INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY I

BA (SOCIOLOGY)
First Semester
IDE-SOC-1001-CC-1110

INSTITUTE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
RAJIV GANHI UNIVERSITY
ARUNACHAL PRADESH, INDIA-791 112

BOARD OF STUDIES

1. Dr. Bikash Bage Head of the Department Department of Sociology, RGU	Chairman
2. Prof. Kedilezo Kikhi Dept. of Sociology, Tezpur University Assam	Member
3. Prof. Simon John Samuel Arunachal Institute of Tribal Studies RGU, Rono Hills, Doimukh, Arunachal Pradesh	Member
4. Dr. S. Yadav Assistant Professor Department of Sociology, RGU	Member
5. Dr. Ashi Lama Associate Professor Department of Economics, RGU	Member
6. Dr. Nani Umie Assistant Professor Dept. of Sociology, RGU	Member
7. Dr. Padi Hana Assistant Professor Dept. of Sociology, RGU	Member
8. Prof. B. Panda Department of Sociology North Eastern Hills University, Shillong, Meghalaya	Member
9. Mr. Tamin Mili Assistant Professor Jawaharlal Nehru College, Pasighat, Arunachal Pradesh	Member

Authors: Dr. Bikash Bage, Associate Professor, Rajiv Gandhi University, Rono Hills, Doimukh, Arunachal Pradesh.

Ms. Chathiam Lowang, Assistant professor, Institute of Distance Education (RGU), Rono Hills, Domukh, Arunachal Pradesh.

About the University

Rajiv Gandhi University (formerly Arunachal University) is a premier institution for higher education in the state of Arunachal Pradesh. Late Smt. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, laid the foundation stone of the university on 4th February, 1984 at Rono Hills, where the present campus is located.

Ever since its inception, the university has been trying to achieve excellence and fulfill the objectives as envisaged in the University Act. The university received academic recognition under Section 2(f) from the University Grants Commission on 28th March, 1985 and started functioning from 1st April, 1985. It got financial recognition under section 12-B of the UGC on 25th March, 1994. Since then, Rajiv Gandhi University, (then Arunachal University) has carved a niche for itself in the educational scenario of the country following its selection as a university with potential for excellence by a high-level expert committee of the University Grants Commission from among universities in India.

The University was converted into a Central University with effect from 9th April, 2007 as per notification of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

The University is located at top Rono Hills on a picturesque tableland of 302 acres overlooking the river Dikrong. It is 6.5 km from the National Highway 52-A and 25 km from Itanagar, the State capital.   The campus is linked with the National Highway by the Dikrong Bridge.

The teaching and research programmes of the University are designed with a view to play a positive role in the socio-economic and cultural development of the State. The University offers Undergraduate, Post- graduate, M. Phil and Ph.D. programmes. The Department of Education also offers the B.Ed. and M.Ed. programme.

There are 37 (Thirty-seven) colleges affiliated to the University. The University has been extending educational facilities to students from the neighbouring states, particularly Assam. The strength of students in different departments of the University and in affiliated colleges has been steadily increasing.

The faculty members have been actively engaged in research activities with financial support from UGC and other funding agencies. Since inception, a number of proposals on research projects have been sanctioned by various funding agencies to the University. Various departments have organized numerous seminars, workshops and conferences. Many faculty members have participated in national and international conferences and seminars held within the country and abroad. Eminent scholars and distinguished personalities have visited the University and delivered lectures on various disciplines.

The academic year 2000-2001 was a year of consolidation for the University. The switch over from the annual to the semester system took off smoothly and the performance of the students registered a marked improvement. Various syllabi designed by Boards of Post-graduate Studies (BPGS) have been implemented. VSAT facility installed by the ERNET India, New Delhi under the UGC-Infonet program, provides Internet access.

In spite of infrastructural constraints, the University has been maintaining its academic excellence. The University has strictly adhered to the academic calendar, conducted the examinations and declared the results on time. The students from the University have found placements not only in State and Central Government Services, but also in various institutions, industries and organizations.   Many students have emerged successful in the National Eligibility Test (NET).

Since inception, the University has made significant progress in teaching, research, innovations in curriculum development and developing infrastructure.

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE
INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY I

Syllabi	Mapping in Book
Unit I: SOCIOLOGY: DISCIPLINE AND PERSPECTIVE Thinking Sociologically Emergence of Sociology and Social Anthropology Impact of French and Industrial Revolution	**UNIT I: Discipline and perspective**
Unit II: Sociology and Other Social Sciences Sociology and Philosophy Sociology and Anthropology Sociology and History Sociology and Political Science	**UNITE II: Sociology and other Social Science**
Unit III: BASIC CONCEPTS Individual and group Associations and Institutions Culture and society Social Change	**UNITE III: Basic concepts**

CONTENTS

Name of the Unit

1.0. Course Introduction

The aim of is course is to have a broad introduction to the discipline of sociology. It familiarizes the students with the meaning, definition, history of the development of Sociology, its relationship with related disciplines of the social sciences and some of the fundamental concepts and concerns of the discipline". There are four Units (Chapters) in this course.

The first Block which is titled "**Introduction to General Sociology**" deals with Thinking Sociologically and emergence of Sociology and Social Anthropology.

Block 2discusses the relationship of Sociology with other Social Sciences, specifically, with Anthropology, Philosophy, History, and Political Science.

Block 3 which is titled "**Basic Concepts deals with** explains some of the basic concepts used in Sociology. They comprise "Individual, Social group, Society, Culture, Institution, Association, Social change. Therefore, in order to help the learner to comprehend the text, the Units have been arranged thematically under successive blocks. The Units under each Block have also been structured in order to help the learner. Every Unit begins with the "Structure" of the Unit and is followed by "Objectives", "Introduction", main content, Summary ("Let us sum up"), and "References". In order to make it engaging, exercises are inserted as "check your progress" wherever required. This exercise could also be useful as sample questions in examination point of view. The other important components for better comprehension of the Units are "further reading" and "glossary" which are appended at the end of the course.

Course Introduction

Sociology is a science based on the study of humans and their culture. It is a combination of the organized study of the growth, architecture, relationships and attitudes of systematic groups of human beings. Sociology paves the way for scientists, social thinkers and activists in understanding the society. It also helps them in improving the quality of life of the people living in the society. The basic principles of sociology are as follows: The behaviour of individuals in social groups is different than that when they are independent.

• Individuals who are part of a social group follow the rules of that social group.

• These rules are created and implemented socially.

• Some people have more authority in the creation of rules than others.

• Those that follow the rules are awarded and those who break them are penalized.

• The rules of social groups have a scientific base. In a society, culture is responsible for giving an identity to the individual. Culture is imbibed in an individual at the time of his birth and persists till his death.

This book—Introduction of Sociology—focuses on society, behaviour of individuals in societies, effects of culture on the human personality, characteristics, and types and functions of culture. It also analyses the relationship between social interaction and socialization. It familiarizes the reader with the basic concepts in sociology, such as customs, competition and

conflict, social institutions, roles, social control, formal and informal agencies of social control, polity and religion, and social conflict and social change. This book is written in a self-instructional format and is divided into seven units. Each unit begins with an Introduction to the topic followed by an outline of the Unit Objectives. The content is then presented in a simple and easy-to-understand manner, and is interspersed with Check Your Progress questions to test the reader's understanding of the topic. A list of Questions and Exercises is also provided at the end of each unit, and includes short-answer as well as long-answer questions. The Summary and Key Terms section are useful tools for students and are meant for effective recapitulation of the text.

Course organisation

Thereare four units in this course. Each unit is incorporate with a view to enables the student to have comprehensive knowledge in relevant topics. Further, for the convenient purpose each unit is divided into sub-headings. The themes focus on the following:
- Thinking Sociologically
- Emergence of Sociology and Social Anthropology
- Basic Concepts
- Social Change

UNIT 1: SOCIOLOGY: DISCIPLINE AND PERSPECTIVE

1.0.   Introduction

The basic premise of sociology is that human behavior is largely shaped by the groups to which people belong and by the social interaction that takes place within those groups. The main focus of sociology is the group not the individual. The sociologist is mainly interested in the interaction between the people - the ways in which people act towards respond and influence each other. Sociology is characterized by its approach to phenomena (the approach to science) and by its subject matter (human interaction). It is rightly defined as scientific study of human interaction. Sociology is about society, its constituent institutions, their inter relationship and the actors. Sociologists study the patterns in social interactions.

According to **Bogardus** sociology has a long past but only a short history. The earliest attempts at systematic thought regarding social life in the west may be said to have begun with the ancient Greek philosophers Plato and his disciple Aristotle. Plato's Republic is an analysis of the city community in all its aspects and in Aristotle's Ethics and Politics the first major attempt to deal systematically with the law, the society and the state. In 16th century writers like Hobbes and Machiavelli provided more clear distinctions between state and society. 'The Prince' of Machiavelli is an objective discussion of the state that he formulated on the basis of historical data. Sir Thomas Moore who in his book Utopia published in 1515 tried to deal with every day social problems by means of depicting an ideal social order out what really meant for emulation. Italian writer Vico and French writer Montesquieu contributed towards the scientific investigation of social phenomenon. Vico in his book The New Science contended that society was subject to definite laws that can be observed through objective observation and study. Montesquieu in his famous book The Spirit of Laws had analyzed the role that external factors especially climate play in the life of human society.

Sociology emerged in the context of twin revolution that is, the Industrial and French Revolutionand off course the intellectual movement which brought and raised fresh questions about their society in general. **Auguste Comte** (1798-1857), **Emile**

Durkheim(1858-1917)**, Herbert Spencer**(1820–1903)**Karl Marx** (1818-1883)and **Max Weber** (1864-1920,)**, etc. has given significant contribution towards the emergence of Sociology as an independent social science.** All these men were reacting to the crisis brought about in society by the flood of ideas upon which the revolutions were borne. Each searched for the dynamics that would explain the underlying causes of social change and in doing so they were also searching for the basis of social order. Therefore, while considering all such facts it is utmost necessary for us to understand the sociology in more in-depth manner. Therefore, in this chapter we will try to understand the meaning, definition, scope of Sociology along with its relations to other social sciences.

The word Sociology is being derived from a Latin and a Greek word. The Latin word *socius* meaning companion and the suffix *logy* is a Greek word meaning study. In simple words,Sociology is the scientific study of social life as identified by Ogburn and Nimkoff. In Sociology we study society, individuals and the interaction between the two as a whole. It emerged as a separate discipline in the late 18th and early 19th century because of the social changes taking place in the society namely because of French and Industrial revolution. An attempt was made by the early sociologists to evolve this discipline on the scientific lines. Some scholars belonging to this school are August Comte and Emile Durkheim.

1.1. UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:
- Thinking Sociologically
- Emergence of Sociology and Social Anthropology.
- Analyze the historical background for the emergence of sociology in 19ht Century.
- Can summarize the impact of French and Industrial Revolution in the emergence of sociology as an independent social science

1.2. Thinking Sociologically

The theory of "thinking sociologically" refers to the systematic approach used by sociologists to understand the intricate relationship between individual experiences and the wider society. This perspective is foundational in sociology, allowing for a deeper analysis of how personal lives are intertwined with social structures, cultural norms, historical contexts, and institutional influences.
Allan G. Johnson's work, particularly in The Forest and the Trees: Sociology as Life, Practice, and Promise, provides a foundational framework for understanding sociological thinking:

A) The Forest and the Trees Metaphor:

- The Trees: Individual actions, choices, and experiences.

- The Forest: The larger social systems, structures, and patterns that influence and shape these individual actions and experiences.
- Interconnectedness: Johnson emphasizes that understanding social phenomena requires looking at both the individual (trees) and societal (forest) levels. He argues that individuals are always part of larger social systems that shape their actions and opportunities.

B) Key Concepts:

- Social Systems: Individuals operate within social systems that influence their behavior. These systems provide contexts that make certain actions possible and others unlikely.
- Power and Inequality: Social systems are often characterized by unequal distributions of power and resources, affecting individuals differently based on their social positions.
- Agency and Structure: Johnson highlights the interplay between agency (the capacity of individuals to act independently) and structure (the social forces that constrain or enable actions).

C) Application:

- Example: In studying education, Johnson would encourage looking at how individual student experiences are shaped by broader social factors like socioeconomic status, educational policies, and cultural expectations.

Conclusion-
By thinking sociologically, we can better understand the complexities of social issues and develop more effective interventions that address both individual and structural factors. This holistic approach is essential for creating a more equitable and understanding society.

Meaning and definition of Sociology

Sociology is one of the significant subject to study. As it is significant because it is one of the branch of social science which study the Human Society in systematic and scientific manner. In short, we can say that, Sociology plays a significant role to understand human society their social relationships, social action, interrelation and institutions, etc. in more in-depth manner. Thereby, Sociology is also known as "science of society". However, the subject matter of Sociology subject is diverse, ranging from crime to religion, from the family to the state, from the divisions of race and social class to the shared beliefs and values of a common culture, and from social stability to radical change in whole societies, etc. Unifying the study of these diverse

subjects of study is purpose of the Sociology "to understanding how human action and consciousness both shape and are shaped by surrounding cultural and social structures" in a very relevance manner.

Etymology

The quest for understanding human society has begun centuries ago by many Philosophers, Scholars, Intellectuals, etc. since time immemorial. People have been thinking like sociologists long before sociology became a separate academic discipline: Plato and Aristotle, Confucius, Khaldun, and Voltaire all set the stage for modern sociology.

The term sociology was first coined in 1780 by the French essayist Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès (1748–1836) in an unpublished manuscript (Fauré et al. 1999). In 1838, the term was reinvented by Auguste Comte (1798–1857) The word "sociology" was first coined by Auguste Comte in his *The Course in Positive Philosophy* (1838). Where the term "Sociology "was derived from the **Latin** word *socius* (companion) and the **Greek** word *logos* (study of), meaning "the study of companionship." The reason why we called "Sociology as the Science of society".

While this is a starting point for the discipline, sociology is actually much more complex. Comte originally studied to be an engineer, but later became a pupil of social philosopher Claude Henri de Rouvroy Comte de Saint-Simon (1760–1825). They both thought that society could be studied using the same scientific methods utilized in natural sciences. Comte also believed in the potential of social scientists to work toward the betterment of society. He held that once scholars identified the laws that governed society, sociologists could address problems such as poor education and poverty (Abercrombie et al. 2000). Comte named the scientific study of social patterns positivism. He described his philosophy in a series of books called *The Course in Positive Philosophy* (1830–1842) and *A General View of Positivism* (1848). He believed that using scientific methods to reveal the laws by which societies and individuals interact would usher in a new "positivist" age of history. While the field and its terminology have grown, sociologists still believe in the positive impact of their work. In simple we can define sociology as the systematic study of society and social interaction. However, its uses many different methods to study a wide range of subject matter and to apply these studies to the real world.

Sociology is a social science that focuses on society, human social behaviour, patterns of social relationships, social interaction, and aspects of culture associated within everyday life.It uses various methods of empirical investigation and critical analysis to develop a body of knowledge about social order and social change. Following definition will enhance your understanding on Sociology as;

1.3.   Emeregence of Sociology and Social Anthropology

Sociology as a social sciences emerged from a tradition of reflection of social phenomena; interest in the nature of human social behavior and society has probably

always existed; however, most people in most past societies saw their culture as a fixed and god-given entity. This view gradually was replaced by more rational explanations beginning from the 17th century especially in Western Europe (Rosenberg, 1987). The sociological issues, questions and problems had been raised and discussed by the forerunners starting from the ancient Greek and Roman philosophers' and Hebrew prophets' times.

Sociology as an academic science was thus born in 19th century (its formal establishment year being 1837) in Great Britain and Western Europe, especially in France and Germany, and it greatly advanced throughout 19th and 20th centuries.

The development of sociology and its current contexts have to be grasped in the contexts of the major changes that have created the modern world (Giddens, 1986). The major conditions, societal changes, upheavals and social ferments that gave rise to the emergence and development of sociology as an academic science include the Industrial Revolution which began in Great Britain, the French Political Revolution of 1789, the Enlightenment and advances in natural sciences and technology. These revolutions had brought about significant societal changes and disorders in the way society lived in the aforementioned countries. Since sociology was born amidst the great socio-political and economic and technological changes of the western world, it is said to be the science of modern society.

The pioneering sociologists were very much concerned about the great changes that were taking place and they felt that the exciting sciences could not help understand, explain, analyze and interpret the fundamental laws that govern the social phenomena. Thus sociology was born out of these revolutionary contexts.

The founders or the pioneering sociologists are the following;

1.   Auguste Comte, French Social Philosopher (1798- 1857)
2.   Karl Marx(German,1818-1883)
3.   Herbert Spencer, British Social Philosopher,(1820-1903).
4.   Emile Durkheim, French Sociologist,(1858-1917)
5.   Max Weber, German Sociologist (1864-1920)

a) Emergence of Sociology

• Mid-19th Century:
Sociology emerged as a distinct academic discipline in the mid-19th century.

• Key Milestones:

1838: Auguste Comte, often called the "father of sociology," coined the term "sociology" in his work Cours de Philosophie Positive. He proposed a systematic science to study society.

Late 1800s: Pioneering works by Karl Marx, Émile Durkheim, and Max Weber laid the foundational theories for sociology. Durkheim's establishment of the first European department of sociology at the University of Bordeaux in 1895 marked a significant institutional development.

b) Emergence of Anthropology

- Mid-to-Late 19th Century:
Anthropology developed as a distinct academic discipline during the mid-to-late 19th century.

- Key Milestones:

1871: Edward Burnett Tylor published Primitive Culture, which is considered one of the first comprehensive anthropological studies. Tylor is often referred to as the "father of cultural anthropology."
Late 1800s: The establishment of anthropological societies and journals, such as the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (founded in 1871), helped formalize the discipline.

Early 1900s: Franz Boas, often called the "father of American anthropology," began to challenge earlier evolutionary theories and emphasize cultural relativism and fieldwork. His work in the early 20th century greatly influenced the development of anthropology as a rigorous scientific discipline.

Emergence of Anthropology

Intellectual Origins:

1) Exploration and Colonialism:

European colonial expansion in the 18th and 19th centuries exposed scholars to a vast diversity of cultures. The need to understand and manage colonial subjects led to the development of anthropological studies.
Travel Literature: Early travel writers and explorers documented their encounters with different cultures, laying the groundwork for anthropological inquiry.
2) Evolutionary Theories:

Charles Darwin: Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection influenced early anthropologists to think about the development of human societies in evolutionary terms.

Herbert Spencer: Applied evolutionary theory to social and cultural development, suggesting that societies evolve from simple to complex forms.

Key Figures and Theories:

1) Edward Burnett Tylor: Often regarded as the father of cultural anthropology, Tylor defined culture as a complex whole that includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, and customs. He advocated for a comparative method to study different societies.

2) Franz Boas: Known as the father of American anthropology, Boas emphasized cultural relativism and the importance of understanding each culture within its own context. He critiqued the evolutionary perspective and promoted ethnographic fieldwork.

3) Bronisław Malinowski: Pioneered participant observation and functionalism in anthropology. His work in the Trobriand Islands emphasized understanding the functions of cultural practices in maintaining social order.

Social and Historical Context:

1) Colonial Administration: The administration of colonial territories required knowledge of local customs, governance, and social structures. Anthropologists often worked to provide this information.

2) Globalization and Cross-Cultural Interaction: Increased global interactions brought about by trade, travel, and communication highlighted the need to understand cultural diversity and human commonalities.

Sociology question

How did the Intellectual forces lead to the emergence of Sociology?

Explain how sociology has emerged as a distinct discipline based on rationality and scientific temper.

1.3.1 Impact of French and Industrial Revolution

A). French Revolution

The French Revolution of 1789 marked a turning point in the history of human struggle for 'liberty, fraternity and equality' had contributed lots to the emergence of Sociology as an independent Social Science. It put an end to the age of feudalism and ushered in a new order of society. An important contribution of this revolution was the far-reaching changes that it brought, not only French society, but in societies throughout Europe. Even distant countries in other continents such as, India, were influenced by the ideas generated during this revolution. Ideas like liberty, fraternity and equality, which now form a part of the preamble to the Constitution of India, owe their origin to the French Revolution.

