CORE COURSE
SEMESTER 1ST
DSC-SOC-1A
INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY

UNIT-I
NATURE AND SCOPE OF SOCIOLOGY

Emergence and Development of Sociology

Sociology emerged as a new subject in the later part of the eighteenth century and developed throughout the nineteenth century. The social events and crisis of this period laid down a fertile terrain of ideas and new values that enabled sociology to take root. Following events comprised the major forces responsible for the emergence of sociology

1. **Social Change and Sociology**

   Striking changes took place in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Three kinds of change were especially important in the development of sociology: the rise of a factory-based industrial economy, the explosive growth of cities, and new ideas about democracy and political rights.

   ***A New Industrial Economy*:** During the middle Ages in Europe, most people ploughed fields near their homes or worked in small-scale *manufacturing* (a term derived from Latin words meaning "to make by hand"). By the end of the eighteenth century, inventors used new sources of energy—the power of moving water and then steam—to operate large machines in mills and factories. Instead of labouring at home or in small groups, workers became part of a large and anonymous labour force, under the control of strangers who owned the factories. This change in the system of production took people out of their homes, weakening the traditions that had guided community life for centuries.

   The Growth of Cities: Across Europe, landowners took part in what historians call the *enclosure movement*—they fenced off more and more farmland to create grazing areas for sheep, the source of wool for the thriving textile mills. Without land, countless tenant farmers had little choice but to head to the cities in search of work in the new factories. As cities grew larger, these urban migrants faced many social problems, including pollution, crime, and homelessness. Moving through streets crowded with strangers, they faced a new and impersonal social world.

Political Change: Europeans in the Middle Ages viewed society as an expression of God's will: From the royalty to the serfs, each person up and down the social ladder played a part in the holy plan. But as cities grew, tradition came under attack. In the writings of Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), John Locke (1632–1704), and Adam Smith (1723–1790), we see a shift in focus from a moral obligation to God and king to the pursuit of self-interest. In the new political climate, philosophers spoke of *personal liberty* and *individual rights.* Echoing these sentiments, our own Declaration of Independence states that every person has "certain unalienable rights," including "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The French Revolution, which began in 1789, was an even greater break with political and social tradition. The French social analyst Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859) thought the changes in society brought about by the French Revolution were so great that they amounted to "nothing short of the regeneration of the whole human race" (1955:13, orig. 1856).

***A New Awareness of Society*:** Huge factories, exploding cities, a new spirit of individualism—these changes combined to make people more aware of their surroundings. The new discipline of sociology was born in England, France, and Germany—precisely where the changes were greatest.

2. Science and Sociology

French social thinker Auguste Comte (1798–1857) coined the term *sociology* in 1838 to describe a new way of looking at society. This makes sociology one of the youngest academic disciplines— far newer than history, physics, or economics, for example. Of course, Comte was not the first person to think about the nature of society. Such questions fascinated many of the brilliant thinkers of ancient civilizations, including the Chinese philosopher K'ung Fu-tzu, or Confucius (551–479 B.C.E.), and the Greek philosophers Plato (c. 427–347 B.C.E.) and Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.). Over the next several centuries, the Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius (121–180), the medieval thinkers Saint Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225–1274) and Christine de Pisan (c. 1363–1431), and the English playwright William Shakespeare (1564–1616) wrote about the workings of society. Yet these thinkers were more interested in imagining the ideal society than in studying society as it really was. Comte and other pioneers of sociology all cared about how society could be improved, but their major objective was to understand how society actually operates. Comte (1975, orig. 1851–54) saw sociology as the product of a three-stage historical development. During the earliest, the *theological stage,* from the beginning of human history to the end of the

European Middle Ages about 1350 C.E., people took a religious view that society expressed God's will. With the dawn of the Renaissance in the fifteenth century, the theological approach gave way to a *metaphysical stage* of history in which people saw society as a natural rather than a supernatural system. Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), for example, suggested that society reflected not the perfection of God so much as the failings of a selfish human nature. What Comte called the *scientific stage* of history began with the work of early scientists such as the Polish astronomer Copernicus (1473–1543), the Italian astronomer and physicist Galileo (1564–1642), and the English physicist and mathematician Isaac Newton (1642–1727). Comte's contribution came in applying the scientific approach—first used to study the physical world—to the study of society. Comte's approach is called **positivism**, *a way of understanding based on science*. As a positivist, Comte believed that society operates according to its own laws, much as the physical world operates according to gravity and other laws of nature. By the beginning of the twentieth century, sociology had spread to the United States and showed the influence of Comte's ideas. Today, most sociologists still consider science a crucial part of sociology. But Sociological Investigation explains that human behavior is far more complex than the movement of planets or even the actions of other living things. We are creatures of imagination and spontaneity, so human behavior can never be fully explained by any rigid "laws of society." In addition, early sociologists such as Karl Marx (1818–1883), were troubled by the striking inequalities of industrial society. They hoped that the new discipline of sociology would not just help us understand society but also lead to change toward greater social justice.

