norms.

The above reasons clearly prove the need for social control. The need is greater in modern society because of its highly complex character and disintegrating forces present in it.

7.4 Types of Social Control:

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

1. Formal control
2. Informal Control.

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

2. Informal Control: The informal means of social control grow themselves in society. No special agency is required to create them. Informal control includes gossip, slander, resentment, public opinion, sympathy, sense of justice, folkways, mores, customs, religion, morality and such other agents. These are not purposefully created. Nothing could be said with certainty regarding their origin. They arise on their own way in course of time gain currency and popularity. Faith in religion, moral

convictions, public opinion artistic standard, and the general state of enlightenment are found to be more important in informal control.

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

7.5 Agencies of Social Control:

The agencies (means) of social control are many and present a spectrum of historical development. As we pass on from the primitive society and come to our own modern industrial society, we find that the means of social control have either changed their form to meet the changing demand or have vanished into the oblivion of history. Agencies of social control of the primitive societies are less complicated and multiple than those of advanced societies. Those means conformed to the simple life in primitive societies. They were controlled mostly by customs, traditions and beliefs. However, despite the difference of our lives with those of the primitive societies, and despite the means of social control between our and the primitive societies, we still have elements which have been inherited by us from early primitive way of life through traditions and customs. The means of social control defy any strict classification. Social control is ensured through many ways and means through indirect suggestions, ridicule, praise, etc. and its is also exercised through more direct ways through denial of privileges and imprisonment. A classification of the means of social control on the basis of their mode of operation will be studied into the following head:

1. Control by Law and Administration

2. Control by Education
3. Control by Public Opinion
4. Control by Physical Force
5. Control by Folkways
6. Control by Mores
7. Control by Customs
8. Control by Religion
9. Control by Morality
10. Control by leadership
11. Control by beliefs
12. Control by Social Suggestion
13. Control by Social Ideals
14. Control by Art and Literature
15. Control by Humour and Satire

1. **Control by Law and Administration:** “Law is the body of rules which are recognized, interpreted and applied to particular situations by the courts of the State. It derives from various sources, including customs but it becomes law when the state which means in the last resort the court is prepared to enforce it is a rule binding on citizens and residents within its jurisdiction.” Behind, law stands the power of state and people know that any breach of law would result in punishment with the breaking up of old tradition and vanishing of established customs and increasing complexity of modern industrial world laws have become more and more important means of social control, Property relationship of our world are more controlled by law than by other factors.

Law requires enforcing agencies. Administrative machinery of the State is the main law enforcing agency. Increasing complexity of industrial civilization has necessitated enormous growth and administrative agencies. Almost every aspect of life is now governed by administrators. They come directly or indirectly in touch with the public. In totalitarian State this phenomena grows to extremes so much that individual as well as social life of men feels suffocated. However, the importance of law and administrative agencies as means of social control has come to stay in our society.

2. **Control by Education:** Education may be defined as a process whereby the social heritage of a group is passed on from one generation to another. It is in this sense, Durkheim conceived of education as “the socialization of the younger generation”. He also stated, “It is actually a continuous effort to impose on the child ways of seeing, feeling and acting which he could not have arrived at spontaneously”. Education is every experience, trifling or profound, which durably modifies, thought, feeling or action.

Some educators have suggested that education must be used for making a “good society”. Education is not primarily an attempt to stuff the mind with information, but train people to think to distinguish between truth and error to arrive at reality. In this regard, the school is taken to mean “community of experience” rather than as a “series of planned lessons”. George S. Counts has remarked that “Education, emptied of all social control and considered solely as method, points nowhere and can arrive nowhere”. Today people send their children to the schools to be taught properly. “To be taught properly means, of course, to be taught in accordance with the wishes of the community”. The community is most sensitive, in particular, to those aspects of teaching that have social and moral significance. Hence much attention is paid to select right persons for the teaching profession.

Education from infancy to adulthood is a vital means of social control. Through education new generation learns the social norms and the penalties for violating them. Theoretical education, that is reading and writing, serves to form the intellectual basis and with practical education one learns to put this into practice. Without proper education the harmony of the individual and society is not merely difficult but also impossible. Education makes social control quite normal. It converts social control into self-control. In the absence of a well organized educational system, social control would remain merely as an arbitrary pressure which may not last long. Hence, education is a necessary condition for the proper exercise of social control.

3. **Control by Public Opinion:** Public Opinion is an important agency of social control. According to V.V. Akolkar, “Public opinion simply refers to that mass

of ideas which people have to express on a given issue". Public opinion may be said to be the collective opinion of majority of members of a group. Public opinion is of great significance especially in democratic societies. Through public opinion the knowledge of the needs, ideas, beliefs, and values of people can be ascertained. It influences the social behaviour of people. Behaviour of the people is influenced by ideas, attitudes and desires which are reflected by public opinion. Public opinion helps us to know what type of behaviour acceptable and what is not. . There are various agencies for the formulation and expression of public opinion. The press, radio movies and legislatures are the main controlling agencies of public opinion. The Press includes newspapers, magazines and journals of various kinds. The newspaper provides the stuff of opinion for it covers everyday events and policies. Many decisions of the people are influence by information available through the press. As an agency of social control the press seeks to influence the tastes, ideas, attitudes and preferences of the readers. Radio is another agency of public opinion that influence behaviour. It influences our language, customs and institutions. It is through the radio that human voice can reach millions of people at the same time. It can dramatize and popularize events and ideas. In the same way, television has also been influencing people's behaviour. Legislature at present is the most effective agency for the formulation and expression of public opinion. The debates in the legislatures influence public opinion particularly in democratic system. It makes laws that control people's life and activities. It should be noted that legislature itself is subject to the influence of the people.

4. **Control by Physical Force:** Physical force is manifested everywhere. It is rooted in the biology of every animal including man. Primitive man knew no power except that of physical force. He quarreled, dominated and defected others by his physical power. But as man advanced on the path of civilization and became a social being other means of control lessened the importance of sheer physical force. Customs, traditions, law and administration gained importance. Now we are trying even to eradicate death as a form of punishment because it represents use of sheer physical force as a means of social control. However, this is mainly due to our idealism and apathy for brutal physical force. In fact social control even today is mostly effected by application of purely physical force either directly or through fear of being applied. People do

not indulge in street fights not only because a policeman is standing nearby but also because they fear that if they do indulge then sooner or later they will be caught and punished. Behind the disciplined behaviour of army, the smiling faces of diplomats and the popular rulers of modern democracies looms the brutality of physical power which can be applied any moment. The police, army and weapons are all instruments of pure physical force and there is ample abundance of these in our world to indicate that physical force is still the most potent means of social control.

5. **Control by Folkways:** Folkways are the recognized modes of behaviour which arise automatically within a group. They are the behaviour patterns of every day life which arise spontaneously and unconsciously in a group. They are in general the habits of the individuals and are common to a group. They are socially approved. They have some degree of traditional sanction. It is not easy for the members of a group to violate the folkways. They are the foundation of group culture. If an individual does not follow them he may be socially boycotted by his group. A particular dress must be worn at a particular function. The Brahmins shall not take meat. The Jains should not take curd. The Hindu women should not smoke. Since folkways become a matter of habit. Therefore, these are followed unconsciously and exercise powerful influence over man's behaviour in society.
6. **Control by Mores:** Mores are those folkways which are considered by the group to be of great significance, rather indispensable to its welfare. The mores relate to the fundamental needs of society more directly than do the folkways. They express the group sense of what is right and conducive to social welfare. They imply a value judgment about the folkways. Mores are always moulding human behaviour. They restrain an individual from doing acts considered as wrong by his group. They are the instruments of control. In society there are innumerable mores like monogamy, prohibition, endogamy, anti-slavery etc. Conformity to mores is regarded necessary. It is essential for the members of the group to conform to them. Behaviour contrary to them is not permitted by society. Certain mores may even be harmful for the physical well being of an individual, yet these must be obeyed. Thus, mores control man's behaviour in society to a very great extent.

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

Customs are the long established habits and usages of the people. They are those folkways and mores which have persisted for a very long time and have passed down from one generation to another. They arise spontaneously and gradually. There is no constituted authority to declare them, to apply them or to safeguard them. They are accepted by society. They are followed because they have been followed in the past. The importance of customs as a means of social control cannot be minimized. They are so powerful that no one can escape their range. They regulate social life to a great extent. They bind men together. They control the purely selfish impulses. They compel the individual to conform to the accepted standards. They are held so sacred that any violation of them is regarded not only a crime but also a sacrilege. In primitive societies customs were powerful means of social control but in modern times their force has loosened.

8. **Control by Religion:** Religion also exercises a powerful influence upon man’s behaviour in society. The dogmatic and brutal forms of religion which influenced the lives of primitive and medieval man do not exist as such in the lives of modern men. Mysterious thought which form the core of every religion has not lost its influence over the thoughts and emotions of modern men. In a way its influence has deepened and expanded in its scope. The term religion has numerous definitions. Religion is an attitude towards superhuman powers. It is a belief in powers superior to man. It expresses itself in several forms like superstition, animism, totemism, magic, ritualism and fetishism. Religion pervades practically in all the societies, though there may be different forms of religious beliefs and practices. The Hindu religion assign great importance to ceremonies. At the time of birth, marriage and death a number of ceremonies are performed. “Mantras” are recited even if one does not understand their

meaning. Religion is a powerful agency in society. It influences man's behaviour. Children should obey their parents, should not tell a lie or cheat, women should be faithful to men, people should be honest and virtuous, one should limit one's desires, man should renounce unsocial activities, are some of the teachings of religion which influence man's behaviour. Men should do good acts is a common teaching of all the religions. Religion makes people benevolent, charitable, forbearing and truthful. It may also be noted that religion may easily be distorted into superstition and dogmatism. Instead of being an incentive to brotherhood, social justice and ethical idealism, religion may be used as a tool to make people content with their lot, obedient to their rulers and defenders of status quo. It may deny freedom of thought. It may favour poverty, exploitation and idleness and encourage practices like cannibalism, slavery, Untouchability communalism and even incest.

9. **Control by Morality:** Morality is an institution that is closely related to religion. Morality is concerned with the conceptions of goodness and evil. It refers to 'that body of rules and principles concerned with good and evil as manifested to us by conscience'. These rules are admitted at large by the community. Honest, faithfulness, fairness, service-mindedness, truthfulness, conscientiousness, kindness, sacrifice, incorruptibility, etc., represent some of the moral concepts. People who are morally good are also socially good. Morality always helps to make a distinction between right and wrong or good and bad. Hence morality acts as a guide of human behaviour. Moral rules are obeyed because of internal pressure. This pressure refers to the pressure of conscience. But in the case of religion, man obeys religious rule because of his fear towards God. In morality, man is not very much afraid of God, but he is afraid of society. Morality is based on rational judgement or rationality whereas religion is based on faith and emotions.

Religion and morality are mutually complementary and supportive. What is morally good is in most of the cases good spiritually also. The fulfillment of God's will and the performance of moral actions are, therefore, two aspects of the same process. Both are concerned with the 'higher law' which stands over and above the sphere of the state and outside state control. Though not always morality supports religious beliefs and considers religiosity

as a moral virtue. In the same way, religion reinforces morality with its supernatural sanctions. Both jointly command and control human conduct. Mathew Arnold says that “Religion is morality touched with emotions”.

10. **Control by leadership:** The phenomena of leadership is found even in animal groups. Persons having native qualities of character have ever influenced and dominated. Even if authority is invested in a person it finds best expression only when that person has that element which makes a man leader of his community. Authority does not make a man leader. He must have those qualities of his personality which can persuade his fellow beings to take to the way pointed out by him. People follow their leaders not because the leaders possess some authoritarian power to drive them, but because they believe in the judgement, wisdom and sincerity of their leaders. These qualities come in a person partly by inborn capitalities and partly to his attitude towards the other fellow beings. Of this aspect of leadership. Gillin and Gillin say, “But the cause of his (leader) authority are to be found in part at least, in the natural qualities which the leader himself possesses. He may have a fine physique or unusual mental qualities, for example strength of will and imagination a sanguine temperament, eloquence, generosity and love, or a number of these in combination. And the force of such qualities is supplemented by the administration aroused in men by the social distinction which a leader has either inherited or achieved through his abilities.

11. **Control by beliefs:** It is an old saying that where reason ends and logic fails, belief begins. In social life of man this seems to happen quite frequently. Today science has shattered many old myths, beliefs and traditions. Sometimes it has been done ruthlessly and we are made to think that the basis of belief has been entirely wrong. In fact science has not been able to harm a bit the foundation of belief. It has only replaced man's belief in old and primitive processes of thoughts by new processes of thoughts, e.g. the primitive man believed, to be of divine origin. Now we believe it to be a result of certain chemical actions taking place between molecules. Belief still is an important means of social control, more important than reason, logic and scientific analysis. These later appear to be assisting the forces of belief in social happenings. Wars revolutions, and great social upheavals, are upto our own times, products of

belief. By all standards of scientific analysis and logic. Britain had no hope before the might of Germany during the days of the Second World War and had they followed the course indicated by reason and logic they would have surrendered. But they followed their belief in the victory of civilization over the Nazi barbarism and won. This can safely be stated that man has not been able to evolve a better agency of social control than the agency of belief. This has its own advantages and disadvantages. The agency of belief of social control often acts through human superstitions and the through processes which centre around the existence of some supernatural power. This is more marked in the case of primitive societies. However, this feature is not entirely lacking in our own industrial society.

According to Gillin and Gillin “:The belief in these supernatural sanctions to conduct has great advantages. It is effective and cheap. Legal and social sanctions are sometimes paralysed by the superior power of offender. They are expensive and after all reach only the outward deed; they do not control the motives of the heart. But the belief that the Great Something knows the thoughts and the very intent of an individual that he approves the types of conduct accepted of the group and that he punishes with dreadful punishments those who offend and rewards with choice blessing those who conform goes to very fountains of individual motivation.”

12. **Control by Social Suggestion:** Social suggestions are also powerful means of social control. Suggestion is the indirect communication of ideas, feeling and other mental states. Such communication may be made through various methods. The first method is putting the life examples of great men. We celebrate the anniversaries of Mahatma Gandhi and Lal Bahadur Shastri. We build monuments in the memory of great men. We place their life ideals before the people and exhort them to follow these ideals. The second method of making suggestion is through literature. Books, journals, newspapers etc. may inspire people to heroic deeds and develop in them national feelings. The literature may also make people narrow minded, communal, conservative and superstitious. The type of literature one reads will indirectly influence his mind and consequently his behaviour. The third method is through education. The educational curriculum may communicate certain ideas to the students and

make them disciplined citizens. The fourth method is through advertisements. Many magazines carry beautiful advertisement depicting the advantages of visiting certain places and suggesting the prestige attached to traveling to these places. The advertisements from the Doordarshan may attract the people to a particular tooth paste. Many of our business enterprises employ advertising to influence attitudes and therefore, action. Suggestions may be conscious or unconscious. It may also be intentional or unintentional.

13. **Control by Social Ideals:** Some one has said that the history of mankind is the history of its great. But if looked closely we find that the great amongst humanity were so because they stood resolutely for certain ideals. Eeven Hitler who moved a nation with a single ideal that Germany is a race of rulers. In Russia, Lenin and Stalin held before oppressed masses the ideal of equality and we saw the rise of a new world power. In our own land ideals put up by Gandhiji before our masses bought out a revolution mighty enough to overthrow the powerful British empire with restoration to bloodshed and destruction. Thus social ideals have been proved to be the mighty agencies of social transformation and change of social behaviour. Ideals once brought into existence never died without fulfilling their function. Ideal owner-labourer relationship once established in a single factory would spread with astounding speed. But to do so ideals should first gain the approval of masses or to say they must become popular. Religion also takes the help of ideal for inspiring men to take to virtuous way of life. God is the supreme ideal of goodness and peach and in order to attain or reach him one has to follow the path of goodness and peace.

14. **Control by Art and Literature:** Art in its narrow sense includes painting, sculpture, architecture, music and dance. Literature includes poetry, drama and fiction. Both art and literature influence the imagination and exert control on human behaviour. The martial music of the military band arouses feelings of determination and strength. A classical dance creates in us an appreciation of our culture. The statue of Mahatma Gandhi teaches us the virtue of simple living and high thinking. A painting may arouse in us a feeling of sympathy, affection and hatred. There is always a close relationship between the art of a period and the national life. The civilization of any specified time can be judged

by an examination of its art. The Ajanta and Ellora caves give a vivid account of the ancient Hindu Culture. An artist has been called an agent of civilization.

Literature also influences human behaviour in society. We have 'good' literature and 'bad' literature. A good literature possesses an indefinable quality which makes it live through the ages. Ramayana, Bhagavad-Gita and Mahabharata are classical work of great social value. On the other hand, detective literature may have its effect on crime. Romantic literature may make the readers passionate while religious literature may make them the readers passionate while religious literature may make them virtuous or superstitious. Rousseau in France hastened the French Revolution. Dickens changed the entire school system in Britain by writing David Copperfield and his other books. In this way both art and literature exert control through their influence on the imagination.

15. **Control by Humour and Satire:** Humour is also a means of social control. It assumes various forms, depending upon the situation and purpose. It often serves to relieve a tense situation. Sometimes it is used with a bad intention to deflate others without a reason. It is also used to gain a favourable response. Humour controls by supporting the sanctioned values of the society. Through cartoons, comics and repartees it can support the values of the society in a form that is light in spirit but effective in control.

Satire employs wit and scorn as indirect criticism of actions felt to be vicious and socially harmful. It exposes by ridicule the falsity and danger of behaviour. Thereby it causes the people to give up their vicious and harmful action. The Flop Show of Mr. Jaspal Bhatti televised by Doordarshan was a great satire on corruption in Indian society and may perhaps lead one to search within one's soul.

7.6 Summary:

The term social control refers to the social regulation of human behaviour. It may be regarded as referring to the aggregate of values and norms by means of which tensions and conflict between individuals and groups are resolved or mitigated in order to maintain the solidarity of some more inclusive group, and also to the arrangements

through which these values and norms are communicated and installed. Social control is necessary To maintain the old order, To establish social unity, To regulate or control individual behaviour, To provide social sanction. Social Control can be classified into two major types on the basis of the means of social control that are employed. They are 1. Formal control, 2. Informal Control. Among the formal means of social control the important ones are law, legislation, military force, police force, administrative devices, education, etc., The informal means of social control grow themselves in society. No special agency is required to create them. Informal control includes gossip, slander, resentment, public opinion, sympathy, sense of justice, folkways, mores, customs, religion, morality and such other agents.

The agencies (means) of social control are many and present a spectrum of historical development. Agencies of social control of the primitive societies are less complicated and multiple than those of advanced societies. Those means conformed to the simple life in primitive societies. They were controlled mostly by customs, traditions and beliefs. However, despite the difference of our lives with those of the primitive societies, and despite the means of social control between our and the primitive societies, we still have elements which have been inherited by us from early primitive way of life through traditions and customs. The means of social control defy any strict classification. Social control is ensured through many ways and means through indirect suggestions, ridicule, praise, etc. and its is also exercised through more direct ways through denial of privileges and imprisonment

7.7 Keywords:

Social Sanction
Social Ideals
Formal Control
Informal Control

7.8 Model Questions:

1. Define social control and discuss major agencies of Social control?
2. What do you understand by the term ‘Social control’? Describe the various types of social control?

7.9 References:

1. Alex Thio Inkeles, Ales: Sociology, What is Sociology? Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
2. Bottomore T.B: Sociology, A guide to Problems and Literature, Blacke & Son (India) Ltd., S. Chand & Co. Ltd., , New. Delhi
3. Davis, Kingsley: Human Society: The Macmillan Company, 1960.
4. Haralmbos M, with R.M. Heald: Sociology Themes & Perspectives Oxford University Press, Delhi.
5. Jayaram N: Introductory Sociology, Macmillan India Limited.
6. Johnson, H.M.: Sociology, Allied Publishers, Bombay, 1960
7. Maciver, R.M.: Society: A text book of Sociology, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1945.
8. Majumdar, D.N. and Madan, T.N.: An Introduction to Social Anthropology, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1956.
9. Ogburn, W.F. : Social Change, Calverton, B.V. edit. The Making of Society, New York, The Modern Library, 1937.
10. Peter Worsley (Ed): Introducing Sociology, Penguin Books.
11. Shankara Rao C.N.: Sociology , Primary Principles, S Chand & Co. Ltd., New-Delhi.

Writer:

Dr. V. Venkateswarlu

Asst. Professor & Co-ordinator,
Dept. of Sociology & Social Work
Acharya Nagarjuna University.
Guntur – 522 510

Editor:

Dr. V. Venkateswarlu

Asst. Professor & Co-ordinator,
Dept. of Sociology & Social Work,
Acharya Nagarjuna University,
Guntur – 522 510

Lesson No - 8

Alienation

8.0 Objective of the Lesson

The objective of this lesson is to explain the concept of alienation.

Structure of the Lesson

- 8.1. Introduction
- 8.2. Definition of Alienation
- 8.3. Meaning of Alienation
- 8.4. Karl Marx
- 8.5. Georg Simmel and Ferdinand Tönnies
- 8.6. Emile Durkheim
- 8.7. Karl Marx - Alienation
- 8.8. Marx's Theory of Alienation
- 8.9. Summary
- 8.10. Technical Terms
- 8.11. Self Assessment Questions
- 8.12. Reference Books

Expansion of the Structure

8.1. Introduction

Alienation, a sociological concept developed by several classical and contemporary theorists, is "a condition in social relationships reflected by a low degree of integration or common values and a high degree of distance or isolation between individuals, or between an individual and a group of people in a community or work environment." The concept has many discipline-specific uses, and can refer both to a personal psychological state (subjectively) and to a type of social relationship (objectively).

8.2. Definition of Alienation

- i. Alienation is a concept that refers to both a psychological condition found in individuals and to a social condition that underlies and promotes it. Karl Marx argued that alienation results from the private ownership of capital and the employment of workers for wages, and arrangement that gives workers little control over what they do. In alienated systems, people no longer work because they experience satisfaction or a sense of connection to the life process, but instead work to earn money, which they need in order to meet their needs. Alienated work becomes a routine, mechanical activity directed by others and serving merely as a means to an end.

- ii. Alienation refers to the distancing of people from each other, from what is important and meaningful to them, or from themselves.
- iii. According to Marx Alienation is the process whereby the worker is made to feel foreign to the products of his/her own labor. The creation of commodities need not lead to alienation and can, indeed, be highly satisfying: one pours one's subjectivity into an object and one can even gain enjoyment from the fact that another in turn gains enjoyment from our craft. In capitalism, the worker is exploited insofar as he does not work to create a product that he then sells to a real person; instead, the proletariat works in order to live, in order to obtain the very means of life, which he can only achieve by selling his labor to a capitalist for a wage (as if his labor were itself a property that can be bought and sold). The worker is alienated from his/her product precisely because s/he no longer owns that product, which now belongs to the capitalist who has purchased the proletariat's labor-power in exchange for exclusive ownership over the proletariat's products and all profit accrued by the sale of those products.