France, like other European countries during the eighteenth century, had entered the age of reason and rationalism. Major philosophers, whose ideas influenced the French people, were rationalists who believed that' all true things could be proved by reason'. Some of these thinkers were, Montesquieu (1689-1755), Locke (1632-

1704), Voltaire(1694-1778), and Rousseau (1712-1778).The ferment created by these ideas along with the prevailing social conditions in the French society led to the French Revolution which marked an end of despotic monarchy. It changed the political structure of European society and replaced the age of feudalism by heralding the arrival of liberal democracy.

The long series of political revolutions that were ushered in by the French Revolution in 1789 and carried over through the nineteenth century was the most immediate factor in the rise of sociological theorizing. The impact of these revolutions on many societies was enormous, and led to many positive and negative changes. These writers were particularly disturbed by the resulting chaos and disorder, especially in France and wanted to restore order in the society. The more rational thinkers recognized that social change had made such a return impossible. Thus, they sought instead to find new bases of order in societies that had been overturned by the political revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This interest in the issue of social order was one of the major concerns of classical sociological theorists, especially Comte, Durkheim, and Parsons, etc. which contributed immensely for the growth of Sociology as a scientific discipline.

B). Industrial Revolution

Another development of the late 18th and early 19th century, which also greatly shaped up the context for Sociology to emerge, was the Industrial Revolution. The early sociologists were greatly disturbed by the changes taking place in the society with the onset of industrialisation, which, with its massive rural to urban migration changed patterns of living, hardened an exploitative class structure all such themes which rose questions fundamental to the development of many sociological theories like Karl Marx's critique to Capitalism.

The Industrial Revolution was not a single event but refers to a set of interrelated developments that led to the transformation of the western world from a largely agrarian system to an overwhelmingly industrial one. It began around 1760 A.D. in England and brought about great changes in the social and economic life of the people, initially in England, and later spread to other countries of Europe. In Europe, especially England, the discovery of new territories, explorations, growth of trade and commerce and the consequent growth of towns brought about an increase in demand for goods. Within this system, a few profited greatly while the majority worked long hours and for a paltry amount of money.

During Industrial Revolution, new tools and techniques were invented, which could produce goods on a large-scale. Spinning Jenny, invented in 1767 by James Hargreaves, led to speeding up of production activity. Arkwright in 1769, invented another tool, called Arkwright's Water Fame which was so large that it could not be kept in one's home and a special building was required to set it up. On account of this, it is often said that the factory system was introduced. This led to a change in economy from a feudal to a capitalist system of production. Subsequently, a new class of capitalists emerged who controlled this new system of production. Due to this

revolution society moved from the old age of handmade goods to the new age of machine-made goods. This shift heralded the emergence of Industrial Revolution.

Impact of the Industrial Revolution on Society With the change in the economy, several changes in the society followed. As capitalism became more and more complex, the developments of banks, insurance companies, and finance corporations took place. New class of industrial workers, managers, capitalists emerged. The peasants in the new industrial society found themselves with thousands of other people like themselves, winding cotton in a textile mill. Instead of the open and bright countryside, they were now living in dirt and squalor.

With the increase in production, population started increasing. Rise of population accompanied by massive rural to urban migration led to urbanisation. The industrial cities grew rapidly. These industrial cities were marked by huge socioeconomic disparities.

These changes concerned both conservative and radical thinkers. The conservatives feared that such conditions would lead to chaos and disorder, while radicals like Friedrich Engels felt that the factory workers would initiate the working-class revolution leading to social transformation. Though the concerns were very different from one another, yet social thinkers of that time were united in the impact the Industrial Revolution would possibly cause. They also agreed upon the importance of the new working class.

Thus, important themes of the Industrial Revolution, which concerned the early sociologists were the condition of the labour, transformation of property, urbanization and technology, etc which play significant role in the emergence of Sociology as an independent Social Science.

Sociologyasscienceemploysperspectivesortheoriestounderstand,explain,analyz eandinterpretsocialphenomena.Tointerpretsocialfacts,theymustbesubjected   to   a theoretical framework. A theory may be defined as a general statement about how some parts oftheworldfittogetherandhowtheywork(Macionis,1997).

The major conditions, societal changes, upheavals and social ferments that gave rise to the emergence and development of sociology as an academic science include the *Industrial Revolution* which began in Great Britain, the French Political Revolution of 1789, the *Enlightenmen*t and advances in natural sciences and technology. These revolutions had brought about significant societal changes and disorders in the way society lived in the aforementioned countries. Since sociology was born amidst the great socio-political and economic and technological changes of the western world, it is said to be the science of modern society. Let's discuss twin revolution which contributed the emergence of Sociology as an independent Social Science in the below;

The pioneering sociologists were very much concerned about the great changes that were taking place and they felt that the exciting sciences could not help understand, explain, analyze and interpret the fundamental laws that govern the social phenomena. Thus, sociology was born out of these revolutionary contexts.

1.3.2. Factors responsible for rise of Sociology

1. Europe was undergoing a process of transformation, i.e. modernization. These changes created a situation of hope & despair- hope of a new era of progress but creating despair & disharmony at the same time. Sociology emerged as an attempt to understand these changes.

2. With the growth of science such beliefs like god created world collapsed. The new world was being created by human enterprise. To make sense of this newly emerging world, sociology emerged as a discipline.

3. Problems of emerging capitalist society created the need for the rise of this discipline.

4. Intellectual developments alongside the socio-economic changes provided the means for the development of sociology. Confluence of social & intellectual conditions produced sociology.

Economic, Political and Social Conditions:

Traditionally European society was a feudal society where feudal lord enjoyed autonomy within his own estate. Socially, it was a rigidly stratified society in form of estates. Each state was governed by his own laws and very little was produced for trade. Economy was a subsistence economy marked by absence of trade.

By the start of 14th century, this system was on decline as:

1. The trade enhanced and trade route to east was discovered by Marco Polo. Magnetic compass was discovered, gold and silver were brought to Europe. Thus, Commercial revolution swept across Europe. (Mercentile phase of capitalism)

2. Commercial revolution began and gradually there was a transition from feudal to capitalistic society (Feudal society was subsistence and slowly towards free market economy). This has led to growth of scientific agriculture. Enclosure movement began where wealthy merchants looked to reinvest surplus profits and they did so in land and they used it for scientific farming (Capitalistic transformation of agriculture) Mercentalistic phase was replaced by capitalistic transformation. They would take away the common lands of the village which was called Enclosure movement in Europe.

3. Putting out system: Capitalistic transformation forced peasants, artisans /rural dwellers to migrate towards urban areas in search of better opportunities (i.e. displacement occurred on the large scale). Big merchants put raw materials inside homes of artisans/ works man and finished products were taken away from their homes. Slowly this has transformed into factory system of production with advancements of science and technology. Steam engine and other machines were invented. Capitalistic system was slowly replaced by industrial capitalism.

Social Implications of these economic changes:

It led to generation of wealth for the first time leading to creation of bourgeoisie(by Karl Marx).On the other hand working class was created which was exploited by the ownership class/ bourgeoisie called proletariats.

The conditions of working class were extremely miserable:

1. Men were paid very less. This forced Women and children to work for long hours.
2. Poverty, disease, crime spread along with urbanisation.
3. Inequality increased and no society can survive along with growing inequalities.

Therefore 19th century witnesses crimes, wars and other forms of rebellions. Community life was gone as migrants moved towards urban areas. The locus of power shifted to wealthy class/bourgeoisie. This new class demanded political power and wanted that state should be run in a manner which suits their interests. At that time political power was wielded by monarchs, kings and nobility. Bourgeoisie challenged the right to rule of monarch. Earlier divine rights theory existed where it was said that 'king can do no wrong' i.e. king is divinely ordained to rule. But soon bourgeoisie realised that kings would not support their interests and challenged their right to rule.

Thus, subjects got transformed to citizens and were provided by certain inalienable rights (civic/political).This conflict became profound which mainly occurred in France. In an incident Charles –I was defeated and beheaded by the bourgeoisie. This occurred in 18th century leading to French revolution. This led to growth of Napolean. He challenged the right to rule Of king and popularised that there is nothing ordainly divine about the king's rule. In this way there was continuous turmoil politically in Europe. Historians call the century as century of wars. In 1870 Famous Paris Commune uprising where peasants uprooted the king. Thus entire 19th century is called the century of chaos. So, people thought of maintaining stability and order within the society as no society can survive in the continuous phase of turmoil.

Traditionally religion played key role in sustaining society but it has lost its faith among people to reorganise society. Therefore, there was a quest of new knowledge to rebuild or reconstruct society. These social conditions necessitated the study of Sociology.
So, these social conditions facilitated the need for new knowledge and intellectual conditions provided means for new knowledge.

How intellectual conditions facilitated growth of Sociology?
Earlier church believed that god created this whole world. Christianity suppresses knowledge based upon sensory observation. According to Christianity only revealed truth is the truth i.e. the knowledge which is acquired by the gifted individual 'the prophet'. Only prophet is capable of revealing the truth and one should unquestioningly follow that knowledge. Any deviance must be punished severely.
Around 14th century Europe witnessed intellectual ferment (growth of new ideas), which led to idea of Greek antiquity in Europe. These ideas found acceptance to people in Europe and came in conflict with Church. Greek philosophy believed that man is the finest creation of god and therefore each man is competent to discover his/her truth. Therefore, developed spirit of enquiry and using sensory data one does enquiry. By discovering nature, you serve god. By this way pursuit of knowledge gave rise to science. So, it was intellectual ferment which gave rise to science in modern Europe. Application of human reasons along with science governs laws that control society. This enlightenment thought represented modernity.

It was during this period August Comte gave the term Social Physics for study of society and later on coined the term Sociology in the year 1937.

Another thought emerged called anti modernity in France which was a conservative reaction to enlightenment thought. Louis De Bonard and Joseph De Maistre condemned French revolution and industrialisation as a journey to disaster, chaos. They said lets go and live in the past in the subsistence economy where people lived in harmony.

So it's the contribution of both modernity and anti-modernity that contributed to growth of Sociology. **Sociology:** Sociology is the study of human social relationships, Social process and social institutions, etc. Therefore, Sociology is considered as a 'Science of Society'.

Let Us Sum Up

This unit has defined Sociology and has discussed its nature and scope. Besides it has discussed the growth of Sociology from the writings of different thinkers. Moreover the unit has also discussed the relation of Sociology with some important disciplines of social sciences.. The term *sociology* is a combination of two words, *socius* and *logos*, which mean respectively *society* and *study.* Thus, a simple etymological definition of sociology is that it is the science of society. Sociology is a social or behavioral science that originated in the 19th century in Western Europe; its main concern is discovering the basic laws and principles that govern human social life, the social world, the working and development of society and its institutions. It grew out of the great revolutionary contexts, with great concern to address the social changes, disorders and problems of the modern world.

Learning sociology provides us with *sociological imagination*, an illuminating way of understanding the forces and factors that affect our lives as individuals, groups, communities and nations. Sociology provides us with much practical benefit and it contributes greatly to the solutions for contemporary societal problems.

Key Term

French Industrial Revolution: The French Revolution was a period of radical political and societal change in France that began with the Estates General of 1789 and ended with the formation of the French Consulate in November 1799. Its ideas of *Liberty, Equality and Fraternity* are considered as fundamental principles.

French Industrial Revolution: The Industrial Revolution was the transition to new manufacturing processes in Britain, continental Europe in the period from between 1760 to 1820 and 1840. This transition included going from hand production methods to machines, new chemical manufacturing and iron production processes, steam power, water power, the development of machine tools and the rise of the mechanized factory system.

Anthropology: The term *anthropology*has derived of Greek word'*anthrōpos'*, meaning "human being' and a latin-*logia*, means "study".Therefore, Anthropolgy is the study of human beings and their ancestors through time and space and in relation to physical character, environmental and social relations, and culture.

Sociology: is a study of human in society. It is a science of society studying social activities, relationship social institution and social behaviour.

Exercise

1.   What is Sociology? Is it a Science?
2.   Write an essay on the emergence of Sociology as an independent Social Science
3.   Impact of French and Industrial Revolution on the emergence of Sociology.
4.   How has Anthropology developed over the years, and what are its major theoretical frameworks?
5.   Discuss the scope and limitations of Anthropology.

Suggested Readings

Giddens, Anthony, 1989 :   *Sociology,* Polity Press, London.

Haralambos, M. (with R.M. Heald), 2004 edition: *Sociology-Themes and Perspectives,* Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Henslin, James M., 1995(8th edition) : *Down to Earth Scoiology –Introductory Readings*. The Free Press, London.

MC Kee, James B., 1981 :   *Sociology-The study of Society*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Ogburn and Ninkoff, 1972:   *A Hand Book of Sociology*, Eurasia Publishing House, New Delhi.

UNIT 2: Sociology and Other Social Sciences.

The Relationship between Sociology and Disciplines

Sociology occupies an important position among the disciplines, usually called the social sciences. These include sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics, political science, history and human geography. These disciplines are sometimes also referred to as behavioral sciences, as they study the principles governing human social behavior.

How is sociology related to other sciences? What are the similarities and differences? These are important questions. Sociology is similar with all other sciences in that it employs the scientific methods and its major aim is production of scientific knowledge. Sociology is related to other social and behavioral sciences in that all of them have more or less similar subject matter; they all in one way or another study society, human culture, social phenomena; and aim at discovering the laws that govern the social universe.

Relation of Sociology with Other Social Sciences.

2.2.   Sociology with History

Sociology and History are closely and intimately related to each other. Sociology cannot be separated from History and History cannot be isolated from sociology. That is why Professor G.E. Howard remarked "History is the past Sociology and Sociology is the present History", John Seely says that" History without Sociology has no fruit, Sociology without History has no root".

Herodotus (484 BC– 425 BC), a Greek historian, is often considered as the "father of history". And The foundations of modern-day sociology were laid through the works of Auguste Comte (January 19th, 1798 – September 5 1857).

History is mainly concerned with past events. It is systematic record of the story of mankind. History presents a chronological account of past events of the human society. It is the social science, which deals with past events and studies the past social, political and economic aspects of the country, According to Gettle

"History is the record of the past events and movements, their causes and inter-relations". It includes a survey of conditions, or developments in economic, religious and social affairs as well as the study of states, their growth and organization and their relation with one another.

Similarities

1. Both Sociology and History depend upon each other and can influence one another. Sociology depends upon History in order to study past events and situations. Say for example, if Sociology would like to study about family, marriage, religion, etc. it has to studies or depend upon the past or historical backgrounds of family, marriage and religion, etc. which directly or indirectly reflect the historical support to understand the said topics. As present knowledge could be more worthful if it'stake historical support or sources.

2. History of cultures and institutions is helpful in the understanding of sociology and on the collections of materials. In order to understand the past society and activities, we have to take the help of History.

3. Sociology concerned with the study of the historical development of human society. It studies ancient customs, modes of living, various stages of life and past social institutions through the historical analysis. This information about the past is of great importance to sociologists. For instance, if a sociologist has to study family and marriage as social institutions he has to study their historical developments also. Owing to this reason, Arnold Toynbee's book "A Study of History" and Spengler's book "Decline of the West" are very valuable of the study of sociology.

4. In the same way, Sociology provides social background of the study of History. History is now being studied from the sociological viewpoint. History supplies facts, which are interpreted and coordinated by the sociologists. The historians need social background for writing and analyzing history and this is provided by the sociologists. The study of History would be meaningless without the appreciation of sociological significance. History becomes meaningful in the social content.

Difference between Sociology and History:

The two social sciences History and Sociology are different. The points of difference between the two may be noted.

1. Sociology is interested in the study of the present social phenomena with all their complexities. But History deals with the past events of man. It is silent regarding the present.

2. Sociology is relatively a young social science. It has very short history of its own. It is not even two centuries old. But history is an age-old social science. It has a long story of 2000 years or even more.

3. Sociology is an analytical science. But history is a descriptive science.

4. Sociology is abstract in nature. It studies mostly regular, the recurrent and the universal. For example, the sociologist does not study all the wars or battles Waged

by the mankind. But History is concrete. The historian is interested in the unique, the particular and the individual. For example, the historian studies all the wars waged by mankind in the past-the wars, the world wars, the Indo-Pak war, etc. For him each war is unique and significant.

5. Sociology is a generalizing science. Sociology seeks to establish generalizations after a careful study of the social phenomena. But History is an individualizing science. History rarely makes generalizations. It seeks to establish the sequence in which events occurred.

6. Sociology follows the sociological approach. It studies human events from the sociological point of view, i.e., from the viewpoint of social relationship involved. But History studies human events in accordance with the time and order. Its approach is historical.

Sociology and History

History is the record of the life of societies of men, of the changes which the societies have gone through, of the ideas which have determined the actions of these societies and of the material conditions which have helped or hindered their development.

Sociology is concerned with the study of the historical development of the societies. It studies the various stages of life, modes of living, customs, manners and their expression in the form of social institutions. Sociology has thus to depend upon history for its material. Arnold Toynbee's book, "A Study of History" is proving very valuable in Sociology.

History supplies facts which are interpreted and co-ordinated by the sociologists. In the same way sociology gives the social background for the study of history. History is now being studied from the sociological point of view. It is rightly said that the Study of history would be meaningless without the appreciation of social significance.

If history is to be useful to understand the present and to serve as a guide for the future, sociological interpretation of facts is absolutely essential. It is because of their such mutual dependence upon each other that has led G. E. Howard to remark that History is past Sociology, and Sociology is present History.

History is concrete.	Sociology is abstract.
History deals with events in all their aspects.	Sociology studies events from the viewpoint of social relationship involved.

Check Your Progress 2

1) Briefly distinguish History from Sociology.

Conclusion

Sociology and History are closely related to each other. It is said that "History without Sociology has no fruit, while Sociology without History has no root".

Yet for all their closeness, both the branches of social science are distinct from one another. Sociology can be defined as a general science of human society as it uses various methods of empirical investigation and critical analysis to develop a body of knowledge. History includes the academic discipline to analyze a sequence of past events, investigate the patterns of cause and effect that are related to them. Hence, both are supplement and complement to each others.

2.3.   Sociology with Political Science

SIMILARITIES

1. Sociology and political science are so closely and deeply related to each other that one becomes meaningless without the other. According to Morris Ginsberg "Historically, Sociology has its main roots in politics and philosophy of history". The state, which is the center of political science in its early stage, was more of a social than political institution.
2. Sociology is the fundamental social science, which studies man's social life as a whole and attempts to discover the facts and the laws of life as a whole which include Poltical life. Political science, on the other hand, is concerned with the political life of a man, which is one part of his total life.

3. Sociology is the science of society where as the political science is mainly concerned with the state and government which (State&Govt) are also parts of Society. These two social sciences are very common in certain spheres.

4. Political Sociology is a branch of sociology, which deals with the principles of organization and government of human society. The subject matter of political science thus comes within the field of sociology.

5. Sociology depends very much on political science in every respect. The state and governments make laws for the welfare of the society; the government removes social evils such as poverty, unemployment, dowry and so on from the society. Social institutions and social organizations are regulated by the state and government. Sociology studies various aspects of political activities through the help of political science. The government can bring about changes in the society with the help of laws. In the same way, political science depends upon sociology and sociology provides material to political science that is the political life of the people. Therefore, some sociologists regard political science as a special branch of sociology, it can be said that without sociological background the study of political science is quite impossible.

6. Political science deals with the social group organized under the sovereignty of the state. The forms of government, the nature of governmental organs, the laws and sphere of the state activity are chiefly determined by the social processes. The laws which are formed by the government are based on the social customs, traditions, mores, norms, etc. of the society. Most of the changes which have been taken place in the political theory, during the past times have been possible due to sociology. For understanding of political problems, some knowledge about sociology is very essential because all political problems are mainly corrected with a social aspect. In this connection F.H. Gidding says "To teach the theory of the state to men who have not learn the first principle of sociology is like teaching astronomy or thermodynamics to men who have not learnt Newton's laws of Motion".

Differences between Sociology and Political Science:

In-spite of the above relationship, both sociology and political science are however different from each other in certain respects,

1. Sociology is the science of political science; on the other hand, it is the science of state and government. Sociology studies society as a whole and man as a social being where as political science deals with a particular aspect of society, which is regarded as a politically organized unit. Therefore, political science is a more specialized science than sociology.

2. Sociology has wider scope than that of political science. Sociology deals with social, political, economic, cultural and other aspects of society and studies will be the social institutions such as family, marriage, religion, kinship, caste and so on. But political science deals with political aspect and studies a specific political institution like state and government only. Thus, sociology is regarded as a general science while political science is viewed as a specialized social science.