Relationship of Sociology with other social sciences

1. **Sociology and Anthropology**: Anthropology is as diversified subject as sociology, incorporating archaeology, physical anthropology, cultural history, many branches of linguistics, and the study of aspects of life of primitive man everywhere. Like psychology it has strong ties with the natural sciences, and in the case of physical anthropology, a close link with biology. It is as the science of culture that anthropology is more germane to sociology. Culture may be defined narrowly, to mean mainly the system of symbols, including language and values, shared by a given people. In that case we consider anthropology to have a distinct subject matter in the same sense that we consider power and authority to be subject matter of political science and the production and distribution

of goods the distinctive matter of economics. But if culture is defined broadly to include all the patterned ways of doing things, including not only shared values but shared institutional arrangements, then anthropology becomes co-extensive with sociology. Nevertheless anthropology and sociology differ in that the former takes prime responsibility for studying primitive or-non-literate man, the later for more advanced civilizations. This basic fact exerts a pervasive influence on the content and subject matter of the two disciplines. Anthropologists tend to study societies in all their aspects as wholes. In so far as they specialize, it is usually in a given 'culture area', such as Melanesia. Sociologists more often study parts of a society, and generally specialize in some institution such as family, or a process such as social mobility. Anthropologists traditionally live in the community they study, directly observing behaviour or recording customs as reported by their informants. Their method of analysis is essentially qualitative and clinical. Sociologists more often rely on statistics and questionnaires; their analysis is more often formal and quantitative. The natural milieu for the anthropologist is the small self-contained group or community, whereas the sociologist is quite at ease in studying larger-scale and impersonal organizations and processes.

2. **Sociology and History**: History seeks to establish the sequence in which events occurred; it is the arrangement of behaviour in time. Sociologists are much more concerned to show the relationship between events occurring more or less at the same time. Historians almost by definition, restrict themselves to study the past, often the more distant the better. Sociologists show much more interest in the contemporary seen or the recent past. Historians with the notable exception of those caked 'philosophers of History', as a rule eschew the exploration of causes; they are content to establish how things actually happened. Sociologists are much more likely to seek for the interrelations between events and to propose causal sequences. The historian prides himself on the explicitness, the concreteness of detail which characterized discipline. The sociologist is more likely to abstract from concrete reality, to categorize and generalize, to be interested in what is true not only of a particular people's history but of the histories of many different people. From the historian's perspective, this sociological process of abstracting from the history of several countries or periods is viewed as likely to distort the distinctive reality of ***one*** historical place or period. Much, perhaps most, of man's history has been written as the history of kings and wars. The history of less glamorous or exciting events, the changes through time in institutional forms such as landowning, or in social relations such as those

of men and women in the family, have less frequently interested historians. Such relationships however lie at the centre of the sociologist's concern.

Despite these differences in emphasis, there are important bases for the concordance of history and sociology. Some historians have written social history-that is history which deals with human relations, social patterns, mores and customs, and important institutions other than monarchy and army, and some of the most outstanding sociological analysis, as in the work of Max Weber, has been applied to historical problems. Sociologists acknowledge historical sociology as one of the standard special fields of their discipline, and Sigmund Diamond, Robert Bellah and Norman Birnhaum may be pointed to as important contemporary practitioners.