8.3. Meaning of Alienation

Alienation refers to the estrangement, division, or distancing of people from each other, from what is important and meaningful to them, or from their own sense of self. The term "alienation" has a long and storied history within sociology, most famously with Karl Marx's use of the phrase in the mid-nineteenth century to describe the distancing of a worker from the product of his labors. This section seeks to trace "alienation" through sociological theory by discussing Marx's use of the term, applying it to social contexts with Emile Durkheim's notion of anomie, and finally discussing alienation in a modern context using technological examples.

8.4. Karl Marx

Marx most clearly articulates his meaning of alienation in *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* (1844) and *The German Ideology* (1846). Here, Marx contends that alienation is endemic in any system based on capitalism. Marx argues that in emerging systems of capitalist industrial production, workers inevitably lose control of their lives and themselves by not having any control of their work. As a result, workers never become autonomous, self-realized human beings in any significant sense, except in the ways in which the bourgeoisie wants the worker to be realized. Marx refers to this as being alienated from one's work, and as such one's self.

Marx's criticisms were directed at capitalist structures, not urban areas specifically. However, one cannot completely divorce urbanity and capitalism. Of course, urban areas do not come from capitalism; there have been urban areas throughout history, emerging from many different economic systems. However, capitalist economies do tend to encourage individuals to congregate in urban areas when seeking out industrialized work. Countries' populations tend to trend more urban the more capitalist the country's economy. Limitations on resources are exacerbated when there is a large population in a particular area. When there is more stress on limited available resources, one pays more attention to how those resources are distributed, such as by the free market means of capitalism. As such, the issues that arise with the unequal distribution of resources under capitalism's tenets are exacerbated in urban areas. Further, scholars following Marx more directly applied his theories to urban spaces.

8.5. Georg Simmel and Ferdinand Tönnies

Late-eighteenth-century German sociologist Georg Simmel, considered to be one of the founders of urban sociology, wrote *The Philosophy of Money*, describing how relationships are increasingly mediated by money. Simmel's colleague, Ferdinand Tönnies, authored *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft* (Community and Society) about the loss of primary relationships, such as familial bonds, in favor of goal-oriented, secondary relationships in capitalist, urban environments.

Tönnies,

Tönnies's work shifted from conceiving of alienation in economic terms to thinking of alienation in social terms. Of course, this transition is not so simple; Marx's work on economic alienation was fundamentally social in nature. However, many of Marx's predecessors focused on the social consequences of alienation where Marx emphasized the economic causes for alienation. Thus, the reorientation to social alienation did not represent a break in thinking on alienation, just a shift to new directions.

8.6. Émile Durkheim

Social alienation was famously described by French sociologist Émile Durkheim in the late nineteenth century with his concept of anomie. Anomie describes a lack of social norms, or the breakdown of social bonds between an individual and his community ties, resulting in the fragmentation of social identity. According to Durkheim, when one is caught in a normless state in society, one has no parameters to hold on to and, accordingly, cannot situate oneself within that society, and so becomes socially adrift and isolated. Durkheim writes that anomie is common when the surrounding society has undergone significant changes in its economic fortunes, whether for better or for worse, and more generally, when there is a significant discrepancy between the ideological theories and values commonly professed, and what is actually practicable in everyday life. Durkheim was writing at a time of sudden industrialization and mass movement of families from rural areas into urban areas. The sociocultural changes associated with such a move contributed to individuals feeling uncomfortable with their new environments, and feeling as though they could not easily place themselves in a social order.

Urban Anomie

A resident in a high-rise apartment building that may house hundreds or thousands of people may feel social alienation if they do not engage in face-to-face interactions with neighbors, who remain strangers despite close physical proximity.

The general principles outlined by Durkheim in his descriptions of anomie can be seen in any social context, including our own. Current debates about social alienation and anomie pop up in many social critiques of an increasingly technological world. Many popular critics and scholars have wondered if the development of a more robustly technological sociality, through mechanisms such as Facebook and multiplayer online gaming sites, can approximate the same positive consequences of more traditional, face-to-face socialization.

Labour and Alienation

An employee on a car assembly line might feel alienation from the product of his/her labor, as he/she cannot claim credit for the finished product (the car), and perhaps cannot even afford to own the car the assembly line produces.

8.7. Karl Marx- Alienation

For Marx, the history of mankind had a double aspect: It was a history of increasing control of man over nature at the same time as it was a history of the increasing alienation of man. Alienation may be described as a condition in which men are dominated by forces of their own creation, which confront them as alien powers. The notion is central to all of Marx's earlier philosophical writings and still informs his later work, although no longer as a philosophical issue but as a social phenomenon. The young Marx asks: In what circumstances do men project their own powers, their own values, upon objects that escape their control? What are the social causes of this phenomenon?

To Marx, all major institutional spheres in capitalist society, such as religion, the state, and political economy, were marked by a condition of alienation. Moreover, these various aspects of alienation were interdependent. "Objectification is the practice of alienation. Just as man, so long as he is engrossed in religion, can only objectify his essence by an alien and fantastic being; so under the sway of egoistic need, he can only affirm himself and produce objects in practice by subordinating his products and his own activity to the domination of an alien entity, and by attributing to them the significance of an alien entity, namely money." "Money is the alienated essence of man's work and existence; the essence dominates him and he worships it." "The state is the intermediary between men and human liberty. Just as Christ is the intermediary to whom man attributes all his own divinity and all his religious bonds, so the state is the intermediary to which man confides all his non-divinity and all his human freedom." Alienation hence confronts man in the whole world of institutions in which he is enmeshed. But alienation in the workplace assumes for Marx an overriding importance, because to him man was above all Homo Faber, Man the Maker. "The outstanding achievement of Hegel's Phenomenology . . . is that Hegel grasps the self-creation of man as a process. . . and that he, therefore, grasps the nature of labor and conceives objective man. . . as the result of his own labor."

Economic alienation under capitalism is involved in men's daily activities and not only in their minds, as other forms of alienation might be. "Religious alienation as such occurs only in the sphere of consciousness, in the inner life of man, but economic alienation is that of real life. . . . It therefore affects both aspects." Alienation in the domain of work has a fourfold aspect: Man is alienated from the object he produces, from the process of production, from himself, and from the community of his fellows.

"The object produced by labor, its product, now stands opposed to it as an alien being, as a power independent of the producer. . . . The more the worker expends himself in work the more powerful becomes the world of objects which he creates in face of himself, the poorer he becomes in his inner life, and the less he belongs to himself."

"However, alienation appears not merely in the result but also in the process of production, within productive activity itself. . . . If the product of labor is alienation, production itself must be active alienation. . . . The alienation of the object of labor merely summarizes the alienation in the work activity itself."

Being alienated from the objects of his labor and from the process of production, man is also alienated from himself—he cannot fully develop the many sides of his personality. "Work is external to the worker. . . . It is not part of his nature; consequently he does not fulfill himself in his work but denies himself. . . . The worker therefore feels himself at home only during his leisure time, whereas at work he feels homeless." "In work [the worker] does not belong to himself but to another person." "This is the relationship of the worker to his own activity as something alien, not belonging to him activity as suffering (passivity), strength as powerlessness, creation as emasculation, and the personal physical and mental energy of the worker, his personal life. . . . As an activity which is directed against himself, independent of him and not belonging to him."

Finally, alienated man is also alienated from the human community, from his "species- being." "Man is alienated from other men. When man confronts himself he also confronts other men. What is true of man's relationship to his work, to the product of his work and to himself, is also true of his relationship to other men. . . . Each man is alienated from others . . . each of the others is likewise alienated from human life." Marx would have liked the lines of the poet, A.E. Housman, "I, a stranger and afraid/In a world I never made." Only Marx would have replaced the poet's I with we.

The term alienation cannot be found in the later writings of Marx, but modern commentators are in error when they contend that Marx abandoned the idea. It informs his later writings, more particularly *Das Kapital*. In the notion of the "fetishism of commodities," which is central to his economic analysis, Marx repeatedly applies the concept of alienation. Commodities are alienated products of the labor of man, crystallized manifestations, which in Frankenstein fashion now dominate their creators. "The commodity form," writes Marx in *Das Kapital*, and the value relation between the products of labor which stamps them as commodities, have absolutely no connection with their physical properties and with the material relations arising there from. It is simply a definite relation between men, that assumes in their eyes the fantastic form of a relation between things. To find an analogy, we must have recourse to the nebulous regions of the religious world. In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relation both with one another and with the human race. So it is in the world of commodities, with the products of men's hands. This I call the fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labor, as soon as they are produced as commodities.

Explicitly stated or tacitly assumed, the notion of alienation remained central to Marx's social and economic analysis. In an alienated society, the whole mind-set of men, their consciousness, is to a large extent only the reflection of the conditions in which they find themselves and of the position in the process of production in which they are variously placed. This is the subject matter of Marx's sociology of knowledge, to which we now turn.

8.8. Marx's Theory of Alienation

The 19th-century German intellectual K.H. Marx (1818–83) identified and described four types of *Entfremdung* (social alienation) that afflict the worker under capitalism.

Karl Marx's theory of alienation describes the social alienation (*Entfremdung*, 'estrangement') of people from aspects of their human nature (*Gattungswesen*, "species-essence") as a consequence of living in a society stratified into social classes; Marx had earlier expressed the *Entfremdung* theory in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (1927). Philosophically, the *Entfremdung* theory relies upon *The Essence of Christianity* (1841), by Ludwig Feuerbach, which argues that the supernatural idea of "God" has alienated the natural characteristics of the human being. Moreover, in *The Ego and its Own* (1845), Max Stirner extends the Feuerbach analysis by arguing that even the idea of "humanity" is an alienating concept for the individual man and woman to intellectually consider; Marx and Engels responded to these philosophic propositions in *The German Ideology* (1845).

Alienation (*Entfremdung*) is the systemic result of living in a socially stratified society, because being a mechanistic part of a social class alienates a person from his and her humanity. The theoretic basis of alienation within the capitalist mode of production is that the worker invariably loses the ability to determine his or her life and destiny, when deprived of the right to think (conceive) of himself as the director of his actions; to determine the character of said actions; to define their relationship with other people; and to own the things and use the value of the goods and services, produced with their labour. Although the worker is an autonomous, self-realized human being, as an economic entity, he or she is directed to goals and diverted to activities that are dictated by the bourgeoisie, who own the means of production, in order to extract from the worker the maximum amount of surplus value, in the course of business competition among industrialists.

Types of alienation

In a capitalist society, the worker's alienation from his and her humanity occurs because the worker can only express labour — a fundamental social aspect of personal individuality — through a privately owned system of industrial production in which each worker is an instrument, a thing, not a person; Marx explained alienation thus:

Let us suppose that we had carried out production as human beings. Each of us would have, in two ways, affirmed himself, and the other person. (1) In my production I would have objectified my individuality, its specific character, and, therefore, enjoyed not only an individual manifestation of my life during the activity, but also, when looking at the object, I would have the individual pleasure of knowing my personality to be objective, visible to the senses, and, hence, a power beyond all doubt. (2) In your enjoyment, or use, of my product I would have the direct enjoyment both of being conscious of having satisfied a human need by my work, that is, of having objectified man's essential nature, and of having thus created an object corresponding to the need of another man's essential nature... Our products would be so many mirrors in which we saw reflected our essential nature.

In the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 (1927), Marx identified four types of alienation (*Entfremdung*) that occur to the worker labouring under a capitalist system of industrial production.

The four types of alienation are:

1. Alienation of the worker from the product — from the product of his labour

The design of the product and how it is produced are determined not by the producers who make it (the workers), nor by the consumers of the product (the buyers), but by the Capitalist class, who, besides appropriating the worker's manual labour, also appropriate the intellectual labour of the engineer and the industrial designer who create the product, in order to shape the taste of the consumer to buy the goods and services at a price that yields a maximal profit. Aside from the workers having no control over the design-and-production protocol, alienation (*Entfremdung*) broadly describes the conversion of labour (work as an activity), which is performed to generate a use value (the product) into a commodity, which — like products — can be assigned an exchange value. That is, the Capitalist gains control of the manual and intellectual workers, and the benefits of their labour, with a system of industrial production that converts said labour into concrete products (goods and services) that benefit the consumer. Moreover, the capitalist production system also reifies labour into the "concrete" concept of "work" (a job), for which the worker is paid wages — at the lowest possible rate — that maintain a maximum rate of return on the Capitalist's investment capital; this is an aspect of exploitation. Furthermore, with such a reified system of industrial production, the profit (exchange value) generated by the sale of the goods and services (products) that could be paid to the workers, instead is paid to the capitalist classes: the functional capitalist, who manages the means of production, and the rentier capitalist, who owns the means of production.

2. Alienation of the worker from working — from the act of producing

In the Capitalist Mode of Production, the generation of products (goods and services) is accomplished with an endless sequence of discrete, repetitive motions that offer the worker little psychological satisfaction for "a job well done". By means of commodification, the labour power of the worker is reduced to wages (an exchange value); the psychological estrangement (*Entfremdung*) of the worker results from the unmediated relation between his productive labour and the wages paid him for the labour. That division of labour, within the capitalist mode of production, further exploits the worker by limiting his or her *Gattungswesen* (species-essence) — the human being's power to determine the purpose to which the product (goods and services) shall be applied; the human nature (species-essence) of the worker is fulfilled when he or she controls the "subject of labour". Hence does capitalism remove from the worker the right to exercise control upon the value and the effects of his and her labour, which, in turn, robs the worker of the ability to either buy (consume) the goods and services, or to receive the full value from the sale of the product. The alienation of the worker from the act of producing renders the worker unable to specialize in a type of productive labour, which is a psychologically satisfying condition; within an industrial system of production, social alienation reduces the worker to an instrument, to an object, and thus cannot productively apply every aspect of his or her human nature.

3. Alienation of the worker from himself, as a producer — from his Gattungswesen (species-essence)

The Gattungswesen (species-essence), the nature of a person is not detached from their activity as a worker; as such, species-essence also comprises all of their innate human potential as a person. Conceptually, in the term “species-essence”, the word “species” describes the uniquely human traits that are characterized by a “plurality of interests” and “psychological dynamism”, whereby every person has the desire and the tendency to engage in the varied activities that are practically and emotionally benevolent, by means of social connections with other people. The cognitive value of a person consists in being able to conceive of the ends of his actions as purposeful ideas, which are distinct from the actions required to realize a given idea. That is, man is able to objectify his intentions, by means of an idea of himself, as “the subject”, and an idea of the thing that he produces, “the object”. Conversely, unlike a human being, an animal does not objectify itself, as “the subject”, nor its products as ideas, “the object”, because an animal engages in directly self-sustaining actions that have neither a future intention, nor a conscious intention. While a person’s Gattungswesen, their nature, does not exist independent of specific, historically conditioned activities, the essential nature of a human being is actualized when a person — within their given historical circumstance — is free to subordinate his will to the external demands he has imposed upon himself, by his imagination, and not the external demands imposed upon him by other people.

Relations of production

Whatever the character of a person’s consciousness (will and imagination), the worker’s existence in society is conditioned by his or her relationships with the people and things that facilitate survival, which is fundamentally dependent upon co-operation with others, thus, a person’s consciousness is determined inter-subjectively (collectively), not subjectively (individually), because Man is a social animal. In the course of history, to ensure human survival, societies have organized themselves into groups who have different, basic relationships to the means of production. One societal group (class) owned and controlled the means of production, while another societal class worked the means of production; in the relations of production of that status quo, the goal of the owner-class was to economically benefit as much as possible from the labour of the working class. Moreover, in the course of economic development, when a new type of economy displaced an old type of economy — agrarian feudalism superseded by mercantilism, in turn superseded by the Industrial revolution — the rearranged economic order of the social classes favoured the social class who controlled the technologies (the means of production) that made possible the change in the relations of production. Likewise, there occurred a corresponding rearrangement of the human nature (Gattungswesen) and the system of values of the owner-class and of the working-class, which allowed each group of people to accept and to function in the rearranged status quo of production-relations.

Exploitation and revolution

Despite the ideological promise of industrialization — that the mechanization of industrial production would raise the mass of the workers, from a brutish life of subsistence existence, to the self-respect of honourable work — the division of labour inherent to the capitalist mode of production, thwarted the human nature (Gattungswesen) of the worker, and so rendered each man and woman into a mechanistic part of an industrialized system of production, from being a person capable of defining his and her value through direct, purposeful activity. Moreover, the near-total mechanization and automation of the industrial production system would allow the (newly) dominant bourgeois capitalist social class to exploit the working class to the degree that the value obtained from their labour would diminish the ability of the workers to materially survive. Hence, when the proletarian working-class become a sufficiently developed political force, they will effect a revolution and re-orient the relations of production to the means of production — from a capitalist mode of production to a communist mode of production. In the resultant Communist society, the fundamental relation of the workers to the means of production would be equal and non-conflictual, because there would be no artificial (class) distinctions about the value of a worker's labour; the worker's humanity (species-essence) thus respected, men and women would not become alienated, from themselves and their society.

Communism

In the Communist socio-economic organization, the relations of production would operate the mode of production and employ each worker according to his abilities, and benefit each worker according to his needs. Hence, each worker could direct his and her labour to productive work suitable to his and her innate abilities — rather than be forced into a narrowly defined, minimal-wage “job” meant to extract maximal profit from the labour of the individual worker, as determined by and dictated under the capitalist mode of production. In the classless, collectively managed Communist society, the exchange of value between the objectified productive labour of one worker, and the consumption benefit derived from that production, will not be determined by or directed to the narrow business interests of a bourgeois capitalist class, but, instead, will be directed to meet the needs of each producer and consumer, of each member of society. Although production will be differentiated, by the degree of each worker's abilities (by what work he and she can do) the purpose of the communist system of industrial production will be determined by the collective requirements of society, not by the profit-oriented demands of an individualistic bourgeois social class who live at the expense of the greater society. Under the collective ownership of the means of production, the relation of each worker to the mode of production will be identical, and will have the social character that corresponds to the universal interests of the communist society. Therefore, the direct distribution of the profits generated by the labour of each worker — to fulfill the interests of the working class, and so to his and her own interest and benefit — will constitute an un-alienated state of labour conditions, which restores to the worker the fullest exercise and determination of his and her human nature.

4. Alienation of the worker from other workers

Capitalism reduces the labour of the worker to a commercial commodity that can be traded in the competitive labour-market, rather than as a constructive socio-economic activity that is part of the collective common effort performed for personal survival and the betterment of society. In a capitalist economy, the businessmen who own the means of production establish a competitive labour-market meant to extract from the worker as much labour (value) as possible, in the form of capital. The capitalist economy's arrangement of the relations of production provokes social conflict by pitting worker against worker, in a competition for "higher wages", thereby alienating them from their mutual economic interests; the effect is a false consciousness, which is a form of ideological control exercised by the capitalist bourgeoisie. (See: Cultural hegemony) Furthermore, in the capitalist mode of production, the philosophic collusion of religion in justifying the relations of production facilitates the realization, and then worsens, the alienation (*Entfremdung*) of the worker from his and her humanity; it is a socio-economic role independent of religion being "the opiate of the masses".

Philosophic Significance

The philosopher Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel (1770–1831) postulated the idealism that Marx countered with dialectical materialism.

The philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach (1804–1872) analyzed religion from the psycho logic perspective in *The Essence of Christianity* (1841) — divinity is Man's projection of his human nature.

Influences — Hegel and Feuerbach

Ted Honderich, writing in his *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, describes the influence of Hegel and Feuerbach on Marx in this way:

For Hegel, the unhappy consciousness is divided against itself, separated from its "essence", which it has placed in a "beyond".

Marx thought essentially the same notion to portray the situation of modern individuals — especially modern wage labourers — who are deprived of a fulfilling mode of life because their life-activity, as socially productive agents, is devoid of any sense of communal action or satisfaction, and gives them no ownership over their own lives or their products. In modern society, individuals are alienated, in so far as their common human essence, the actual co-operative activity which naturally unites them, is power-less in their lives, which are subject to an inhuman power — created by them, but separating and dominating them instead of being subject to their united will. This is the power of the market, which is "free" only in the sense that it is beyond the control of its human creators, enslaving them by separating them from one another, from their activity, and from its products.

The German verbs *entäusern* and *entfremden* are reflexive, and, in both Hegel and Marx, alienation is always fundamentally self-alienation. Fundamentally, to be alienated is to be separated from one's own essence, or nature; it is to be forced to lead a life in which that nature has no opportunity to be fulfilled or actualized. In this way, the experience of 'alienation' involves a sense of a lack of self-worth, and an absence of meaning in one's life.

Entfremdung (alienation) is a foundational proposition in Marxist theory about man's progress towards self-actualization. Earlier in the history of philosophy, in *The Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), G.F.W. Hegel described a succession of historic stages in the human *Geist* (Spirit), by which the human spirit progresses from ignorance towards perfect self-understanding. In Marx's response to Hegel, those poles of idealism (spiritual ignorance and self-understanding) are replaced with categories of materialism, wherein, for man, spiritual ignorance becomes "alienation" and self-understanding becomes the "realization of his species-being"; thus, the transcendent end of history results in the human triumph over alienation, and the establishment of an objectively better society.

Nonetheless, such a teleological (goal-oriented) reading of Marx, supported by Alexandre Kojève before the Second World War (1939–45), was criticized by Louis Althusser in his discussion of "random materialism" (*matérialisme aléatoire*), in which he said that such a teleological reading rendered the proletariat as the subject of history; therefore, such an interpretation was tainted with Hegelian idealism, with the "philosophy of the subject", that had been in force for five centuries, which he criticized as the "bourgeois ideology of philosophy". (cf. *History and Class Consciousness* [1923], by Georg Lukács)

Alienation and the Theory of History

In Part I: "Feuerbach — Opposition of the Materialist and Idealist Outlook" of *The German Ideology* (1846), Marx said: "Things have now come to such a pass that the individuals must appropriate the existing totality of productive forces, not only to achieve self-activity, but also, merely to safeguard their very existence". Hence, although people psychologically require the activities that lead to their self-actualization as persons, it remains a consideration of secondary historical relevance, because the capitalist mode of production eventually will exploit and impoverish the proletariat until compelling them to social revolution for survival. Yet social alienation remains a concern, especially among the philosophers of Marxist Humanism; in the book *The Marxist-Humanist Theory of State-Capitalism* (1992), Raya Dunayevskaya discussed the existence of the desire for self-activity and self-actualization among wage-labour workers struggling to achieve the elementary goals of life in a capitalist economy.

In Chapter 4 of *The Holy Family* (1845), Marx said that capitalists and proletarians are equally alienated, but that each social class experiences alienation in a different form:

The propertied class and the class of the proletariat present the same human self-estrangement. But the former class feels at ease and strengthened in this self-estrangement, it recognizes estrangement as its own power, and has in it the semblance of a human existence.