3. Sociology studies forms of associations and institutions where as political science deals with the state and government which are known as specific forms of association. That is why professor Garner remarks "Political science is concerned with only human form association such as state, sociology deals with all forms of association."

4. Sociology studies all kinds of social relationship in a general way. But political science studies only the political aspect of social relationship in a particular way.

5. Sociology studies both organized and disorganized societies. But political science studies only the politically organized societies.

6. Sociology deals with both formal as well as informal relations of the society, which are based on customs, traditions, folkways, mores, norms etc. But political science deals only with formal relations based on laws and order of the state.

7. Sociology is the study of all means of social control. Political science, on the other hand, is the study of only government-recognized means of control.

Sociology and Political Science

According to Morris Ginsberg "Historically, Sociology has its main roots in politics and philosophy of history." The main works on social subjects such as Plato's Republic, the Politics of Aristotle and other classical works were meant to be complete treatise on political science.

Political science is a branch of social science dealing with the principles of organisation and government of human society. In other words, Political Science deals with the social groups organised under the sovereign of the state.It is rightly said that without the sociological background the study of political science will be incomplete. The forms of government, the nature of governmental organs, the laws and sphere of the state activity are determined by the social process.

Barnes has written, "The most significant thing about sociology and modern political theory is that most of the changes which have taken place in the political theory in the last thirty years have been along the line of development suggested and marked out by sociology."

The behavioural approach in politics has taught political scientists to draw heavily on the research methods of the sociologists. In the words of Giddings, "to teach the theory of the state to men who have not learnt the first principles of sociology is like teaching astronomy or thermodynamics to men who have not learnt Newton's laws of motion."

In the same way, sociology is also to depend on political science for its conclusions. The special study of political life of the society is indispensable for the complete study of the society as a whole. According to Comte and Spencer, there is no difference whatsoever between the two. G. E. G. Catlin has remarked that political science and sociology are two facets or aspects of the same figure.

In the opinion of F. G. Wilson, "It must be admitted, of course, that it is often difficult to determine, whether a particular writer should be considered as sociologist, political theorist or philosopher".

Eminent sociologists like Durkheim, Malinowski, Parsons, Spencer, Mertons, Max Weber and Leryhaix made important contributions in the field of political science. Political Sociology is an inter-disciplinary science which seeks to combine sociological and political approaches.

Sociology is the science of society.	Political science is the science of state.
The Scope of Sociology is wider than that of	Political Science studies the state and

Political Science.	government only, whereas sociology studies all the social institutions.
Sociology being the science of society deals with man in all his associated processes.	Political Science being the science of the political society is concerned with only one form of human association.
Sociology is a general science.	Political science is a special science. Political organisation is a special kind of social organisation and that is why political science is a special science while sociology is a general science.
Sociology is the study of both organised and unorganised communities.	Political Science deals with organised communities only.
Sociology deals with unconscious activities also.	Unlike Political Science which treats only conscious activities of man, sociology treats unconscious activities of man also.

Conclusion

Thus, both sociology and political science depends upon each other. Both are inter-related and inter-dependent. Truly, it can be said that society is the mirror of politics of the country. According to G.E.G. Catlin, sociology and political science are the two faces of the same figure. In the opinion of E G. Wilson "It must be admitted of course, that it is often difficult to determine, whether a particular writer should be considered as sociologists or political theorist or philosopher.

However, sociology differs from other social sciences in terms of its focus of study, approach of study, and the method of study. The closest discipline to sociology is social anthropology. The two share concepts, theories and methods, and have similar historical background. However, they are different in that sociology is primarily interested in the problems of modern society, whereas anthropology is primarily interested in the problem of traditional, non-western society. (It should be noted here that this conventional distinction between the two is now disappearing.) Further, sociology focuses mainly on quantitative techniques where as anthropology on qualitative research techniques. Perhaps, the methods of research are more important in differentiating the two. Anthropology's heavy focus on qualitative method and sociology's on quantification are still persistent natures of the two disciplines. Further, one point of difference worth mentioning is that sociology is narrower in scope than anthropology, which has four sub fields; and anthropologists tend to stay in the field for long period (several months to few years) while sociologists prefer brief stay (weeks to few months).

2.4. Sociology with Anthropology

Sociology and social anthropology are closely related in many aspects. Sometimes, it is rather difficult to differentiate sociology from social anthropology in some areas of enquiry and methodology. There are also certain differences that can also be observed between the two subjects in terms of the areas and thrust of enquiry, methodology, practice and tradition.

Sociology is the youngest of the social sciences. It is also one of the fastest growing academic disciplines. The word 'sociology' is derived from the Latin word – 'socius' ('companion' or 'associate')and the Greek word 'logie'/ 'logos'('knowledge'). The term 'sociology' was coined by Auguste Comte in 1838. Sociology is a scientific study of human society which tries to explain the contexts of social phenomena. It emphasizes on the collective aspects of human behaviour.

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

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

Similarities:

1. The relation between Sociology and Anthropology is widely recognised today. Anthropologist Kroeber pointed out that the two sciences are twin sisters.
2. According to Hoebel, "Sociology and Social Anthropology are, in their broadest sense one and the same". Evans Pritchard considers social anthropology a branch of sociology. Sociology is greatly benefited by anthropological studies.
3. Sociologists have to depend upon anthropologists to understand the present-day social phenomena from our knowledge of the past which is often provided by anthropology. The studies made by famous anthropologists like Radcliffe Brown, B. Malinowski, Ralph Linton, Lowie, Raymond Firth, Margaret Mead, Evans Pritchard and others, have been proved to be valuable in sociology.
4. Sociological topics such as the origin of family, the beginning of marriage, private property, the genesis of religion, etc., can better be understood in the light of anthropological knowledge. The anthropological studies have shown that there is no correlation between anatomical characteristics and mental superiority. The notion of racial superiority has been disproved by anthropology.

5. Further, sociology has borrowed many concepts like cultural area, culture traits, interdependent traits, cultural lag, culture patterns, culture configuration etc., from socio-cultural anthropology.

6. The knowledge of anthropology, physical as well as socio-cultural, is necessary for a sociologist. An understanding of society can be gained by comparing various cultures, particularly, the modern with the primitive.

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

   The conclusions drawn by sociologists have also helped the anthropologists in their studies. For example, anthropologists like Morgan and his followers have come to the conclusion regarding the existence of primitive communism from the conception of private property in our moder

Differences

1 Sociology and social anthropology are related but different fields with dissimilar origins. While sociology has its roots in philosophy and history, anthropology began as a study of physical measurements of humans. However, the two subjects have developed hand-in- hand, especially when it comes to concepts and scientific methods.

2 Socialanthropologistsgenerallystudysmallsocietiesthatareoftenconsideredprimitive,suchasinthePacificIslands.Theytendtoliveintheparticularcommunitytheyare studying, witnessing their daily activities and almost becoming a part of the community themselves.

Sociologists,ontheotherhand,studyfacetsofasociety,suchasfamilyorsocialmobility,andtheir organizationandprocesses.Asociologistusesmethodsthatareloadedwithvalues,therefore,theirconclusionsarelinedwithethicalconsiderations.

3. Perhaps, the biggest difference between sociology and social anthropology is in their method of research. A social anthropologist uses qualitative methods to collect information, usually by immersing oneself into the society that is being studied. Sociologists generally collect quantitative data based on which they make their conclusions. However, not specific lines drawn with regards to its methodological perspective between the both disciplines.

4. Sociologists study, "small" as well as vast societies. It studies dynamic aspects society and processes. Anthropology, on the other hand, studies small society culture, which are relatively static in nature. They study tribal communities like Na Gonads and Bhils etc. which are small self-contained groups of communities. However, certain continuum or overlapping practices could be found between both the disciplines at certain level.

Sociology and Social Anthropology

Sociology and Anthropology lie close to each other to an extent that they are often seen as two names for the same field of enquiry.
Anthropology is derived from two Greek words 'Anthropos' meaning 'man' and 'Logos' meaning 'study'. Thus, Anthropology is the study of man.

Anthropology has been divided into three divisions:
(i) Physical anthropology deals with bodily characteristics of early man and our primitive contemporaries (ii) Cultural Anthropology investigates the cultural remains of early man and of the living cultures of some of the primitive contemporaries (iii) Social Anthropology deals with the institutions and human relationships of primitive, of the past and present.

Anthropology thus devotes its attention entirely to the study of man and his culture as they developed in times long past. Sociology, on the other hand, studies the same phenomena as they exist at present. According to Kluckhon, "The sociological attitude has tended towards the practical and present, the anthropological towards pure understanding and the past."

Sociology depends very much on the material supplied by Anthropology. In fact, the historical part of Sociology is identical with Cultural Anthropology. Anthropology has contributed substantially to the study of Sociology.

Sociology has to depend upon Anthropology to understand the present-day social phenomena from our knowledge of the past. Sociology has borrowed cultural area, cultural traits, interdependent traits, cultural lag and other conceptions from social anthropology on whose basis cultural sociology has developed.

Anthropology contributes to the growth of Sociology. Without the help of anthropology the study of Sociology can't be complete. It is a part of Sociology. Anthropology provides knowledge about ancient societies. To have a comprehensive understanding of present society Sociology takes the help of anthropology. Contributions of many Anthropologists like R. Brown, Linton, Mead and Pritchard enriches sociological knowledge's. The origin of family, marriage, religion etc. can be better understood through anthropological knowledge. The concepts like cultural area, cultural traits, and cultural lag etc. sociology accept from anthropology.

Sociology accepts the anthropological conclusion that 'racial superiority is not responsible for mental development.' Thus, Sociology is greatly benefited by anthropological studies.
Similarly, Sociology contributes richly towards the growth of anthropology. Anthropology accepts many concepts of Sociology. Research and contributions of many Sociologists like Emile Durkheim, Herbert Spencer is of great help to anthropology. Anthropologists greatly benefited by the Sociological researches. Ideas and conclusions of Sociology contributes to the research in anthropology.

Thus there exists a great deal of relationship between Sociology and Anthropology. Both study human society and both are concerned with all kinds of social groups like families, friends, tribes etc. Many of the ideas and concepts are

used in both the discipline. Hence both are interrelated and interdependent. But in spite of the inter-relationship both differ from each other.

"But the two academic disciplines have grown up independently, and handle quite different types of problems, using markedly different research methods."

Sociology is a science of society.	Anthropology is a science of man and his behaviour.
The scope of Sociology is very wide.	The scope of Anthropology is very limited and it is a part of Sociology.
Sociology studies society as a whole.	Anthropology studies man as a part of society.
Sociology studies civilizations which are vast and dynamic.	Anthropology studies cultures which are small and static.
Sociology studies modern, civilized and complex societies.	Anthropology studies ancient and non-literate societies.
Sociology is concerned with social planningand thus make suggestion for future.	Anthropology is not concerned with social planning and thus do not make any suggestion for future.

2.5. Summary

Sociology is not an island; it is interdependent with other sciences; and as to its subject matter it is more or less similar with the other social or behavioral sciences such as anthropology, social psychology, political science, economics, and human geography. However, as to its methods, focus, unit of analysis, and approaches, it is different. The closest discipline to sociology is social anthropology; they share similar historical development, concepts, theories, and approaches; although the former focuses on modern societies and quantitative research and the latter focuses on traditional societies and qualitative research techniques.

This unit has defined Sociology and has discussed its nature and scope. Besides it has discussed the growth of Sociology from the writings of different thinkers. Moreover

the unit has also discussed the relation of Sociology with some important disciplines of social sciences. Sociology is defined as the science of society which studies human being in the society along with social relationship and human interaction. The scope of Sociology has been discussed from both formalistic and synthetic view points. The formalistic school believes in the limited scope of Sociology and prescribes for the study of the forms of social relations. On the other hand the synthetic believes in the wider scope of Sociology and consider it as an synthesis of social sciences. Sociology is a science because it studies the human in society in a systematic manner by applying scientific methods of investigation. However, it is not a science like physics or chemistry. Sociology being a discipline in social sciences is related to other branches of social sciences like political science, history, , anthropology, – Nevertheless all disciplines has their core of subject matter which distinguishes one discipline from the other. The relations show interconnectedness between social aspects which are studied rather independently under designated disciplines.

2.6.   KEY TERMS

Social Anthropology: Social Anthropology is a branch of Anthropology that studies human as a social being.

History: History is the study of past events, particularly in human affairs. In other words, the whole series of past events connected with a particular person or thing.

Political Science: Political Science is the branch of knowledge that deals with the state and systems of government; the scientific analysis of political activity and behaviour.

2.8.   Check your progress;

.
1.   Discuss the Relationship of Sociology with Anthropology.
2.   Analyze the Relationship of Sociology with History.
3.   Relation of Sociology with Political Science.
4.   Who said, "History is past Sociology, and Sociology is present History"?
5.   What does the relation of Sociology with other subjects mean?

2.9. Further Reading

Berger, P. (1963). Invitation to Sociology A Humanistic Perspective.NewYork :Anchor Books Double Day & Company, Inc.

Bidney, D. (1953). Theoretical Anthropology. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Boas, Franz. (1911). The Mind of Primitive Man. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Boas, Franz.(1940). Race, Language, and Culture. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Bottomore, T.B. (1962). Sociology: A Guide to Problems and Literature. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. (1995). Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology. 2nd edition 2001. London: Pluto Press.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland and Finn Sivert Nielsen. (2001). A History of Anthropology (Second Edition). New York: Pluto Press.

Ginsberg, M. (1961). Sociology. London: Oxford University Press.

Gisbert, P. (2010). Fundamentals of Sociology. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Horton, Paul B. and Hunt, Chester L. 2004. Sociology. New York: Tata McGrawHill.

MacIver, R. M. (1924). Community. London: Macmillan.

Tonnis, F. (1955). Community and Association. London: Routledge and Keega Paul.

Reuter, E. B. (1948). Handbook of Sociology. New York: The Dryden Press.

Young, K. (1949). Sociology: A Study of Sociology and Culture. New York. American Book Company

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. (1951). Social Anthropology. London: Cohen & West Ltd.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1966). Social Anthropology and Other Essays. New York: Free Press.

Frazer, Sir James. (1891).The Golden Bough: A Study in Comparative Religion. New York: Macmillan and Co.

Harris, Marvin.[1979] (1969).The Rise of Anthropological Theory. London & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hoebel, E.A. (1958). Man in the Primitive World. New York/ London/ Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, INC.

Inkeles, A. (1975).What is Sociology? New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.

Koepping, Klaus-Peter. (1983). Adolf Bastian and the Psychic Unity of Mankind: The Foundations of Anthropology in Nineteenth-Century Germany. New York: University of Queensland Press.

Kuper, Adam J. (2018). "History of Anthropology." In EncyclopaediaBritannica ("Anthropology").https://www.britannica.com/science/anthropology(Accessed 20 July 2018).

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. (1949). The Elementary Structures of Kinship. [Trans. 1969]. Boston: Beacon Press.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. (1955). Tristes Tropiques. [Trans. John Weightman and Doreen Weightman, 1973].New York: Atheneum.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. (1963). Structural Anthropology. USA: Basic Books.

Mair, Lucy. (1965). An Introduction to Social Anthropology. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Bagga, Q.L. & Singh, A. (1990). Elements of General Psychology. New Delhi: Arya Book Depot.

Baron, R.A. (1999). Essentials of Psychology. (2nd edition). USA: Allyn& Bacon.

Garvie, A.E. (1928). Ethics, Psychology, and Sociology. Journal of Philosophical Studies, Vol. 3 (12), p. 457-467.

Haralambos, M., and Holborn, M. (2008). Sociology Themes and Perspectives. London: Collins Educational.

Lowie, R. H. (1915). Psychology and Sociology. American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 21(2), p.217-229.

Merton, K. Robert. (1949). Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.

Myers, D.G. (2010). Social Psychology (10th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rohall, D., Milkie, M. and Lucas, J. (2011). Social Psychology Sociological Perspectives. (2nd edition). New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Thoits, P.A. (1995). The Interplay between Sociology and Psychology. Social Forces, Vol.73 (4), p.1231-1243.

Abbott, A. (1991). History and Sociology: The Lost Synthesis. Social Science History, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 201-238

Carr, E. H. (1967). What is History? London, Vintage

Ginsberg M. (1932). History and Sociology. Philosophy, Vol. 7, No. 28, pp. 431-445

Goldthorpe John H. (1991). The Uses of History in Sociology: Reflections on Some Recent Tendencies. The British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Jun., 1991), pp. 211-230.

Griffin, L. J. (1995). How Is Sociology Informed by History? Social Forces, Vol. 73, No. 4, pp. 1245-1254 .

Mallari, A. A. T. (2013). Bridging History and Sociology in Studying Colonial Prisons: Notes and Reflections. Philippine Sociological Review, Vol. 61, No. 1, Sociology and Interdisciplinary, pp. 43-54.

Mills, C. Wright (1959) The Sociological Imagination, New York, Oxford University Press.

Oestereicher, Emil (1978). Marx's Comparative Historical Sociology. Dialectical Anthropology, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 139-155.

Appadurai, A. (1986). The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1984). Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Gisbert, Pascual. (1973). Fundamentals of Sociology. Kolkata: Orient Longman Private Limited.

Omkarnath, G. (2012) Economics: A Primer for India. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan.

Smelser, A Martinelli and N. (1990). Economy and Societies: Overviews in Economic Sociology. London : Sage.

Swedberg, Neil J Smelser and Richard. (2005). The Hand Book of Economic Sociology. New York: Princeton University Press.

Formisano, Ronald P. (2001). The Concept of Political Culture. The Journal of Interdisciplinary History, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 393-426.

Giddens, Anthony (1995). Politics, Sociology and Social Theory: Encounters with classical and Contemporary Social Thought. Stanford: Stanford: University Press.

Jain, C.M and Doshi, S.L. (1974). Bearing of Sociology on Political Science: The Indian Case. The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 50- 59.

Kauppi, Niilo (2003). Bourdieu's Political Sociology and the Politics of European Integration. Theory and Society, Vol. 32, No. 5/6, Special Issue on The Sociology of Symbolic Power: A Special Issue in Memory of Pierre Bourdieu, pp. 775- 789.

Lipset, S. M. (1964). Sociology and Political Science: A Bibliographical Note. American Sociological Review, Vol. 29, No. 5, pp. 730-734.

Rathore, L. S. (1986). Political Sociology: Its meaning, evolution and scope. The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 47, No., pp. 119-140.

Sharma, L. N. (1978). Political Sociology: A Perspective for the study of comparative politics. The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 390-405.

Smith Rogers M. (2004). Identities, Interests, and the Future of Political Science. Perspectives on Politics, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Jun., 2004), pp. 301-312.

UNIT 3: BASIC CONCEPTS

3.0.   Introduction

Sociology is the study of human society. But such a simple initial definition like Society, Group, culture, Socialization, Institution, Association, Social change, etc. poses the question, 'What is human society?' As stated before, sociology has always studied societies, both taken separately and together, as 'human societies'. This unit looks at institutions and organisations as units of society. It highlights the relationship between society, institutions and organisations. It further examines in details what is meant by institutions, organisations and organisational behaviour. It also captures the various sociological perspectives on the idea of institutions and organisations, and their relationship with the society. Society is made up of individuals and collectives and a sum total of all the relationships that exist between them. Society, however, needs to order itself through organising its various constituents. One of the ways in which society orders itself is through institutions and organisations. Institutions and organisations provide the society a fair amount of consistency and predictability which is essential for the stability of the society. Institutions are set of rules that structure social interaction (Jack Knight, 1992). Institutions can be understood as code of conduct or a set of rules and guidelines for human activity. Institution's structure human interaction through stated or implied rules that set expectations. Some examples of institutions are law, education, marriage, and family.

Being from Sociological background it is very important for us to understand the term Social Change and itsall interrelated concepts in more systematic and scientific manner. As social change occurred in society and Society is the key subject matter of Sociology. Therefore, it will be incomplete to understand any "society" without understanding 'its changing nature'. Thus, to understand society in comprehensive manner it is prerequisite for us to understand its changing nature too. Hence,

Therefore, we will discuss the topics like; Society, Group, Culture, Institution, Association, Social group and social change, which will contributes one to enhance

their understanding on the said topics. And as a student of Sociology it is utmost necessity to have the basic ideas on the following topics.

3.1. Unit objectives
After going through this Unit, you will be able to:
- Explain what is Society?
- Able to understand Individual and Social group.
- Conceptualise the concept of Culture.
- Understand the term" Institution"
- Explain the meaning of Association
- Understand the meaning of Social group.
- Social Change.