3. **Sociology and Economics:** Economics is sometimes called the 'dismal science', a fact in which sociologists take some comfort whenever their discipline is dubbed 'the painful elaboration of the obvious'. Whatever comic relief this exchange of insults may give, it does not suffice to distinguish between economics and sociology as behavioural sciences. Economics is the study of the production and distribution of goods and services. As it developed in the western world, largely under the influence of the classical school in England, Economics had dealt almost exclusively with the interrelations of purely economic variables: the relations of price and supply, money flows, input-output ratios and the like. Relatively little attention has been paid to the individual's actual economic behaviour or motivation, and only modest energy has gone into studying productive enterprises as social organizations. This left great gaps in our knowledge of economic life. More important, it left the discipline inadequate to account for the actual course of economic events. Recently economists have shown more interest in the motivation and in the institutional context of economic action. Nevertheless, many important problems, highly relevant to economics, have not yet become the object of concentrated economic research. Studies of the role of values and preferences is affecting the supply of labour, the influence exerted by prestige or customs on the price of goods, the origins and the motivations of entrepreneurs and managers, and the contribution of education to productivity have largely boon left to sociologists and psychologists. Only a few hardcore economists have ventured to deal with them. Sociologists often envy the economists for the precision of their terminology, the exactness of their measures, the ease with which they can communicate with each other in a standard technical language, the extent of their agreement about certain basic principles, and their ability to translate the results of their theoretical work into practical suggestions having major implications for public policy. On

the other hand the economists record in predicting economic events is very imperfect indeed, presumably because they fail to give due weight to the factors such as individual motivation and institutional resistance, which the sociologists feels well-qualified to study. The parallels between the structure of economic and sociological thinking are nevertheless, many and striking. Most modern sociologists find the economist's way of thinking more congenial than that of the historian or the political theorist. Economists think, as do sociologists, in terms of sub-systems; they stress the relations between parts, especially patterns of dependence, dominative, exchange, an the like. Both are interested in measurement, often precise, and in relationships between sets of variables. Both are impressed with mathematical models as aids in analysing data.

4. **Sociology and psychology:** Psychology is often defined as the science of mind or of mental processes. Its studies encompass the capacities of the mind to receive sensations, to give them meaning, and to respond to them. Psychology has deep roots in biology and physiology, and remains closely tied to them. Much of the research by psychologists on visual and aural perception has little relevance for social behaviour. On the other hand, studies of emotion, cognition, motivation, and the like, have an intimate connection with the individual's participation in social relationships. Students of perception, learning, and other mental processes generally took for laws of psychic functioning which transcend the differences between individuals and even species, Those dealing with the emotions, feelings, and conative (striving) behaviour are more often concerned with the individual and the distinctive or unique organization of his personality. This is particularly true of 'clinical' psychologists. For those psychologists more concerned with the psyche than with physiology, the term 'personality' serves as a central organizing concept in much the same way as 'society' and 'social system' serve the sociologist. Psychology, in this perspective, seeks to explain behaviour as it is organized in an individual personality and determined by the combined influence of his physiology, his psychic apparatus, and his unique personal experience. By contrast sociology attempts to understand behaviour as it is organized in the society, and as it is determined by such factors as the number of people it contains, their culture, their objective situation and their social organization. Sociology and psychology draw closest in the special field of social psychology. From the psychological point of view, social psychology is concerned with the ways in which personality and behaviour are influenced by a person's social characteristics or his social setting. From a sociological perspective, social; psychology, includes any study of social processes which systematically considers how the psychological properties of every man,

or the personality dispositions of particular men, acting in a situation influence the outcome of the social process. The distinction between the sociological and psychological perspective in social psychology often breaks down in the actual practice of research. In studies of public opinion, of mob action, of mass movements in politics or religion, it is often difficult to see any difference in the work of those who were sociologically trained as against those trained in psychology. Indeed, many argue that social psychology should be recognized a distinct field.

UNIT-II

SCHOOLS OF THOGHT

Formalistic or Pure or Specialistic School

Scientific abstraction cuts through the full concreteness of social phenomena from yet a different angle. It thereby connects all that is "sociological" in a sense that will be discussed presently and that appears to be the most decisive sense of the term. In doing this, scientific abstraction produces a consistent manner of cognition. Yet it fully realizes that in actuality, sociological phenomena do not exist in such isolation and, but that they are factored out of this living reality by means of an added concept. It will be remembered that societal facts are not only societal. It is always an objective content (sense-perceived or intellectual, technical or physiological) which is socially embodied, produced, or transmitted, and which only thus produces the totality of social life. Yet this societal formation of contents itself can be investigated by a science. Geometrical abstraction investigates only the spatial forms of bodies, although empirically, these forms are given merely as the forms of some material content. Similarly, if society is conceived as interaction among individuals, the description of the forms of this interaction is the task of the science of society in its strictest and most essential sense. The first problem area of sociology consisted of the whole of historical life insofar as it is formed societally. Its societal character was conceived as an undifferentiated whole. The second problem area now under consideration consists of the societal forms themselves. These are conceived as constituting society (and societies) out of the mere sum of living men. The study of this second area may be called "pure sociology' which abstracts the mere element of sociation. It isolates it inductively and psychologically from the heterogeneity of its contents and purposes, which, in themselves, are not societal. It thus proceeds like grammar, which isolates the pure forms of language from their contents through which these forms, nevertheless, come to life. In a comparable manner, social groups which