The class of the proletariat feels annihilated, this means that they cease to exist in estrangement; it sees in it its own powerlessness and in the reality of an inhuman existence. It is, to use an expression of Hegel, in its abasement, the indignation at that abasement, an indignation to which it is necessarily driven by the contradiction between its human nature and its condition of life, which is the outright, resolute and comprehensive negation of that nature. Within this antithesis, the private property-owner is therefore the conservative side, and the proletarian the destructive side. From the former arises the action of preserving the antithesis, from the latter the action of annihilating it.

8.9. Summary

Alienation has been primarily described in two ways: economic alienation, as articulated by Karl Marx, or social alienation, as described by Émile Durkheim with his concept of anomie. Both economic and social alienation come to bear in urban environments as cities exacerbate the economic pressures associated with capitalism and create environments in which it is more difficult to attach oneself to a social structure. Social alienation was famously described by French sociologist Émile Durkheim in the late nineteenth century with his concept of anomie. Anomie describes a lack of social norms, or the breakdown of social bonds between an individual and his community ties, resulting in the fragmentation of social identity.

8.10. Technical Terms

1. Alienation
2. Social identity
3. Isolation
4. Psychological state
5. Social relationship
6. Normlessness
7. Anomie
8. Urbanism
9. Social class
10. Social identity

8.11. Self Assessment Questions

1. Define alienation and discuss its role in social life.
2. Capitalists and proletarians are equally alienated, but that each social class experiences alienation in a different form says Marx- Comment.
3. Explain the various types of alienation.
4. Discuss alienation with the help of sociological theories.

8.12. Reference Books

1. Marx, Karl. "Comment on James Mill," Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844: 1844.
2. A Dictionary of Sociology, Article: Alienation
3. Marx on Alienation Honderich, Ted. Oxford Companion to Philosophy, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
4. Marx, Karl (Fall 1845 to mid-1846). "Part I: Feuerbach. Opposition of the Materialist and Idealist Outlook". The German Ideology.

Lesson Writer

Dr. Saraswati Raju Iyer

Assistant Professor,

Department of Sociology & Social Work,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur– 522 510.

Resource Person

Dr. Saraswati Raju Iyer

Assistant Professor,

Department of Sociology & Social Work,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur– 522 510.

Editor

Dr. V.Venkateswarlu

Assistant Professor,

Department of Sociology & Social Work,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur– 522 510.

Lesson No: 9

Anomie

9.0 Objective of the Lesson

The objective of this lesson is to explain the concept of anomie.

Contents

- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Meaning of Anomie
- 9.3 History of Anomie
- 9.4 Anomie Theory and Deviant Behaviour
- 9.5 Summary
- 9.6 Technical Terms
- 9.7 Self Assessment Questions
- 9.8 Reference Books

9.1 Introduction

Anomie is a social condition in which there is a lack of cohesion and order, especially in relation to norms and values. The concept, thought of as “normlessness,” was developed by Emile Durkheim as part of his explanation of pattern of suicide in nineteenth-century Europe. He argued that suicide rates were higher among Protestants than Catholics because Protestant culture placed a higher value on individual autonomy and self-efficacy. This made Protestants less likely to develop close communal ties that might sustain them during times of emotional distress, which in turn made them more susceptible to suicide.

9.2 Meaning of Anomie

Anomie, also spelled anomy, in societies or individuals, a condition of instability resulting from a breakdown of standards and values or from a lack of purpose or ideals. The term was introduced by the French Sociologist Émile Durkheim in his study of suicide. He believed that one type of suicide (anomic) resulted from the breakdown of the social standards necessary for regulating behaviour. When a social system is in a state of anomie, common values and common meanings are no longer understood or accepted, and new values and meanings have not developed.

According to Durkheim, such a society produces, in many of its members, psychological states characterized by a sense of futility, lack of purpose, and emotional emptiness and despair. Striving is considered useless, because there is no accepted definition of what is desirable. American sociologist Robert K. Merton studied the causes of anomie, or normlessness, finding it severest in people who lack an acceptable means of achieving their personal goals. Goals may become so important that if the institutionalized means—i.e., those means acceptable according to the standards of the society—fail, illegitimate means might be used. Greater emphasis on ends rather than means creates a stress that leads to a breakdown in the regulatory structure—i.e., anomie. If, for example, a society impelled its members to acquire wealth yet offered inadequate means for them to do so, the strain would cause many people to violate norms. The only regulating agencies would be the desire for personal advantage and the fear of punishment. Social behaviour would thus become unpredictable. Merton defined a continuum of responses to anomie that ranged from conformity to social innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and, finally, rebellion. Delinquency, crime, and suicide are often reactions to anomie.

Although Durkheim's concept of anomie referred to a condition of relative normlessness of a society or social group, other writers have used the term to refer to conditions of individuals. In this psychological usage, anomie means the state of mind of a person who has no standards or sense of continuity or obligation and has rejected all social bonds. Individuals may feel that community leaders are indifferent to their needs, that society is basically unpredictable and lacking order, and that goals are not being realized. They may have a sense of futility and a conviction that associates are not dependable sources of support.

9.3 History of Anomie

In 1893, Durkheim introduced the concept of anomie to describe the mismatch of collective guild labour to evolving societal needs when the guild was homogeneous in its constituency. He equated homogeneous (redundant) skills to mechanical solidarity whose inertia retarded adaptation. He contrasted this with the self-regulating behaviour of a division of labour based on differences in constituency, equated to organic solidarity, whose lack of inertia made it sensitive to need changes.

Durkheim observed that the conflict between the evolved organic division of labour and the homogeneous mechanical type was such that one could not exist in the presence of the other.

When solidarity is organic, anomie is impossible. Sensitivity to mutual needs promotes evolution in the division of labour. "Producers, being near consumers, can easily reckon the extent of the needs to be satisfied. Equilibrium is established without any trouble and production regulates itself." Durkheim contrasted the condition of anomie as being the result of mechanical solidarity: But on the contrary, if some opaque environment is interposed... relations [are] rare, are not repeated enough... are too intermittent. Contact is no longer sufficient. The producer can no longer embrace the market at a glance, nor even in thought. He can no longer see its limits, since it is, so to speak limitless. Accordingly, production becomes unbridled and unregulated.

Durkheim's use of the term anomie was about a phenomenon of industrialization—mass- regimentation that could not adapt due to its own inertia—its resistance to change, which causes disruptive cycles of collective behavior e.g. economics, due to the necessity of a prolonged buildup of sufficient force or momentum to overcome the inertia.

Later in 1897, in his studies of suicide, Durkheim associated anomie to the influence of a lack of norms or norms that were too rigid. But such normlessness or norm-rigidity was a symptom of anomie, caused by the lack of differential adaptation that would enable norms to evolve naturally due to self-regulation, either to develop norms where none existed or to change norms that had become rigid and obsolete.

9.4 Anomie Theory and Deviant Behaviour

Anomie refers to the confusion that arises when social norms conflict or don't even exist. In the 1960s, Robert Merton used the term to describe the differences between socially accepted goals and the availability of means to achieve those goals. Merton stressed, for instance, that attaining wealth is a major goal of Americans, but not all Americans possess the means to do this, especially members of minority and disadvantaged groups.

Those who find the "road to riches" closed to them experience anomie, because an obstacle has thwarted their pursuit of a socially approved goal. When this happens, these individuals may turn to deviant behaviors to attain their goals, retaliate against society, or merely "make a point." The primary contribution of anomie theory is its ability to explain many forms of deviance. The theory is also sociological in its emphasis on the role of social forces in creating deviance. On the negative side, anomie theory has been criticized for its generality. Critics note the theory's lack of statements concerning the process of learning deviance, including the internal motivators for deviance.

Robert Merton's Anomie Theory

Robert Merton's Anomie Theory is also termed strain theory or means-ends theory. In one of the most famous articles in sociology, its first version written in the 1940s, Robert Merton begins by addressing biological explanations of deviance and concludes that biology cannot account for variations from one society to the next in the nature and extent of deviance. His primary interest is not so much why a particular individual deviates, but why the rates of deviance differ so dramatically in different societies and for different subgroups within a single society. Merton works within the overall functionalist perspective that we have already addressed, which puts a great deal of emphasis on the role of culture, particularly its unifying aspects, but now Merton adapts a concept he borrows from Durkheim to analyze situations in which culture creates deviance and disunity. In Durkheim's usage, anomie referred to a situation in which cultural norms break down because of rapid change. Anomic suicide, for example, can occur during a major economic depression, when people aren't able to achieve the goals that they have learned to pursue, but it can also occur when the economy experiences a boom and suddenly the sky's the limit—people don't know how to limit their goals and be satisfied with their achievements.

Merton changes the concept slightly, to refer to a situation in which there is an apparent lack of fit between the culture's norms about what constitutes success in life (goals) and the culture's norms about the appropriate ways to achieve those goals (means).

In Merton's formulation, anomie becomes the explanation for high rates of deviant behavior in the U.S. compared with other societies, and also an explanation for the distribution of deviant behavior across groups defined by class, race, ethnicity, and the like. The U.S., in fact, Merton sees as a polar example of a society in which success goals (often defined primarily in monetary terms) are emphasized for everyone in the culture, and people are criticized as being quitters if they scale back their goals. On the other hand, the culture is at best ambivalent in its norms about the appropriate means of being successful. Certainly hard work and ambition, in school and then in the economic marketplace, are the culturally approved means of success, but there's also an element of admiration for the robber baron and the rogue who breaks the rules about appropriate means but achieves success goals by deviant means. In America, in other words, success is probably rated a lot more highly than virtue.

In addition, the U.S. has minority groups whose access to success by conventional means is clearly limited. In the period in which Merton was writing, ours was a clearly racist society. Black Americans, for example, were severely limited in their access to education, but if they overcame those obstacles and obtained a good education, that education would not "buy" them as good a job as it would for a white person. In some societies that emphasize ascriptive criteria in allocating power and privilege, the culture sets a very different standard of success. Someone who was born an untouchable in the Indian caste system, for example, would learn not to aspire to the kind of success that might be available to an upper-caste individual. But in the U.S. the same kind of success goals are held out to all. Thus our very high rates of deviance and crime, compared with other societies, in Merton's analysis can be understood, first as a result of our emphasizing success goals more than we emphasize approved means of achieving those goals, and second, our emphasizing the same kind of success for everyone even while the race, ethnic, and class stratification of the society limits the opportunities for success by those in the less privileged groups.

How do people respond to this disjunction of goals and means? Merton creates a typology of adaptations. The first symbol designates people's relationship to norms about goals; the second symbol designates their relationship to norms about the means of achieving those goals.

Mode of Adaptation

I. Conformity ++

II. Innovation +-

III. Ritualism -+

IV. Retreatism --

V. Rebellion xx

In this diagram, a "+" means acceptance, a "-" signifies rejection, and an "x" means rejection of prevailing values and substitution of new ones.

Although Merton spends some time discussing each of these modes of adaptation, it's probably the second one, "innovation," which most logically follows from his earlier discussion of the relationship between culture and deviance in general and the deviance-producing features of American society in particular. Innovators are people who break the rules (and often the laws) in order to achieve the success goals that are so heavily promoted in the society. At the upper levels, Merton points out, "the pressure toward innovation not infrequently erases the distinction between business-like strivings this side of the approved norms and sharp practices beyond the norms." Merton quotes Thorstein Veblen: "It is not easy in any given case--indeed it is at times impossible until the courts have spoken--to say whether it is an instance of praiseworthy salesmanship or a penitentiary offense."

But he sees the greatest pressures toward "innovation" operating at the lower levels of the stratification system." Here "incentives for success are provided by the established values of the culture and second, the avenues available for moving toward this goal are largely limited by the class structure to those of deviant behavior. It is the combination of the cultural emphasis and the social structure which produces intense pressure for deviation." "Despite our persisting open-class ideology, advance toward the success-goal is relatively rare and notably difficult for those armed with little formal education and few economic resources." "Within this context, Al Capone represents the triumph of a moral intelligence over a morally prescribed failure," when the channels of vertical mobility are closed or narrowed in a society which places a high premium on economic affluence and social ascent for all its members."

Notice that Merton's analysis is not ultimately aimed at the individual level--why does this individual deviate and this one not--but at the level of groups and societies as reflected in differing rates of deviance. Merton isn't saying that every individual exposed to these cultural conflicts reacts the same way; on the contrary, his typology is designed to allow for variation at the individual level. In his concluding remarks, Merton himself highlights the major weaknesses of his analysis. "This essay on the structural sources of deviant behavior remains but a prelude. It has not included a detailed treatment of the structural elements which predispose toward one rather than another of the alternative responses open to individuals living in an ill-balanced social structure. It has largely neglected but not denied the social psychological processes determine the specific incidence of these responses; it has only briefly considered the social functions performed by deviant behavior; ...it has only touched upon rebellious behavior which seeks to refashion the social framework." Unfortunately, as is so often the case with people doing what they label as preliminary or exploratory work, Merton never went on to attempt the additional work that he himself recognized as crucial to a full understanding of the dynamic he describes in this essay.

Durkheim's Anomie Theory Crime is

Necessary

Crime is necessary; it serves a function in society. Although it is not preferable, with the progression and evolution of modernity and emphasis on monetary success, crime is inevitable because a perfectly stable, uniform, and able society is impossible. As the father of sociology and a functionalist, Emile Durkheim provides a variety of explanations of society's ills, like crime and deviance, and accounts for the punishments and repercussions that follow. He asserts that man is a product of his social environment; thus, socialization begins at birth and continues through language and interaction with other people. The basis of his theory rests on the idea that the "collective conscience of a society varies along with the division of labor. In less complex and more primitive societies, people tended to do and think alike and there was little tolerance for difference" (Smith, 2008). According to Durkheim, one of the pivotal points in history in terms of crime and deviance was the industrial revolution. As this revolution evolved, there was a steep increase in immigrant migration into the United States. With this increase in immigration and the evolution toward a more modern society came rising levels of individualism, flexibility, and diversity amongst belief systems. This was the first sign of problems in the new society. Although these immigrants found no protest to their own belief systems, they failed to adapt them to the previously held norms the American people valued. Inevitably, there was a sense of imbalance between the previously held norms and values and the new and evolving ones. This imbalance, Durkheim deemed 'anomie.' According to Durkheim, anomie reflects a sense of normlessness, the lack of any societal norms that spurs the tendency to act in a deviant way. In general terms, Durkheim's theory of anomie proposes that because of industrialization and the need for cheap labor in this newly modern society, the influx of immigrants inherently brought with them their own sets of norms and values. Thus came a temporary imbalance of norms, anomie, which enhances individual's propensity to commit crime in search for a stable environment. In turn, Durkheim puts forth not just a theory for the social origins of crime, but also he theorizes about the social origins of law and punishment.

Before addressing Durkheim's explanation for crime and deviance, it is necessary to discuss his theory regarding the origins of law and punishment. In its entirety, he describes "the law as a concrete and objective indicator of morality...the law is restitution rather than simply repressive" (Smith, 2008). From this comes the conclusion that law is a production of the collective society, a myriad of all beliefs of society, an embodiment of everything a society holds to be right, true, and just. This concept of the 'collective conscience' has everything to do with where society's laws, and ills, come from. Initially, Durkheim asserted that crime holds some religious qualities. Because "religion was a reflection of the force of a shared collective conscience...early legal codes were also religious codes," thus providing Durkheim the ability to argue, "Offenses against the gods were offenses against society" (Durkheim, 1964). Crime became a deeply meaningful thing, very passionate and powerful, that ultimately prompted for very strong emotions, anger and vengeance specifically. Because of this, punishment was less about the offense or the offender and held more weight in regard to restoring the cohesion and core values of society.

So what are these social origins of crime? As previously stated, the fragmentation amongst society from the evolution to a more industrial and modern society, and the anomic division of labor, provide the basis for crime and deviance. This division of labor emerged as a result of the “needs of society which has become larger through an increase in population and a more highly integrated interactive network” (Krohn, 1980). Durkheim theorized that there is a bundle of ‘social facts,’ or empirical facts describing societal tendencies, that determine individual qualities. Drawing on statistics, he drew a correlation between suicide rates and social variables. What he deemed egoistic or anomic suicide were those that described “weak social integration and failed moral regulation” as seen through the conclusion that protestants, intellectuals, and single people had higher suicide rates than religious folk, specifically Catholics and Jews. In other words, the individual and isolated people had a higher tendency for suicide than the collective and densely networked community because of their lack of cohesion and relationship with the collective conscience of society (Smith, 2008). More rare cases of altruistic and fatalistic suicide were common when an individual was too closely bound to the group. Ultimately, this study concluded that social cohesion, or group solidarity, and the values held to be true by the collective conscience could both prevent and generate deviant activity. Of the two types of solidarity, mechanical and organic, Durkheim concluded that organic solidarity, the more complex of the two, which emphasizes a community’s interdependence upon each other, is far stronger than mechanical solidarity in which there is common beliefs within society solely because the individuals are alike. This “solidarity based on the functional interdependence necessitated by and productive of the industrial revolution” would replace the dependence on the collective conscience (Krohn, 1980).

Although there have been a small handful of direct examinations of Durkheim and his theories, there are a few studies that have analyzed more specific aspects of social disorganization and its effects. Theorists Gibbs and Martin, and later Miley and Micklin, focused on suicide and how the social integration enabled or inhibited such behavior. When Miley and Micklin developed the research, they theorized that “population and technological development will be directly related to the division of labor...and the division of labor will produce a decrease in status integration which, in turn, will increase suicide rates,” furthermore, supporting Durkheimian theory (Krohn, 1980). In contrast to Durkheim’s emphasis on the division of labor, research and analysis of the

U.S. Census Bureau and the Uniform Crime Report done by Webb, found that relationship of population size, density, and proportion of communication, did not decrease the rates of crime. However, when analyzing Webb’s research it is necessary to recognize that he did not include the concept, or measure, of anomie (Krohn, 1980).

There are various different perspectives on what anomie is and how it affects deviant behavior. On one hand Durkheim claims that anomie refers to the ill-formulated goals within the culture of an industrial society; whereas, Robert Merton relied on the Marxist explanation of anomie, which claims that there is normlessness due to the inadequate means available to fulfill society’s goals. Ultimately, each theory revolves around the weight that the market economy holds in regards to the spirit and atmosphere of the cultural. Rather than the ethos of the culture being dependent on the values set forth by family and education, “the pursuit of self interest, attraction to monetary rewards and competition, become exaggerated relative to the value orientations of these institutions...economic dominance stimulates the emergence of anomie at a cultural value” (Bernburg, 2002).

In regard to crime, the emphasis on competition and materialism combined with anomic ethic, as theorists have termed it, spark a disregard for the moral status of the way in which one achieves goals.

This strain of anomic theory is called “Institutional anomie theory.” This position incorporates the idea that if the market economy is left unregulated by other social institutions it will ultimately be obtrusive to society. According to Merton, this notion of anomie is a result of the “uneven distribution of opportunities in the social structure because it fails to live up to its promise of equal opportunity” (Bernburg, 2002). Durkheim, on the other hand, claims anomie is more than just one simple thing; anomie is the normlessness of goals in which the “absence of social authority causes our capacity for feeling in itself insatiable and bottomless” (Bernburg, 2002). In addition, anomie may also come forth “when socially prescribed goals are practically unattainable...to pursue a goal which is by definition unattainable is to condemn oneself to a state of perpetual unhappiness, ends are not really undefined...they are limitless” (Bernburg, 2002). Ultimately, anomie institutional theory uses Merton’s definition of anomie but brings attention to the social criticism what Durkheim’s definition emphasizes. Merton highlights an imbalance between the components of how a society is made up; however, Durkheim focuses on the social make up itself.

As Durkheim’s theory has progressed as a basis of modern theory and policy, it has had to adapt to the values and norms of an immensely modernized and industrialized society. Institutional anomie has become the primary basis to the concept of normlessness and the basis of crime and deviance in accord with the concept of anomie that Durkheim asserted initially. In short, Institutional anomie describes a society in which economic values, like monetary success, penetrate non-economic institutions, like family, education, and policy. From there, community values and social bonds are weakened, ultimately causing social control over self serving behavior, like deviance and crime, to be vastly reduced. Inherently in its nature, institutional anomie theory has some similarities to Robert Merton and Robert Agnew’s strain theory of crime and deviance. Strain theory asserts that there is a discrepancy between culturally defined goals and the means available to achieve these goals. Currently, the culturally defined goals are wealth and material success and that happiness is equivalent to these goals; thus, the institutionalized means to acquire these goals that are hard work and education. Furthermore, it is widely accepted that those who do not succeed are inherently lazy or inept in some way. Through the application of Merton and Agnew’s strain theory it is simple to see the trouble that the lower and middle class face. The institutionally defined means of education and hard work are only attainable by those who are wealthy or financially comfortable enough to access a formal education or well paying occupation. As a result, or consequence, of this inability or unrealistic goal the middle and lower classes are subject to there is strain, or anomie. Therefore, this sense of anomie, imbalance, and division of labor justify the modes of adaptation the disadvantaged resort too. The modes of adaptation are, more often than not, criminal, ultimately supporting Durkheim’s anomie theory.

So what does the criminal justice system do to avoid this? What are the policies put forth to deal with this inevitable dependence on crime? Although difficult, it is essential to strengthen the non-economic social institutions, like church or public school educations. There must be less emphasis placed on the importance or status of private school education. In addition, it is necessary to equalize the opportunities for success.

The lower level employees must have the same amount of opportunity that the upper level employees have, or once had. The lesser employees must not be alienated within the workplace or held accountable for things that the upper level employees are excused of. The current crack down on white-collar crime is an example of how the criminal justice system is working to even the playing field in the work place. Due to the fact that monetary success and status are the goals set by the collective conscience, as Durkheim would say, the criminal justice system has began to withdraw from the biased environment that causes this anomie and strive to balance the means by which success is attainable.

9.5 Summary

Anomie is a "condition in which society provides little moral guidance to individuals". It is the breakdown of social bonds between an individual and the community e.g. if under unruly scenarios resulting in fragmentation of social identity and rejection of self-regulatory values. Anomie is an important topic for discussion in Sociology since it is related to important issues pertaining to crime, juvenile delinquency and suicide.

9.6 Technical Terms

1. Anomie
2. Normlessness
3. Suicide
4. Crime
5. Juvenile delinquency
6. Deviant behavior
7. Moral guidance
8. Self-regulatory values
9. Criminal justice system
10. Mental imbalance
11. Social bonds
12. Individual
13. Society
14. Rejection
15. Community
16. Fragmentation
17. Altruism

9.7 Self Assessment Questions

1. What is anomie? Discuss its role in our social life.
2. Examine the concept of anomie with Durkheim's Theory.
3. Trace the history of anomie.
4. Explain anomie in relation to deviant behavior.
5. Anomie is an important area of study for Sociologist in the study of deviant behaviour-Justify.