3.2. Individual and Social group.

A human being possesses the trait of sociality or sociability. Aristotle laid a great deal of stress on this trait of human. He said that man was a social animal. He further said that it was neither good nor wise for man to live in isolation. An individual who did not live in society was either a God or beast. Human is really a social animal. S/he has always lived in some kind of society. Society is indispensable for his survival. S/he has never lived in isolation. To live in society or the trait of sociality is almost in born in human. Prof. Park remarks that "Man is not born human but to be made human". The human nature is the product of social interaction in a cultural milieu. Human being is a social animal due to the following reasons:

(i)   "Man is social by nature." His/her nature is such that s/he can not but lives in society. The human qualities like the capacity to learn a language, think and enquire, play and work, help or harm others, etc. are developed inhuman society only. These capacities are revealed through interaction. Eminent sociologists like Maclver and others have cited a number of case studies. These case studies include the case of Kasper Hausar, of the two "wolf children of India-Amala and Kamala of Anna and of Ramu, the 'wolf-boy'. These cases strengthen the evidence that human nature depends on human's membership of society.

(ii)   The social consciousness of a child provides further confirmation on man's natural sociality. The infant at his/her birth is neither social nor human, it is just an organism of an animal. The 'human nature', personality, self-hood, etc.–all these attributes are gradually acquired by human over a long period of time beginning from his/her infancy to adult-hood in course of his/her interaction with his/her fellow beings. S/he does not possess any 'self' at this stage. S/he is not fully aware of the relationship with other people. In the process of his/her natural growth the child becomes more and more identified with other persons and his/her 'self' begins to develop. His/her 'self' comes into being when s/he takes the role of other people such as the playmates, friends, teachers, etc. The process of growth of 'self' helps the child adjusts him/herself with other persons. Recent studies prove that the 'self' can come into being only in society and it is possible within the give-and-take of group life.

(iii)   A human is social because of his/her dependence upon social heritage which consists of customs, mores, beliefs, ideals, etc. Society preserves the social heritage and hands it down to the succeeding generations. Human beings have very

intimate and important relationship with social heritage. The social heritage contributes a lot to the formation of an individual's personality. It is society which moulds human's beliefs, attitudes, morals and ideals. "Man only becomes man among men." Social heritage determines the manner in which his/her in born tendencies express themselves in society. In this way his personality is determined.

(iv) An individual depends upon society due to the pressure of his/her various needs. These needs include the services of education, protection, nurture, comfort, opportunity, equipments, etc. His/her needs can be fulfilled by the help of co-operation with his/her fellow beings. It is the human society which provides the child, who is in a state of helplessness at birth, with protection, attention and opportunity necessary for his/her survival and growth. It is very difficult for a child to survive a day without the support of society. Society fulfils individual's basic needs. It also satisfies his/her desires, dreams and aspirations. His personality is well developed by fulfilling these needs. In this way it is necessity which compels people to live in society.

When there is a conflict between individual and social interests or the individual deviates from the social norms the society has its mechanism to address the issue. This is discussed in a following Section.

Human's life is a group life to a large extent. If a person lives in society, he typically is also a member of a number of groups which may themselves be considered as existing in a society. A group is a number of people involved in a pattern of association with one another.

The key to the nature of human grouping is the notion of association. Groups are created and maintained because they enable individual members to attain certain goals or interests which they hold in common. Our social behaviour and personalities are shaped by the groups to which we belong. Throughout his life, individual is a member of various groups, some are chosen by him, others are assigned to him at birth.Groups constitute the complex pattern of the 'social structure'. Groups are a part of society.

Meaning of Social Groups:

Two or more persons in interaction constitute a social group. It has common aim. In its strict sense, group is a collection of people interacting together in an orderly way on the basis of shared expectations about each other's behaviour. As a result of this interaction, the members of a group feel a common sense of belonging.

A group is a collection of individuals but all collectivities do not constitute a social group. A group is distinct from an aggregate (people waiting at railway station or bus stand) member of which do not interact with one another. The essence of the social group is not physical closeness or contact between the individuals but a consciousness of joint interaction.

This consciousness of interaction may be present even there is no personal contact between individuals. For example, we are members of a national group and think ourselves as nationals even though we are acquainted with only few people. "A social group, remarks Williams, "is a given aggregate of people playing interrelated roles and recognized by themselves or others as a unit of interaction.

The Sociological conception of group has come to mean as indicated by Mckee," a plurality of people as actors involved in a pattern of social interaction,

conscious of sharing common understanding and of accepting some rights and obligations that accrue only to members.

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

According to MacIver and Page "Any collection of human beings who are brought into social relationship with one another". Social relationships involve some degree of reciprocity and mutual awareness among the members of the group.

Thus, a social group consists of such members as have reciprocal relations. The members are bound by a sense of unity. Their interest is common, behaviour is similar. They are bound by the common consciousness of interaction. Viewed in this way, a family, a village, a nation, a political party or a trade union is a social group.

In short, a group means a group of associated members, reciprocally interacting on one another. Viewed in this way, all old men between fifty and sixty or men belonging to a particular income level are regarded as ' aggregates' or 'quasi-groups'. They may become groups when they are in interaction with one another and have a common purpose. People belonging to a particular income level may constitute a social group when they consider themselves to be a distinct unit with special interest.

There are large numbers of groups such as primary and secondary, voluntary and involuntary groups and so on. Sociologists have classified social groups on the basis of size, local distribution, permanence, degree of intimacy, type of organisation and quality of social interaction etc.

Characteristics of Social Groups:

Following are the important characteristics of social group:
1. Mutual Awareness:
The members of a social group must be mutually related to one another. A more aggregate of individuals cannot constitute a social group unless reciprocal awareness exists among them. Mutual attachment, is therefore, regarded as its important and distinctive feature. It forms an essential feature of a group.

2. One or more Common Interests:
Groups are mostly formed for the fulfillment of certain interests. The individuals who form a group should possess one or more than one common interests and ideals. It is for the realization of common interests that they meet together. Groups always originates, starts and proceed with a common interests.

3. Sense of Unity:
Each social group requires sense of unity and a feeling of sympathy for the development of a feeling or sense of belongingness. The members of a social group develop common loyalty or feeling of sympathy among themselves in all matters because of this sense of unity.

4. We-feeling:
A sense of we-feeling refers to the tendency on the part of the members to identify themselves with the group. They treat the members of their own group as friends and the members belonging to other groups as outsiders. They cooperate with those who

belong to their groups and all of them protect their interests unitedly. We-feeling generates sympathy, loyalty and fosters cooperation among members.

5. Similarity of Behaviour:
For the fulfillment of common interest, the members of a group behave in a similar way. Social group represents collective behaviour. The-modes of behaviour of the members on a group are more or less similar.

6. Group Norms:
Each and every group has its own ideals and norms and the members are supposed to follow these. He who deviates from the existing group-norms is severely punished. These norms may be in the form of customs, folk ways, mores, traditions, laws etc. They may be written or unwritten. The group exercises some control over its members through the prevailing rules or norms.

Cclassification of Groups:

Different sociologists have classified groups in different ways. Social groups are not only innumerable but also diverse. It is not possible to study all the groups. A systematic study of groups needs a classification. Various thinkers have chosen many criteria or bases for the classification of social groups such as size, kind of contact, nature of interests, degree of organisation and degree of permanence etc. Some of these bases have received more attention than others.

- 1. Dwight Sanderson has classified groups into three types on the bases of structure such as involuntary, voluntary and delegate groups. An involuntary group is that to which man has no choice, which is based on kinship such as the family, tribe or clan. A voluntary group is one which a man joins of his volition or wishes.
- At any time he is free to withdraw his membership from this group. A delegate group is one to which a man joins as a representative of a number of people either elected or nominated by them. Parliament or Assembly is a delegate group.
- 2. P.A. Sorokin, an American sociologist, has divided groups into two major types – the vertical and the horizontal. The vertical group includes persons of different strata or statuses. But the horizontal group includes persons of the same status. A nation, for instance, is a vertical group, while a class represents horizontal grouping.
- 3. F.H. Giddings classifies groups into genetic and congregate. The genetic group is the family in which a man is born involuntarily. The congregate group is the voluntary group to which he joins voluntarily.
- 4. George Hasen has classified groups into four types on the basis of their relations to other groups. They are unsocial, pseudo-social, antisocial and pro-social groups. An unsocial group is one which largely lives to itself and for itself and does not participate in the larger society of which it is a part. It does not mix-up with other groups and remains aloof from them.
- But it never goes against the interests of the larger group. A pseudo-social group participates in the larger group of which it is a part but mainly for its own gain and not for the greater good. An antisocial group is one, which acts against the interest of the larger group of which it is a part. A pro-social group is the reverse

of the antisocial group. It works for the larger interest of the society of which it is a part.

- 5. C.H. Cooley classified groups on the basis of kind of contact into primary and secondary groups. In primary group, there is face-to-face, close and intimate relationship among the members such as in the family. But in a secondary group the relationship among the members are indirect, impersonal and superficial such a the political party, a city and trade union etc.
- 6. W.G. Sumner made a division of groups into in-group and out-group. The groups with which the individual identifies himself are his in-groups such as his family, tribe, college, occupation etc. All other groups to which he does not belong are his out-groups.

Besides these above, the groups can be classified further into following categories:

(i) Disjunctive and overlapping groups.

(ii) Territorial and non-territorial groups.

(iii) Homogenous and Heterogeneous groups.

(iv) Permanent and Transitory groups.

(v) Contractual and non-contractual groups.

(vi) Open groups and closed groups.

Thus, sociologists have classified groups into numerous categories according to their own way of looking at them.

Reference Group:

- The term 'reference group' was coined by Herbert Hyman (1942) to apply to the group against which an individual evaluates his or own situation or conduct. He distinguished between membership group to which people actually belong and a reference group which is used as a basis for comparison.
- A reference group may or may not be a membership group. The term reference was introduced into the literature on small group by Muzaffar Sheriff in his book "An Outline of Social Psychology". The concept was subsequently elaborated by R.K. Merton and Turner.
- Strictly specking, a reference group is one to which we do not actually belong but with which we identify ourselves or to which we would like to belong. We may actually belong to a group, yet we accept the norms of another group to which we refer but to which we do not actually belong. L Merton writes, individual in the society choose not only reference group but also reference individual. Reference individual has often been described as "role model". The person who identifies himself with a reference individual will seek to approximate the behaviour and value of that individual in his several roles.
- According to Sherif, "A reference group is one to which the individual refers and with which he identifies himself, either consciously or sub-consciously. The central aspect of the reference group is psychological identification."
- According to Shibutani, "A reference group is that group whose outlook is used by the act or as the frame of reference in the organization of his perceptual field.
- As Horton and Hunt have pointed out, "A reference group is any group to which we refer when making judgments – any group whose value-judgements become our value-judgements". They have further said, "Groups which are

important as models for one's ideas and conduct norms…"can be called reference groups.

Ogbum and Nimkoff say, "Groups which serve as points of comparison are known as reference groups". They have further added that the reference groups are those groups from which "we get our values or whose approval we seek".

CONCLUSION

An individual or a group regards some other group as worthy of imitating, such group is called reference and the behaviour it involves is called the reference group behaviour. It accepts the reference group as model or the ideal to imitate or to follow. Reference groups, therefore, can be numerous- some may begin imitating, other may be potential imitators and some others may be aspiring to imitate.

The importance of the reference group concept is highlighted by R. Moerton in his theory of "relative deprivation" and "reference group". He argues that we orient our behaviour in terms of both membership and non-membership, i.e. reference group

3.3. Associations and Institutions

3.3.1. Definitions of Association

Association is a group of people, formed to a particular goal. Such a group is not of a permanent type. Its membership is voluntary and it can be dissolved after the attainment of the goal.

An association is sort of a cooperative unit having its own organisation, rules and regulations.

An association is a group of people organized for a particular purpose or a limited number of purposes. To constitute an association there must be, firstly, a group of people; secondly, these people must be organized one, i.e., there must be certain rules for their conduct in the groups, and thirdly, they must have a common purpose of a specific nature to pursue. Thus, family, church, trade union, music club all are the instances of association.

Associations may be formed on several bases, for example, on the basis of duration, i.e. temporary or permanent like Flood Relief Association which is temporary and State which is permanent; or on the basis of power, i.e. sovereign like state, semi-sovereign like university and non-sovereign like club, or on the basis of function, i.e. biological like family, vocational like Trade Union or Teachers' Association, recreational like Tennis Club or Music Club, Philanthropic like charitable societies, etc.

According to MacIver, "An organization deliberately formed for the collective pursuit of some interest or set of interest, which the members of it share, is termed as association.

Ginsberg writes, "An association is a group of social beings related to one another by the fact those they posses or have instituted in common an organization with a view to securing specific end or specific ends:"

G. D. H. Cole says, "By an association I mean any group of persons pursuing a common purpose by a course of corporative action extending beyond a single act and for this purpose agreeing together upon certain methods of procedure, and laying down, in however, rudimentary a form, rule for common action."

"An association is a group organised for the pursuit of an interest or group of interests in common." MacIver and Page
 "Association is usually working together or people to achieve some purpose ." Bogardus
" An association is a group of social beings related to one another by the fact that they possess or have instituted in common, an organisation with a view to achieving specific ends " Ginsberg

Essential elements of an association are as follows:

(1) It is a concrete form of Organization:

Association is a group of persons collected together with some particular aim. It is, thus, a concrete group which can be seen; while at work. Thus, in contrary to society' Association is a concrete form of organization of human beings.

(2) It is established:

Like community, association does not grow spontaneously. It has no natural growth and it does not grow itself. They are created by men to satisfy some motive or cause Rules and regulations are formed to run a particular kind of association and the member of the association run it on the basis of these rules and regulations.

There, we find a 'code of conduct' to be followed by the office-bearers and other members of the association. Moreover, their rules and regulations are subjected to drastic changes if the creator of association desire so.

(3) Its aim is determined:

No association is formed without any aim. First, there is the problem and the solution of which, becomes the aim of the association formed to solve such problems. For example, if it is a dramatic association, then its aim will naturally be to stage dramas and plays. No association can maintain its identity without any distinct aim and object.

(4) Followers of rules and regulations are the only members:

Every association floats on the ground of certain rules and regulations. It also contains code of conduct for the members. Those who follow the rules^ and regulations provided for and participate in the pursuit of the aim of the association are only called as the members of it.

Anyone acting contrary or disowning the obligations as members may be expelled from the membership; as per procedure framed for the purpose. For example, if the

member of "political association" stops believing or start criticizing the policies of the association of which he has been, hitherto the supporter, shall cease to be the member.

It also becomes obligatory for every member to co-operate with other in the achievement of the goals of the association. Otherwise, what for else is he the member? What is his aim of joining such an association? The answer is; it is useless for him to be the member of such an association, and it is equally useless for an association to keep such an individual on the membership list.

(5) Its membership is voluntary:

An association is not an essential organization like State or society. Neither it is a natural organization in which every one's contribution can be asked for on natural grounds. Neither there is any common instinct among the persons based on common and unified ideology to become the member of a particular association. And, also there is no 'whips' from the heaven or State to every citizen to form a association and to become its member.

But the membership of an association is voluntary. A person becomes the members because he wants it and only because he likes it and if he grows a feeling of dislike he is absolutely free to disown any such association. "Mr. A is free to become the member of Arya Samaj and shift its memberships from Arya Samaj to Sanatan Dharam Samaj." There are no restrictions, no law and no suppression of Mr. A for his changes.

(6) An association exists for its aims and objects:

The life of an association is upto the achievement of the aim for which it has been created. The existence of association after his achievement of the aim becomes, immaterial and irrelevant. It becomes nominal and lifeless body of formalities only. "The aim is the soul of the association.

3.3.2. Institution

The concept of institution is an important one in the social sciences. Unfortunately, however, it has been used in different ways, and its meaning has become ambiguous.

Some writers use the term "institutions" when referring to large social groups, reserving the term "associations" for small groups. The distinction is then only one of size. But no one knows how large a group must be to become an institution; furthermore, used in this way, the term adds little to our understanding of social structure.

Society is made up of individuals and collectives and a sum total of all the relationships that exist between them. Society, however, needs to order itself through organising its various constituents. One of the ways in which society orders itself is through institutions and organisations. Institutions and organisations provide the

society a fair amount of consistency and predictability which is essential for the stability of the society.

Institutions are set of rules that structure social interaction (Jack Knight, 1992). Institutions can be understood as code of conduct or a set of rules and guidelines for human activity. Institutions structure human interaction through stated or implied rules that set expectations. Some examples of institutions are law, education, marriage, and family.

Consider the examples of education as an institution and school as an example of organisation. Every known society formulates some ways in which it trains and cultivates the faculties of its young ones, constructs new knowledge and transmits the existing knowledge. In doing so, it organises human interactions and human activity within the society. Education becomes a way in which the young are made to understand their roles, expectations and duties as members of the society. All societies (clans, tribes, agrarian, industrial) have devised some or the other way of transmission of knowledge, values and skills among their younger members.

According to MacIver, "an institution is a set of formal, regular and established procedures, characteristic of a group or number of groups that perform a similar function within a society. In short, an institution is an organized way of doing something".

Barnes defines social institution as "the social structure and machinery through which human society organizes, directs and executes the multifarious activities required to satisfy human needs". The simple language social institutions are the established ways through which the social interaction among the individuals are structured, regulated and controlled for the purpose of satisfying human needs.

Sumner said, "An institution consists of a concept (idea, notion, doctrine, interest) and a structure." He added, "the structure is a framework or apparatus or perhaps only a number of functionaries set to cooperate in prescribed ways at a certain conjuncture. The structure holds the concept and furnishes instrumentalities for bringing it into the words of facts and action in a way to serve the interests of men in society." Then he points out that "institutions begin in folkways, become customs and develop into mores by having attached to them a philosophy of welfare.

Institutions are components of the society that help to maintain order and stability through structuring human interaction and activity. Institutions manifest themselves in terms of overt or implicit rules that structure human interactions. Institutions function through the members of a society being socialised into them. This makes the study of institutions critical to the field of sociology. Emile Durkheim referred to sociology as the scientific study of principle institutions. Institutions such as religion, family, education et cetera are still critical to the discipline of sociology.

Let us consider a few scholarly definitions of institutions to acquaint with the meaning of institution:

According to Morris Ginsberg (1921), "Institutions are definite and sanctioned forms or modes of relationship between social beings, in respect to one another or to some external object".

Robert Morrison MacIver1 defines Institutions as "established forms or conditions of procedures characteristic of group activity".

William Graham Sumner (1906:53) suggests that "an institution consists of a concept, idea, notion, doctrine or interest and a structure".

Bronislaw Malinowski 2 argues that, "every institution centres around a fundamental need, permanently unites a group of people in a co-operational task and has its particular body of doctrines and its technique or craft. Institutions are not correlated simply and directly to new functions. One need not receive one's satisfaction in one institution."

Jonathan Turner defines institution as "a complex of positions, roles, norms and values lodged in particular types of social structures and organising relatively stable patterns of human activity with respect to fundamental problems in producing life-sustaining resources, in reproducing individuals, and in sustaining viable societal structures within a given environment" (Turner 1997: 6).

From the above definitions we learn that;

1) Institutions may not be physical entities but visible in the co-ordinated patterns of behaviour of members of a society.

2) Institutions can help explain the behaviour of individual members.

3) Institutions have both restrictive and enabling potential in that it both constraints the choices available to an individual and defines the ways in which choices are to be exercised. Consider a situation whereby two individuals decide to live together the institution of marriage both defines and constraints the way in which they exercise their desire to live with each other.

4) Institutions function to forge and reiterate solidarity among members of a society.

5) It structures the interaction between members.

Institutions can be identified, in terms of the regular and consistent patterns of behaviours that are structured through norms and sanctions. Institutions function well in so far as they maintain stable patterns of expectation, thought and action. The consistency and synchronisation among these elementsdetermine the stability of the institution. It is often argued that institutions have equilibrium like qualities, in that, when disturbed, institutions reinstate their stability by reinforcing order as purpose or preference. Repeated and consistent behaviour that has rule-like qualities assumes normative weight and act in ways that stabilise the equilibrium status of the

institution. Sociologists consider institutions not singularly as stable static phenomena but as process. Institutions have been understood in terms of the processes of institutionalisation, de-institutionalisation, and re-institutionalisation. They are generally considered as the "more enduring features of social life" (Giddens, 1984: 24).