are the most diverse imaginable in purpose and general significance, may nevertheless show identical forms of behaviour toward one another on the part of their individual members. We find superiority and subordination, competition, division of labour, formation of parties, representation, inner solidarity coupled with exclusiveness towards the outside, and innumerable similar features in the state, in a religious community, in a band of conspirators, in an economic association, in an art school, in the family. However diverse the interests are that give rise to these sociations, the forms in which the interests are realized may yet be identical. And on the other hand, a contextually identical interest may take on form in very different sociations. Economic interest is realized both in competition and in the planned organization of producers, in isolation against other groups as well as in fusion with them. The religious contents of life, although they remain identical, sometimes demand an unregulated, sometimes a centralized form of community. The interests upon whom the relations between the sexes are based are satisfied by an almost innumerable variety of family forms; etc. Hence, not only may the form in which the most divergent contents are realized be identical; but, inversely, the content, too, may persist, while it's medium the interactions of the individuals adopts a variety of forms. We see, then, that the analysis in terms of form and content transforms the facts which, in their immediacy, present these two categories as the indissoluble unity of social life in such a way as to justify the sociological problem. This problem demands the identification, the systematic ordering, the psychological explanation, and the historical development of the pure forms of sociations. Obviously, in terms of its subject matter, sociology thus seen is not a special science, as it was in terms of the first problem area. Yet in terms of its clearly specified way of asking questions, it is a special science even here.

Synthetic or General school

These considerations afford a glimpse, beyond the mere concept of sociological method, at the first basic problem area of sociology. Although it covers almost all of human existence, it does not therefore lose that character of one-sided abstraction that no science can get rid of. For however socially determined and permeated, as it were, each item in the economic and intellectual, political and juridical, even religious and generally cultural spheres may be, nevertheless, in the actuality of concrete life, this social determination is interwoven with other determinations that stem from other sources. Above all, from the circumstance those things also have a purely objective character. It is always some objective content technical,

dogmatic, intellectual, physiological which channels the development of the social forces and which, by virtue of its own character, logic, and law, keeps it within certain directions and limits. Any social phenomenon, no matter in what material it realize itself, must submit to the natural laws of this material. Any intellectual achievement is tied, in however various ways, to the laws of thought and to the behaviour of objects. Any creation in the fields of art, politics, law, medicine, philosophy, or in any other field of invention, observes a certain order that we can understand in terms of the objective situation of its contents and that is characterized by such relations as intensification, connection, differentiation, combination, etc. No human wish or practice can take arbitrary steps, jump arbitrary distances, and perform arbitrary syntheses. They must follow the intrinsic logic of things. Thus, one could very well construct the history of art, as a perfectly understandable development, by presenting works of art themselves, anonymously, in their temporal sequence and stylistic evolution; or the development of law, as the sequence of particular institutions and laws; or that of science, as the mere series, historical or systematic, of its results; etc. Here, as in the cases of a song that is analyzed in terms of its musical value, or of a physical theory in terms of its truth, or of a machine in terms of its efficiency, we realize that all contents of human life, even though they materialize only under the conditions and in the dynamics of social life, nevertheless permit interpretations ignoring it. Objects embody their own ideas; they have significance, laws, value standards which are independent of both the social and the individual life and which make it possible to define and understand them in their own terms. In comparison with full reality, of course, even this understanding involves abstraction, since no objective content is realized by its own logic alone but only through the cooperation of historical and psychological forces. Cognition cannot grasp reality in its total immediacy. What we call objective content is something conceived under a specific category. Under one of these categories, the history of mankind appears as the behavior and product of individuals. One may look at a work of art only in regard to its artistic significance; one may place it, as if it had fallen from the sky, within a series of artistic products. Yet one may also understand it in terms of the artist's personality and development, his experiences and tendencies. One may interpret it as a pulsation or immediate experience of individual life. Thus viewed, the work of art remains within the bounds of the individual and his continuity. Certain cultural data above all art and, in general, everything that has the breath of creativity appear more easily graspable in such a perspective than do other data. Quite generally, to look at the world as something that is carried by the active and receptive, typical or unique subject, is one of the possibilities of translating the unity of all human creation into understandability. The