9.8 ReferenceBooks

1. Bernburg, J. (2002). Anomie, social change and crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42(4), 729-742. doi: 0007-0955.
2. Durkheim,E.(1964).Thedivisionoflaborinsociety.NewYork,FreePressofGlencoe.
3. Krohn, M. D. (1980, Dec). A Durkheimian Analysis of International Crime Rates. *Social Forces*. 57(2), 654-670. From JSTOR.
4. Smith, P. (2008). Durkheim and Criminology: Reconstructing the Legacy. *Australian & New Zealand Journal Of Criminology* (Australian Academic Press), 41(3), 333-344. doi:10.1375/acri.41.3.333.
5. The Division of Labor in Society, The MacMillan Co. 1933, Free Press edition, 1964, pp. 182-183.
6. The Division of Labor in Society, The MacMillan Co. 1933, Free Press edition, 1964, pp. 368-369.

LessonWriter

Dr.SaraswatiRajulyer

AssistantProfessor,

DepartmentofSociology&SocialWork,

Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna

Nagar, Guntur – 522 510.

ResourcePerson

Dr.SaraswatiRajulyer

AssistantProfessor,

DepartmentofSociology&SocialWork,

Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna

Nagar, Guntur – 522 510.

Editor

Dr.V.Venkateswarlu

AssistantProfessor,

DepartmentofSociology&SocialWork,

Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna

Nagar,

Guntur-522510.

Lesson 10

Social Process-Associative Social Process

10.0 Objective of the Lesson

The objective of this lesson is to explain the social process and associative social process.

Contents

- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Meaning of Social Interaction
- 10.3 Social Processes
- 10.4 Meaning of Social Process
- 10.5 Types of Social Processes
- 10.6 Associative Social Processes
- 10.7 Summary
- 10.8 Technical Terms
- 10.9 Self Assessment Questions
- 10.10 Reference Books

Expansion of the Structure

10.1 Introduction

Social processes are the ways in which individuals and groups interact, adjust and readjust and establish relationships and pattern of behavior which are again modified through social interactions.

Social Process According to Maclver and Page a process means "continuous change taking place in a definite manner through the operation of forces presents from the first within the situation". It is also called the processes of social interaction. Social processes are the products of social interaction which can be classified into two types associative and disassociate social process.

Associative social process involve

1. Cooperation
2. Accommodation
3. Assimilation
4. Acculturation
5. Amalgamation

Dissociative Social Process involve

1. Competition and
2. Conflict

All the social processes are the product of social interaction. Human life is full of social process like cooperation, competition and conflict. As the interaction pattern changes the process also change simultaneously. These processes can be called patterns of social interaction. The processes of social interaction is either associative or dissociative.

Associative processes are those patterns in which people help one another. They share in one or more aspects of social life. The dissociative processes make the people apart from one another. They differ in one or more aspects of social life. Below are some important definitions.

1. Horton and Hunt "The social process refers to the repetitive forms of behavior which are commonly found in social life".

2. According to Moris Ginsberg social processes mean the various modes of interaction between individuals or groups including cooperation and conflict, social differentiation and integration, development, arrest and decay".

3. F.E. Merill says "It refers to the recurrent forms that social interaction takes. He further said the social processes involve forms of social interaction that occur again and again in the group".

The concept of social process refers to some of the general and recurrent forms that social interaction may take. The interaction or mutual activity is the essence of social life. Interaction between individuals and groups occurs in the form of social process. Social processes refers to forms of social interaction that occur again and again.

Let us discuss social interaction in order to have an understanding of social process.

10.2 Meaning of Social Interaction

Man is a social animal. It is difficult for him to live in isolation. They always live in groups. As members of these groups they act in a certain manner. Their behaviour is mutually affected. This interaction or mutual activity is the essence of social life. Social life is not possible without interactions.

10.3 Social Processes

Social interactions are reciprocal relationships which not only influence the interacting individuals but also the quality of relationships.

According to Gillin and Gillin, "By social interaction we refer to social relations of all sorts in functions –dynamic social relations of all kinds –whether such relations exist between individual and individual, between group and group and group and individual, as the case may be".

Eldredge and Merrill say, "Social interaction is thus the general process whereby two or more persons are in meaningful contact-as a result of which their behaviour is modified, however, slightly". The mere placing of individuals in physical proximity, although it usually results in at least a medium of interaction, does not weld them into a social unit or group. When the interacting individuals or groups influence the behaviour of each other it is called social interaction. People in action with one another means interaction of some kind. But not every kind of action is social. When people and their attitudes are involved the process becomes social. Social interaction may then be defined as that dynamic interplay of forces in which contact between persons and groups result in a modification of the attitudes and behaviour of the participants.

The two basic conditions of social interaction are (i) social contact and (ii) communication. In the words of Gillin and Gillin, "social contact is the first phase of interaction". Social contacts are always established through the medium of someone causes sense organ. An object can be perceived by the sense organ only when that object causes communication with that sense organ. Hence the means of communication are essential adjuncts of social contact. Communication may be the form of direct person to person or it may take place through some medium of long-range contacts such as the telephone, telegraph, television etc. Social interaction usually takes place in the forms of cooperation's, competition, conflict, accommodation and assimilation. These forms of social interaction are called "social processes".

10.4 Meaning of Social Process

Social processes refer to forms of social interaction that occur repeatedly. By social processes we mean those ways in which individuals and groups interact and establish social relationships. There are various forms of social interaction such as cooperation, conflict, competition and accommodation etc.

According to Maclver, "Social process is the manner in which the relations of the members of a group, once brought together, acquire a distinctive character".

As Ginsberg says, "Social processes mean the various modes of interaction between individuals or groups including cooperation and conflict, social differentiation and integration, development, arrest and decay".

According to Horton and Hunt, "The term social process refers to the repetitive form of behaviour which are commonly found in social life".

10.5 Types of Social Processes

There are hundreds of social processes. But we find some fundamental social processes that are found to appear repeatedly in society. These fundamental processes are socialization, cooperation, conflict, competition, accommodation, acculturation and assimilation etc. Loomis classified social processes into two categories; the elemental and the comprehensive or master processes. He describes elemental processes are those by which the separate elements of the social system are articulated and comprehensive processes are those by which several or all of the elements are articulated or involved. These elements are beliefs (knowledge), sentiment, end or goal, norm, status-role (position), rank, power, sanction, and facility.

The elemental process are (1) Cognitive mapping and validation, (2) Tension management and communication of sentiment, (3) Goal attaining and concomitant 'latent' activity, (4) Evaluation, (5) Status-role performance, (6) evaluation of factors and Allocation of status-roles, (7) Decision-making and initiation of action (8) Application of sanctions, (9) Utilization of facilities.

The comprehensive or master processes are (1) Communication, (2) Boundary maintenance, (3) System linkage, (4) Social control, (5) Socialization and (6) Institutionalization.

Social process can be positive or negative. Accordingly, social processes have been classified into two broad categories, variously entitled 'conjunctive and disjunctive, 'associative and dissociative'.

10.6 Associative Process

The associative or conjunctive social processes are positive. These social processes work for the solidarity and benefit of society. This category of social processes include cooperation, accommodation, assimilation and acculturation etc. Three major social processes such as cooperation, accommodation and assimilation are discussed below.

1. Cooperation

Cooperation is one of the fundamental processes of social life. It is a form of social process in which two or more individuals or groups work together jointly to achieve common goals. Cooperation is the form of social interaction in which all participants benefit by attaining their goals. Cooperation permeates all aspects of social organization from the maintenance of personal friendships to the successful operation of international programmes. The struggle for existence forces the human beings not only to form groups but also to cooperate with each other. The term 'cooperation' has been derived from two Latin words – 'Co' meaning 'together' and 'Operary' meaning 'to work'. Hence, cooperation means working together for the achievement of a common goal or goals. When two or more persons work together to gain common goal, it is called cooperation. Boys cooperate in games, men in business, workers in production, and public officials in community controls and so on, in an endless variety of beneficial activities that make possible an integrated social life. Co-operation means working together in the pursuit of like or common interests. It is defined by Green as "the continuous and common Endeavour of two or more persons to perform a task or to reach a goal that is commonly cherished.

According to Merrill and Eldregde, "Cooperation is a form of social interaction where two or more persons work together to gain a common end".

In the words of Fairchild, "Cooperation is the process by which the individuals or groups combine their effort in a more or less organized way for the attainment of common objective",

Cooperation involves two elements: (i) Common end and (ii) Organized effort. When different persons have the same goals and also realize that individually they cannot achieve these goals, they work jointly for the fulfillment of these goals. The impossibility of solving many of our personal problems alone cause to work with others. Cooperation also results from necessity. It would be impossible to operate a modern factory, a large department store, or an educational system if the divisions and branches in each do not work together.

Characteristics of Cooperation

Following are the important characteristics of cooperation:

1. Cooperation is an associative process of social interaction which takes place between two or more individuals or groups.
2. Cooperation is a conscious process in which individuals or groups have to work consciously.
3. Cooperation is a personal process in which individuals and groups personally meet and work together for a common objective.
4. Cooperation is a continuous process. There is continuity in the collective efforts in cooperation.
5. Cooperation is a universal process which is found in all groups, societies and nations.
6. Cooperation is based upon two elements such as common end and organized effort.
7. Common ends can be better achieved by cooperation and it is necessary for the progress of individual as well as society.

Types of Cooperation

Cooperation is of different types. MacIver and Page have divided cooperation into two main types namely, (i) Direct Cooperation (ii) Indirect Cooperation.

(i) Direct Cooperation

Under direct cooperation may be included all those activities in which people do like things together. For example, plying together, working together, carrying a load together or pulling the car out of mud together. The essential character of this kind of cooperation is that people do such identical function which they can also do separately. This type of cooperation is voluntary e.g., cooperation between husband and wife, teacher and student, master and servant etc.

(ii) Indirect Cooperation

Under indirect cooperation are included those activities in which people do unlike tasks together towards a common end. For example, when carpenters, plumbers and masons cooperate to build a house. This cooperation is based on the principle of the division of labour. In it people perform different functions but for the attainment of the common objective. In the modern technological age, specialization of skills and function are more required for which indirect cooperation is rapidly replacing direct cooperation.

A.W.Green has classified cooperation into three main categories such as (i) Primary cooperation (ii) Secondary cooperation (iii) Tertiary cooperation.

(i) Primary Cooperation

This type of cooperation is found in primary groups such as the family. In this form, there is an identity of interests between the individuals and the group. The achievement of the interests of the group includes the realization of the individual's interests.

(ii) Secondary Cooperation

Secondary cooperation is found in secondary groups such as Government, industry, trade union and church etc. For example, in an industry, each may work in cooperation with others for his own wages, salaries, promotion, profits and in some cases prestige and power. In this form of cooperation there is disparity of interests between the individuals.

(iii) Tertiary Cooperation

This type of cooperation is ground in the interaction between the various big and small groups to meet a particular situation. In it, the attitudes of the cooperating parties are purely opportunistic; the organization of their cooperation is both loose and fragile. For example, two political parties with different ideologies may get united to defeat their rival party in an election.

Ogburn and Nimikoff divided cooperation into three main types:

i. General Cooperation

When some people cooperate for the common goals then there is cooperation, which is known as general cooperation e.g. cooperation found in cultural functions is the general cooperation.

ii. Friendly Cooperation

When we want to attain the happiness and contentment of our group we give cooperation to each other, then this type of cooperation is known as friendly cooperation e.g. dancing, singing, dating etc.

iii. Helping Cooperation

When some people work for the victims of famine or flood then this type of cooperation is known as helping cooperation.

Role of Cooperation

Cooperation is the most elementary form of social process without which society cannot exist. According to Kropotkin, it is so important in the life of an individual that it is difficult to survive without it. Even among the lowest animals such as ants and termites, cooperation is evident for survival. Cooperation is the foundation of our social life. The continuation of the human race requires the cooperation of male and female for reproduction and upbringing of children. Cooperation for human beings is both a psychological and social necessity. It is needed at every step in our life. If one does not cooperate with others, he is left to live a solitary life. The physical, mental and even the spiritual needs of the individual remain unsatisfied if he does not agree to cooperate with his fellow-members. It is very difficult for a man to lead a happily conjugal life without the active cooperation of his wife and vice-versa. Cooperation helps society to progress. Progress can better be achieved through united action. The outstanding progress in science and technology, agriculture and industry, transport and communication would not have been possible without cooperation. All the progress that mankind has made in the various fields is to be attributed to the cooperating spirit of the people. Cooperation is an urgent need of the present-day world. It is not only needed among the individuals and groups but also among the nations. It provides solutions for many international problems and disputes.

2. Accommodation

Adjustment is the way of life. It can take place in two ways such as adaptation and accommodation. Adaptation refers to the process of biological adjustment. Accommodation, on the other hand, implies the process of social adjustment. "Accommodation is the achievement of adjustment between people that permits harmonious acting together in social situation. It is achieved by an individual through the acquisition of behaviour patterns, habits and attitudes which are transmitted to him socially. It is a process through which individuals or groups make adjustment to the changed situation to overcome difficulties faced by them. Sometimes new conditions and circumstances arise in the society. Individuals have learned to make adjustment to the new situation. Thus, accommodation means adjusting oneself to the new environment.

According to Park and Burgess, human social organization is fundamentally the result of an accommodation of conflicting elements. Conflicts are bound to be there in life. Since conflict cannot continue indefinitely, the conflicting individuals or groups reach an agreement and understanding and conflict comes to an end. Adjustment and agreement reached by the conflicting individuals and groups is called accommodation. Accommodation is a process by which those once in conflict can work together in common enterprises. As an end result of a conflict there emerge arrangements, agreements, treaties and laws which define relationships, rights, obligations and methods of cooperation.

As MacIver and Page say, "the term accommodation refers particularly to the process in which man attains sense of harmony with his environment".

According to Ogburn and Nimkoff, "Accommodation is a term used by sociologists to describe the adjustment of hostile individuals or groups."

As Horton and Hunt defines "Accommodation Is a process of developing temporary working agreements between conflicting individuals or groups".

In the words of Gillin and Gillin "Accommodation is the process by which competing and conflicting individuals and groups adjust their relationship to each other in order to overcome the difficulties which arise in competition, contravention or conflict".

It is the termination of competing or conflicting relations between individuals, groups and other human relationship structures. It is a way of inventing social arrangement which enable people to work together whether they like it or not. This led Sumner to refer to accommodation as 'antagonistic cooperation'.

Characteristics of Accommodation

Characteristics of accommodation are discussed below:

(i) It is the End-result of Conflict

The involvement of hostile individuals or groups in conflict makes them realize the importance of accommodation. Since conflict cannot take place continuously, they make room for accommodation. It is the natural result of conflict. If there were no conflict, there would be no need of accommodation.

(ii) It is both Conscious and Unconscious Process

Accommodation is mainly an unconscious activity because a newborn individual accommodates himself with his family, caste, play-group, school, and neighbourhood or with the total environment unconsciously. Sometimes, individuals and groups make deliberate and open attempts to stop fighting and start working together. For example, warring groups enter into pacts to stop war. Striking workers stop strike after having an understanding with the management.

(iii) It is a Universal Activity

Human society is composed of antagonistic elements and hence conflicts are inevitable. No society can function smoothly if the individuals and groups are always engaged in conflict. They must have to make efforts to resolve conflicts, so accommodation is very much necessary. It is found in some degree or other in every society all the time.

(iv) It isa Continuous Process

Accommodation is not confined to any particular stage or to any fixed social situation. Throughout the life, one has to accommodate oneself with various situations. The continuity of the process of accommodation does not break at all. It is as continuous as man's breathing.

(v) It is a Mixture of both Love and Hatred

In the words of Ogburn and Nimkoff, accommodation is the combination of two kinds of attitude love and hatred. The attitude of love makes people to cooperate with one another but it is the hate which leads them to create conflicts and to get involved in them and then to accommodate with one another.

Forms or Methods of Accommodation

Accommodation or resolution of conflicts may be brought about in many ways and accordingly may assume various forms, the most important of them being the following:

1. Admission of one's Defeat

This method of accommodation is applicable between the conflicting parties of unequal strength. The stronger group can pressurize the weaker group by its strength. The weaker party submits to the stronger one out of fear or because of fear of being over-powered. For example, in war, the victorious nation imposes its will on the vanquished and the war comes to close when the stronger party achieves a clear-cut victory over the other. The loser has to choose whether it will admit one's own defeat or continue the conflict with the risk of being eliminated together.

2. Compromise

This method is applicable when the combatants are of equal strength. In compromise, each party to the dispute makes some concessions and yields to some demand of the other. The "all or nothing" attitude gives way to a willingness to yield certain points in order to gain others. In other words, it can be said that this method is based on the principle of give and take. Both the combatants should make some concessions or sacrifices voluntarily for each other because they know that conflict would cause the sheer waste of their energy and resources.

3. Arbitration and Conciliation

Accommodation is also achieved by means of arbitration and conciliation which involves attempts of the third party to resolve the conflict between the contending parties. For example, the conflict between the employer and the employee, husband and wife, two friends, labour and management are resolved through the intervention of an arbitrator or a conciliator or a mediator. Differences should, however, be noted between conciliation and arbitration. The conciliator offers only suggestions in order to terminate a conflict. The acceptance of these suggestions is up to the discretion of the contending parties. It has no binding force upon them.

Arbitration differs from conciliation in that the decision of the arbitrator is binding on the parties concerned.

4. Toleration

Toleration is the method of accommodation in which there is no settlement of dispute but there is only the avoidance of overt conflict or open conflict. Toleration is found in the field of religion where different religious groups exist side by side, having different policies and ideologies. For example, the co-existence of States with radically different economic and social systems such as communist and capitalist systems are the examples of toleration. Similarly, at many places we find temples, churches, mosques etc. standing in close proximity to each other for centuries. After many years of religious conflict this kind of religious toleration has been possible.

5. Conversion

Conversion is a method of accommodation in which one of the contending parties tries to convert his opponents to his view of point by proving that he is right and they are wrong. As a result, the party which has been convinced is likely to accept the view point of other party. For example, the conversion of a large number of Hindus to Islam and Christianity was owing to their inability to tolerate the sufferings of caste-restriction in India. This method may also occur in politics, economics and other fields.

6. Rationalization

Accommodation can be achieved by rationalization. It is a method which involves the withdrawal of contending party from the conflict on the basis of some imaginary explanations to justify his action. In other words it means an individual or a group rationalizes his behaviour by plausible exercises and explanations. For example, the poor people, attribute their poverty to the will of God. Sometimes, students believe that their failure in the examination is due to the defects in the evaluation of their answer scripts by examiners, they do not see the fact that their preparation for examination is quite inadequate.

7. Superordination and Subordination

The most common method of accommodation which is found in each and every society is superordination and subordination. In the family the relationships among parents and children are based on this method. In larger groupings whether social or economic the relationships are fixed on the same basis. Even under a democratic order there are leaders who give order and the followers who obey order. A caste society, for example, is a stratified society in which groups have accommodated to a low or high position. When individuals or groups ordinarily accept their relative positions as a matter of fact, accommodation is said to have reached a state of perfection.

Importance of Accommodation

Accommodation is the way which enable people to work together whether they like it or not. Society can hardly go on without accommodation. Since conflict disturbs social integration, disrupts social order and damages social stability, accommodation is essentially essential to check conflict and to maintain cooperation which is the sine qua non of social life. It not only reduces or controls conflict but also enables the individuals and groups to adjust themselves to changed conditions. It is the basis of social organization. As Burgess remarks: "Social organization is the sum total of accommodation to past and present situations. All the social heritages, traditions, sentiments, culture, techniques are accommodations....." "Accommodation makes for group life. It is indispensable in modern complex society. In accommodation the barriers between the parties have been partially broken down, social distance weakened and formal relations established whereby groups can work together. Thus, accommodation is essential for social harmony. It is close to cooperation and conflict and thus must take trends on both fields into consideration.

3. Assimilation

Assimilation is a fundamental social process; it is that process by which individuals belonging to different cultures are united into one. Successful accommodation sets the stage for an additional consequences of human interactions, namely assimilation. This implies the complete merging and fusion of two or more bodies into a single common body, a process analogous to digestion, in which we say that food is assimilated. Assimilation in social relationships means that the cultural differences between divergent groupings of people disappear. Thus, they come to feel; think and act similarly as they absorb new common traditions, attitudes and consequently take on a new cultural identity. We see the process operating among ethnic groups which enter a society with their own society's culture. For instance, American Indians adopted cultural elements of whites abandoning their own culture. But assimilation is not limited to this single field only. For example, husbands and wives with dissimilar background often develop a surprising unity of interest and purpose. The term is usually applied to an immigrant or ethnic minority in process of being absorbed socially into a receiving society, e.g. the assimilation of African Negroes as immigrants in American society. But this does not mean that the immigrants have abandoned everything of their culture and that they have not contributed anything to the host country. The assimilation of Negroes has contributed much to American cultural store in the form of Jazz music. Assimilation is a slow and gradual process. It takes quite some time before individuals or groups once dissimilar becomes similar. Acculturation is the first step to assimilation. Acculturation is the name given to the stage when the cultural group which is in contact with another borrows from it certain cultural elements and incorporates them into its own culture. The contact between the two groups inevitably affects both; though it is natural that culturally weaker group would do more of the borrowing from and would give very little to the culturally stronger group. When two cultures meet, the dominant culture becomes the common culture of the two interacting cultures. For example, before Muslim rule Malay had the influence of native culture and Buddhism. But subsequently, Muslim culture prevailed upon the local culture.

Some of its definitions of assimilation are given below:

According to Biesanz and Biesanz, "Assimilation is the social process whereby individuals or groups come to share the same sentiments and goals".

E.S. Bogardus says, "Assimilation is a process whereby attitudes of many persons are united, and thus, develop into a united group".

As Ogburn and Nimkoff define, "Assimilation is the process whereby individuals or groups once dissimilar become similar, that it becomes identified in the interests and outlook".

According to Park and Burgess, "Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which individuals and groups acquire the attitudes and values of other persons or groups, and by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life".

Characteristicsof Assimilation

1. Assimilation is an associative process.
2. Assimilation is a universal process. It is found in every place and at all times.
3. Assimilation is a slow and gradual process. It is gradual as the individual comes to share the expectations of another group and slowly acquires a new set of values. The process cannot take place overnight. The assimilation of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman cultures has taken more than two centuries in Britain.
4. Assimilation is a unconscious process. Individuals are not conscious that they discard their own values and acquire new set of values.
5. Assimilation is a two-way process. It is based on the principle of give and take. Assimilation takes place when groups of individuals borrow cultural elements from each other and incorporate them to their own culture. Contact between two groups essentially affects both. Both the groups discard their cultural element and substitute them with new ones.