Types of Institutions Sociologists generally classify institutions into five clusters of major institutions. They are:

➤ Economic Institutions: These are the institutions that correspond to production, consumption and distribution of goods and services.

➤ Kinship, Marriage and Family: These institutions control and regulate reproduction.

➤ Institutions of Social Stratification: These are the institutions that regulate and control differential access to social status and prestige.

➤ Political Institutions: They are concerned with regulation and distribution of power.

➤ Cultural Institutions: They regulate religious, symbolic and cultural practices.

Types of Institutions by Summer:

Institutions may be classified in several ways. Sumner has classified institutions into two main types.

1. Crescive Institutions such as property, marriage and religion which originate from mores. These are unconscious in origin.

2. Enacted institutions such as credit institutions, business institutions which are consciously organized for definite purposes.

Functions of Institutions:

There are various important functions of the institutions. Institutions have manifest functions which are easy to recognize as part of the professed objectives of the institution, and latent functions which are unintended and may be unrecognized or if recognized, regarded as by products, says Merton. The primary institutions function in manifest manner. The working is direct and clear. These, however, give rise to the secondary institutions. They function in latent manner.

1. Institutions Simplify Action for the Individual:

An institution organizes many aspects of behaviour into a unified pattern, thus making more or less automatic very complex and sometimes long-continued segments of social behaviour. The participant in an institution is accustomed to pass from one complicated set of behaviour traits to another towards a recognized goal.

One of the most highly integrated institutions in modern society is Military establishment. The soldiers learn to pass in orderly fashion from one type of behaviour to another without hesitation towards the objective of eliminating enemy.

2. Institutions Provide a Means of Social Control:

The institutions are the most important agencies through which the sanctions of the society are brought to bear on the individual. In other words, institutions play a central part in the process of social control. All major institutions, the family, the school, the religious institution, the State inculcate basic values and definitions to the young one. Thus most of the controls that deal with the basic concerns of life are transmitted through the social institutions.

3. Institutions Provide a Role and Status for Individuals:

Some people serve in groups devoted to public welfare. Others find a place in business, in the professions, in public service or in the home. Some shine in sports, others in literature or art. The institutions to a degree provide for the individual the opportunity for the development of his peculiar characteristics and determine his role and status.

4. Institutions Provide Order to the Society:

Besides helping individuals to satisfy their basic needs, institutions provide unity to the society. The law of the jungle would prevail if there were no institutions that maintained order. In other words, institutions enable societies to keep functioning.

5. Institutions act as Stimulant:

The institutions may stimulate certain individuals to react against it and formulate new patterns of behaviour. Sometimes individual feels the disharmony between the various institutions. He seeks some way out of the impasse. He must devise some way whereby his urges may be more fully satisfied. Hence, the institution functions in such cases to stimulate the individual to "break new roads to freedom." Thus, institution provides the stimulus which starts a revolt against the established order.

6. Institutions act as Harmonizing Agencies in the Total Cultural Configuration:

The institutions are not independent, but are related to each other in a cultural system or configuration. Most of the institutions in the system tend to support one another and the configuration as a whole. Thus, courtship supports marriage which in turn supports the family, all three institutions being mutually interdependent.

7. Institutions Display Tension between Stability and Change:

Workable ways of doing things, repeated over and over, tend to become rigid forms. This is why mere habits become institutions. Looked at from this point of view, institutions tend to maintain stability and the status quo. But as new ways of doing things appear and are found workable, they challenge stability and impel institutions towards change.

Function of the institutions also changes, since they are not static. Like any other part of culture, they change through time, Alteration in one institution invariably reverbate throughout the institutional structure of society. With changes is one set of norms bringing in them, make changes in others?

The expanding area of State activity, Industrialization and the urbanization has squeezed the function of the primary institutions in certain respects, while the Secondary institutions are on the expansion.

3.3.3. Differences between Institution and Association:

Sometimes confusion arises between institutions and associations because the same term, in a different context, may mean either one of the other. But there is a much more important distinction to be made between institutions and associations. The differences between institution and association are as follows:

1. Association represents human aspect. An association is a group of people organised for the pursuit of a specific purpose. Institutions, on the other hand, are the rules of procedure. Family is an association organised for the preparation of children, while marriage is its main institution.

Political party is an institution, State is an association. Thus, association represents human aspect, while an institution is a social condition of conduct and behaviour.

2. An institution is considered as a 'form of procedure'. It has no form and is abstract. On the other hand, association is considered as "an organised group". It is a group of people organised for the purpose of fulfilling a need or needs. It has form and it is concrete.

3. Institutions grow, while associations are formed deliberately.

4. Association indicates membership, while institution indicates procedure of work.

5. Every association bears a particular name, while every institution is based on cultural symbol.

6. An institution is an organised procedure, an association is organised group.

7. Institutions fulfil all the primary and basic need of people. But association is a group of people organised for the pursuit of some specific purposes.

8. The rules of an institution are based on informal mean of social control such as customs, traditions etc., while the laws of association are formed on the basis of formal means of social control.

In spite of the differences between the two, it may be noted that no institution can function without an association. Institutions are impossible without associations One simple test can help us to understand the difference between institutions and associations. As association has a location. On the other hand an institution does not have a location. For example, an university can be located (in space); education cannot.

3.4.   Culture and Society

3.4.1.   Culture

Culture and Society are mutually interdependent. Every society has a culture which guides its members. In order to understand the relationship between culture and society we need to understand what a society is. Ralph Linton defines society as "an organized group of individuals. A culture is an organized group of learned responses characteristic of a particular society" (Linton, 1955:29). Society is a much larger concept and culture is an important part of the society that we live in. A society is a group of individuals who interact and share a common culture. Through culture, the members of society experience their lives. In other words, society refers to persons and groups; culture is the behaviour patterns of these groups which emerge from communal living. Culture distinguishes a man from an animal. It is culture that shapes our attitude, beliefs, values and norms. So, culture and society cannot be separated. Giddens and Sutton (2014) say that sociology has always studied culture as bound up with social relations and the structure of society

Different scholars define culture in different ways. Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn had discovered more than 150 definitions of culture. The first definition of culture was given by E.B Tylor. He says, "Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capability acquired by man as a member of society" (Tylor, 1871:1). Malinowski when referring to Arunta society, talks about the behaviour patterns like the customs, language, beliefs and also the ways of thinking feeling and acting which are important aspects of culture and also applies to any society. Abraham (2006) defines culture as "a total way of life of a social group, meaning everything they are, they do and they have. It is

a complex system that consists of beliefs, values, standards, practices, language and technology shared by members of a social group" (Abraham, 2006:64).Majumdar and Madan (2008) say that a culture complex is not an institution but is the outcome of interaction between several institutions. They are defined as the pattern of the interrelation of culture traits.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURE

1. Culture is social: Culture is acquired through social life. Human being is a social animal and has a culture of its own. Culture is shaped by our social interaction and is bound up with social relations within the members of a group. Culture regulates the behaviour of the members of a group and fulfils human's needs like hunger, shelter, clothing etc. Culture is defined as a social adjustment or the means by which man adjusts to his environment.

2. Culture is learned and shared: Culture is a behaviour acquired by man from his birth and as a member of society. When a human baby is born, it is helpless. It does not have the pattern of behaviour that is required for living in society or culture is not innate. The baby learns the behaviour and culture from the elders and is socialized to become a member of society. In course of time, man becomes human by acquiring the culture of a particular society and is thus called 'culture-bearing animal'. The influence of culture on human beings is hence deep rooted. After man learns a culture, culture is internalized and is shared by the members of the group. Culture is shared through communication and cooperation by the members of a society.

3. Culture is transmitted: Culture is handed down from one generation to the other and also between nations and people within the lifetime. Culture is what we receive from previous generations and subsequently adapt to. Culture is transmitted to humans by parents, teachers, friends through traditions, customs etc. Cultural transmission is different from genetic transmission. One has no control on genetic transmission such as skin color, hair and color of eyes but through culture man acquires the habits, thoughts, attitudes of his or her parents and through this it is transmitted to the group. Ralph Linton (ibid.) appropriately says that the culture is the way of life of the members of a society. It is the collection of ideas and habits which they learn, share and transmit from generation to generation.

4. Culture is dynamic: It is no longer seen as static, natural, well bounded and independent of political power. Culture is constantly undergoing change and often adapts to external forces. It also undergoes internal adaptation and change. Various parts of culture are integrated with each other to constitute a whole.

5. Culture is symbolic A symbol is something on which some value is bestowed by us or it has a meaning. The meaning of symbols is a matter of cultural intervention. For example, the National Flag is not any piece of cloth but has a culture. Similarly to the Christians the cross is a symbol of salvation.

Types of Culture: Material and Non-Material Culture

Sociologist William F. Ogburn distinguished between material and non material culture.

1. **Material culture** refers to the objects which satisfies the material needs of human beings like houses, means of transport, factories, food items etc. They are the tangible aspects of society.

2. **Non- material culture** on the other hand refers to non tangible aspects of culture like customs, ideas, beliefs, patterns of communication etc.

However, there are a lot of debates as to what should be included in the ambit of culture. Some anthropologists believe, only those aspects which can be communicated can be a part of culture. Many others also include objects in the definition of culture. Giddens and Sutton (2014) say that culture has always dealt with the non material aspect, it had not conventionally included the material artifacts like the buildings, furniture but this has changed as gradually sociologists became interested in 'material culture'. So, both material and non 87 material objects are part of culture. Culture not only includes knowledge, beliefs, Culture and Society and practices but also includes manmade objects like tools, buildings, means of transport and communication or various artifacts. Green (1964) defines culture as "the socially transmitted system of idealized ways of knowledge, practice and belief, along with the artifacts that knowledge and practice produce and maintain as they change in time" (Green, 1964:80).

Elements of Culture

1. Language: Language is the most important element of culture. The essence of a culture is reflected in the language which facilitates day to day interaction with other people. The use of language distinguishes human beings from other species. It is instrumental in the transmission of cultural tradition from one generation to another as it is infused with meaning. Sapir- Whorf Hypothesis says that language is not 'given' but is culturally determined and through language reality is interpreted in different ways (Schaefer and Lamm 1999). For example, in the Arab world in which people depend on camels, there are 3,000 words for camels. Similarly, when we describe vegetables like Drumstick, bitter gourd etc. in Indian words we don't use any adjective. But the English words reflect the taste or appearance of these vegetables (Abhraham, 2006). Language and culture are intertwined.

2. Belief: Abraham (2006) says that belief is a statement or idea about reality which people accept as true. For example, many people in India believe in God and many auspicious occasions like marriage are scheduled on the basis of auspicious dates. Even marriages are fixed when the horoscopes of the bride and the groom matches. But beliefs are not static and are subject to change over time. We may be practicing a certain belief but by coming in contact with other cultures we may change our beliefs. People migrating to cities may shed off some of the superstitious beliefs. But in many other occasions the beliefs towards something is so strong that we may not be able to let it go.

3. **Norms**: Norms are the prescribed rules of society which guides the behaviour of the members of a society. Sutherland (1961) says that social norms are group developed and group held standards of behaviour of the groups' members. They direct the conduct of the members of the society or it is the guideline for appropriate behaviour. For Haralambos and Heald (2006) a norm is a specific guide to action which defines acceptable and appropriate behavior in particular situations. For example, in every society there are norms governing dressing patterns. In particular occasions we tend to wear a particular kind of dress. We wear different dresses when we go to a party, a funeral, a office or even a hospital. But norms vary from society to society. For example in a tribal society wearing a particular dress is acceptable but in other societies it is not.

Norms can be both formal and informal. Formal norms are written down and attract punishment when violated. Informal norms are not formally written down but are generally accepted. For Abraham (ibid.), formal norms are explicit norms like the explicit rules imposed by schools about uniforms etc. Implicit norms can be some restriction on the public display of affection or norms governing dress that we discussed above. Norms are further classified into folkways and mores and laws. Folkways are the informal rules which guide our actions. For example, do not poke your nose when elders discuss something, cover your nose when you sneeze etc. Mores are those folkways which are important for the welfare of the group. Sumner (1906) says, when the relation of welfare is added to folkways they are converted to mores. Laws grow out of mores and have a rational element in them or they are formally established rules. Mores are more strictly enforced than folkways but less strictly enforced than laws.

4. **Sanctions:** Sanctions are penalties and rewards for social conduct of a person. Sanctions can be both positive and negative. Conformity to a norm prescribes positive sanction like rewards, praise etc. On the other hand violation of a norm attracts negative sanctions like fines, imprisonment etc. Schaefer and Lamm (1999) says that the norms and sanctions in a culture reflects that culture's values and priorities The most cherished values will be the most heavily sanctioned, the less critical matters will have light sanctions.

5. **Values:** Values are the general guidelines regarding the conduct in society unlike norms which provide specific conduct. For Abraham (2006) values are agreements among members of the society as to what is desirable and what is undesirable in society. They are generalized standards that define what is good or bad, ugly or beautiful. Values are the way people conduct themselves in society, it reflects the orientation of individuals, groups towards achieving essential goals of society. For example, paying attention when national anthem is played, respecting elders is a value of the Indian society. Different cultures have different value systems. American value system is different from Indian value system. Certain values are also given importance in a culture over others. Schaefer and Lamm (1999) give the example of

Papua culture in which contributing to the public good is much more valuable than making a personal profit. Erasov and Singh (2006) mention families, relatives, older generation as values forming basis of cultural criteria.

SOME KEY CONCEPTS IN CULTURE:

1. CULTURAL CHANGE
Culture is dynamic**.** The elements of culture change from time to time. In todays society, we see a lot of changes in the culture of societies. There is a change in the eating habits, dressing pattern, types of family, education, caste and many changes which are imminent. Cultural changes occur due to innovation, diffusion, acculturation and assimilatio**n.**

A. Cultural Innovation: Innovation is something which is newly created by someone. It may be a physical object or an artifact, or social in terms of rituals, stories, new ideas, new knowledge etc. For example, the carvings on the temples, the delicate artistic works or the carvings of the white marble of the Taj Mahal to the orbiting of satellites are all which are cultural innovations which we cherish. Innovation also happens when there is a modification on something that exists beforehand. Innovation is the most important element of cultural change as, if there is no innovation there cannot be diffusion, acculturation, and assimilation.

B. Cultural Diffusion: Cultural diffusion is a process by which the elements of culture spread from one society to another or it is the spread of cultural traits from one group to the other. Due to the development in transportation and communication and the movement of people from one place to another without restriction there is spread of culture in the form of food, dress, lifestyle, education etc. Cultural diffusion happens at two levels – diffusion of material culture and diffusion of non material culture. According to William F. Ogburn (1966) the elements of non material culture are more resistant to change than the material culture. He refers to the term 'cultural lag' to refer to the maladjustment in which non material culture fails to adjust to the rapidly changing material conditions. For example, it is difficult to adapt to a Western culture and accept foreign ideas than to accept foreign technology. We accept technology much faster as it makes our lives much easier but we are unable to change our ways of life accordingly. In a fast changing society, cultural lag is very prominent as a change in one aspect will bring stress and strains in other parts, there is a time lag before the other part of the culture catches up and restores the equilibrium in society. This sometimes disturbs the balance of society and brings 'anomie'. Anomie is a concept coined by Emile Durkheim which refers to a condition in which the normative order of society is broken down.

C. Acculturation: Cultural diffusion brings with it the question of cultural contact. When two cultures come into contact, there is some interchange of ideas and culture leading to cultural diffusion. But when the way of life of one culture is in the process

of change under the influence of another culture it is called acculturation. It may lead to either a least partial modification of one culture or may result in substantial transformation. In acculturation, the minority culture still retains some of its cultural elements.

D. Assimilation: It is the way in which one way of life is being displaced by another or it is a process in which a minority group is absorbed into the dominant culture. For example, with the coming up of development projects leading to the clearance of forests there are many tribal cultures which are getting displaced and the tribals are slowly getting assimilated into the society.

2. CULTURAL DIVERSITY

A society is made up of diverse cultures. It can be said that the culture of one society is distinct from the other society. The societal culture is a broad culture representing a society. But apart from the societal culture there are different subcultures, countercultures which occasionally lead to a culture shock.

A). Subcultures: It is a culture within a larger dominant culture. In many complex societies there are many subcultures. Schaefer and Lamm (1999) say that "a subculture is a segment of society which shares a distinctive pattern of mores, folkways and values which differs from the pattern of the larger society" (Schaefer and Lamm, 1999:81). Abhraham (2006) says that these subcultures are not partial or miniature cultures but are complete cultures which are unique to a particular social group. He gives the example of the Todas of Nilgiris, Nairs and Ezhavas of Kerala, Rajputs of Rajasthan; Bodos of Assam have cultures of their own. For him, thedistinct subcultures also evolve around occupations, political parties etc. Apart Culture and Society from this, there are deviant subcultures which are associated with the criminals gangs, the mafias, drug addicts. In American Society there may be New Englanders, Southerners, Texans etc. When we talk of subcultures, one issue that has gained prominence is "youth culture" or "youth subculture". Youth subculture implies that young are socialized into a type of values, standards, and a certain type of behavior pattern that distinguishes it from the adult society.

B).Countercultures: Though there are different subcultures in a society, these subcultures of a particular group are always not compatible with the dominant culture. Some subcultures challenge the prevailing culture and contrast the prevailing culture. For example, a group of dacoits have their own norms and standards which differ from the conventional prevailing patterns. The countercultures are very popular among the youth who generally find it difficult to cope up with the dominant culture which is shared by the older generations. In some countries an exclusive youth culture is being formed consisting of the youth population. This happens due to a lot of factors like the growing importance of technology, emergence of political radicals, hippie culture. Schaefer and Lamm (1999), give the example of a new counterculture that surfaced in Great Britain in 1968 were the skinheads who were young people

with shaved heads, often sported tattoos, steel- toed shoes who had very less expectation of being a part of mainstream society. They championed racist ideologies and even engaged in vandalism, violence and even murder. The deviant subcultures can be appropriately called counter cultures.

C). Culture Shock: When people come across a unfamiliar culture and are unable to cope up with it they suffer maladjustment. In this situation they face a cultural shock. As our society has many subcultures we may not be aware of all of them and when we confront the ways of living of some other cultures we get disoriented. For example, when we go to a foreign country we may come across a particular way of life which is different from ours.

3. ETHNOCENTRISM: The term ethnocentrism was coined by William Graham Sumner to refer to a feeling that ones culture is always superior to other cultures. Sumner (1906) says "ethnocentrism is the technical name of this view of things in which ones own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it" (Sumner,1906:13). He further says that it leads people to exaggerate everything in their folkways which differentiate them from others. On the basis of this feeling, other cultures are judged in relation to one's own culture. The South Indians feel that their culture is superior to the North Indian culture. Similarly, people still feel that Africa is a country only inhabited by primitive tribals and is a Dark Continent. Ethnocentrism gives rise to a feeling of superiority in the sense that we judge other cultures as "wrong" rather than just the "other" or the other way. Ethnocentrism sometimes may lead to xenophobia or the fear of the foreign**.**

4. CULTURAL RELATIVISM: It is a process in which we evaluate a culture by its own standards or in its own context rather than from our own cultural lens. Abraham (2006) says that every element of the culture has a function unique to the group which shares the culture. Many customs and practices in a culture should not be judged as right or wrong, good or bad but are to be understood in terms of their function. Many Americans wonder why the Indian farmers refuse to eat their cows even if they starve. Cultural relativism may lead to xenocentrism which is the opposite of ethnocentrism. Xenocentrism is the belief that other cultures is superior to one's own culture.

5. MULTICULTURALISM: In order to understand what a multicultural society is we have to understand what an ethnic group is. In today society there is the existence of multiple ethnic groups. Ethnic group is a community of people who share a common cultural background or they share certain common characteristics such as race, language, religion etc which differentiates them from other groups. Kymlicka (2012) defines multiculturalism as a legal and political accommodation of the ethnic diversity. He says multiculturalism emerged in the West as an attempt at replacing the older forms of ethnic and racial hierarchy with the ideals of democratic citizenship. Abraham (2006) says that "it is a principle of coexistence of different cultures which fosters understanding and appreciation of different cultures" (Abraham, 2012:72). A

multicultural society is often equated with a 'salad bowl' in which all communities retain their distinct identities as opposed to a 'melting pot' in which the majority culture swallows up a minority culture. Multiculturalism in recent times has become a highly debated concept with people questioning whether a multicultural society is possible.