manifestation of the individual strikes us as an active element everywhere. Its laws permit us to form a plane, as it were, on which to project reality in all its fullness. The purpose of this discussion is to show that there exists not only social life as a basis for the life of mankind and as a formula of it. This life may also be derived from the objective significance of its contents, and be interpreted in these terms. And it may finally be conceived in the framework of the nature and creativity of the individual. Perhaps there are other interpretive categories that have not yet been clearly developed. At any rate, all these analyses and structuralizations of our immediate life and creativity experience this life as a unity. They lie on the same plane and have the same right to be heard. Therefore and this is the point no one of them can claim to be the only or the only adequate manner of cognition. Naturally, neither can such a claim be made by the approach which proceeds in terms of the social form of our existence. It, too, is limited; and it supplements other approaches by which in turn it is supplemented. With this qualification, however, it can, in principle, offer a possibility of cognition in front of the totality of human existence. The facts of politics, religion, economics, law, culture styles, language, and innumerable others can be analyzed by asking how they may be understood, not as individual achievements or in their objective significance, but as products and developments of society. Nor would the absence of an exhaustive and undisputed definition of the nature of society render the cognitive value of this approach illusory. It is a characteristic of the human mind to be capable of erecting solid structures, while their foundations are still insecure. Physical and chemical propositions do not suffer from the obscure and problematical character of the concept of matter; juridical propositions, not from the quarrel over the nature of law and of its first principles; psychological ones, not from the highly questionable "nature of the soul'. If, therefore, we apply the "sociological method" to the investigation of the fall of the Roman Empire or of the relation between religion and economics in the great civilizations or of the origin of the idea of the German national state or of the predominance of the Baroque style; if, that is, we view these and similar phenomena as the result of indistinguishable contributions made by the interaction of individuals, or as life stages in the lives of super individual groups; then we are, in point of fact, conducting our investigations according to the sociological method. And these investigations may be designated as sociology. Yet from these sociological investigations there emerges a further abstraction that may well be characterized as the result of a highly differentiated scientific culture. This abstraction yields a group of sociological problems in the narrower sense of this term. If we study all kinds of life data in terms of their development within and by means of social groups, we must assume that they have common elements in their materialization (even

though different elements, under different circumstances). These common elements emerge if, and only if, social life itself emerges as the origin or the subject of these data. The question thus arises whether perhaps it is possible to find, in the most heterogeneous historical developments that share nothing but the fact that they are exhibited by one particular group, a common law, or a rhythm, that is fully derivable from this one fact. It has been maintained, for instance, that all historical developments pass through three phases. The first is the undifferentiated unity of manifold elements. The second is the differentiated articulation of these elements that have become alienated from one another. The third is a new unity, the harmonious interpenetration of the elements that have been preserved, however, in their specific characters. More briefly, the road of all completed developments leads from an undifferentiated unity through a differentiated manifoldness to a differentiated unity. Another conception of historical life sees it as a process which progresses from organic commonness to mechanical simultaneousness. Property, work, and interests originally grow out of the solidarity of the individuals, the carriers of the group life; but later are distributed among egoists each of whom seeks only his own benefit and, only because of this motive, enters into relations with others. The first stage is the manifestation of an unconscious will which inheres in the very depth of our nature and becomes evident only as a feeling; the second stage, by contrast, is the product of an arbitrary will and of the calculating intellect. According to a still different conception, it is possible to ascertain a definite relation, in any given epoch, between its intellectual world view and its social conditions: both equally are manifestations, in some sense, of biological development. Finally, there is the notion that human cognition, on the whole, must go through three stages. In the first or theological stage, natural phenomena are explained by recourse to the arbitrary will of all kinds of entities. In the second, metaphysical stage, the supernatural causes are replaced by laws which, however, are mystical and speculative (as, for instance, "vital force," "ends of nature," etc.). Finally, the third or positive stage corresponds to modern experimental and exact science. Each particular branch of knowledge develops by passing through these three stages; and the knowledge of this fact removes the enigmatic character of social development, which pervades areas of all kinds. A further sociological question under this category is the problem concerning conditions of group power, as distinguished from individual power. The conditions for the power of individuals are immediately evident: intelligence, energy, an apt alternation between consistency and elasticity, etc.; but to account for the historical power of such extraordinary phenomena as Jesus, on the one hand, and Napoleon, on the other, there must also exist as yet unexplained forces which are by no means clarified by labels like "power of