FactorsConduciveforAssimilation

Assimilation is a complex process. There are certain factors which facilitate assimilation and other which hinder or retard it. The rate of assimilation depends upon whether facilitating or hindering factors predominate. Assimilation occurs most readily when social contacts are those of primary group – that is when they are intimate, personal and face to face.

According to Gillin and Gillin, factors favouring assimilation are toleration, equal economic opportunity, sympathetic attitude on the part of the dominating groups towards the minority group, exposure to the dominant culture, similarity between the cultures of the minority and dominant groups, and amalgamation or intermarriage. On the other hand, factors hindering assimilation are isolating conditions of life, attitude of superiority on the part of the dominant group, excessive cultural and social difference etc.

The following factors may account for the ready occurrence of assimilation:

1. Toleration

Toleration is an important factor which facilitates the process of assimilation. Tolerance helps people to come together, to develop contacts and to participate in common cultural and social activities. When the dominant group is hospitable and tolerant towards differences, the minority groups have a greater opportunity to participate in the total community life.

2. Close Social Contact

Close social contact is another leading factor which promotes the process of assimilation in a greater way. When the people or group of different cultures comes into close proximity with each other, the assimilation process takes place very easily. The close social contact creates a good understanding among the people and the group and this creates a healthy atmosphere in which people exchange their views in a better way. For instance, in India the assimilation between Hinduism and Buddhism is possible due to the close social contact among the members of these two religious groups. Thus, the close physical proximity plays a vital role in promoting the assimilation process.

3. Amalgamation

Amalgamation is another promoting factor of assimilation. By amalgamation we mean, individuals or groups come into close contact to one another. It occurs when two different cultural groups establish matrimonial relationship among themselves. For example, the marital relations among the Hindus and non-Hindus facilitate the process of assimilation. The marital relationship brings the people of different culture very close to one another. Thus, amalgamation is an important factor which promotes assimilation process through matrimonial contacts or alliances.

4. Equal Economic Opportunity

The inequality of economic status among the people of different cultural groups hinders the process of assimilation. But the equal economic opportunities facilitate the assimilation process. The people or groups having equal economic position become more easily intimate. Thus, intimate relationship promotes assimilation.

5. Common Physical Traits

Common physical traits or qualities of the people of different cultures also promote the process of assimilation. The foreign immigrants of the same race can more easily assimilate than those with different races. For instance, the Indians who live in America permanently can easily assimilate with the Indian culture.

6. Cultural similarity

Cultural similarities between two groups of individuals promote assimilation. If there are similarities between culture groups, assimilation is quick to take place. Similarly, assimilation occurs most readily when two culture groups have common language. Without knowledge of language, the individual remains outside the adopted society. The first step in assimilation into a new society is, therefore, to learn a language. In reality, assimilation is a part of life itself, as the individual slowly learns to participate in the symbols and expectations of another group. Assimilation can be hastened by such devices as learning of language, getting a job and joining a union. But these things all take time.

Factors Hindering Assimilation

Merely bringing persons of different backgrounds together does not assure that a fusion of cultures and personalities takes place. Sometimes it results in conflict rather than fusion between the contiguous groups.

There are various factors that retard assimilation. These factors are discussed below.

1. Physical Differences

Differences in features, complexion of skin and other physical traits may also help or hinder in assimilation. Generally the adjustment problems are the easiest for those immigrants who in appearance are supposedly most like the people of the new land. It may be pointed out that physical differences in themselves may not produce antagonisms or prejudice between peoples as is the case in South Eastern, Asia and Latin America, but when other factors operate to produce group frictions, physical differences give rise to inferiority and undesirability.

2. Cultural Differences

Language and religion are usually considered to be main constituents of culture. Immigrants having the same religion and language can easily adjust themselves in other areas or countries. In America for example English speaking Protestants are assimilated with the great speed and ease whereas non-Christians who do not speak English, have the greatest difficulty in being assimilated there. Customs and belief are other cultural characteristics which can aid or hinder assimilation.

3. Prejudice

Prejudice is a barrier to assimilation. Prejudice is the attitude on which segregation depends for its success. As long as the dominant group prejudices those who have been set apart, neither they as a group nor their individual members can easily become assimilated to the general culture. Prejudice also impedes assimilation between constituent elements within a given society. Religious groups often allow the social distance created by prejudice to maintain their separateness when both would benefit by a cooperative effort in community undertakings.

Prejudice within a community, within a family or within any group plays into the hands of factions who prefer disunity to a fusion of interests. Not all prejudice is negative; however, when groups prejudice one another with unusually favourable attitudes, the process of assimilation is speeded, just as it is retarded by negative attitudes.

4. Sense of superiority and inferiority

Assimilation is hindered by the feelings of superiority and inferiority. The people, who have strong feelings of superiority, generally hate the people who suffer from a sense of inferiority. Due to this reason intimate relationship between two groups of people becomes difficult. Hence, assimilation is retarded.

5. Domination and subordination

Assimilation between two groups of people is almost impossible where one group dominates the other. In this case social relation which is essential for assimilation does not develop among the people of dominant and subordinate groups. The dominant group always considers the people of subordinate group as inferior and exercises its power over them. As a result jealousy, hatred, suspicion and conflict etc. develop among them. All these hinder the process of assimilation.

6. Isolation

Isolation also hinders assimilation. People who live in isolation fail to establish social contacts with others. The isolated people cut off entire social relationship with other people in society. Therefore, the process of assimilation becomes very difficult. In short, it can be summed up that assimilation is a slow process of adoption and adjustment on the part of individuals. There is no abrupt change in the way of life. In short, assimilation is a process of cultural adoption and adjustment.

10.7 Summary

Social interaction usually takes place in the form of cooperation, competition, conflict, accommodation and assimilation. These forms of social interaction are also designated as social processes. These social processes may, therefore, be described as the fundamental ways in which men interact and establish relationship. Social processes are further classified as associative social process and dissociative social process.

10.8 Technical Terms

1. Social process
2. Social interaction
3. Associative social process
4. Dissociative social process
5. Cooperation
6. Accommodation
7. Assimilation

8. Acculturation
9. Amalgamation
10. Competition
11. Conflict

10.9 SelfAssessmentQuestions

1. Givethemeaningofsocial interaction.
2. Explainsocialprocesseswithrelevantexamples.
3. Givethemeaningofsocialprocessandexplainitsvarioustypes.
4. Discussassociativesocialprocesses.
5. Definecooperationandexplainitscharacteristics.
6. Whatare the typesofcooperation?
7. Explaintheroleofcooperationinoursociallife.
8. Defineaccommodationandexplain itscharacteristics.
9. Writeabouttheimportanceofaccommodationinoursociallife.
10. Explainthevarioustypesofaccommodation.
11. Defineassimilationandexplainitscharacteristics.
12. Discussthefactorsconduciveforassimilationandfactorshinderingsassimilation.

10.10 ReferenceBooks

1. Green.A.W.Sociology–AnAnalysisofLifeinModernSociety,p.61.
2. OgburnandNimkoff,AHandbookofSociology,p.261.
3. ReuterandHart,IntroductiontoSociology,p.322.
4. VidyaBhushanandD.R.Sachdeva,AnIntroductiontoSociology,KitabMahal,Allahabad, 2001.

LessonWriter

Dr.SaraswatiRajulyer

AssistantProfessor,

DepartmentofSociology&SocialWork,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur – 522 510.

Resource Person

Dr. Saraswati Raju

Assistant Professor,
Department of Sociology & Social Work,
Acharya Nagarjuna University,
Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur – 522 510.

Editor

Dr. V. Venkateswarlu

Assistant Professor,
Department of Sociology & Social Work,
Acharya Nagarjuna University,
Nagarjuna Nagar,
Guntur–522510.

LessonNo:11
Dissociative Social Process

11.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain the dissociative social process.

Contents

- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.2 Dissociative Social Processes
- 11.3 Competition
- 11.4 Conflict
- 11.5 Cooperation, Competition and Conflict : Interrelationship
- 11.6 Summary
- 11.7 Technical Terms
- 11.8 Self Assessment Questions
- 11.9 Reference Books

11.1 Introduction

Opposition and cooperation occur in every society although their form and direction are culturally conditioned. Opposition may be defined as a struggle against another or others for a commodity, goal or value. Cooperation is a joint venture with another or others for a commodity, goal or value. Opposition may be divided into competition and conflict. Competition is a less violent form of opposition in which two or more persons or groups struggle for some end or goal. Attention is focused on the reward or the goal rather than on the competitor. In conflict, the person or group hurls, injures, or destroys the opponent in order to secure a goal or a reward. As competition becomes more personal, it shades into conflict – the more disjunctive social process.

11.2 Dissociative Social Processes

Social process which leads to negative results is called dissociative processes. These social processes result in disintegration of society. These are also known as disjunctive social processes. Competition and conflict etc. are examples of dissociative social processes.

11.3 Competition

Competition is one of the dissociative from of social processes. It is actually the most fundamental form of social struggle. It occurs whenever there is an insufficient supply of anything that human beings desire, in sufficient in the sense that all cannot have as much of it as they wish.

Ogburn and Nimkoff say that competition occurs when demand out turns supply. People do not compete for sunshine, air and gifts of nature because they are abundant in supply. But people compete for power, name, fame, glory, status, money, luxuries and other things which are not easily available. Since scarcity is in a sense an inevitable condition of social life, competition of some sort or the other is found in all the societies. In any society, for example, there are normally more people who want jobs than there are jobs available; hence there is competition for them. Among those who are already employed, there is likewise competition for better jobs. There is thus competition not only for bread but for luxuries, power, social, position, mates, fame and all other things not available for one's asking.

According to, Sutherland, Woodward and Maxwell. "Competition is an impersonal, unconscious, continuous straggles between individuals and groups for satisfaction which, because of their limited supply, all may not have".

As E.S. Bogardus says. "Competition is a contest to obtain something which does not exist in quantity sufficient to meet the demand."

According to Biesanz and Biesanz, "Competition is the striving of two or more persons for the same goal with is limited so that all cannot share it".

Park and Burgess write, "Competition is an interaction without social contract".

Characteristics of Competition

By analyzing various definitions, the following characteristics of competition can be drawn:

(i) It is Universal: Competition is found in every society and in every age. It is found in every group. It is one aspect of struggle which is universal not only in human society but also in the plant and animal worlds. It is the natural result of the universal struggle for existence.

(ii) It is Impersonal: Competition is not a personal action. It is an 'interaction without social contact.' The competitors are not in contact and do not know one another. They do not compete with each other on a personal level. The attention of all the competitors is fixed on the goal or the reward they aim at. Due to this reason competition is known as an impersonal affair.

(iii) It is an Unconscious Activity: Competition takes place on the unconscious level. Achievement of goal or the reward is regarded as the main object of competitors. Rarely do they know about other competitors. For example, the students of a particular class get engaged to secure the highest marks in the final examination. They do not conceive of their classmates as competitors. Students may, no doubt, be conscious of the competition and much concerned about marks. Their attention is focused on the reward or goals rather than on the competitors.

(iv) It is a Continuous Process: Competition never comes to an end. It is not an intermittent process. It is continuous. As goods are short in supply there must be competition among the people for their procurement. The desire for status, name, fame, glory, power and wealth in an ever increasing degree makes competition a continuous process in human society.

Forms of Competition

Competition can be divided into many categories or forms. They are economic competition, cultural competition, social competition, racial competition, political competition etc. It exists everywhere but appears in many forms.

1. Economic Competition

Generally, economic competition is found in the field of economic activities. It means a race between the individuals and groups to achieve certain material goods. Thus economic competition takes place in the field of production, consumption, distribution and exchange of wealth. For example, competition between two industrial sectors for the production of goods. In modern industrial society, the materialistic tendency of people has led to economic competition to a great extent.

2. Cultural Competition

Cultural competition is found among different cultures. It occurs when two or more cultures try to establish their superiority over others. This type of competition leads to cultural diversities in society. When one culture tries to establish its supremacy over other cultures, it gives birth to cultural competition. In ancient times, it was found that there was a strong competition between the Aryans and non-Aryans and sometimes it led to conflict. The religious competition between the Hindus and Muslims in present day is a bright example of cultural competition.

3. Social Competition

Social competition is mainly found in modern societies. It is the basic feature of present day world. For acquiring a high status, popularity, name and fame in society people compete with each other. Social competition plays a vital role in the determination of individual's status in society.

4. Racial Competition

Racial competition is found among different races of the world. It takes place when one race tries to establish its superiority over the other. The whole human society is divided into a number of races and there always arises an intense competition among them. The competition between the Indo-Aryan race and Dravidian race in India is an example of racial competition. Similarly, in South Africa, there is a competition between the white and black races.

5. Political Competition

Political takes place in the political field. In all democratic countries, competition is inevitable among the various political parties and even between the different members of a political party to obtain political power. Similarly, at the international level, there is always diplomatic competition between different nations. In India, competition between Congress (I) and B.J.P. for political power is a bright example of political competition.

Besides the above types, there are two other types, of competition such as personal and impersonal competitions. Personal competition means the rivalry between the people. It occurs among the two opponents on their personal level. In this competition, the competitors are well known to each other personally. Competition between the two students in a class-room or competition between two players in a particular game is the bright example of personal competition. Impersonal competition, on the other hand, takes place among the groups not among the individuals. In this competition, the competitors compete with one another not on a personal level but as members of groups such as business, social and cultural groups. In India, competition between the various religious groups like Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs etc. is an example of impersonal competition.

Role of Competition

Competition is considered to be a very healthy and a necessary social process. It is indispensable in social life. It has played a major role in the survival of human beings. It is the basic law of life. It is extremely dynamic. It performs many useful functions in society. According to H.T. Mazumdar; it performs both positive and negative functions. They are briefly mentioned below:

(i) Assignment of right individual to proper place

Competition assigns right individual to a place in the social system. It provides the individuals better opportunities to satisfy their desires for new experiences and recognition. It believes in achieved status. It spurs individuals and groups on to exert their best efforts. Competition determines who is to perform what function. The division of labour and specialization of function in modern life are the products of competition. It fulfills one's desire for higher status, which one can achieve by struggling and competing.

(ii) Source of motivation

Competition motivates others to excel or to obtain recognition or to win an award. The practice of awarding prizes and scholarships to those who occupy the few top positions on the merit is designed to foster creativity and promote striving excellence. Competition stimulates achievement by lifting the levels of aspiration for which some individuals work harder for success.

(iii) Conducive to progress

Healthy and fair competition is considered essential for economic, social as well as technological and scientific progress. Through competition a proper man is selected and placed in the proper place. It is obvious that when a proper man is in the proper place the technological and general progress of the society cannot be hampered. People make their best efforts when they find themselves in competition. It is competition which has made inventions and discoveries in different fields possible.

Besides the above positive functions, competition also performs a few negative functions as well.

(i) Competition may lead to frustration

Competition may create emotional disturbances. It may develop unfriendly and unfavourable attitudes among the persons or groups toward one another. Unfair and unhealthy competition has the most disintegrating effects. It may lead to neurosis through frustration and to violation of the rules by those who fail in the struggle for status according to "the rules of the game".

(ii) Competition may lead to monopoly

Unlimited competition in a capitalist economy gives rise to monopoly. It throws the real needs of the people into waste and causes starvation in the midst of plenty. It may cause fear, insecurity, instability and panic. For example, in the economic field, businessmen seek to protect themselves against competition that is, by erecting tariff barriers against foreign competition by agreeing upon prices. Labourers unite for protecting their wages and bureaucrats protect themselves through their associations.

(iii) Competition may lead to conflict

Competition, if it is uncontrolled, may lead to conflicts which are considered inimical to group solidarity or cohesion. Sometimes it may become violent involving unethical and unfair means to divert the competitors' attention from sportsmanship which is the outcome of fair competition. Therefore, competition should always be healthy and fair.

11.4 Conflict

Conflict is one of the dissociative or disintegrative social processes. It is a universal and fundamental social process in human relations. Conflict arises only when the attention of the competitors is diverted from the object of competition to themselves. As a process, it is the anti-thesis of cooperation. It is a process of seeking to obtain rewards by eliminating or weakening the competitors. It is a deliberate attempt to oppose, resist or coerce the will of another or others. Conflict is a competition in its occasional, personal and hostile forms. Conflict is also goal oriented. But unlike cooperation and competition, it seeks to capture its goal by making ineffective the others who also seek them.

According to J.H. Fitcher, "Conflict is the social process in which individual or groups seek their ends by directly challenging the antagonist by violence or threat of violence".

As K. Davis defines, "Conflict is a codified form of struggle".

According to A.W. Green, "Conflict is the deliberate attempt to oppose, resist or coerce the will of another or others".

Gillin and Gillin say, "Conflict is the social process in which individuals or groups seek their ends by directly challenging the antagonist by violence or threat of violence".

Characteristics of Conflict

Conflict is an important form of social process. It is a part of human society. The main characteristics of conflict are as follows:

(i) It is a Universal Process: Conflict is an ever-present process. It exists at all places and all times. It has been in existence since time immemorial. The cause of the universality of conflict is the increase of man's selfishness and his materialist tendency. Karl Marx has rightly mentioned, that 'violence is the mid-wife of history'.

(ii) It is a Personal Activity: Conflict is personal and its aim is to eliminate the opposite party. The defeat of the opponent is the main objective in conflict. When competition is personalized it becomes conflict. The parties, locked in conflict, lose sight of their definite goal or objective and try to defeat one another.

(iii) It is a Conscious Activity: Conflict is a deliberate attempt to oppose or resist the will of another. It aims at causing loss or injury to persons or groups. The attention of every party is fixed on the rival rather than on the reward or goal, they seek for. So consciously, knowingly or deliberately the parties make struggle with each other in conflict.

(iv) It is an Intermittent Process: There is no continuity in conflict. It is occasional. It lacks continuity. It is not as continuous as competition and cooperation. It may take place all of a sudden and may come to an end after sometime. If the conflict becomes continuous, no society can sustain itself. So it is an intermittent process.

Causes of Conflict

Conflict is universal. It cannot be definitely said when conflict came into existence or there is no definite cause for its emergence. Still then a number of thinkers have pointed out the valid causes of conflict.

Malthus an eminent economist and mathematician says that conflict arises only when there is shortage of food or means of subsistence.

According to him, the increase of population in geometrical progression and the means of subsistence in arithmetical progression is the main cause of conflict between the people.

According to C. Darwin, an eminent biologist, the principle of struggle for existence and survival of the fittest are the main causes of conflict.

According to Freud and some other psychologists, the cause of conflict lies in man's innate or inborn aggressive tendency.

Some thinkers point out that the differences in attitudes, aspirations; ideals and interest of individuals give rise to conflicts. No two men are exactly alike. On account of the differences they fail to adjust themselves which may lead to conflict among them.

Social change becomes cause of conflict. When a part of society does not change along with changes in the other parts, cultural lag occurs which leads to conflict. The old generation and new generation conflict is the result of social change. The rate of change in the moral norms of a society and in man's hopes, demands, and desires is also responsible for the emergence of conflict. For example, the moral norm that children should obey their parents have persisted in our country since time immemorial but now the younger generation wants to go in its own way. In consequence, there is more parent-youth conflict than before.

Types of Conflict

Conflict expresses itself in thousands of ways and various degrees and over every range of human contact.

MacIver and Page have distinguished two fundamental types of conflict. Direct and Indirect conflict.

(i) Direct Conflict

When a person or a group injures, thwarts or destroys the opponent in order to secure a goal or reward, direct conflict occurs; such as litigation, revolution and war.

(ii) Indirect Conflict

In indirect conflict, attempts are made by individuals or groups to frustrate the efforts of their opponents in an indirect manner. For example, when two manufacturers go on lowering the prices of their commodities till both of them are declared insolvent, indirect conflict in that case takes place.

George Simmel has also distinguished four types of conflict. These

are:

(i) War

When all the efforts to resolve the conflict between two States fail, war finally breaks out as it is the only alternative to the peaceful means of solution. War provides only means of contact between alien groups. Though it is dissociative in character but it has a definitely associative effect.

(ii) Feud

Feud or factional strife does not take place among the state ornaments. It usually occurs among the members of the society. This kind of strife is known as intra-group but not the inter-group conflict.

(iii) Litigation

Litigation is a form of conflict which is judicial in nature. To redress their grievances and to get justice people take recourse to legal means in the court of law.

(iv) Conflict of Impersonal Ideals

It is a conflict carried on by the individuals not for themselves but for an ideal. For example, the conflict carried on by the communists and capitalists to prove that their own system can bring in a better world order.

Another eminent Sociologist, Gillin and Gillin has mentioned five types of conflict: personal, racial, class, political and international conflict. Personal conflict is a conflict between two persons within the same group. Racial conflict is conflict between the two races-whites and Negroes in South Africa. The class conflict is a conflict between two class such as poor and rich or the exploiters and the exploited. Conflict between the two political parties for power is the political conflict. International conflict is the conflict between two nations such as between India and Pakistan over Kashmir issue.

Beside the above, conflict can also be of the following types:

(i) Latent and Overt Conflict

Sometimes individuals or groups do not want to express their feeling of conflict due to some reasons. The unexpressed or hidden conflict is known as the latent conflict. When the individuals or groups feel bold enough to take advantage of a particular situation, they express their feeling of conflict openly. Such open conflict is known as overt conflict. For example, the latent conflict between India and Pakistan may become overt in the form of war over Kashmir issue.

(ii) Personal and Corporate Conflict

Personal conflict arises among people within a group. It occurs due to various personal motives like hostility, envy, treachery etc. Corporate conflict, on the other hand, arises among groups within a society or between two societies. It is both inter-group and intra-group conflict. For example, racial riots, communal riots, war between nations, labour management conflict etc.

Role of Conflict

At the outset, it may be said that conflict causes social disorder, chaos and confusion. It may disrupt social unity but like competition, conflict performs some positive functions. Conflict is both harmful as well as useful for the society.

Positive Functions

Following are the positive functions of conflict.

(i) It promotes the solidarity and fellow-feeling

The conflict which promotes the solidarity and fellow-feeling within the groups and societies is known as corporate conflict. This conflict tends to increase the moral and promote the solidarity of the in-group, threatened by the out-group. For example, in war time cooperation and patriotism among the citizens of a nation are more perfect than in peace time. "Inter-group conflict", to quote Ogburn and Nimkoff is a potent factor in promoting inter-group cooperation."

(ii) It enlarges the victorious group

The victory won through the process of conflict enlarges the victorious group. The victorious group either increases its power or incorporates new territory and population. In this way conflict makes possible the emergence of a larger group.

(iii) It leads to redefinition of value system

Conflict may lead to a redefinition of the situation by the contesting parties. Generally, the parties which are in conflict with each other give up the old value system and accept new ones when the conflict is over. In this way conflict may give rise to new types of cooperation and accommodation.

(iv) It acts as a cementing factor in the establishment of intimate relations

Conflict in certain cases acts as a cementing factor in the establishment of intimate and friendly relations among people or parties that were involved in it until a short time ago. For example, the end of the verbal conflict between lovers, friends and married couples leads to the establishment of relations which are now more intimate than before.