6. GLOBALISATION AND CULTURE: Sunanda Sen (2007) says that "globalization is associated with the integration of the world, with the markets breaking open the barriers across nation states in terms of flows of trade, finance, technology, knowledge, culture and even movements of people"(Sen, 2007:1). An improvement in transportation and communication and a global contact between cultures, led to the transmission of values, ideas, meanings and even movement of people around the world. The phenomenon of globalisation has brought in significant changes in the economy, politics, culture etc of the world. Arjun Appadurai discusses about the global cultural flow. Appadurai (1996) mentions five dimensions of global cultural flow as Ethnoscapes – the landscapes of persons such as tourists, immigrants, refugees and the movement of persons who affect the politics of a particular place. Technoscapes – The global spread of technology both material and informational across boundaries. Finanscapes – The rapid flow of money through currency markets and stock exchange. Mediascapes – The distribution of electronic capabilities like television, films to produce and disseminate information. Ideoscapes – The exchange of ideologies and counter – ideologies which consists of notions of freedom, justice, rights, democracy, sovereignty.

CULTURE IN INDIAN CONTEXT:
A). Cultural Diversity in India: The Indian society is very diverse and extremely complex. S.C Dube (1990) says that "the Indian society had covered a span of five thousand years since the period of its first known civilization. During this long period several waves of immigrant representing different ethnic strains and linguistic families have merged into its population to contribute to its diversity, richness and vitality" (Dube, 1990:1). The Indian society consists of a large number of languages, dialects, beliefs, rituals, customs, traditions etc. It has 22 national languages and hundred dialects. It is one of the most religiously and ethnically diverse nations of the world. There are even many languages which are till now not even recognized. Dube (1990) says that in the state of Nagaland itself there are nineteen languages. Religious faiths include Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Sikhism, Buddhism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism and even Baha'i faith which is practiced by a smaller number of communities with the Hindus constituting the majority. It has been the dominant religion and has put considerable influence on the Indian culture and society. People in India belong to different castes, sub castes or jati and social classes. Each caste has their unique rituals, rules customs etc. Indian society is also characterized by sharp contrasts or inequalities. On the one hand there are very rich people the elites who are comparatively smaller in number and on the other hand there

are vast majority of people who are poor or the working classes. In the middle are certain classes called the middle classes.

Moreover the Indian society is also a home to a number of tribal communities who have their distinct cultural identity and heritage. These diversities can be attributed to the existence of different cultural traditions like the classical, folk and the tribal. In other words these traditions can be divided into little tradition and great tradition, the concepts coined by Robert Redfield. The little traditions are unwritten and are transmitted orally. On the other hand great traditions are written traditions and are found in literature and religious texts. Though in the present context there has been much overlap between traditions and there has been an interaction between the two traditions.

Todays society creates division on the basis of division of labour, specialization of knowledge which separates the highly educated from the less educated. One of the most significant divisions among people is found in the field of educational attainment. Education which should be a great leveler instead it reproduces the existing cultural and social divisions. Pierre Bourdieu (1986) calls this 'cultural capital'. Apart from this religious, spatial segregation also brings in variability of culture in terms of manners, speech, activities, recreation. Cultural diversity can be best understood when we talk about Indian Society.

B). Cultural Unity and Integration: Inspite of these diversities in the Indian society discussed above, the Indian society is characterized by unity and this unity in diversity has become a part of India's self identity says S.C Dube. India is a secular state and has a constitution which ensures that the identities of different communities are preserved. Moreover the different facets of culture like religion, music, art and architecture, painting, dance and drama, habits and customs have contributed to the unity and integrationof India. Dube (ibid.) says that problems persists and many also have spawned in recent decades like ethnic movements, religious fundamentalism, linguistic conflicts, regionalism which pose a major challenge to the contemporary Indian society. The Indian society has witnessed a lot of invasions. Moreover libaralisation, privatization and globalization also has ushered in a lot of changes. But these have not led to the disintegration of the Indian society. It can be said that despite a lot of diversity, dissent, protests there is an underlying unity derived from its unique culture which is the cornerstone of Indian society.

Check Your Progress-I

1. What do you mean by Cultural Trade?

2. Enumerate the attribute of culture.

3. Enumerate two essential qualities of culture.

4. Name the first anthropologist.

5. What is Cognitive aspect of culture?

6. Enumerate some material culture.

7.	Does a baby born with a culture?

8.	Does a baby born in a culture?

9.	What are the agents of culture?

10.	Why is a human in social?

CONCLUSION

Culture and Society are closely interrelated. Society is a broad aspect and culture is a part of it. Society refers to persons and groups and culture refers to behaviour patterns, the sum total of man's activities, thoughts, beliefs, attitude and all that is characteristics of man as a social being. Culture has been defined by different scholars differently as it is highly variable and differs from society to society. Though animals adapt to their environment, but the adaptation pattern of both humans and animals are very different. As a result of this there is a difference between culture and biology. Culture is learned and transmitted from generation to generation through language, an important element of culture. Culture is also conveyed through customs, beliefs, norms, sanctions, values, laws, institutions. Hence, culture is social, symbolic and dynamic. The distinguishing elements of culture are language, customs, belief, norms, sanctions, values and law. All cultures have basic structure like the cultural traits, complexes, culture area. It is through these structures communication is possible in a society.

3.4.2. Society

In popular speech the word 'society' has several meanings. Scores of definitions of the word 'society' exist and the word has a range of meanings extending far beyond sociology, including history, economics and political science.

In everyday life this term is used for various kinds of social units or social aggregates as if it exists 'out there' and beyond the individual subject such as Indian Society, French Society, American Society, Capitalist Society, etc. At many times, we associate this term for secondary associations—Indian Sociological Society, The Theosophical Society, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals or to Children. The reason why Wallerstein, in his World Systems Analysis (1974) writes: "No concept is more pervasive in modem social science than society, and no concept is used more automatically and unreflectively than society, despite the countless pages devoted to its definition.".

The term "society" came from the 12th Century French *société* (meaning 'company'). This was in turn from the Latin word *societas*, which in turn was derived from the noun *socius* ("comrade, friend, ally"; adjectival form *socialis*) used to describe a bond or interaction between parties that are friendly, or at least civil.

In simple a **society** is a group of individuals involved in persistent social interaction, or a large social group sharing the same spatial or social territory, typically subject to the same political authority and dominant cultural expectations. Societies are characterized by patterns of relationships (social relations) between individuals who share a distinctive culture and institutions; a given society may be described as the sum total of such relationships among its constituent of members. In the social

sciences, a larger society often exhibits stratification or dominance patterns in subgroups.

Sociologist *Peter L. Berger* defines society as "...a human product, and nothing but a human product, that yet continuously acts upon its producers." According to him, society was created by humans, but this creation turns back and creates or molds humans every day.

Sociologist *Gerhard Lenski* differentiates societies based on their level of technology, communication, and economy: (1) hunters and gatherers, (2) simple agricultural, (3) advanced agricultural, (4) industrial, and (5) special (e.g. fishing societies or maritime societies).

How sociologists view society?

As against its commonsense usage, sociologists use this term in a specific sense and in a precise way. In social sciences since nineteenth century there is a long debate about the use of the concept 'society'. It was taken to mean as tissues of manners and customs that hold a group of people together. In some sense, 'society represented something more enduring and deeper than the 'state', less manipulative and certainly more elusive. Therefore, Sociologists have defined society with two angles:

1. *In abstract terms,* as a network of relationships between people or between groups.
2. *In concrete terms*, as a collection of people or an organisation of persons.

Definition

L.T. Hobhouse (1908) defined society as "tissues of relationships".

R.M. MacIver (1937) also defined it in more or less the same terms as "web of social relations which is always changing".

Talcott Parsons (Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1934) wrote: "Society—may be regarded as the most general term referring to the whole complex of relations of man to his fellows."

Anthony Giddens (2000) states; "A society is a group of people who live in a particular territory, are subject to a common system of political authority, and are aware of having a distinct identity from other groups around them."

Characteristics:

1. **Society is abstract:** If society is viewed as web of social relationships, it is distinct from physical entity which we can see and perceive through senses. As written earlier, MacIver argued, "we may see the people but cannot see society or social structure, but only its only external aspects". Social relationships are invisible and abstract. We can just realize them but cannot see or touch them. Therefore, society is abstract. Reuter wrote: "Just as life is not a thing but a process of living, so society is not a thing but a process of associating".

2. **Likeness and difference in society:** Society involves both likeness and difference. If people are all exactly alike, merely alike, their relationships would be limited. There would be little give-and- take and little reciprocity. If all men thought alike, felt alike, and acted alike, if they had the same standards and same interests, if they all accepted the same customs and echoed the same opinions without questioning and without variation, civilisation could never have advanced and culture would have remained rudimentary. Thus, society needs difference also for its existence and continuance.

Likeness and difference are logical opposites but for understanding likeness, comprehension of its relation to the other is necessary. Society exists among those who have some degree of likeness in mind and in body. F.H. Giddings called this

quality of society as "consciousness of kind" (a sense of likeness). Though likeness and difference both are necessary for the society to exist, but difference is always subordinated to likeness in society. Likeness has a predominant share in the constitution of society.

3. **Cooperation and conflict in society:** Cooperation and conflict are universal elements in human life. Society is based on cooperation but because of internal differences, there is conflict also among its members. This is why; Maclver and Page observed that "society is cooperation crossed by conflict". We know from our own experience that a person would be handicapped, showed down, and feels frustrated if he is expected to do everything alone, without the aid of others. "Cooperation is most elementary process of social life without which society is impossible" (Gisbert, 1957). Though cooperation is essential for the constitution of society but modem conflict theorists (such as Marx) have highlighted the role of conflict in society. If there is no conflict, even in small measure, society may become stagnant and people may become inert and inactive. However, the expression of disagreement in the form of conflict must always be held within tolerable bounds

4. **Society is a process and not a product:** "Society exists only as a time sequence. It is becoming, not a being; a process and not a product" (Maclver and Page, 1956). In other words, as soon as the process ceases, the product disappears. The product of a machine endures after the machine has been scrapped. To some extent the same is true not only of material relics of man's past culture but even of his immaterial cultural achievements.

5. **Society as a system of stratification:** Society provides a system of stratification of statuses and classes that each individual has a relatively stable and recognisable position in the social structure.

Conclusion

When society is viewed from the point of view of persons who constitute it, it takes the shape of 'a society' instead of 'society' in general terms. A society is the largest number of human beings who interact to satisfy their social needs and who share a common culture. "A society may be defined as a network of interconnected major groups viewed as a unit and sharing a common culture" (J.H. Ficther, Sociology, 1957).

3.5.   SOCIAL CHANGE
3.5.1. Meaning and Definition of Social Change

According to sociologists, social change is a constantly occurring phenomenon. It is the process through which social structures and institutions are reconstructed, undergoing a cultural transformation. Society is built upon certain value systems that maintain social order and shifts in the root of these value systems- human interaction- lead to the disruption of the maintained social order. Disruption is always acquainted with negativity, however, as society is constantly developing and innovating, change and disruption is not only inevitable but needed. Social change can result in positive or negative outcomes.

Change and continuity are the inevitable facts of life. Not only people themselves undergo the process of change but also the habitat they live in. That is why 'change' is often called the unchangeable or inescapable law of nature. Change is the only reality. Looking at the inevitability of change, Greek Philosopher Heraclitus pointed out that a person cannot step into the same river twice since in between the first and the second occasion, both the water in the river and the person concerned get changed (Giddens 2001, 42). History reveals that man's life has been transformed from the caves and jungles to the palatial buildings. People, family, religion, value and system will not remain same forever. Societies grow, decay and modify to the changing conditions. Every society, from primitive to industrial and post-industrial, has witnessed continuous state of transformation. Change is permanent, although the intensity or degree of change is different in different societies. According to British sociologist Anthony Giddens (2001), in human societies, to decide how far and in what ways a particular system is in a process of change or transformation, we have to show to what degree there is any modification of basic institutions during a specific time period. There are social systems which change very fast, whereas there are others which have ties with the remote past. W

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 relationships and social change means a change in the system of social relationships. Thus, the term social change is used to desirable variations in social interaction, social processes and social organization. A society generally has two distinct tendencies. They are- conservative and progressive. People in society have their tendency to conserve or preserve the social heritage of the past. Every society is proud of its own cultural history of the past. This is what may be describing as the conservative tendency of the society. But at the same time, it has the tendency to change, modify and improve the existing social heritage. Man is never satisfied with his present situation or existing condition. He wants to make changes and improvement of the existing state of affairs. This change is the law of nature and it is inevitable in the life of an individual as well as of society.

So social change and development is inevitable in human society. It is also an instinctive tendency in man to have the curiosity for new knowledge and new experiences. It leads to dissatisfaction with the existing situations that result in the changes. So, social situation undergoes changes with the changes of time that result in social progress.

Social change, in sociology, the alteration of mechanisms within the social structure, characterized by changes in cultural symbols, rules of behaviour, social organizations, or value systems.Throughout the historical development of their discipline, sociologists have borrowed models of social change from other academic fields. In the late 19th century, when evolution became the predominant model for understanding biological change, ideas of social change took on an evolutionary cast, and, though other models have refined modern notions of social change, evolution persists as an underlying principle.

Other sociological models created analogies between social change and the West's technological progress. In the mid-20th century, anthropologists borrowed from the linguistic theory of structuralism to elaborate an approach to social change called structural functionalism. This theory postulated the existence of certain basic institutions (including kinship relations and division of labour) that determine social behaviour. Because of their interrelated nature, a change in one institution will affect other institutions.

Various theoretical schools have emphasized different aspects of change. Marxist theory suggests that changes in modes of production can lead to changes in class systems, which can prompt other new forms of change or incite class conflict. A different view is conflict theory, which operates on a broad base that includes all institutions. The focus is not only on the purely divisive aspects of conflict, because conflict, while inevitable, also brings about changes that promote social integration. Taking yet another approach, structural-functional theory emphasizes the integrating forces in society that ultimately minimize instability.

Social change can evolve from a number of different sources, including contact with other societies (diffusion), changes in the ecosystem (which can cause the loss of natural resources or widespread disease), technological change (epitomized by the Industrial Revolution, which created a new social group, the urban proletariat), and population growth and other demographic variables. Social change is also spurred by ideological, economic, and political movements

According to Kingsley Davis- "By social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organization, that is, structure and functions of society."

According to Maclver ad Page-"Social change refers to "a process" responsive to many types of changes; to change in the manmade condition 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.
Lundberg, "Social change refers to any modifications in the established patterns of inter-human relationship and standard of conduct."
H.T. Mazumdar, "Social change may be defined as a new fashion or mode, either modifying or replacing the old, in the life of people or in the operation of society."

Morris Ginsberg, "By social change I understand a change in social structure, i.e. the size of a society, the composition or balance of its parts or the type of its organisation."

Gillin and Gillin, "Social changes are variations from the accepted modes of life; whether due to alternation in geographical conditions, in cultural equipments, composition of the population or ideologies whether brought about by diffusion or inventions within the group.

M.E. Jones, "Social change is a term used to describe variations in, or modifications of, any aspect of social process, social patterns, social interaction or social organisations."

Nature and characteristics of social change:

1. Social change is continuous: Society is always undergoing endless changes. Society cannot be preserved in a museum to save it from the ravages of time. From the dawn of history society has been in continuous flux.

2. Social change is temporal: Social change is temporal in the sense it denotes the timesequence. In fact, society exists only as a time-sequence. Innovation of new things, modification and renovation of the existing behavior and the discarding of the old behavior patterns take time.

3. Social change is environmental: It must take place within a geographic or physical and cultural context. Both these contexts have impact on human behavior and in turn man changes them. A social change 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.

5. Social change may be planned or unplanned: The direction and tempo of social change are often conditioned by human plans and programmes of 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, floods, earthquakes etc.

6. 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.

7. 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 amoral. It means the study of social change involves no value judgment. One can study change even within the value system without being for against the change.

8. 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 political pattern of both rural and urban society.

3.5.2   Diffusion

Diffusion refers to the spread of cultural traits from one group to another. It operates
both within and between societies. It takes place whenever societies come into contact with each other. Diffusion is a two way process. The British gave us their language and made tea an important ritual for us Indians; but they adopted several terms in English from us, for example, Pacca Sahib, Chchotahaziri, Jaggernaut, etc. Diffusion is also a selective process. Majority of the Indians may adopt the English language, but not their beef-eating habits. Diffusion generally involves some modification of the borrowed elements of culture either in form, function or meaning. Therefore, the process by which cultural traits spread from one culture to another.

3.5.3.   Evolution

The notion evolution is derived from the **Latin** word 'evolvere'. It means 'to develop' or to 'unfold' which is closely related to the **Sanskrit** world 'vikas'. The concept of evolution is specifically applied to mean the internal growth of a living organism—theplant,animals, etc. Moreover, internal growth has also seen through various stages of gradual transition. For example, seeds evolve to seedlings, then to plants, to trees and then starts the maturity and aging process of the trees.

The use of the word 'evolution' or 'social evolution' in sociology is borrowed from biology. Biology studies 'organic evolution', which denotes the evolution of all kinds of organisms. Social evolution, on the other hand, refers to the process of evolution of human society, human social relationships, societal values, norms and the way of life. It involves the idea that every society passes through different phases, from simple to complex. Sociologists and social anthropologists were impressed by the idea of organic evolution which could convincingly explain how one species evolves into another, and wanted to apply the same to the social world (Shankar Rao 2000, 491). As put forward by eminent sociologists MacIver and Page (2005, 522), evolution means more than growth. Growth does connote a direction of change, but it is quantitative in character. Evolution involves something more intrinsic, a change not merely in size, but at least in structure also. Social evolution is also a type of social change. Both of them are natural and are inevitable facts of life. However, there are differences between the two. First, every change is not evolutionary in nature, whereas evolution always implies change. Second, evolution, unlike change, is a continuous process. Third, the cause of social change may be both internal and external, whereas evolution is mostly affected through the operation of internal factors. Fourth, social change can be planned or unplanned but evolution is an automatic process. Fifth, social change is a value-neutral concept, whereas evolution

is value-loaded. Sixth, there can be slow or fast social change, but evolution is always a slow process (Mohanty, 1997, 27). Self-Instructional Material 129 Social Change NOTES As discussed in the beginning of this sub-section, any kind of change that we witness in the society can come under the broader definition of either social or cultural change. However, some specific variety of change can also be discussed here, although they come under the umbrella term of social or cultural change.

Evolution expresses continuity and direction of change. It means more than growth. 'Growth' implies a direction of change but essentially in size or quality. Evolution involves something more intrinsic, a change not only in size but also of structure. All changes are not evolutionary and all changes are not progressive. Discussion ofthe direction of change need not involve any value judgements. The diminishing   size of the family, and the increasing size of economic units, are matters of historical fact. 'Social change' is a value-neutral term, in the sense that the sociologists do not study social change in terms of "good or bad", desirable or undesirable. One must admit, however, that it is a difficult task indeed to make a value-free critical analysis of changes, taking place in the structure of a society

3.5.4   Revolution

A **revolution** is a very sharp change made to something. The derives from Latin, and is related to the word *revolution* which means '*a turn around'*.Revolutions can be found in many fields but are usually political in their nature. Some people feel unhappy with their lives, some are not happy with whole systems. They might join together, share their ideas, and make something change. Often, revolutions include fighting, and civil unrest. But there are also revolutions that happen without fighting. We can also understood it as "a forcible overthrow of a government or social order, in favour of a new system".

The Soviet Union was made by the ***Russian Revolution*** that killed millions, and later fell apart in a counterrevolution without much fighting. But in the ***French Revolution*** (1789), there was much bloodshed. The years right after this Revolution in France are often called the Reign of Terror. Other events often called "revolutions" include: ***American Revolution*** and the ***Shift from an agrarian society to an industrial one:*** The ***Industrial Revolution*** (1750).

Revolutions and disturbances: The most intense conflict may result in a revolution in the society like the Russian Revolution, the French Revolution and the American Revolution, and bring about wide ranging changes. These revolutions were the result of exploitation of a large majority by a small minority, the suppression of freedoms, tyranny, corruption and bad policies of the state.

How do we implement change in our society? If we see something we think is wrong, how do we address it? A **social revolution** is a fundamental change in a society. It involves a shift in power in a society. Revolutions occur when a number of people in a society feel discontent with the current order and agree that change is necessary. When we stop wanting to live the way we're living, or if we stop believing in the legitimacy of our current social or political order, we may turn to revolution.