suggestion," "prestige," and so forth. But in the exercise of power by groups, both over their members and over other groups, there operate still other factors. Some of these are the faculty of rigid concentration, as well as of diversion into independent activities by individual group members; conscious faith in leading minds; groping toward expansion; egoism of the individual paralleled by sacrificial devotion to the whole; fanatic dogmatism, as well as thoroughly critical intellectual freedom. All these are effective in the rise (and, negatively, in the decay) not only of political nations but also of countless economic and religious, party-like and family groups. In all investigations of group power, the question, clearly, is not the origin of sociations as such, but the fate of society as something already constituted. And this fate is ascertained inductively. Another question that arises out of the sociological consideration of conditions and events is that of the value relations between collective and individual conduct, action, and thought. The inner, fundamental structure of society itself here becomes as little the central problem as it did in connection with the preceding question. Again, this structure is already presupposed, and the data are considered on the basis of this presupposition.

UNIT-III

BASIC CONCEPTS

SOCIETY

Society is the basic concept of sociology. It is the sum total of interactions among individuals. Thus, society is a group of people who share a common culture, occupy a specific territorial area and feel themselves to constitute a unified and distinct entity.

Maciver and Page: “Society is a system of usages and procedures, authority and mutual aid of many groupings and divisions of controls of human behaviour and liberties”

Giddens: “Society is the union itself, the organization, the sum of formal relations in which associating individuals are bound together”

Characteristics

1. Population is large or small.
2. Mutual awareness and cooperation.
3. A territorial base or boundary.
4. A shared culture and minimal degree of value consensus.

5. Likeness and difference.
6. Psychic unity.
7. Cooperation and conflict.

   In other words society symbolises a network of social relationship, i.e. a plurality of individuals existing in patterns of relationship and it is the most inclusive collectivity to which other collectivities extend.

Community

Community is a small or large group in which people share no particular interest but the basic condition of life itself. The basic criterion of community is that all of one's social relationships may be found within it.

Lundberg: "Community is a human population living within a geographical area and carrying on a common independent life".

Kingsley Davis: "Community is a smallest territorial group that can embrace all aspects of social life".

Talcott Parsons: "A community is that collectivity the members of which share a common territorial area as their base of operation for daily activities".

Elements of Community

1. Life is live wholly within the community. There exists self sufficiency.
2. It identifies itself with a territorial identity or locality.
3. Common culture and cultural self-sufficiency.
4. Community sentiment, we feeling, reciprocity and interdependence are basic elements.
5. Community growth is a natural growth and not a planned conscious effort.

Maciver argues that communities exist within great communities, the town within a region, the region within a nation and nation within a world community which perhaps is in process of development. Monastery, convent or prison are termed as community as they are territorially based and the functions of the inhabitants are restricted same as human functions which are limited by the nature of one's community. Similarly, immigrants group living in specific locality and own sub-culture are included in the category of distinct community whereas a social caste is not considered as a community because it has social coherence and lacks territorial basis. Territory, mutuality and organized interaction are three main characteristics of community. Community provides its members with stability, culture and power to resist radical changes.

Association

Association are groups which are established in order to protect and enhance some specified interests or purpose through fixed rules, system of organization and formal manner. It can be temporary or permanent. Complex society tends to have plurality of associations whereas simple societies are just communities. There cannot be communities within associations but associations can be there within communities.

Maciver and Page: "An association is an organization deliberately formed for the collective pursuit of some interests or set of interests which its members share. According to them, associations develop systems of instruments for serving interests".

Bogards: "Association is usually working together of people to achieve some purposes".

Ginsberg: "An association is a group of social beings related to one another by the fact that they possess or have instituted in common organization with a view to secure a specific end".

Characteristics

1. Membership of association is formal.
2. Fixed rules for its functioning
3. Formed to achieve some goal or objective.
4. Office bearers are bound to their duties.
5. Apart from economic or political association, there are associations to serve humanity like NGO.