(v) It changes the relative status of the conflicting parties

Conflict changes the relative status of the contestants and of the non contestants as well. For example, after the Second World War, both Germany and Japan lost their status as great powers. China today has become a leading Asian power; United States has emerged as a superpower.

Negative Functions

The negative functions of conflict are mentioned below:

(i) It causes social disorder, chaos and confusion

War, a type of conflict, may destroy the lives and properties of which are involved in it. It may bring incalculable damage and immeasurable suffering to a number of people. The warring parties generally incur great losses. They gain nothing in comparison with the loss incurred. The modern mode of warfare which can destroy millions of people and vast amount of properties within a few minutes has brought new fears and anxieties for the mankind.

(ii) It disrupts social unity and cohesion

Conflict is regarded as anti-thesis to cooperation. It disrupts normal channels of cooperation. It is a costly way of settling disputes. The results of intergroup conflict are largely negative. Conflict weakens the solidarity of the group by diverting members' attention from group objectives. It violates the national integration in a greater way which may lead to the disorganization of the society.

(iii) It causes a lot of psychological and moral damage

The morale of individuals touches a new low in conflict on a personal level. It makes people psychologically weak. It spoils the mental peace of man. It may even make the people to become inhuman. In case, conflict does not come to quick end, it makes the conflicting individuals very weak and apprehensive about losing something. Therefore, it is quite likely that- it

may lead to their moral deterioration.

Distinction between Competition and Conflict

To clarify the distinction between conflict and competition the following points may be noted:

- i. Conflict takes place on a conscious level, competition is unconscious.
- ii. Conflict involves contact, competition does not.
- iii. Conflict may involve violence, competition is non-violent.
- iv. Conflict is personal, competition is impersonal activity.
- v. Conflict lacks continuity, competition is a continuous process.
- vi. Conflict disregards social norms, competition does care for norms.
- vii. Conflict diverts members' attention from group objectives, competition keeps members alert to the goal or objective.

11.5 Cooperation, Conflict and Competition: Interrelationship

Cooperation is the basic form of human interaction in which men strive jointly with each other for a good goal. Competition as a form of interaction occurs when two or more persons or groups struggle for some goal. Conflict takes the form of emotionalized and violent opposition in which the major concern is to overcome the opponent as a means of securing a given goal or reward. It is direct and openly antagonistic struggle of persons or groups for the same object or end, cooperation is an associative process, while competition and conflict are dissociative processes. Competition and conflict divide men. But competition differs from conflict in that the former is impersonal, while the latter is personalized competition in a less violent form of struggle than conflict. The three forms of interaction thus appear to be distinct and separate. In reality, however, cooperation, conflict and competition are interrelated. They are ever-present processes in human relations. They are not separable things but phases of one process which involves something of each.

According to Cooley, conflict and cooperation are not separable things, but phases of one process which always involves something of both. Even in the friendliest relations and in the most intimate associations there is some point where interest diverges. They cannot therefore cooperate beyond that point and conflict is inevitable. The closest cooperation, for instance, within the family does not prevent the occurrence of quarrels. Cooperation exists between men when their interests remain harmonious. But according to Davis, there is no group whether family or the friendly group which will not contain the seeds of suppressed conflict. Elements of conflict exist in all situations, because the ends which different individuals try to attain are

always to some extent mutually exclusive. Conflict also involves cooperation. In very conflict, there is some hidden basis of compromise or adjustment. For example, enemies in wartime cooperate under certain rules while they proceed to annihilate each other with the accepted modes and weapons of war. As end-result of conflict, there emerge arrangements and agreements which give rise to cooperation.

Regarding the end of a conflict Mack and Young comments, "At its most rudimentary level, conflict results in the elimination or annihilation of the opponent. In human society, however, most conflict ends in some sort of arrangement or accommodation or in the fusion of the two opposing elements".

There is no competition which will not contain the seeds of conflict. As competition becomes more personal, it shades into conflict. Conflict does not always occurs when competition become acute. It only happens if attitudes of the competitors become personal and hostile toward one another. But every competition will contain such attitudes, though suppressed. An individual wishes not only to win the prize but beat another individual. Each knows that he can win the prize only by defeating the other. When competition becomes personalized in this way and becomes keener, hostility between the competitors easily develops. Competition also involves cooperation. A competitive struggle implies some agreement among the competitors. Members of football teams compete according to rules prescribed for them.

The interrelations between three processes has been stated by Giddings in following ways. In a given region, with specific physiographic characteristics, including food supplies, an 'area of characterization' is formed ; and human being dwelling intend to become increasingly alike', and to develop solidarity on the basis of 'consciousness of kind'. In this way, says Giddings, The first two conditions of social life... namely grouping and substantial resemblance are provided. But since they are alike, individuals living together in one habitat compete with each other in obtaining things which each is able to get by his own effort, and they combine their effort obtain things that no one can get without the help of others. Whatever happens, their interests and activities are not wholly harmonious and easily become antagonistic. Competition tends to endanger conflict inimical to group solidarity. Eventually, says Giddings, an equilibrium of 'live and let live' is arrived at, which makes conscious association possible for human beings.

11.6 Summary

Both competition and conflict the two forms of dissociative social process has an important role in social life. Competition performs a number of useful functions in society. Conflict is an ever-present process in human relations. It is one of the forms of struggle between individuals or groups. Conflict takes place whenever a person or group seeks to gain a reward not by surpassing other competitors but by preventing them from effectively competing.

11.7 Technical Terms

1. Dissociative social process
2. Competition
3. Conflict
4. Social life

11.8 Self Assessment Questions

1. What is a dissociative social process? How far is conflict, a social process? What is its place in social life?
2. Explain the various types of dissociative social process with relevant examples.
3. Evaluate the role of competition in social life.

11.9 Reference Books

1. Green.A.W.Sociology–An Analysis of Life in Modern Society, p.61.
2. Ogburn and Nimkoff, A Handbook of Sociology, p.261.
3. Reuter and Hart, Introduction to Sociology, p.322.
4. Vidya Bhushan and D.R.Sachdeva, An Introduction to Sociology, Kitab Mahal, Allahabad, 2001.

Lesson Writer

Dr.Saraswati Rajulyer

Assistant Professor,

Department of Sociology & Social Work,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur – 522 510.

Resource Person

Dr.Saraswati Rajulyer

Assistant Professor,

Department of Sociology & Social Work,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur – 522 510.

Editor

Dr.V.Venkateswarlu

AssistantProfessor,

DepartmentofSociology&SocialWork,

Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Nagarjuna Nagar,

Guntur-522510.

Lesson - 12

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION

12.0 Objective:

The main objective of this lesson is to understand Meaning, Differences in different fields, causes of Social Differentiation and types of Role Differentiation.

Contents:

- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Society Rests on Differences
- 12.3 Society Compares and Ranks Individuals and Groups
- 12.4 Differences in Different Fields.
- 12.5 Causes of Differentiation
- 12.6 Differentiation of Roles of Status
- 12.7 Summary
- 12.8 Key Words
- 12.9 Model Questions
- 12.10 References

12.1 Introduction:

Differentiation is the law of nature . True, it is in the case of human society, Human society is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. Men differ from one other, in many respects. Human beings are equal so far as their bodily structure is concerned. But the physical appearance of individuals, their intellectual, moral, philosophical, mental, economic, religious, political and other aspects are different. No two individuals are exactly alike. Diversity and inequality are inherent in society. Hence, human society is everywhere stratified. All societies arrange their members in terms of superiority,

inferiority, and equality. The vertical scale of evaluation, this placing of people in strata or layers, is called stratification. Those in the top stratum have more power, privilege and prestige than those below.

12.2 Society Rests on Differences

Every where individuals and societies differ. In no society people are absolutely equal in all respects. Differentiation is the keynote of human society. Society rests on the principle of difference. Differences are inherent in the very nature of the society. In all societies there is social differentiation of the population by age, sex, occupation and personal characteristics. There are the major factors of social differentiation. Men and women, teenagers and adults, children and old men, masters and servants, managers and attendants, rulers and ruled, teachers and the taught, rich and the poor, literate and the illiterate, engineers and doctors, teachers and advocates, shopkeepers and hotel-owners are not always adjudged as equal. There are no equalitarian societies in the world. Societies are marked by differentiation. Societies may only differ in the degree of differentiation and nature of stratification.

12.3 Society Compares and Ranks Individuals and Groups:

Members of a group compare different individuals, as when selecting a mate, or employing a worker, or dealing with a neighbour, or developing friendship with an individual. They also compare groups such as castes, races, colleges, cities, athletic teams. These comparisons are valuations and when members of a group agree, these judgments are social evaluations.

All societies differentiate members in terms of roles and all societies evaluate roles differently. Some roles are regarded as more important or socially more valuable than others. The persons who perform the more highly esteemed roles are rewarded more highly. Thus stratification is simply a process of interaction of differentiation whereby some people come to rank higher than others.

12.4 Differences in Different Fields:.

Some type of differentiation or specialization of role is found in practically every society. It is clearly related to the rise and operation of social classes. In the economic order, differentiation is found in the different roles of entrepreneur, manager, and skilled and unskilled labourers. It is evident in the professions; in the political order as witnessed in the varying roles of public administrators, legislators, and judges; in education as between teachers and administrators; and in religion, as in the distinct roles of prophet, seer and priest. In reality, some form of specialization of the role is found in every association of men.

12.5 Causes of Differentiation:

Talcott Parsons mentions three causal factors of social differentiation – (i) possession (ii) qualities, and (iii) performance. These three are, however, interrelated.

1. **Possession:** Possession refers to mainly material possessions, such as money, wealth, property and all the other valuable, utilitarian material objects. People do not have equal access to these possessions. The unequal distribution of these material possessions has contributed to inequality and differentiation.
2. **Qualities:** Qualities refers to the intrinsic capacities or abilities of people to undertake or to do a task. These qualities are also not equally distributed. For example, physical strength, intelligence, ‘beauty’ courage, loyalty to a cause, moral courage, industriousness, selflessness, sacrifice and other internal qualities are not equally distributed. People are ranked differently depending upon the degree of possession of these qualities.
3. **Performance:** Performance refers to the execution of a task in a given time under a given situation. Performances are always judged first according to their products or results. Secondly, they are judged according to the manner and style of the performing. Performances are always subject to regulatory norms. When the norms are violated, performances are often disvalued, regardless of their results.

Possessions, qualities and performances are closely related. Material possessions like wealth may help a man to develop his qualities which may better his performance.

Similarly qualities may help a man to make possessions or to acquire material possessions. We should note that a person's qualities, possessions and performances are usually judged in relation to his age and with references to a particular social role. Not only persons but also groups are ranked according to the merit of their imputed qualities and performances. The term 'prestige' is used to refer to the approval, respect, admiration, or difference a person or group is able to command by virtue of his or its imputed qualities or performances. The term 'ranking' is generally used to refer to the degree of prestige. The term 'stratification' denotes the process or condition in which layers (strata) of persons or groups are ranked differently. Any one stratum contains many persons or groups of roughly the same rank. Standards of evaluation vary from one social system to another, and from one situation to another within the same social system.

In all societies there is differentiation of the population by age, sex, and personal characteristics. The roles and privileges of children differ from those of adults; and those of good hunters or warriors differ from those of the rank and file. It is not customary to speak of a society as stratified if every individual in it has an equal chance to succeed to whatever statuses are open. Strictly speaking, there are no purely equalitarian societies, only societies differing in degree of stratification. Even Russia which dreamt of a 'classless society', could not, any more than any other society escape the necessity of ranking people according to their functions. The criteria of rank have changed along with values of society. "Un stratified society with real equality of its members, is a myth and that has never been realized in the history of mankind—(P.A. Sorokin). All societies exhibit some system of hierarchy whereby its members are placed in positions that are higher or lower, superior or inferior in relation to each other. The concept of 'social stratification' is made use to refer to such classification or gradation and placement of people in society. Through this process of stratification people are fixed in the social structure of the society. Stratification assumes three main forms: caste, estates and class.

12.6 Differentiation of Roles of Status:

In every society there are various types of roles and positions. Role signifies activities and position signifies status. In a stratified society, roles and status are differentiated. Thus in further analysis, social stratification rests on differentiation of roles and differentiation of status. Each individual is with a particular rank and particular work. In simple social structures, this differentiation is reflected in terms of age, sex and physical power. Besides, in some societies differentiation rests on political and economic grounds. But in modern industrial societies stratification is almost complex. It is derived from a variable complementary criteria.

(1) Roles:

In a stratified society, roles are differentiated. Differentiation of roles means distribution of members among the various positions and activities. There must be some structure of differentiation and assignment if any society is to exist.

In brief, the differentiation rests in the following considerations:

- (i) There are differentiated activities which are performed for the persistence of the society.
- (ii) These differentiated activities are assigned to capable persons who carry them out.
- (iii) Not all persons are capable to perform all types of activities.
- (iv) If all individuals are capable to perform a similar activity simultaneously.

Types of Role Differentiation:

The following are the major types of role differentiation:-

1. **Role differentiation on the basis of age:** Differences of age are relevant to differences in capabilities. In every society, a marked distinction is recognized between infancy, childhood, adulthood and old age. Age is thus accepted as a qualification for the performance of role.

2. **Role differentiation on the basis of generation:** Generation refers to individual's relative position in the biological line of descent. Thus despite the differentiation on the basis of age, roles are differentiated between mother, father and their offspring's. In primitive societies, such roles are organized in terms of kinship system.
3. **Role differentiation on the basis of Sex:** In physiological terms sexes are differentiated in terms of roles. The role of female is the care and rearing of children while the role of male is to perform outside activities. Besides, certain religious role are differentiated on the basis of sex. Certain religious rites are excluded from female's participation.
4. **Role differentiation on the basis of economic allocation:** Economic allocation involves distribution of goods and services. The allocation is of similar to all. Thus differentiation is created according to the attachment with productive labour. Therefore, when production becomes the basis of differentiation, then that is called division of labour.
5. **Role differentiation on the basis of Political allocation:** Political allocation involves distribution of power and responsibility. Therefore, individuals are differentiated with respect to power and responsibility. There are persons who hold power and control over others, while there are persons who accept their supremacy. Thus superiors and subordinates are differentiated.
6. **Role differentiation on the basis of religion:** Religion refers to those aspects of actions which are directly oriented to the attainment of ultimate ends. The principles of religion ascribes certain roles for different individuals.
7. **Role differentiation on the basis of cognition:** Cognition refers to knowledge. Therefore, on this ground roles are differentiated. For example technical and non-technical, teacher and student.

8. **Role differentiation on the basis of non-environment:** Non human environment refers to seasonal and typographical factors. These factors are subject to wide variation. Therefore, in different seasons and in different geographical regions, different types of activities are performed.
9. **Role differentiation on the basis of solidarity:** Solidarity refers to social relationships. Therefore mutual roles are differentiated according to the type and nature of relationship.

(2) Status

Status is a relative term. An individual may have different status in respect of his caste as compared to the one offered by the job that the individuals. Status of a person is determined in a particular community by the role which he plays in that community.

Any change in the pattern of social set-up is followed by a corresponding change in the status patterns. In societies in which status is determined mostly by virtue of the parenthood, race or community, changes in status pattern are casual. Opposed to this are those societies where wealth or political power are the main determinant of status. Here changes in status are more frequent. Accordingly, status presents both changeable and unchangeable aspects.

“All the positions occupied by a single individual constitute when taken together an important element in his personality. Since each person has but so much time, energy and ability and since his activity must achieve results and satisfy needs, his system of statuses must be to some degree integrated. His personal efficiency, his mental stability and contentment depend to a large extent on the integration of his various social position.”

Thus status is also a symbol of integrated personality and worldly achievement. Our society ascribes different status to men and women. Sex difference thus becomes a determinant of statuses. A host of other factors come to contribute in the overall determination of the status which a person holds in the society.

Wherever and whenever people vary in respect of their intelligence, abilities, achievements and other acquired or inherited things, there is bound to be a division of people into various status layers. Economical classes of our society also form one of such important factors. If we go further we find that even a small group of persons is divided into individuals of varying statuses. For example a professor may find himself at a lower level of status.

Besides the economical division of our society, it is also divided into functional bases. Different persons in our society are entrusted with roles of varying degrees of importance. This further results in the multiplicity of status layers: --

According to Maclver and Page “Status is the social position that determines for its possessor, apart from his personal attributes or social service, a degree of respect, prestige and influences.”

However, “function” or the “award” aspect cannot be regarded as representing the complete integrated status, which, as has been stated above, is a product of integrated personality.”

Status is expressed in society in a way more symbolic than concrete. The objects by which the symbolism of status is represented keep on changing with the change of material wealth forms. In feudal order of society, land was the most prevalent symbol of social status. In commercial societies, money evolved was the most important factor. The new form of wealth was more mobile, resulting in naked mobility of statuses:--

“Under the conditions of modern capitalism, wealth takes on a more determined role, and wealth though in degree is associated with a role of living, cultural opportunity, occupational advantage and political power, is of all attributes the most detachable from personality and from cultural attainment. In democracies particularly the bulwarks of the older class system have been undermined, so that whether cohesion the new system

possess depends mainly on the rule of wealth. Yet the older determinants of status still modify and limit it, and new criteria are often introduced.”----- **Maclver and Page.**

It is, therefore, impossible to determine the proportional contribution of the many factors which determine status. Often an officer, a member of parliament and owner of industries associate freely for the time being. The status distinction subsides. On other times, a conflict may arise between the various factors of status determination, for the position of supremacy. Such as political power may come to determine the status in the first place.

12.7 Summary:

Differentiation is the law of nature . True, it is in the case of human society, Human society is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. Men differ from one other, in many respects. Every where individuals and societies differ. In no society people are absolutely equal in all respects. Differentiation is the keynote of human society. Society rests on the principle of difference. Differences are inherent in the very nature of the society. In all societies there is social differentiation of the population by age, sex, occupation and personal characteristics. All societies differentiate members in terms of roles and all societies evaluate roles differently. Some roles are regarded as more important or socially more valuable than others. The persons who perform the more highly esteemed roles are rewarded more highly. Thus stratification is simply a process of interaction of differentiation whereby some people come to rank higher than others.

In every society there are various types of roles and positions. Role signifies activities and position signifies status. In a stratified society, roles and status are differentiated. Thus in further analysis, social stratification rest on differentiation of roles and differentiation of status. Thus status is also a symbol of integrated personality and worldly achievement. Our society ascribes different status to men and women. Sex difference thus becomes a determinant of statuses. A host of other factors come to contribute in the overall determination of the status which a person holds in the society.

12.8 Key Words:

Differentiation

Personality

Symbolism

Determination

Solidarity

Stratification

12.9 Model Questions:

1. What is Social Differentiation? Discuss differences in different fields?
2. Explain causes of Social Differentiation and types of Role differentiation?

12.10 References:

1. Green.A.W.Sociology–AnAnalysisofLifeinModernSociety,p.61.
2. OgburnandNimkoff,AHandbookofSociology,p.261.
3. ReuterandHart,IntroductiontoSociology,p.322.
4. VidyaBhushanandD.R.Sachdeva,AnIntroductiontoSociology,KitabMahal,Allahabad, 2001.

Lesson - 13

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION : THEORIES

13.0 Objective:

The main objective of this lesson is to understand the concept of Social Stratification and its characteristics, functions, forms and theoretical perspectives.

Contents:

13.1 Introduction

13.2 Definition:

13.3 Social Differentiation and Stratification

13.4 Characteristics of Social Stratification

13.5 Functions of Social Stratification

13.6 Forms of Social Stratification

13.7 Origin of Social Stratification

13.8 Summary

13.9 Glossary

13.10 Model Questions

13.11 References

13.1 Introduction:

Differentiation is the law of nature . True, it is in the case of human society, Human society is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. Men differ from one other, in many respects. Human beings are equal so far as their bodily structure is concerned. But the physical appearance of individuals, their intellectual, moral, philosophical, mental, economic, religious, political and other aspects are different. No two individuals are exactly alike. Diversity and inequality are inherent in society. Hence, human society is everywhere stratified.

All societies arrange their members in terms of superiority, inferiority, and equality. The vertical scale of evaluation, this placing of people in strata or layers, is called stratification. Those in the top stratum have more power, privilege and prestige than those below.

Society Compares and Ranks Individuals and Groups:

Members of a group compare different individuals, as when selecting a mate, or employing a worker, or dealing with a neighbour, or developing friendship with an individual. They also compare groups such as castes, races, colleges, cities, athletic teams. These comparisons are valuations and when members of a group agree, these judgments are social evaluations.

All societies differentiate members in terms of roles and all societies evaluate roles differently. Some roles are regarded as more important or socially more valuable than others. The persons who perform the more highly esteemed roles are rewarded more highly. Thus stratification is simply a process of interaction of differentiation whereby some people come to rank higher than others.

13.2 Definition:

1. **Raymond W. Murray:** “Social stratification is a horizontal division of society into ‘higher’ and ‘lower’ social units.”
2. **Ogburn and Nimkoff:** “The process by which individuals and groups are ranked in a more or less enduring hierarchy of status is known as stratification.”
3. **Gisbert:** “Social stratification is the division of society into permanent groups of categories linked with each other by the relationship of superiority and subordination.”
4. **Lundberg:** “A stratified society is one marked by inequality, by differences among people that are evaluated by them as being ‘lower’ and ‘higher’.

Economic Stratification:

Economic strata have existed in almost every society. In this materialistic philosophy, Marx has given enormous importance, in the economic analysis of strata but in place of strata he prefers the term ‘class’. This concept of class is though quite ancient going back as far as Plato but it was Marx who constructed a comprehensive view of the economic foundations of class. These economic classes, according to Marx, are the actual representative of social stratification.

Similarly Emile Durkheim and Ferdinand Tonnies also gave attention to economic strata in their interpretation of Gesellschaft and organic solidarity. Class, thus from economic point of view, is one of the most important base of social stratification. But according to Karl Mannhiem, stratification is not only based on economic condition but it also related with non-economic factors.

Political Stratification:

Besides economic conception of stratification, there is also a political conception propounded by Gumplowicz and Ratzenhofer. According to these thinkers, stratification is derived from the conquests of divergent ethnic groups. On the other hand, according to Mosca, stratification is simply a distinction between dominant political groups and the masses. Thus the ruling class determine the structure of society and the level of

civilization. Similarly Plato also assumed that stratification is based on the structure and dynamics of ruling class.

The Universality of Social Stratification:

Social stratification is ubiquitous. In all societies there is social differentiation of the population by age, sex, and personal characteristics. The roles and privileges of children differ from those of adults: and those of good hunters of warriors differ from those of the rank and file. It is not customary to speak of a society as stratified if every individual in it has an equal chance to succeed to whatever statuses are open. Strictly speaking there are no purely equalitarian societies, only societies differing in degree of stratification. Even Russia which dreamt of a 'classless society' could not any more than any other society, escape the necessity of ranking people according to their functions. The criterion of rank have changed along with values of society, P.A. Sorokin wrote in his 'Social Mobility' that 'Unstratified Society with real equality of its members, is a myth which has never been realized in the history of mankind'.