It's important to note that revolution is different than **reform**, which seeks to change small parts of an existing system, but ultimately keep it in place. Revolution seeks to overthrow this whole system. Revolution can bring about important social, political, and economic changes. Let's talk about some of the causes of social revolution.

Theda Skocpol in her article "France, Russia, China: A Structural Analysis of Social Revolutions" states that social revolution is a "combination of thoroughgoing structural transformation and massive class upheavals". She comes to this definition by combining Samuel P. Huntington's definition that it "is a rapid, fundamental, and violent domestic change in the dominant values and myths of society, in its political institutions, social structure, leadership, and government activities and policies" and Vladimir Lenin's, which is that revolutions are "the festivals of the oppressed... [who act] as creators of a new social order". She also states that this definition excludes many revolutions, because they fail to meet either or both of the two parts of this definition. Therefore, A revolution is a successful attempt by a large group of people to change the political system of their country by force. A revolution in a particular area of human activity is an important change in that area.

3.5.5. Progress and Development

Introduction

It is often notice that the concepts of development and progress are often used in a positive sense to indicate the processes of advancement of individual or of collective phenomena or of objects or of actions. Human society has made a long journey in this; so is the concept of development. For centuries development was understood as progress, thereafter as growth, as change, as transfer of notion, as modernisation and so on. Very recently it is understood (along with economic) as social and human development as well. Human society has progressed and developed through several stages. Indeed, human society has made a ceaseless journey from the stages of savagery to barbarism, from barbarism to civilisation, from theological to metaphysical, from metaphysical to positive scientific, from simple to doubly compound, from doubly compound to trebly compound, from homogenous to heterogeneous, from under-developed to developed, from ancient to feudal, from feudal to capitalist, from traditional pre-industrial (mechanic solidarity), to industrial (organic solidarity) from pre– rational /pre-capitalist to rational capitalist, from primitive to intermediate, from intermediate to modern, agrarian to industrial, rural to urban and so on. In social science literature, these advancements have been viewed from diverse perspectives or orientations and have been diversely understood in philosophical, political, economic and social terms. This unit delineates the major perspectives on progress and development. We have initially located these concepts in the evolutionary perspectives as elaborated by the classical social thinkers like Morgan, Comte, Spencer, Hobhouse, Marx, Weber, McClelland, Durkheim and Parsons and go on to explain development in economic and social terms as has been visualised in the contemporary world.

The economic notions of development as predominantly understood by growth in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and the Capitalist, Socialist and theThird World models of development are also widely explained. Developmental perspectives have experienced a paradigm shift since the late 1970s. The notions of human and social development have required a central place in the emerging perspective on development. New strategies have also emerged to integrate the marginalised people and women in the development process and to redefine the role of the state in development. Hence the reformulated strategy of development, i.e., development with empowerment of the marginalised groups and the related issues are also examined in the last section of this unit. As this is the first unit of this course, we have raised several issues here. These issues would be discussed and critically analysed at length in the following units of this course. Let us begin with an understanding of the concepts of development and progress

Progress:

Progress is the movement towards a refined, improved, or otherwise desired state. In the context of progressivism, it refers to the proposition that advancements in technology, science, and social organization have resulted, and by extension will continue to result, in an improved human condition; the latter may happen as a result of direct human action, as in social enterprise or through activism, or as a natural part of sociocultural evolution.

The concept of progress was introduced in the early-19th-century social theories, especially social evolution as described by Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer. It was present in the Enlightenment's philosophies of history. As a goal, social progress has been advocated by varying realms of political ideologies with different theories on how it is to be achieved.

As the quote from Mencken indicates, *"Change is not progress," but progress requires change*. Thus, neither the "Big Bang" nor evolution necessarily implies progress, although I willargue that both have resulted in advancement. *Mankind has made progress; improvements insociety are indispensable and almost inevitable; and economic growth and progress are vital goals.* The alternatives to progress are stagnation, deterioration, and the eventual extinction of all life. Progress can be defined as an improvement in the well-being of human beings.

The notion of progress, on the other hand, is used to mean 'to step forward' that coincides with the Sanskrit word 'pra-gat'.Progress implies change in direction towards somefinaldesiredgoal.Itinvolvesa values judgement. Progress is a change in a desirable direction. It can also refer to change for the better. It involves value-judgement because it implies betterment or improvement. Progress involves change that leads to certain well-defined goals. It is also a type of social change. However, there are differences between the two. Every change is not progress, but every progress can be called as a change. Moreover, change is a value-free concept, while progress always denotes change for the better. In that sense, progress is a valueladen concept. It has been discussed before that change can be planned and unplanned.

Nonetheless, progress is always planned and ideally fixed. Besides, change is obvious and certain. Small or big, slow or fast, change takes place in every society, but progress is uncertain (Mohanty 1997, 21).

Alterations which proceed in the direction of some desired goal.Every event of social change cannot be regarded as progress, for progress must connote the taking of a step forward. If at the root of evolution we have the stages of integration and differentiation, progress would stand for a development in a particular direction which is regarded as a step forward according to definite criteria of value- judgments.

While evolution has no definite direction other than the one which is inherent and irresistible in itself, progress must stand for a march in a forward direction according to some accepted principle that is formulated by a particular principle of judgment.

Ginsberg maintains (Idea of Progress) that progress 'is a development or evolution in a direction which satisfies rational criteria in value'. In order to measure progress, it is necessary to apply the test of ethical advancement made by society which, of course, is an irrelevant factor so far as evolution is concerned.

Writers like Comte and Spencer would maintain that any evolutionary development of society must necessarily mean that it has progressed. Herbet Spencer particularly insists that social evolution cannot have any meaning other than that of progress. But these views are not accepted now by more modern writers. McIver states in his Society that 'evolution is a scientific concept and progress an ethical concept'.

Even Hobhouse observes that evolution of any form does not necessarily imply that it is changing into the better form; and, therefore, we cannot conclude that evolution necessarily implies that society is progressing.

According to him, progress can be made only when the individual in society strives for ethical advancement. Social progress, therefore, is not a phenomenon marked by spontaneity; it is the product of conscious efforts made by social individuals. **Progress** means more than economic growth.Itmeansalongerandbetterqualitylifeforalarger proportion of people.

Progress has many dimensions. For primitive peoples and for most of the less developed
countries of the world, it signifies a reduction in infant mortality, an increase in life spans, and anextension of literacy. For the developed world, which may have achieved life spans close to thelimit and in which infant mortality has fallen close to zero, while over 95 percent of the populationcan read and write, progress entails improvements different in kind and in degree. Simple literacyis no longer enough. Instead one looks for a rising level of education, a betterment ofhealthforallages and groups of the population, and for an extension in the command over resources. It is also significant to note that, a rising per capita income does not necessarily constitute betterment for mankind.

Hence, we can conclude that the society in which scientific development is hindered will not progress, while the one which encourages such development will have chances of making progress; and this observation about social progress can remain scientific in so far as it is based on social facts and not merely upon ethical considerations.

Development

Though there are perceptive disagreements, development has also beenunderstoodwidely in terms. discuss the different connotations of development asin general perceived in the post-World War II period. We shall also discuss theimpact of these notions ofdevelopment in society very briefly.Development as Multiple Connotations:There are several connotationsabout development, such as development as growth, development aschange or transformation and development as modernisation.a) Growth: In economic terms,development as growth refers to anincreased capacity to produce consumption goods and a concomitantincrease in consumption patterns. (Little, cfMarglin and Marglin1990: 1). As growth, development very simply may be defined withrespect to an increased ability to fulfill basic human needs of food,clothing, shelter, healthcare and education. (Streeten and associates,cfMarglin and Marglin 1990: 2). In a third sense of growth,development has alsobeen defined in terms of expansion ofpossibilities, an increase in individual choices, capabilities andfunctioning (Sen, cfMarglin and Marglin 1990: 2). Development in theabove senses carries with it connotations of being positive,progressive, and natural beneficial and inevitable.b) Change and Transformation: Development as change andtransformation refersto the economic, social, political and culturalprocesses of change in human societies (Schrijvers 1993).c) Modernisation: Development is also understood as modernisation,though some may disagree about them being one and the samething. Often modernisation being seen as a means to development.In the economic realm it refers to the processes of industrialisation,urbanisation and technological transformation of agriculture. In thepolitical realm, it requires a rationalisation of authority in generaland a rationalising bureaucracy in particular. In the social realm it ismarked by the weakening of ascriptive ties and the primacy of personalachievement in advancement, and in the cultural realm it is thegrowth of science and secularization, along with an expansion of theliterate population that makes for what has been referred to as a"disenchantment" of the world (Marglin 1990). Development in thissense of modernity stands for what is understood as Westernisation,where the west stands asthe model for the progress of the rest ofthe world. Development in this sense becomes a comparativeadjective, which is based on the western centric assumption thatthere is aprocess of linear evolution of the world in which the Westleads world history and evolution and that other nations must followin their footsteps towards a homogenous world.The termdevelopment has acquired a special meaning since the endof World War II when an era of development was launched by theAmerican President, Harry S. Truman, who publicly expressed theneed to embark on a bold new program for making the benefits ofscientific advances and industrial progress of his country available forthe improvement and growth of"underdeveloped" areas. Discountingold imperialism and exploitation for foreign profit, he announced aprogram of development based on concepts of democratic fair dealingEsteva1992). Development by this declaration came to connote asan escape from the undignifiedcondition called "underdevelopment".Paradigm Shift in Development StrategiesThe postcolonial developing world since the early 1970s has experienced

aphenomenal shift in thedevelopment strategy. For example, immediately afterindependence, India adopted adevelopmental strategy of "growth withstability" with the basic thrust on industrialisation, agricultural modernisation,expansion of infrastructure, education and mass communication. However, inthe backdrop of the declining access of a vast number of people to the meansof livelihood security, literacy/education, healthcare facilities, housing andother basic necessities of life, the philosophy of "social justice" was integratedin the development discourse in the 1970s. It is important that the focus ofdevelopment has been shifted for thedisadvantaged section of society. Again,since the early 1990s, especially in the wake of globalisation, the strategy of"empowerment with development" has been adopted to integrate themarginalised sections into the mainstream (SinghaRoy 2001). The developmentalprocesses have experienced a phenomenal shift especially in the wake of thecollapse of the socialist model of economy, the fast spread of neo-liberalisedglobalisation, introduction ofnew structural adjustment programmes, formationof the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and enactment of GATT and GATSagreements. The neo-liberal developmentism has provided a new dimension tothe notion of development with the philosophy of one world,one market andoneideology:

a) RedefiningtheRoleoftheStateTheWorld Development Report, 1997 emphasised the needforaneffectiverole of the State for social and economic development but in a new form.According to it, the State is central to economic and social development, notas a direct provider of growth but as a partner, catalyst and facilitator. Theworld is changing, and with it our ideas about the state's role in economic asocial development.

b) FocusonEmpowermentoftheMarginalisedThe World Development Summit,1995, talks about"people'sinitiatives","peopleempowerment" and "strengthening capacities of the people". Regardingtheobjectives of development, it specifically mentions "thatempowering people,particularly women, to strengthen their capacities is the main objective ofdevelopment and its principal resource. Empowerment requires the fullparticipation of people in the formulation, implementation and evaluation ofdecisions determining thefunctioning and well-being of societies" (WorldDevelopmentSummit,1995).To ensure the full participation of the people, it is pointed out that the stateshould provide "a stable legalframework" in accordance with the "Constitution,laws and procedures consistent withinternational laws and obligations" whichpromotes, among other things, the encouragement of "partnership with freeand representative organisations of civil society, strengthening of the abilitiesand opportunities of civil society and local communities to develop their ownorganisations, resources and activities" (World Development Summit, 1995)The economic notions of development as predominantly understood by growthin the Gross DomesticProduct (GDP), and the Capitalist, Socialist and theThird World models of development are also widely explained. Developmentalperspectives have experienced a

paradigm shift since the late 1970s. Thenotions of human and social development have required a central place in theemerging perspective on development. New strategies have also emerged tointegrate themarginalised people and women in the development process andto redefine the role of thestate in development. Hence the reformulatedstrategy of development, i.e.,development with empowerment of themarginalised groups and the related issues are also examined the term'development', as has been discussed earlier, means formal and structural changes in anorganism. Even though society is not an entity like the living organism, the term as applied tosuch organism can have its valid application in social matters. Just as life grows from thesimple to the complex form, society develops in the sense that its 'energy' accumulatescollectively, such energy is 'organized' for functioning in a definite direction, and 'harmony'is achieved between the different social organs for the purpose of effecting an overalldevelopment.

3.5.6. Factors of Social Change

1. Cultural Factor: Social and cultural changes are often regarded as the same and denote similar kind of change. However, there are differences between the two. 'Social' refers to interactions and interrelationship between people. 'Culture', on the other hand, refers to the customs, beliefs, symbols, value systems and, in general, the set of rules that are created by people in society. It can be both material and non-material. The concept of culture relates to the body of knowledge, techniques and values through which a society directs and expresses its life as an interacting entity (Mohanty 1997, 13). So, the change in social relationships, human interactions, modifications in role expectations and role performance, and so on, are regarded as social change, whereas changes in human artifacts, beliefs, values, body of knowledge, and so on, are called as cultural change. Culture changes through time and it spreads from place to place and group to group. As Biesanz and Biesanz (1964, 61–62) put it, in the span of time since the Second World War began, immense changes have taken place. Television, since the experimental stage before the war, has entered almost every living room in the world. From the first atomic reaction in the early decades of 20th century, we have progressed to space capsules and satellites, and in a few short post-War years, plastics and synthetic fabrics, wash-and-wear clothes, stretch socks, automatic washers, dishwashers, clothes driers, food freezers and packaged mixes have changed the housewife's fate.

It is important to mention here that sometimes changes that occur in a cultural system do not go smooth and face maladjustment with other parts of the system. Such a situation is termed as 'cultural lag'. Defining the concept, American sociologist William Fielding Ogburn (1957) wrote, 'A cultural lag occurs when one of the two parts of culture which are correlated changes before or in greater degree than the other parts does, thereby causing less adjustment between the two parts than existed

previously.' However, any cultural change has its impact on human relationships and, therefore, influences social changes too. The advent of mobile telephony and Internet has far-reaching consequences on interpersonal relationships. Thus, cultural change positively affects social change and change in a society comes through both social and cultural changes. As Kingsley Davis stated, cultural change is broader than social change and social change is only a part of it (Shankar Rao 2000, 485). All social changes are cultural changes, but not vice-versa. Those cultural changes that affect social organizations and human interpersonal relations can be called as social changes

2.Demographic Factor: Demography deals with the size, distribution, growth, and so on, of population over a period of time. Demographic change is change in the patters of fertility, mortality, age structure, migration, and so on. High fertility or high mortality can have important implications in any society. The same can happen if the rate of such indicators are too slow. High fertility might lead to large-scale instances of poverty and unemployment, and might affect the developmental efforts of a state. Over-population also leads to greater use of natural resources and affects environmental sustainability. High birth and death rates bring about change in the attitude of people towards family and marriage. In India, demographic change in the form of high fertility led to the adoption of family planning programmes and following which there was a decrease in the population growth rate. The small family norm has introduced change in social relationships between husband and wife, parents and children, the status of women, and so on.

3.Technological Factor: Human civilization is moving from the most rudimentary technology of bow and arrow to the modern and highly sophisticated instruments of the present day. The invention of computers, Internet, mobile phones, jet planes, atomic bomb and discoveries of men like Vasco da Gama and Columbus have changed the socio-cultural space of the modern man dramatically. Ancient man walked on bare feet. Then came the bullock cart which made movement comparatively faster. Subsequent technological innovations brought about bicycles, automobiles, jet planes, and so on. These have helped the movement of people faster than ever before. These technological changes have enormous societal implications. The introduction of high-yield seeds in the form of Green Revolution in India that ensured massive increase in foodgrains like rice and wheat managed the hunger situation in the country quite well. Dramatizing the fact that technological change may lead to social change, sociologist William F. Ogburn once attributed the emancipation of women to the invention of the automobile self-starter, which enabled women to drive cars, freed them from their homes and permitted them to invade the world of business (Biesanz and Biesanz 1964, 64). The modern means of entertainment and communication like TV, Radio, Internet, cell phones, and so on. Have drastically changed the family life in India and substantially affected the role of women in society. Not only they are empowered and emancipated but also the husband-wife ties are now being seen as that of co-partners rather than that of superiors and inferiors. Although technological changes have not spread equally

everywhere in the country, still phenomenal improvement in this respect cannot be ignored.

4. Economic Factor: Economy plays a cardinal role in man's daily life. Noted sociologist and philosopher Karl Marx pointed out the significance of economy as a factor in social change. He propounded that economy which constitutes the means of production like labour, instruments, and so on, and the relations of production is the infrastructure and all others like family, legal system, education, religion, polity, and so on are the superstructure. As he says, a conflict between the oppressor and the oppressed, haves and the have-nots brings change in the society and the society transforms to a new mode of production. In this manner Marx says, society gets transformed from primitive communism to slavery, slavery to feudalism, from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism, Marx predicted, socialism, a classless society, will emerge (Morrison, 2006). In Indian society, industrial economy brought enormous change in the lives of people. Not only did it change the occupation structure in the society but also it affected interpersonal relationships. People from rural areas migrated to cities to work in factories. This drastically reduced the effect of caste/untouchability and also transformed joint families to nuclear households. India, once an agricultural economy, is now manufacturing industrial products to emerge a world leader in producing software, making it a service economy. The software giants like Infosys, Wipro, TCS, and so on are renowned the world over. Thus, economic change is one of the important forms of social change.

5. **Religious Factors:** German sociologist Max Weber regarded religion as an important contributor to economic development or stagnation. He tried to explain this theory in his book Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1930), in which he explains the rise of the capitalist spirit, which led to economic dynamism in the West, especially through the rise of Calvinism—an individualistic ethic of Christianity. Religions of the East, Weber argues, are usually accompanied by a rejection of worldly affairs, including the pursuit of wealth and possessions. He defines the spirit of capitalism as the ideasthat favour the rational pursuit of economic gain. Weber shows that certain branches of Protestantism had supported worldly activities dedicated to economic gain, seeing them as endowed with moral and spiritual significance. This recognition was not a goal in itself; rather they were a by-product of other doctrines of faith that encouraged planning, hard work and self-denial in the pursuit of worldly riches.

In this connection Marx has propounded that- Reformation reforms in the 16th century Europe, to rid Christianity of its superstitions, and corruption that had plagued the church and its officials led to the rise of scientific temperament and rationality. It finally led to Industrial Revolution in the later era. • Most of the churches of southern US supported the civil rights movement for African-Americans and helped in abolishing racism in the US. • In medieval India, socio-religious movements like the Bhakti and Sufi movements helped in spreading tolerance among both Hindus and

Muslims as their leaders came from all castes and classes, and preached an ideology of tolerance.

6. Other Factors: Sometimes due to emergences of new ideas and ideologies certainly bring about social changes. There are many examples where people steps over old existing orthodox socio-cultural and religious ideologies and practices and adheres to new ideas which may brings about social changes**.**

3.5.7.   Theories of Social Change

A variety of reasons have been offered throughout history to explain why social change occurs. The problem of explaining social change was central to nineteenth century sociology. Many earlier theories of society that claimed to be scientific were in fact theories of change. They sought to explain the present in terms of the past. Many different theories were propounded to define and explain social change. The DIFFERENT theories of social change are as follows: 1. Evolutionary Theory 2. Cyclical Theory 3. Economic (Mandan) Theory of Social Change 4. Conflict Theory 5. Technological Theory.;

1. Evolutionary Theory

The notion of evolution came into social sciences from the theories of biological evolution. With the advent of Darwinian Theory of biological evolution, society and culture began to be regarded as undergoing the same changes and demonstrating the same trends.

Charles Darwin (1859), the British biologist, who propounded the theory of biological evolution, showed that species of organisms have evolved from simpler organisms to the more complicated organisms through the processes of variations and natural selection. After Darwin, 'evolution', in fact, became the buzz word in all intellectual inquiry and Darwin and Spencer were the key names of an era in the history of thought.

Herbert Spencer (1890), who is known to be the forerunner of this evolutionary thought in sociology, took the position that sociology is "the study of evolution in its most complex form". For him, evolution is a process of differentiation and integration.