Culture

Culture is an extremely broad concept. To sociologists, culture is made up of all of the ideas, beliefs, behaviors, and products common to and defining, a group's way of life. Culture encompasses everything humans create and have as they interact together. Culture is the ways of thinking, the ways of acting, and the material objects that together form a people's way of life. Culture includes what we think, how we act, and what we own. Culture is both our link to the past and our guide to the future.

Components of Culture

The concept of culture is not easy to understand, perhaps because every aspect of our social lives is an expression of it and because familiarity produces a kind of nearsightedness towards our own culture, making it difficult for us to take an analytical perspective toward

our everyday social lives. Sociologists find it helpful to break down culture into separate components: material culture (objects), and nonmaterial culture (rules and shared beliefs).

Material culture *consists of human technology—all the things human beings make and use, from small, handheld tools to skyscrapers.* Without material culture, our species could not survive long because material culture provides a buffer between humans and their environment. Using it, human beings can protect themselves from environmental stresses, as when they build shelters and wear clothing to protect themselves from the cold or from strong sunlight. Even more important, humans use material culture to modify and exploit the environment. They build dams and irrigation canals, plant fields and forests, convert coal and oil into energy, and transform ores into versatile metals. Using material culture, our species has learned to cope with the most extreme environments and to survive and even to thrive on all continents and in all climates. Human beings have walked on the floor of the ocean and on the surface of the moon. No other creature can do this; none has our flexibility. Material culture has made human beings the dominant life-form on earth.

Nonmaterial Culture: consists of *the totality of knowledge, beliefs, values, and rules for appropriate behaviour.* The nonmaterial culture is structured by such institutions as the family, religion, education, economy, and government. Whereas material culture is made up of things that have a physical existence (they can be seen, touched, and so on), the elements of nonmaterial culture are the ideas associated with their use. Although engagement rings and birthday flowers have a material existence, they also reflect attitudes, beliefs, and values that are part of American culture, with rules for their appropriate use in specified situations. Norms are central elements of nonmaterial culture.

Social groups

The term group has a specific definition in sociology that differs from everyday usage. Sociologically speaking, a group is a collection of people who interact regularly based on some shared interest and who develop some sense of belonging that sets them apart from other gatherings of people. They form a social relationship. This is sometimes referred to as developing a sense of "we-ness." All groups share this factor of interdependence. People who just happen to be in the same place at the same time are not a group. Rather, they are an aggregate. Individuals riding the bus or walking their dogs in a park are examples of aggregates. If these people interact and develop some sort of shared interests or sense of themselves as a group, then they become a group by definition.

Primary Group: According to Charles Horton Cooley (1864–1929), a primary group is a small social group whose members share personal and lasting relationships. Joined by primary relationships, people spend a great deal of time together; engage in a wide range of activities, and feel that they know one another pretty well. In short, they show real concern for one another. The family is every society's most important primary group. Cooley called personal and tightly integrated groups "primary" because they are among the first groups we experience in life. In addition, family and friends have primary importance in the socialization process, shaping our attitudes, behavior, and social identity. Members of primary groups help one another in many ways, but they generally think of the group as an end in itself rather than as a means to some goal. In other words, we prefer to think that family and friendship link people who "belong together."Members of a primary group also tend to view each other as unique and irreplaceable. Especially in the family, we are bound to others by emotion and loyalty. Brothers and sisters may not always get along, but they always remain "family."

Secondary Group: In contrast to the primary group, the secondary group is a large and impersonal social group whose members pursue a specific goal or activity. In most respects, secondary groups have characteristic opposite to those of primary groups. Secondary relationships involve weak emotional ties and little personal knowledge of one another. Many secondary groups exist for only a short time, beginning and ending without particular significance. Students enrolled in the same course at a large university−who may or may not see one another again after the semester ends−are one example of a secondary group. Secondary groups include many more people than primary groups. For example, dozens or even hundreds of people may work together in the same company, yet most of them pay only passing attention to one another. In some cases, time may transform a group from secondary to primary, as with co-workers who share an office for many years and develop closer relationships. But generally, members of a secondary group do not think of themselves as "we." Secondary ties need not be hostile or cold, of course. Interactions among students, co-workers, and business associates are often quite pleasant even if they are impersonal. Unlike members of primary groups, who display a personal orientation, people in secondary groups have a goal orientation. Primary group members define each other according to who they are in terms of family ties or personal qualities, but people in secondary groups look to one another for *what* they are, that is, what they can do for each other. In secondary groups,

we tend to "keep score," aware of what we give others and what we receive in return. This goal orientation means that secondary group members usually remain formal and polite. In a secondary relationship, therefore, we ask the question "How are you?" without expecting a truthful answer.