13.3 Social Differentiation and Stratification:

As it is clear from the above, all societies exhibit some system of hierarchy whereby its members are placed in positions that are higher or lower, superior or inferior, in relation to each other. The two concepts—'Social differentiation' and 'Social stratification'—are made use of to refer to such classification or gradation and placement of people in society. In differentiation society bases status on a certain kind of trait which may be (i) physical or biological such as skin-colour, physical appearance, age, sex, (ii) social and cultural such as differences in etiquettes, manners, values, ideals, ideologies, etc., Thus, differentiation serves as a sorting process according to which the people are graded on the basis of roles and status.

Stratification tends to perpetuate these differences in status. Hence, through this process people are fixed in the structure of the society. In some cases, (as it is in the case of caste) status may become hereditary. Differentiation may be considered the first stage preceding

stratification in society, sorted and classified into groups. It does not, however, mean that all differentiation leads to stratification in society.

13.4 Characteristics of Social Stratification :

According to M.M. Tumin the main attributes of stratification are as follows:

1. It is Social
2. It is Ancient.
3. It is Universal
4. It is in Divers Forms
5. It is Consequential

1. **It is Social:** Stratification is social in the sense, it does not represent biologically caused inequalities. It is true that such factors as strength, intelligence, age and sex can often serve as the basis on which statuses or strata are distinguished. But such differences by themselves are not sufficient to explain why some statuses receive more power, property and prestige than others.
2. **It is Ancient:** The stratification system is quite old. According to historical and archaeological records, stratification was present even in the small wandering bands. Age and sex were the main criterion of stratification then. 'Women and children last' was probably the dominant rule of order. Difference between the rich and poor, powerful and humble, freemen and slaves was there in almost all the ancient civilizations. Ever since the time of Plato and Kautilya social philosophers have been deeply concerned with economic, social and political inequalities.
3. **It is Universal:** The stratification system is a worldwide phenomenon. Difference between the rich and the poor or the 'haves' and the 'have nots' is evident every where. Even in the 'nonliterate' societies stratification is very much present. As Sorokin has said, all permanently organized groups are stratified.

4. **It is in Diverse Forms:** The stratification system has never been uniform in all the societies. The ancient Roman Society was stratified into two strata; the patricians and the plebians, the ancient Aryan society into four Varnas; the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and the Shudras, the ancient Greek Society into freemen and slaves; the ancient Chinese society into the mandarins, merchants, farmers and the soldiers and so on. Class, caste and estate seem to be the general forms of stratification to be found in the modern world. But stratification system seems to be much more complex in the civilised societies.
5. **It is Consequential:** The Stratification system has its own consequences. The most important, most desired, and often the scarcest things in human life are distributed unequally because of stratification. The system leads to two main kinds of consequences: (i) 'life chances' and (ii) 'life-styles'. 'Life-chances' refer to such things as infant mortality, longevity, physical and mental illness, childlessness, marital conflict, separation and divorce.

13.5 Functions of Social Stratification:

The glimpse of the cultures of the world reveals that no society is 'classless', that is, unstratified. All the known established societies of the world are stratified in one way or the other. According to Wilbert Moore and Kingsley Davis, stratification system came to be evolved in all the societies due to the functional necessity. As they have pointed out the main functional necessity of the system is ; "...the requirement faced by any society for placing and motivating individuals in the social structure... Social inequality is thus an unconsciously evolved device by which societies ensure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons". As analyzed by H.M. Johnson certain things here can be noted about the "functional necessity" of class stratification system.

1. **Encourages hard work:** One of the main functions of class stratification is to induce people to work hard to live up to values. Those who best fulfill the values of a particular society are normally rewarded with greater prestige and social

acceptance by others. It is known that occupations are ranked high if their functions are highly important and the required personnel is very scarce. Hard work, prolonged training and heavy burden of responsibility are associated with such occupational positions. People undertaking such works are rewarded with money, prestige, comforts, etc., Still we cannot say that all those positions which are regarded as important are adequately compensated for.

2. **Ensures circulation of elites:** To some extent class stratification helps to ensure what is often called “the circulation of the elite”. When a high degree of prestige, comforts and other rewards are offered for certain positions, there will be some competition for them. This process of competition helps to ensure that the more efficient people are able to rise to the top, where their ability can best be used
3. **Serves an economic function:** The competitive aspect has a kind of economic function in that it helps to ensure the rational use of available talent. It is also functionally necessary to offer differential rewards if the positions at the top are largely ascribed as it is in the case of caste system.
4. Even in caste system the people at the top can lose their prestige if they fail to maintain certain standards. Hence differential rewards provide the incentives for the upper classes to work at maintaining their positions.
5. **Prevents waste of resources;** The stratification system prevents the waste of scarce resources. The men in the elite class actually possess scarce and socially valued abilities and qualities, whether these are inherited or acquired. Because of their possession of these qualities their enjoyment of some privileges such as extra comfort and immunity from doing menial work, are functionally justified. It becomes functionally beneficial for the society to make use of their talents without being wasted. For Example, it would be a waste to pour the resources of society into the training of doctors and engineers, and then making them to work as peons and attendants. When once certain individuals are chosen and are trained for certain difficult positions it would be dysfunctional to waste their time and energy on tasks for which there is enough manpower.

6. **Stabilizes and reinforces the attitudes and skills:** Members of a class normally try to limit their relations to their own class. More intimate relationships are mostly found between fellow class members. Even this tendency has its own function. It tends to stabilize and reinforce the attitudes and skills that may be the basis of upper-class position. Those who have similar values and interests tend to associate comfortably with one another. Their frequent association itself confirms their common values and interests.
7. **Helps to pursue different professions or jobs:** The values, attitudes and qualities of different classes do differ. This difference is also functional for society to some extent. Because society needs manual as well as nonmanual workers. Many jobs are not attractive to highly trained or 'refined' people for they are socialized to aspire for certain other jobs. Because of the early influence of family and socialization the individuals imbibe in them certain values, attitudes and qualities relevant to the social class to which they belong. This will influence their selection of jobs.
8. **Social Control:** Further, to the extent that 'lower class' cultural characteristics are essential to society, the classes are, of course, functional. In fact, certain amount of mutual antagonism between social classes is also functional. To some extent, upper-class and lower-class groups can act as negative reference groups for each other. Thus they act as a means of social control also.
9. **Controlling effect on the 'shady' world:** Class stratification has another social control function. Even in the 'shady' world of gamblers and in the underworld of lower criminals, black-marketers, racketeers, smugglers, etc., the legitimate class structure has got respectability. They know that money is not a substitute for prestige but only a compensation for renouncing it. Hence instead of continuing in a profitable shady career, such people want to gain respectability for their money and for their children. They try to enter legitimate fields and become philanthropists and patrons of the arts. Thus the legitimate class structure continues to attract the shady classes and the underworld. This attraction exerts a social control function.

13.6 Forms of Social Stratification :

The forms of social stratification as distinguished by sociologists are as follows:

1. Slavery
2. Estates
3. Caste
4. Social class and status.

1. **Slavery:** The term slave is used to denote “ a man whom law and custom regard as the property of another. In extreme case he is wholly or without rights a pure chattel; in other cases he may be protected in certain respects, but so may ox or an ass” This is the observation of L.T. Hobhouse. But many sociologists prefer to treat slavery as an industrial system rather than a system of social stratification. But this view is not entirely convincing. It may be argued that in fed together with a system of ranks. Hence if we examine social stratification in terms of social inequalities we can legitimately regard slavery as a system of stratification.

In slavery, “every slave has his master to whom he is subjected”. The master’s power over his slave is unlimited. Slaves are in lower condition and have no political rights. The basis of slavery is economic.

2. **Estates:** The feudal estates of medieval period have also been the basis of social stratification. The feudal estates were legally defined. They represented as broad division of labour having definite function to perform. The mobility was ordained to defend all, the clergy to pay for all, and the commons to provide food for all. Besides this, the feudal estates were political groups. Their system was complex and varied.
3. **Caste:** The Indian caste system is also a unique system of social stratification. In the first place, caste is connected with economic differentiation. It is more apparent when we consider the four traditional Varnas where there is clear specification of occupation. In the traditional village economy caste is a occupational group.

4. **Social class and Social status:** A social class system is based on economic consideration. It represents to the groups of industrial societies. Thus industrial society is divided into various classes such as upper class, middle class, and lower class etc., The organization of these is hierarchical.

13.7 Origin of Social Stratification:

There are two main theories concerning the origin of “social stratification”

1. Theory of economic determinism of Karl Marx, which is often referred to as the conflict theory and
2. The functionalist theory.

1. **Theory of economic Determinism or the Conflict Theory:** According to Marx, economic factors are responsible for the emergence of different social strata or social classes. Therefore, social classes are defined by their relation to the means of production (i.e. by their ownership or own-ownership). Thus, there are, in every society two mutually conflicting classes – the class of the capitalists and the class of the workers or the rich and the poor. Since these two classes have mutually opposite interests, conflicts between the two are inevitable—Marx maintained.

Gumplowicz and Oppenheimer and others have argued that the origin of social stratification is to be found in the conquest of one group by another. The conquering group normally dominates the conquered. The conquered group is forced to accept the lower status and lower class life. C.C. North also has expressed more or less the same opinion.

2. **Functionalist Theory:** Kingsley Davis, P.A. Sorokin, Maclver and others have rejected the conflict theory of Marx. Sorokin maintained that conflict may facilitate stratification but has never originated it. He attributed social

stratification mainly to inherited individual differences in environmental conditions.

Kingsley Davis has stated that the stratification system is universal. According to him, it has come into being due to the functional necessity of the social system. The main functional necessity is “the requirement faced by any society of placing and motivating individuals in the social structure...” Social stratification is an unconsciously evolved device by which societies ensure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons.

The Conflict Theory of Marx emphasizes conflict between large and stable groups, with strong community sentiments, while the Functional Theory emphasizes the integrating function of social stratification based upon individual merit and reward. Both have their own merits and demerits.

13.8 Summary:

Differentiation is the law of nature . True, it is in the case of human society, Human society is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. Men differ from one other, in many respects. Human beings are equal so far as their bodily structure is concerned. Economic strata have existed in almost every society. In this materialistic philosophy. Marx has given enormous importance, in the economic analysis of strata but in place of strata he prefers the term ‘class’. Besides economic conception of stratification, there is also a political conception propounded by Gumplowicz and Ratzenhofer. According to these thinkers, stratification is derived from the conquests of divergent ethnic groups. According to M.M. Tumin the main attributes of stratification are Social, Ancient, Universal, in Diverse Forms and Consequential. The forms of social stratification as distinguished by sociologists are Slavery, Estates, Caste and Social class and status. There are two main theories concerning the origin of social stratification. They are Theory of economic determinism of Karl Marx, which is often referred to as the conflict theory and The functionalist theory.

13.9 Glossary:

Social Stratification
Economic determinism
Social differentiation
Social inequality
Homogeneity

13.10 Model Questions:

1. What is Social Stratification? Discuss characteristics and functions of Social Stratification?
2. Explain various forms and theoretical perspectives on Social Stratification?

13.11 References:

1. Johnson, H.M.: Sociology, Allied Publishers, Bombay, 1960
2. Majumdar, D.N. and Madan, T.N.: An Introduction to Social Anthropology, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1956.
3. Maciver, R.M.: Society: A text book of Sociology, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1945.
4. Shankara Rao C.N.: Sociology , Primary Principles, S Chand & Co. Ltd., New-Delhi.
5. Srinivas M.N.: Caste in Modern India and other Essays, Bombay: Media Promoters & Publishers, 1985.

Writer:

Dr.V. Venkateswarlu

Asst,Professor

Dept. Of Sociology & Social Work

Acharya Nagarjuna University.

Guntur – 522 510

Lesson: 14

SOCIAL CHANGE FACTORS AND THEORIES

14.0 Objective:

The main objective is to understand the concept of Social Change , Factors and Theories of Social Change.

Contents:

- 14.1 Introduction
- 14.2 Meaning and Definition of Social Change
- 14.3 Nature and Characteristics of Social Change
- 14.4 Social Change and Cultural Change
- 14.5 Causes of Social Change
- 14.6 Sources of Social Change
- 14.7 Factors of Social Change
- 14.8 Theories of Social Change
- 14.9 Summary
- 14.10 Glossary
- 14.11 Model Questions
- 14.12 References

14.1 Introduction:

Change is an ever present phenomenon everywhere. An ancient Greek Philosopher Heraclitus in an emphatic way hinted at this fact when he said that it is impossible for a man to step into the same river twice. It is impossible, because in the interval of time between the first and the second stepping both the river and the man have changed. Neither remains the same. “This is the central theme of the everything but change itself”. The order that is society, is after all the changing order. Ever since Comte,

sociologists have faced two large social questions—the question of social statics and the question of social dynamics, what is and how it changes. The sociologist is not satisfied when he has outlined the structure of society. He seeks to know its causes also. Thus, the Roman Poet Lucretius remarks, “Happy is he who can know the causes of things”. The casual curiosity of a sociologist never rests; nothing stills his desire to know and to understand. He is engaged in an endless endeavour to unravel the mystery of social change. Social change is indeed a perplexing problem. Nothing social remains the same nothing social abides.

Changes in the Law of Nature :

The nature is never at rest. It is changeful. Change is ever present in the world, because change is the Law of Nature. Similarly, society is not at all a static phenomenon, but it is a dynamic entity. It is an “on-going process”. Society is subject to constant changes. Social change has occurred in all societies and at all times. Of all the objects we study, none changes before our very eyes as the society itself. Every society and culture, no matter how traditional and conservative, is constantly undergoing change. Society changes in ceaseless flux and flow.

Incessant changeability is the very inherent nature of the human society. Individuals may strive for security and stability; societies may foster an illusion of permanence and the belief in eternity may persist unshaken. Yet the fact remains true that society like all other phenomenon changes inevitably. Society is influenced by many forces and factors that irresistibly cause changes. India of today is different from the India of yesterday; what it is going to be tomorrow is hence, difficult to predict. In course of a decade or two, significant changes can and do occur in human society. The territory which the sociologist explores, changes even as he explores it. This fact has an important bearing both on his methods and on his results. Here at least we can seek the principles of eternal change. What then, do we mean by change? And social change?

14.2 Meaning and Definition of Social Change:

Any alteration, difference or modification that takes place in a situation or in an object through time can be called change. The term 'social change' is used to indicate the changes that take place in human interactions and interrelations. Society is a "web of social relationships" and hence 'social change' obviously means a change in the system of social relationships. Social relationships are understood in terms of social processes and social interactions and social organization. Thus the term 'social change' is used to desirable variations in social interaction, social processes and social organization. It includes alterations in the structure and functions of the society.

Definition

1. M.E. Jones: "Social change is a term used to describe variation in, or modifications of any aspect of social processes, social patterns, social interaction or social organization".
2. Kingsley Davis: "By social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organization, that is structure and functions of society".
3. Majumdar, H.T. "Social change may be defined as a new fashion or mode, either modifying or replacing the old, in the life of a people—or in the operation of society.
4. Maclver and Page: "Social change refers to 'a process' responsive to many types of changes; to changes in the manmade conditions of life; to changes in the attitudes and beliefs of men, and to the changes that go beyond the human control to the biological and the physical nature of things."
5. Maclver (in some other context) also refers to social change as simply a change in the human relationships.

Social Change—A complex Phenomenon

"The fact of social change has fascinated the keenest minds and still poses some of the great unsolved problem in social science." The phenomenon of social change is not simple but complex. It is difficult to understand this phenomenon in its entirety. The unsolved problems are always pestering and pressurizing us to find an appropriate answer. Some such problems are as follows—What is the direction of social change?

What is the form of social change? What is the source of social change? What are its causes? Its consequences? What are its conditions and limitations? What is the rate of change? Whether the changes are due to human engineering or the uncontrollable cosmic design? Is it necessary to control social change? Can man, regulate it to suit his conveniences? Can he regulate and decide the direction of social change to satisfy his desires? These are some of the translating questions—tantalising not only because of their complexity but also because of their human significance.

14.3 Nature and Characteristics of Social Change

1. **Social Change is Continuous:** Society is undergoing endless changes. These changes cannot be stopped. Society cannot be preserved in a museum to save it from the ravages of time. From the dawn of history, down to this day society has been in continuous flux.
2. **Social Change is Temporal:** Change happens through time. Social change is temporal in the sense it denotes the time-sequence. In fact, society exists only as a time-sequence. As Maclver says, “it is a becoming, not a being; a process, not a product”. Innovation of new things, modification and renovation of the existing behaviour and the discarding of the old behaviour patterns take time. But the mere passage of time does not cause change as in the biological process of ageing.
3. **Social Change is Environmental:** It must take place within a geographic or physical and cultural context. Both these contexts have impact on human behaviour and in turn man changes them. Social changes never takes place in vacuum.
4. **Social change is Human Change:** The sociological significance of the change consists in the fact that it involves the human aspect. The composition of society is not constant, but changing. The fact that people effect change and are themselves affected by it make change extremely important.
5. **Social Change Results from Interaction of a Number of Factors:** A single factor may trigger a particular change, but it is always associated with other factors. The physical, biological, technological, cultural and other factors may,

together bring about social change. This is due to the mutual interdependence of social phenomenon.

6. **Social Change May Create Chain Reaction:** Change in one aspect of life may lead to a series of changes in its other aspects. For example, change in rights, privileges, and status of women has resulted in a series of changes in home, family relationships and structure, the economic and to some extent, the political pattern of both rural and urban society.
7. **Social Change Involves Tempo (or Rate) and Direction of Change:** In most discussions of social change some direction is assumed. This direction is most necessarily inevitable. Some times, the direction is determined ideally. Change towards such a destination is more appropriately regarded as progress. In actuality, social change may tend towards any direction. The tempo or the rate of change is also not governed by any universal laws. The rate of change varies considerably from time to time and society to society depending upon its nature and character—open and closed, rural and urban and others.
8. **Social Change may be Planned or Unplanned:** The direction and tempo of social change are often conditioned by human engineering. Plans, programmes and projects may be launched by man in order to determine and control the rate and direction of social change. Unplanned change refers to change resulting from natural calamities such as famines and floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, etc.,
9. **Short Versus Long-run Changes:** Some social changes may bring about immediate results while some others may take years and decades to produce results. This distinction is significant, because a change which appears to be very vital today may be nothing more than a temporary oscillation having nothing to do with the essential trends of life, some years later. This is what historians mean when they say that time alone can place the event of the day in their true perspective.

10. Social Change is an Objective Term: The term social change describes one of the categorical processes. It has no value-judgments attached to it. To the sociologist social change as a phenomenon is neither moral nor immoral, it is a moral. It means the study of social change involves no-value-judgment. It is ethically neutral. One can study change even within the value system without being for against the change.

14.4 Social Change and Cultural Change:

The difference between social change and cultural change has a great sociological importance. By 'social change' is meant only such alterations as occur in social organization, that is structure and functions of society. Social change, in this sense, is only a part of what is essentially a broader category called "cultural change". The term "cultural change", according to Kingsley Davis, "embraces all changes occurring in any branch of culture including art, science, technology, philosophy, etc., as well as changes in the forms and rules of social organization." As he says, cultural change is broader than social change, and social change is only a part of it.

All social changes are cultural changes, but all cultural changes need not necessarily be the social changes also. Cultural changes can be called social changes only when they affect human relations and the social organization and cause some variation in them. Ex. Changes in the musical styles, painting styles, rules of writing poetry and drama, pronunciation of words, etc., represent cultural changes. They are purely cultural changes. They cannot be called social changes, because, they do not in any way affect the existing pattern of human interactions, social system and social organization.

On the other hand, the rise of organized labour in the capitalistic society and the introduction of communism in the place of democracy, represent social change. These two changes may cause a series of changes in human relations and social organization. They represent a basic alteration in the relation of employer and employee, rulers and the ruled. They may contribute to the changes in the economic organization, methods of administration, legislations, economic policies and programmes and so on. These may, in

course of time affect the way of life of people. Hence, they can also be called cultural changes.

Cultural change, is thus much broader than the social change. No part of culture is totally unrelated to the social order, but it remains true that changes sometimes occur in these branches without noticeably affecting the social system. Sociologically, therefore, we are interested in cultural change only to the extent that it arises from or has an effect on social organization

14.5 Causes of Social Change:

Social change is a complex phenomenon in which the cause and effect relationship is not always clear. No single cause produces single effect in the social world. There is always the plurality of causation. Several factors or causes operate together to produce the same results.

According to Harry M. Johnson the causes of social change are of three types

1. Firstly, the causes of social change are inherent either in social system in general or in particular kinds of social system.
2. Secondly, the change may be due to some impact from the social environment of the social system of reference.
3. Finally, change may also be due to some impact from the non-social environment.

He is of the opinion that these are combined in various ways. One change may lead to a series of changes. The component parts of the social system are so interrelated that any change in one causes adjustive changes in the others.

A. Internal Causes of Social Change:

1. **Strain and Conflict:** Conflict of interests is always present to some extent in all the social systems. It is more evident in the political field. The concept of power

virtually implies the idea of conflicting purposes. In the stable social systems conflicts of interest are settled largely within institutionalized rules. No society is free from conflict is always present at all times between those whom the existing system is benefiting more and those whom it is benefiting less. This conflict will become manifest if the disadvantages are made to feel that the existing order is not the only realistically possible order.

2. **Social Problems:** Problems such as caste prejudices, prostitution, juvenile delinquency, over 'population, unemployment, poverty, beggary, the need for slum clearance, etc., involve a good deal of social conflict, in the course of which social change occurs. These are social problems. They arise mainly due to some internal deficiencies. Therefore, if they are to be solved or reduced, the existing social order will have to be changed to some extent. Thus, an attempt to tackle social problem may contribute to social change. For example, in order to reduce the size of the growing population in India, people may have to be convinced of the importance of following birth control measures, family planning, etc., This may affect the value system, marriage and family system and moral system of India.
3. **Revolutions and Upheavals:** The most intense conflict in a society is found during a revolution. Various internal factors may contribute to it. For example, the American Revolution, the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution took place due to several factors such as –exploitation, suppression of liberty, hunger, tyranny, bad roads, commercial restrictions, corruption, military or diplomatic defeat, famine, high prices, low wages, unemployment, and so on. These revolutions brought about far-reaching changes.
4. **Cultural Change:** Cultural innovation also contributes to social change. An innovation is a new combination of old elements which may come from the innovator's own society or from some other. The diffusion of culture within

society and from one society to another has been a great source of social and cultural change in every society.

B. The Impact of the Social and Non-social Environment:

The environment, whether social or nonsocial, has its own influence on social structure. As far as social change is concerned, the impact of the social environment is more important than the impact of the nonsocial environment.