The basic assumptions of Evolutionary Theory **can be summarised as under:**
1. That change is inevitable and natural.
2. That change is gradual and continuous.
3. That change is sequential and in certain stages.
4. That all successive stages of change are higher over preceding stage, i.e., evolution is progressive.
5. That stages of change are non-reversible.
6. That forces of change are inherent in the object.
7. That the direction of change is from simple to complex, from homogeneity to heterogeneity, from undifferentiated to the differentiated in form and function.
8. That all societies pass through same stages of development.

There are three main types of evolutionary theory:
(1) Theory of Unilinear Evolution:
It postulates the straight-line, ordered or progressive nature of social change. According to this theory, change always proceeds toward a predestined goal in a unilinear fashion. There is no place of repetition of the same stage in this theory.

Followers of this pattern of change argue that society gradually moves to an even higher state of civilization which advances in a linear fashion and in the direction of improvement. The pace of this change may be swift or slow. In brief, linear hypothesis states that all aspects of society change continually in a certain direction, never faltering, never repeating themselves.

Theories of Saint-Simon, Comte, Morgan, Marx and Engels, and many other anthropologists and sociologists come under the category of unilinear theories of social evolution because they are based on the assumption that each society does, indeed must, pass through a fixed and limited numbers of stages in a given sequence. Such theories long dominated the sociological scene.

(2) Universal Theory of Evolution:

It is a little bit variant form of unilinear evolution which states that every society does not necessarily go through the same fixed stages of development. It argues, rather, that the culture of mankind, taken as a whole, has followed a definite line of evolution.

Spencer's views can be categorised under this perspective who said that mankind had progressed from small groups to large and from simple to compound and in more general terms, from homogenous to the heterogeneous. The anthropologist Leslie White has been a leading exponent of this conception.

Similar ideas were greatly elaborated by William Ogbum, who stressed the role of invention in social change. On this basis he gave birth to the famous concept of 'cultural lag' which states that change in our non-material culture, i.e., in our ideas and social arrangements, always lag behind changes in material culture, i.e., in our technology and invention.

(3) Multilinear Theory of Evolution:

This brand of evolutionism has more recently developed and is more realistic than the unilinear and universal brand of evolutionary change. Multilinear evolution is a concept, which attempts to account for diversity. It essentially means identification of different sequential patterns for different culture or types of cultures. This theory holds that change can occur in several ways and that it does not inevitably lead in the same direction. Theorists of this persuasion recognise that human culture has evolved along a number of lines.

Those who share this perspective, such as Julian Steward (1960), attempt to explain neither the straight-line evolution of each society, nor the progress of mankind as a whole, but rather concentrate on much more limited sequences of development.

It does identify some social trends as merely universal: the progression from smaller to larger, simpler to more complex, rural to urban, and low technology to higher technology but it recognises that these can come about in various ways and with distinct consequences. This theory is related to what is known as episodic approach, which stresses the importance of accidents and unique historical, social and environmental circumstances that help to explain a particular course of social change. Later on, the views of Leslie White and Julian Steward were named as neo-evolutionism.

Cyclical Theory:

Cyclical change is a variation on unilinear theory which was developed by *Oswald Spengler* (Decline of the West, 1918) and *Arnold J. Toynbee* (A Study of History, 1956). They argued that societies and civilisations change according to cycles of rise,

decline and fall just as individual persons are born, mature, grow old, and die. According to German thinker Spengler, every society has a predetermined life cycle—birth, growth, maturity and decline. Society, after passing through all these stages of life cycle, returns to the original stage and thus the cycle begins again.

On the basis of his analysis of Egyptian, Greek Roman and many other civilisations, he concluded that the Western civilisation is now on its decline. The world renowned British historian Toyanbee has also upheld this theory. He has studied the history of various civilisations and has found that every civilisation has its rise, development and fall such as the civilisation of Egypt. They have all come and gone, repeating a recurrent cycle of birth, growth, breakdown and decay. He propounded the theory of "challenge and response" which means that those who can cope with a changing environment survive and those who cannot die.

Thus, a society can grow and survive if it can constructively respond to the challenges. Cyclical theory of change or sometimes called 'rise and fair theory presumes that social phenomena of whatever sort recur again and again, exactly as they were before in a cyclical fashion.

A variant of cyclical process is the theory of a well-known American sociologist **P.A. Sorokin** (Social and Cultural Dynamics, 1941), which is known *as 'pendular theory of social change'*. He considers the course of history to be continuous, though irregular, fluctuating between two basic kinds of cultures: the 'sensate' and the 'ideational' through the 'idealistic'. According to him, culture oscillates like the pendulum of a clock between two points.

The pendulum of a clock swings with the passage of time, but ultimately it comes to its original position and re-proceeds to its previous journey. Thus, it is just like a cyclical process but oscillating in character. A sensate culture is one that appeals to the senses and sensual desires.

It is hedonistic in its ethics and stresses science and empiricism. On the other hand, the ideational culture is one in which expressions of art, literature, religion and ethics do not appeal to the senses but to the mind or the spirit. It is more abstract and symbolic than the sensate culture.

The pendulum of culture swings from sensate pole and leads towards the ideational pole through the middle pole called 'idealistic' culture, which is a mixed form of sensate and ideational cultures—a somewhat stable mixture of faith, reason, and senses as the source of truth. Sorokin places contemporary European and American cultures in the last stage of disintegration of sensate culture, and argues that only way out of our 'crisis' is a new synthesis of faith and sensation. There is no other possibility.

In Sorokin's analysis of cultures, we find the seeds of both the theories—cyclical and linear change. In his view, culture may proceed in a given direction for a time and thus appear to conform to a linear formula. But, eventually, as a result of forces that are inherent in the culture itself, there will be shift of direction and a new period of development will be ushered in. This new trend may be linear, perhaps it is oscillating or it may conform to some particular type of curve.

Vilfredo Pareto's (1963) theory of 'Circulation of Elites' is also essentially of this variety. According to this theory, major social change in society occurs when one elite replaces another, a process Pareto calls it 'circulation of elites'. All elites tend to become decadent in the course of time. They 'decay in quality' and lose their 'vigour'. According to Marx, history ultimately leads to and ends with the communist Utopia, whereas history to Pareto is a never-ending circulation of elites. He said that

societies pass through the periods of political vigour and decline which repeat themselves in a cyclical fashion.

Functionalism and Social Change:

Functionalism, as a new approach of study of society, developed mainly as a reaction to evolutionism, in the early years of twentieth century. Critics of evolutionism advocated that there was no use to know the first appearance of any item of culture and social behaviour. They called it the "fruitless quest for origin". One of the most significant assumptions of functionalists is that society (or culture) is comprised of functionally interdependent parts or the system as a whole.

These theorists believed that the society, like human body, is a balanced system of institutions, each of which serves a function in maintaining society. When events outside or inside the society' disrupts the equilibrium, social institution makes adjustments to restore stability.

This fundamental assumption became the main basis of the critics of functionalism to charge that if the system is in equilibrium with its various parts contributing towards order and stability, it is difficult to see how it changes.

The functionalists responded to this charge by employing concepts such as equilibrium and differentiation. For instance, a leading proponent of functionalist approach, Talcott Parsons approaches this problem in the following way: He maintained, no system is in a perfect state of equilibrium although a certain degree of equilibrium is essential for the survival of societies. Changes occur in one part of society, there must be adjustments in other parts. If this does not occur, the society's equilibrium will be disturbed and strain will occur. The process of social change can therefore be thought of as a 'moving equilibrium'.

Parsons views social change as a process of 'social evolution' from simple to more complex form of society. Social evolution involves a process of social differentiation. The institutions arid roles which form the social system become increasingly differentiated and specialised in terms of their function. As the parts of society become more and more specialised and distinct, it increases the problem of integration of parts which in turn set forth the process of social change and social equilibrium.

Some followers of functionalism argued that if it is a theory of social persistence (stability), then it must be also a theory of change. In the process of adaptation of social institutions in a society, change is a necessary condition or rather it is imminent in it. Thus, one can explain changes in the economy as adaptations to other economics or to the polity, or changes in the family structure in terms of adaptation to other institutions, and so on.

Conflict Theory:

Social theorists in the nineteenth and early twentieth century's were concerned with conflict in society. But, the label of conflict theorists is generally applied to those sociologists who opposed the dominance of structural-functionalism. These theorists contend that in functionalism there is no place of change and as such it cannot explain change.

They have neglected conflict in favour of a unitary concept of society which emphasises social integration. By contrast to functionalist approach, conflict theorists contend that institutions and practices continue because powerful groups have the ability to maintain the status quo. Change has a crucial significance, since it is needed to correct social injustices and inequalities.

Conflict theorists do not believe that societies smoothly evolve to higher level. Instead, they believe that conflicting groups struggle to ensure progress (Coser, 1956). Conflict theorists assert that conflict is a necessary condition for change. It must be the cause of change. There is no society, changing or unchanging, which does not have conflict of some kind or another. Thus, conflict is associated with all types of social change in some way or other.

The modem conflict theory is heavily influenced by the ideas of karl Marx. It may be regarded as the offshoot of his economic theory of social change which states that economic change only occurs and produces other change through the mechanism of intensified conflict between social groups and between different parts of the social system. Conflict would ultimately transform society. While Marx emphasised economic conflict. Max Weber based his arguments on conflict about power. Ralf Dahrendorf (1959), although critical of Marxist notions of class, tried to reconcile the contrast between the functionalist and conflict approaches of society. He contends that these approaches are ultimately compatible despite their many areas of disagreement. He disagreed with Marx not only on the notions of class but on many other points also. Marx viewed social change as a resolution of conflict over scarce economic resources, whereas Dahrendorf viewed social change as a resolution of conflict over power. Marx believed a grand conflict would occur between those who had economic resources and those who did not; whereas Dahrendorf believed that there is constant simultaneous conflict among many segments of society.

Commenting on this theory, Percy S. Cohen (Modem Social Theory, 1968) writes: "This theory is plausible, but it is not necessarily true. The contention that group conflict is a sufficient condition for social change is obviously false. It is arguable that structured conflict, when it involves a fairly equal balance of forces, actually obstructs change which might otherwise occur. For example, in societies where there are deep divisions between regional, ethnic or racial groups, there may be little possibility of promoting economic development or welfare policies; such 'ameliorative' changes require some degree of consensus. The simple point is that conflict may lead to impasse not to change. It should be emphasised that social conflict is often as much the product of social change as the cause. And it is commonly a great obstacle to certain types of change."

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

Check your progress

1. The word "Evolution"is derived from which word?
2. Discuss the Meaning and Characteristics of Social Change.

</div>

3. What do you mean by Diffusion?
4. Define the term "Evolution"
5. Explain the term 'Revolution"
6. Discuss the difference between Progress and Development.

Conclusion

The causes of social change are diverse, and the processes of change can be identified as either short-term trends or long-term developments. Change can be either cyclic or one-directional.

The mechanisms of social change can be varied and interconnected. Several mechanisms may be combined in one explanatory model of social change. For example, innovation by business might be stimulated by competition and by government regulation.

To the degree that change processes are regular and interconnected, social change itself is structured. Change on different levels—social dynamics in everyday life and short-term transformations and long-term developments in society at large—has been the focus of much attention in the study of society.

Check your progress-1

2.1. Discuss the difference between Society and Culture

2.2. write short notes on the following;
- Culture
- Institution
- Association
- Social group.
- Social change

3.6. Summary

Therefore, in sociology, socialization is the process of internalizing the norms and ideologies of society. Socialization encompasses both learning and teaching and is thus "the means by which social and cultural continuity are attained". Humans need social experiences to learn their culture and to survive. Socialization essentially represents the whole process of learning throughout the life course and is a central influence on the behavior, beliefs, and actions of adults as well as of children.

Therefore, the abovementioned explanation on the topics like; Society, Community, Culture, Institution, Association, Social group, Social change contributes one to enhance their understanding on the said topics. And as a student's of Sociology

it is utmost necessity to have the basic ideas on the given topics. Therefore, from above mentioned explanations and exercises, etc. one can broaden their understanding on the given topics. Which will definitely helps one to deal the subject matter in more relevant and scientific manner. Further, it will also help to understand its further topics which we will be dealing in next chapter.

Associations are simply formed for the fulfilment of certain goals and are temporary in nature. Community however, is of permanent type and takes care of different facets of human life.

Basically sociology is a study of human in society. More specifically, it studies his/her social relations and interactions with social institutions. It is, therefore, necessary to understand some basic concepts which help in understanding the subject matter of sociology. The present Unit has discussed, keeping the above objectives in view, the nature and characteristics of society and social institutions like association and group. It has also discussed an understanding of human in his/her relation to society and other human beings by explaining the concept of status and role. Human interaction with the society has different manifestations. One of the manifestations that gives us an understanding of such a interaction is the study of social structure. This unit has explained all the above concepts with a view to provide basic knowledge for an understanding of subject matter of sociology.

3.7.   KEY TERMS

1. **Group of People:** An association is a group of people who form it for the attainment of common goals.
2. **Voluntary Membership:** Only those people who endorse endorse the common goals of the association become its members. Membership is voluntary and cannot be imposed on people who do not wish to do so.
 3. **Common Goals:** Members form an association for the attainment of common objectives. Those who do not endorse these objectives do not become members of the association.

Society: In sociological terms, society refers to a group of people who live in a definable community and share the same culture. On a broader scale, society consists of the people and institutions around us, our shared beliefs, and our cultural ideas, etc.

Culture: It refers to the sum of human beings' ways of life, their behaviour, beliefs, feelings, thought; it connotes everything that is acquired by them as social beings. To the British anthropologist Edward Tylor. He defined culture as *" that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society".*

Institution: A social institution is an interrelated system of social roles and social norms, organized around the satisfaction of an important social need or social

function. Social Institutions are organized patterns of beliefs and behaviour that are cantered on basic social needs.

Association: Association is a group of people collected together with some particular aim. It is, thus, a concrete group which can be seen; while at certain social situation. substitutability of individuals and recorded control, etc. These interactions come together to constitute common features in basic social units.

Group: Comprises two or more people who have a meaningful interaction and common goals.

Social group: social group consists of members which has areciprocal relations. The members are bound by a sense of unity. Their interest is common, behaviour is similar. They are bound by the common consciousness of interaction.

Social Change: Social change may be defined as a new fashion or mode, either modifying or replacing the old, in the life of people or in the operation of society."

Society: A relatively independent, self-perpetuating human group which occupies a particular territory shares a culture and actively lives within this group.

Evolution: In biology, evolution is the change in the characteristics of a species over several generations and relies on the process of natural selection.

The theory of evolution: is based on the idea that all species are related and *gradually change* over time.

Revolution: in Social Science it refers to "the activity or movement designed to effect fundamental changes in the social, economical and political, etc. which brought paradigm changes in the existing system.

Progress: Progress is the movement towards a refined, improved, or otherwise desired state. In the context of progressivism, it refers to the proposition that advancements in technology, science, and social organization have resulted, and by extension will continue to result, in an improved human condition.

Development: development means as event constituting a new stage or a changing situation which has implicitly intended as something positive or desirable. Very recently it is understood as along with *economic*, it as *social* and *human development* as well.

3.9. Exercise

1. Discuss the relationship between individual and society.
2. Is likeness between the group members is absolute? Give reason.
3. What is social relationship?

4. Write notes on the Factors of Social Change.
   Write short essay on Theories of Social Change Define an Institution.

5. What are the bases of formation of association?

3.10. Further Reading

Haralambos, M, 1998, Sociology: Themes and Perspectives, New Delhi; Oxford University Press.

Horton, P.B, and Chester L, Hund, 1972, Sociology, Blackikck, Ohio; McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Inkeles, Alex, 1978, What is Sociology? New Delhi, Prentice.

Hall Jayaram, N.2005, Introductory Sociology, Madras.

Oommen T.K, & C.N. Venugopal, 1988, Sociology for Law Students: Lucknow, Eastern Book Co.

Schaefer, Rechard T and Rober P. Lamm, 1999, Sociology, New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.

Berger , Peter L: An invitation to Sociology

Batteille, A 2005, Sociology: Essays on Approach and Method, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Coulson, Margarret Anne & Carol Rifdel, 1980, Approaching Sociology, London Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bottmore, T. B. 2008. Sociology — A Guide to Problems and Literature. Delhi, India: S. Chand.

Davis, Kingsley. 1937. Human Society. New York, USA: Macmillan.

Horton, Paul. B, Chester, L. Hunt, 1968. Sociology. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill. Hadden W. Richard. 1997. Sociological Theory — An Introduction to the Classical Tradition. Canada, USA: Board View Press.

Mac Iver, R. M, Charles Page. 1962. Society, an Introductory Analysis. New Delhi, India: Macmillan Publishers India. Spencer, H. 1961. Study of Sociology. Michigan, USA: University of Michigan Press

Blau, P. M., and Scott, W. R. (1963). Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Coleman, J. (1982). The Asymmetric Society. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Etzioni, A. (1961). A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations: On Power, Involvement, and Their Correlates. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: PrenticeHall. Etzioni, A. and Lehman, E.W. (1969). A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Giddens, A., & Sutton, P. W. (2014). Essential Concepts in Sociology. Polity Press.

Green, A. W. (1964). Sociology; An Analysis of Life in Modern Society. McGrawHill.

Merton, R. K. (1996). On Social Structure and Science. University of Chicago Press.

Murdock, G. P. (1965). Culture and Society: Twenty-four Essays. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Ogburn, W.F (1966). Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature. Oxford England: Delta Books.

Ogburn, W. F., &Nimkoff, M. F. (1964). A Handbook of Sociology. Routledge.

Parsons, T. (1972). Culture and social system revisited. Social Science Quarterly, 253-266.

Schaefer, R. T., & LAMM, R. (2000). Sociology: A Brief Introduction. McGrawHill. Sen, S. (2007). Globalization and Development. New Delhi: National Book Trust

Dube, S.C. 1992. Understanding Change. Vikas Publishing House: New Delhi

McMichael, P. 1996. Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective. Fine Forge Press: Thousand Oaks .

Singha Roy, D.K. 2003. Social Development and the Empowerment of the Marginalised Groups: Perspectives and Strategies. Sage Publication: New Delhi.

"social revolution". *oxforddictionaries.com.* Oxford University Press. Retrieved 24 August 2017.

Irving E. Fang, A History of Mass Communication: Six Information Revolutions, Focal Press, 1997, ISBN 0-240-80254-3, p. xv

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., p. 173

Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. Political Order in Changing Societies. New Haven: Yale University Press., p.264(Skopcol, op cit).

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., p.3.

*Hobsbawm, Eric (1957). "Methodism and the Threat of Revolution in Britain". History Today. **7** (5). Historians have held that religious Revivalism in the late eighteenth century distracted the minds of the English from thoughts of Revolution.*

Swatos, William H. (1998). Encyclopedia of Religion and Society. Rowman Altamira. p. 385. ISBN 9780761989561.

Thomis, Malcom I.; Holt, Peter (1 December 1977). Threats of Revolution in Britain 1789–1848. Macmillan International Higher Education. p. 132. ISBN 9781349158171.

Rocher, Gay. (1974). Talcott Parsons and American Sociology. London: Nelson.

Turner, Jonathan H. (1987). The Structure of Sociological Theory. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Wallace, Ruth A. and Alison Wolf. (1980). Contemporary Sociological Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Sorokin, Pitirim. (1957). Social and Cultural Dynamics: A Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics, Law, and Social Relationships. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Spencer, Herbert. (1898). The Principles of Sociology. 3 vols. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Spengler, Oswald. 1962 (1918). The Decline of the West. New York: Knopf.

Steward, Julian H. (1963). Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Toynbee, Arnold. 1946 (1934). Study of History. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tylor, Edward B. (1871). Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Customs. London: J. Murray.

White, Leslie A. 1959. The Evolution of Culture. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Janoski, Thomas et al (2005). The Handbook of Political Sociology: State, Civil Societies and Globalisation. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

McAuley, W, James (2003). An Introduction to Politics, State and Society. New Delhi, Sage Publications.

Nash, Kate (2010). Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalisation, Politics and Power. Malden, Wiley-Blackwell.

Horton, Paul B. & Chester L. Hunt. 1987 (1984). Sociology. London et al: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Moore, Wilbert E. (1987). Social Change. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.

Ogburn, William F. 1950 (1922). Social Change. New York: Viking. Orenstein, David Michael. (1985). The Sociological Quest: Principles of Sociology. St. Paul, New York et al: West Publishing Company.

Tonnies, Ferdinand. 1963 (1887). Community and Society. Trans. C.P. Loomis. New York: Harper & Row