The impact of the non-social environment on the social structure is relatively slight under normal conditions. Changes in the non-social environment (which are due to human engineering) such as – soil erosion, deforestation, exhaustion of mineral resources, etc., may bring about some social changes. Changes in the nonsocial environment due to nature itself such as – floods and famines, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, cyclones and hurricanes, etc., may sometimes cause adoptive social changes.

The influence of the Social Environment is more significant in bringing about social changes. Shifts of political alliances, military invasions, peaceful immigration, trade shifts, etc., can present difficult problems of adjustment to the social system. Any one of these changes is likely to affect some parts of the social structure first and then have effects in others parts later.

14.6 Sources of Social Change:

Sociologists have been debating and discussing the question of the sources of social change. Cultural anthropologists are more interested in this topic. There are two groups among them (1) the Diffusionists, and (2) the Inventionists.

1. **According to the diffusionists:** Social or cultural change takes place due to cultural diffusion. Diffusion refers to the introduction of a behaviour modification from another culture. It denotes the spread of elements of culture, either singly or in a complex, from one local group to another local group. It is less frequently used to refer to dissemination within a group. The argument of the diffusionists is that since inventions do not take place all the time and in all the societies in the same manner, every society borrows the cultural elements of another society for its progress directly or indirectly. They have cited the example of several tribes who could achieve progress by borrowing the cultural elements from the other groups. It takes very long time for a society to achieve progress if it fails to get profited by the achievements of others. For example, the Maori people of New Zealand became civilized within one hundred years by borrowing many cultural elements from others. Thus, according to the diffusionists, the source of social change is to be found in cultural diffusion.
2. **According to the Inventionists:** The source of social change is to be found in the inherent capacity of the people to make inventions. They have said that inventions constitute the major source of social change. Invention, whether in the field of social organization or the cultural framework, refers to the rearrangement of known traits into new patterns or configurations. These inventions, whether material or non-material, have led to profound social changes. The invention of electricity, for example, has led to astounding changes in the fields of industry, agriculture, communication, transport and so on. Inventionists have argued that it is wrong to assume that social change always takes place due to cultural diffusion. They have criticized the argument of diffusionists that many of the elements of South American culture have been borrowed from India, Egypt, Jawa, Polynesia and other places. They have contended that people are capable of initiating changes on their own.

14.7 Factors of Social Change:

1. **Biological Factors:** Under biological factors of social change we include (i) The plants and animals in the area and (ii) human beings themselves. The non-human biological environment affects human, social and cultural life. Man utilizes the available plant and animal life in ways determined by his culture. The human biological environment includes the factors that determine the numbers, the composition, the selection and the hereditary quality of the successive generations.
2. **The Physical Factors:** The surface of our planet is never at rest. There are slow geographical changes as well as the occasional convulsions of nature in storm, earthquakes and floods. Besides the seasonal changes there are sometimes epochal changes which raise and submerge portions of the earth's surface. These changes in the physical environment sometimes bring about important changes in society.
3. **The Technological Factors:** Technology affects society greatly in that a variation in technology causes a variation in some institution or custom. The introduction of machine technology as a result of the discovery the new sources of energy has had such far-reaching consequences that it is often described as a "revolution." Invention and discovery are significant characteristics of our age. The present age is often called the "age of power", the "scientific age." Changes in the production, agricultural techniques, means of communication, means of transportation, material inventions are the subsequences of technological development.
4. **The Cultural Factors—The Cultural LAG:** Before we examine the influence of cultural factors on social change. We shall first explain the concept of 'social lag' or 'cultural lag'. The concept of cultural lag has come to occupy an important place in the writings of eminent sociologists. It is a concept that has a particular appeal in an age in which technological invention and innovation of many kinds are constantly disturbing the older ways of living. Ogburn was the first sociologist to elaborate the idea of cultural lag and to formulate a definite theory. In his words "The strain that exists between two correlated parts of culture that change at unequal rates of speed may be interpreted as a lag in the part that is changing at the slowest rate for the one lags behind the other." It may also be noted that

culture not only influences our social relationship, it also influences the direction and character of technological change.

14.8 Theories of Social Change:

The Direction of Social Change:

Early sociologists viewed the culture of primitive peoples as completely static, but this was abandoned with the appearance of scientific studies of pre-literate cultures. Anthropologists now agree that primitive cultures have undergone changes. Although at such a slow pace as to give the impression of being stationary. In recent years the social change has proceeded at a very rapid rate. Various theories have been advanced to explain the direction of social change. We take a brief consideration of each of them.

1. **Theory of Deterioration:** Some thinkers have identified social change with deterioration. According to them man originally lived in a perfect state of happiness in a golden age. Subsequently, however, deterioration began to take place with the result that man reached an age of de-generation. The modern age is the age of kaliyuga wherein man is deceitful, treacherous, false, dishonest.

Cyclic Theory:

1. **Spengler Theory:** Spengler developed a version of psychological theory of social change. He analyzed the history of various civilizations including the Egyptian, Greek and Roman and concluded that all civilizations pass through a similar cycle of birth, maturity and death. The western civilization is now on its decline which is unavoidable.
2. **Pareto's Theory:** Vilfredo Pareto propounded the theory that societies pass through the periods of political vigor and decline which repeat themselves in cyclical fashion. The society according to him, consists of two types of people – (1) who like to follow traditional ways whom he called reentries, and those who like to take chances for attaining their ends whom he called as Speculators.

Speculators arise from among the subjugated to become the new ruling class and overthrow the old group. Then the cycle begins.

3. **Linear Theory:** Some thinkers subscribe to the linear theory of social change. According to them society gradually moves to an even higher state of civilization and that it advances in a linear fashion and in the direction of the improvement.
4. **Auguste Comte's Theory:** Auguste Comte postulated three stages of social change: The theological, The metaphysical and the positive. Man has passed through the first two stages, even though in some aspects of life they still prevail and is gradually reaching the positive stage.
5. **Herbert Spencer's Theory:** Herbert Spencer, who likened society to an organism, maintained that human society has been gradually progressing towards a better state.. In its primitive state, the state of militarism, society was characterized by warring groups. By merciless struggle for existence. From militarism society moved towards a state of industrialism in which greater differentiation and integration of its parts.

Some Russian Sociologists also subscribed to the linear theory of change Nikolai K. Mikhailovsky opined that human society passes to three stages:

- (1) The objective anthropocentric
- (2) The eccentric and
- (3) The subjective anthropocentric.

In the first stage man considers himself the centre of the universe and is pre-occupied with mystic beliefs in the super natural. In the second stage, man is given over to abstractions and in third stage man comes to rely upon empirical knowledge.

Deterministic Theories of Social Change:

The deterministic theory of social change is a widely accepted theory of social change among contemporary sociologists. Keller maintained that conscious effort and rational planning have very little chance to effect change unless and until the folk ways and mores are ready for it. Social change is an essentially irrational and unconscious process.

Karl Marx Theory:

Karl Marx held that human society passes through various stages, each with its own well defined organizational system. Each successive stage comes into existence as a result of conflict with the one proceeding it. Change from one stage to another is due to changes in the economic factors, namely the methods of production and distribution. The material forces of production are subject to change, and thus a rift arises between underlying factors and the relationships built upon them.

Functionalists Theories

1. **Parsons' Theory of Social Change:** Parsons considers change “not as something that disturbs the social equilibrium, but as something that alters the state of the equilibrium so that a qualitatively new equilibrium results”. He has stated that changes may arise from two sources. They may come from outside the society, through contact with other societies. They may also come from inside the society, through adjustments that must be made to resolve strains within the system.
2. **R.K. Merton and others tried to overcome this limitation.** Merton writes, “The strain, tension, contradiction and discrepancy between the component parts of social structure” may lead to changes. Thus, in order to accommodate the concept of change within the functional model, he has borrowed concepts from conflict theories of change.

14.9 Summary:

The nature is never at rest. It is changeable. Change is ever present in the world, because change is the Law of Nature. Similarly, society is not at all a static phenomenon, but it is a dynamic entity. The difference between social change and cultural change has a great sociological importance. By 'social change' is meant only such alterations as occur in social organization, that is structure and functions of society. Social change, in this sense, is only a part of what is essentially a broader category called "cultural change". Biological factors, Technological factors, Physical factors and Cultural factors are the main factors that are leading to Social Change. Among theories of Social Change Deterioration theory, Cyclic theory, Linear theory and Functionalist theory are discussed as important theories.

14.10 Glossary:

Determinism

Deterioration

Functionalism

Cultural Lag

14.11 Model Questions:

1. Define Social Change ? analyze Characteristics and Factors of Social Change?
2. Explain various Theories of Social Change?

14.12 References:

1. Johnson, H.M.: Sociology, Allied Publishers, Bombay, 1960
2. Majumdar, D.N. and Madan, T.N.: An Introduction to Social Anthropology, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1956.
3. Maciver, R.M.: Society: A text book of Sociology, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1945.
4. Shankara Rao C.N.: Sociology , Primary Principles, S Chand & Co. Ltd., New-Delhi.

5. Srinivas M.N.: Caste in Modern India and other Essays, Bombay: Media Promoters & Publishers, 1985.

Editor:

Dr.V. Venkateswarlu

Asst,Professor

Dept. Of Sociology & Social Work

Acharya Nagarjuna University

Guntur – 522 510

Writer:

Dr. M. Trimurthi Rao

Asst. Professor,

Dept. of Sociology & Social Work,

Acharya Nagarjuna University.

Guntur – 522 510

Lesson 15

Caste as a Dimension of Stratification

15.0 Objective:

The objectives of this lesson is to explain the Caste as a Dimension of Stratification and Cultural and Structural View and Perspectives of Caste system.

Contents

- 15.1 Introduction
- 15.2 TheOriginof theWord‘Caste’
- 15.3 Origin of Caste
- 15.4 Definitionof Caste
- 15.5 Characteristics of Caste
- 15.6 Caste as a Unit and a System
- 15.7 Caste–Cultural and Structural Concepts
- 15.8 ProminentViewaboutCaste
- 15.9 PerspectivesofCasteSystem
- 15.10 Indological–ReligiousPerspective
- 15.11 Social–AnthropologicalPerspective
- 15.12 TheInstitutionalistPerspective
- 15.13 Summary
- 15.14 TechnicalTerms
- 15.15 SelfAssessmentQuestions
- 15.16 ReferenceBooks

15.1 Introduction

Societies are divided into hierarchical groups in a way that though various groups are considered in equal in relation to each other but within one group, members are viewed as equals. Two main criteria of social stratification are caste and class, but some other recognized units of stratification are age, gender and race/ethnicity too. Social stratification is different from social differentiation.

The term ‘differentiation’ has broader application as it makes individuals and groups separate and distinct from each other for purposes of comparison. For example, within class strata, income, occupation, and education provide basis for differentiation and comparison. Stratification occurs where differences are ranked hierarchically.

15.2 TheOriginoftheWord‘Caste’

The term ‘Caste’ is derived from the Spanish (also Portuguese) word ‘caste’ meaning ‘bread’ or ‘lineage’. The Portuguese used the term ‘caste’ first to denote the divisions in the Indian caste system. The word ‘caste’ also signifies ‘race’ or ‘kind’. The Sanskrit word for caste is ‘Varna’ which means ‘colour’. Races and colour seem to be the bases of Indian caste in addition to the division of labour and occupation. The popular equivalent of caste is ‘Jati’.

15.3 Origin of Caste System

The caste stratification of the Indian Society has had its origin in the 'Chaturvarna' system. According to the Chaturvarna doctrine, the Hindu society was divided in four main varnas namely: the *Brahmins*, the *Kashtriyas*, the *Vaishyas*, and the *Shudras*. The Varna system which was prevalent during the Vedic period was mainly based on the division of labour and occupation. The Caste system owes its origin to the Varna system. The present caste system can be said to be the degenerated form of the original Varna system. Varnas which were four in number and castes which are found in hundreds and thousands are not one and the same.

15.4 Definition of Caste

'Caste' is so complex a phenomenon which is difficult to define. Writers and thinkers are not unanimous in their opinion regarding caste, its definition and characteristics. Hence caste has been defined variously.

- i. Sir Herbert Risely: Caste is a "collection of families, bearing a common name, claiming a common descent, from a mythical ancestor, human and divine, professing to follow the same hereditary calling and regarded by those who are competent to give an opinion as forming a single homogeneous community".
- ii. MacIver and Page: "When status is wholly predetermined so that men are born to their lot without any hope of changing it, then the class takes the extreme form of caste."
- iii. C.H. Cooley: "When a class is somewhat strictly hereditary, we may call it a caste."
- iv. A.W. Green: "Caste is a system of stratification in which mobility up and down the status ladder, at least ideally may not occur".
- v. Ketkar: "A caste is a group having two characteristics; (i) membership is confined to those who are born of members and includes all persons so born, (ii) the members are forbidden by an inexorable social law to marry outside the group".
- vi. D.N. Majumdar and T.N. Madan have said that caste is a 'closed group'.

15.5 Characteristics of Caste

The caste system is highly complex in nature. As Dr. G.S. Ghurye says, any attempt to define caste is 'bound to fail because of the complexity of the phenomenon'. He describes the characteristics of caste in his 'Caste and Class in India' – 1950-56 (also in his Caste, Class and Occupation – 1961 and Caste and Race in India – 1970). The following have been the main traditional features of the caste system.

- a) **Caste - As a Hierarchical Division of Society.** The Hindu society is gradational one. It is divided into several small groups called castes and sub castes. A sense of 'highness' and 'lowness' or 'superiority' and 'inferiority' is associated with this gradation or ranking. The Brahmins are placed at the top of the hierarchy and are regarded as 'pure' supreme or superior. The degraded caste or the so called 'untouchables' (Harijans) have occupied the other end of the hierarchy. All over India neither the supremacy of the Brahmins nor the degraded position of the Harijans or 'outcastes' has been questioned. It is taken for granted, but regarding the exact position of the intermediary castes there are disputes on the part of the members.
- b) **Caste – As a Segmental Division of Society.** The Hindu society is a caste-ridden society. It is divided into a number of segments called 'castes'. It is not a homogeneous

society. Castes are groups with defined boundary of their own. The status of an individual is determined by his birth and not by selection nor by accomplishments. No

amount of power, prestige and pelf can change the position of man. The membership of the caste is hence unchangeable, unacquirable, inalienable, unattainable and nontransferable. Further, each caste in a way, has its own way of life. Each caste has its own customs, traditions, practices and rituals. It has its own informal rules, regulations and procedures. There were caste councils or 'caste panchayats' to regulate the conduct of members also. The caste used to help its members when they were found in distress. Indeed, 'the caste was its own ruler'.

15.6 Caste as a Unit and a System

In India, both caste and class are used as basis of hierarchical ranking and exist side by side. However, caste, which is rooted in religious belief, is considered a more important basis of social stratification for social, economic, and religious purposes. 'Caste' is a hereditary social group which does not permit social mobility to its members. It involves ranking according to birth which affects one's occupation, marriage, and social relationships.

Caste is used both as a unit and as a system. As a unit, caste is defined as 'a closed-rank status group', i.e., a group in which the status of members, their occupations, the field of mate-selection, and interaction with others is fixed. As a system, it refers to collectivity of restrictions, namely, restrictions on change of membership, occupation, marriage, and commensal and social relations. In this context, there is a presupposition that no caste can exist in isolation and that each caste is closely involved with other castes in the network of economic, political, and ritual relationships. The 'closed-rank group' feature of caste also explains its structure.

15.7 Caste-Structural and Cultural Concepts

Caste is looked upon as a structural as well as a cultural phenomenon. As a structural phenomenon, it refers to interrelated statuses, patterned interaction among castes on the basis of different restrictions, and a stable set of social relations. As a cultural phenomenon, it is viewed as 'a set of values, beliefs and practices'. Most scholars have viewed caste as solidarity and not as a set of values and attitudes. The structure of the caste system is such that it has an organised pattern of interrelated rights and obligations of members of each caste and individual castes as groups, in terms of statuses, roles and social norms.

In structural terms, Bougie has explained castes as "hereditarily specialised and hierarchically arranged groups", while as a system, he has referred to its three characteristics: hierarchy, hereditary specialisation, and repulsion. Explaining the last characteristic, he claims that different castes repel rather than attract each other. Repulsion is manifested in endogamy, commensal restriction, and social contact. This interpretation is, however, not true. We do not and cannot find repulsion among castes because they need each other.

Gough views castes as "ranked birth-status groups which are usually endogamous and tend to be associated with an occupation". Senart (1930) has described caste as "a closed corporation, rigorously hereditary, bound with others (castes) by common occupation, and equipped with a council that rules its members by the sanction of certain penalties".

In this definition, the words 'closed corporation' have been questioned. Besides, all castes do not have councils. Bailey and Srinivas have viewed castes as structures and have avoided the definition of caste. Dutt, describing caste system has referred to restrictions on marriage, eating and drinking, occupation, change in hereditary membership, and the hierarchical gradation of castes. Morris also believes that a short definition of caste is not satisfactory so it is

more illuminating to talk in terms of the characteristics of cast" He describes castesystemas"characterisedbyhereditarymembershipandendogamyandprescribing specific norms which regulate social interaction". Ghurye too has given similar features of the caste system.

Besides, referring to hereditary membership, caste councils, hierarchy and endogamy as important features of the caste system, he also refers to the restrictions on feeding and social intercourse, lack of unrestricted choice of occupation, and civil and religious disabilities. D' Souza has referred to the definition of caste system as "the integration of the interacting and heterogeneous but internally homogeneous hereditary groups into a structure of status hierarchy". This concept not only describes the caste system as a superior or subordinate relationship among hereditary groups in a society, but also explains the conditions under which such a relationship takes place.

Singh holds that structurally, the caste system simultaneously manifests two tendencies: one, segmental and other, organic. As a segmental reality, each caste or a sub-caste tends to articulate mutual repulsion, social distance and social inequality, but as an organic system, the caste segments are mutually interlinked by a principle of reciprocity through the jajmani system. Bailey (1960) has referred to caste stratification as a 'closed organic stratification' in contrast with the class principle which is based on 'segmentary stratification'. In the former, the social segments (castes or sub-castes) interact through cooperation and in the latter through competition.

Social Structural Aspects:

The caste system is a hierarchy of values in terms of the concept of purity and impurity. It is organized as a characteristic hereditary division of labour.

It is committed to organic coordination with the larger communities.

Dumont, the French sociologist used the term 'homo-hierarchy' meant for the minority opposition and mutual repulsion in the inter-caste relationship.

There is a lot of cooperation especially in the socio-religious lines between various castes.

Cultural Aspects:

The cultural or symbolic system of caste has the following important things: A hierarchy of values in terms of the concept of purity and impurity.

Hereditary transmission of psychological traits within caste groups.

The concept of karma and punarjanma giving one's attitudes and way of life. Commitment to caste occupation of caste style.

Tolerance of different styles of life of other castes.

15.8 Prominent views about caste

(1) The structural aspect of caste, which is explained by accepting it as a general principle of stratification; and

(2) Caste as a cultural system, which is understood in terms of prominence of ideas of pollution-purity and notions of hierarchy, segregation and corporateness. The structural view explains that stratification is a universal reality, and caste is, therefore, an aspect of this reality. The culturological view perceives caste as a distinct phenomenon found in Indian society in particular.

15.9 Perspectives of Caste System

Caste system in India has been studied from three perspectives i.e. Indological, Socio-Anthropological and Institutionalist. Indologists view caste from the scriptural point of view, Social-Anthropologists from the cultural point of view, and Sociologist from the point of view of stratification.

15.10 Indological-Religious Perspective

In the Indological-religious perspective, the exponents take their cue from the ancient scriptures and present their views on the origin, purpose, and future of the caste system. They hold the view that Varnas originated from Brahma and castes emerged as fissional units of the varna system.

The origin of Castes came due to the need and development of division of labour in the society. Brahmins were given the superior position in society because of their knowledge of scriptures and a belief in the divine right of Brahmins to interpret and administer rules in accordance with the dictates of ancient, divine and revered scriptures.

15.11 Social-Anthropological Perspective

The Social-anthropologists like Hutton, Risley, Kroeber and several others adopt a cultural perspective for explaining the origin, meaning and nature of Caste system. Their perspective takes four major directions: organizational, structural, institutional and relational.

The organizational and structural perspectives of Hutton consider caste as a unique system found in India. Structural aspect of caste explains that caste is a general form of stratification.

The structural view upholds the view that stratification is a universal reality and caste is therefore an aspect of reality.

15.12 The Institutionalist Perspective

The Institutionalist Perspective does not favour the view that caste is relevant only to India. It takes into account the presence of caste in ancient Egypt, Southern United States and some other societies.

The Relational perspective accepts the presence of caste situations in army, business, factories and some other social units, where a form of caste divisions are identified which are either present till today or have become almost obsolete.

The sociological perspective views caste system in terms of social stratification of society and as a hierarchical system of social inequality. The cultural view understands caste in terms of ideas of pollution, purity and notions of hierarchy, segregation and corporateness. It views castes as a distinct phenomenon.

15.13 Summary

Caste is the form of social stratification and the agencies of social mobility and selection. It decides largely the position that a man occupies in society. The range of one's social contracts is almost fixed by one's status in society. One's status is recognized mainly through one's caste or

class. The caste system is unique to India and it can influence and condition the way of life or the 'lifestyles' of people to a very large extent. The caste system is the basis of stratification in India.

Caste is looked upon as a structural as well as a cultural phenomenon. As a structural phenomenon, it refers to interrelated statuses, patterned interaction among castes on the basis of different restrictions, and a stable set of social relations. As a cultural phenomenon, it is viewed as 'a set of values, beliefs and practices'. Most scholars have viewed caste as solidarity and not as a set of values and attitudes. The structure of the caste system is such that it has an organised pattern of interrelated rights and obligations of members of each caste and individual castes as groups, in terms of statuses, roles and social norms.

15.4 Technical Terms

Ancestor

Hereditary

Divine

Homogeneous

Predetermined

15.15 Self Assessment Questions

1. Define the concept of Caste System.
2. Explain Cultural and Structural view of Caste system.
3. Discuss the Perspectives of Caste system.

15.16 Reference Books

1. **Ahuja Ram**: Indian Social System: Jaipur Rawat Publications: 1993
2. **Davis, Kingsley**: Human Society
3. **Singh, Yogendra**. Modernization of Indian Tradition (A systematic Study of Social Change). Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 1996
4. **Johnson, H.M**: An Introduction to Systematic Sociology
5. **Nobbs, Jack**: Society in Context
6. **MacIver & Page**: Society

Editor

Dr. M. Trimurthi Rao
Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Sociology & Social Work,
Acharya Nagarjuna University

Lesson Writer

Dr. Y. Ashok Kumar
Co-ordinator & Asst. Professor
Dept. of Sociology & Social Work
Acharya Nagarjuna University