Reference Group: Frequently, we use a reference group, a social group that serves as a point of reference in making evaluations and decisions regarding our own behaviour. A young man who imagines his family's response to a woman he is dating is using his family as a reference group. A supervisor who tries to predict her employee's reaction to a new vacation policy is using them in the same way. As these examples suggest, reference groups can be primary or secondary. In either case, our need to conform shows how other's attitudes affect us. We also use groups that we do not belong to for reference. Being well prepared for a job interview means showing up dressed the way people in that company dress for work. Conforming to groups we do not belong to is a strategy to win acceptance by others and illustrates the process of anticipatory socialization.

Status

In every society, people build their everyday lives using the idea of status, a social position that a person holds. In everyday use, the word status generally means "prestige," as when we say that a college president has more "status" than a newly hired assistant professor. But sociologically speaking, both "president" and "professor" are statuses, or positions, within the collegiate organization. Status is part of our social identity and helps define our relationship to others. As Georg Simmel, one of the founders of sociology, once pointed out, before we can deal with anyone, we need to know who the person is.

Status set: Each of us holds many statuses at once. The term status set refers to all the statuses a person holds at a given time. A teenage girl may be a daughter to her parents, a sister to her brother, a student at her school, and a goalie on her soccer team. Status sets change over the life course. A child grows up to become a parent, a student graduates to become a lawyer, and a single person marries to become a husband or wife, sometimes becoming single again as a result of death or divorce. Joining an organization or finding a job enlarges our status set; withdrawing from activities makes it smaller. Over a lifetime, people gain and lose dozens of statuses.

Ascribed and achieved status: Sociologists classify statuses in terms of how people attain them. An ascribed status is a social position a person receives at birth or takes on involuntarily later in life. Examples of ascribed statuses include being a daughter, a Cuban, a teenager, or a widower. Ascribed statuses are matters about which we have little or no choice. By contrast, an achieved status refers to a social position a person takes on voluntarily that reflects personal ability and effort. Achieved statuses in the United States include honors student, Olympic athlete, nurse, software writer, and thief. In the real world, of course, most statuses involve a combination of ascription and achievement. That is, people's ascribed statuses influence the statuses they achieve. People who achieve the status of lawyer, for example, are likely to share the ascribed benefit of being born into relatively well-off families. By the same token, many less desirable statuses, such as criminal, drug addict, or unemployed worker, are more easily achieved by people born into poverty.

Role

A second important social structure is **role,** behavior expected of someone who holds a particular status. A person holds a status and performs a role. For example, holding the status of student leads you to perform the role of attending classes and completing assignments. Both statuses and roles vary by culture. In the United States, the status of "uncle" refers to the brother of a mother or a father. In Vietnam, the word for "uncle" is different on the mother's and father's sides of the family, and the two men have different responsibilities. In every society, actual role performance varies with an individual's unique personality, and some societies permit more individual expression of a role than others.

Role set: Because we hold many statuses at once—a status set—everyday life is a mix of many roles. Robert Merton (1968) introduced the term **role set** to identify a number of roles attached to a single status. A global perspective shows that the roles people use to define their lives differ from society to society. In low-income countries, people spend fewer years as students, and family roles are often very important to social identity. In high-income nations, people spend more years as students, and family roles are typically less important to social identity.

Role conflict and role strain: People in modern, high-income nations juggle many responsibilities demanded by their various statuses and roles. As most mothers (and more and more fathers) can testify, the combination of parenting and working outside the home is

physically and emotionally draining. Sociologists thus recognize **role conflict** as conflict among the roles connected to two or more statuses. We experience role conflict when we find ourselves pulled in various directions as we try to respond to the many statuses we hold. One response to role conflict is deciding that "something has to go." More than one politician, for example, has decided not to run for office because of the conflicting demands of a hectic campaign schedule and family life. In other cases, people put off having children in order to stay on the "fast track" for career success. Even roles linked to a single status may make competing demands on us. **Role strain** refers to tension among the roles connected to a single status. A college professor may enjoy being friendly with students. At the same time, however, the professor must maintain the personal distance needed to evaluate students fairly. In short, performing the various roles attached to even one status can be something of a balancing act. One strategy for minimizing role conflict is separating parts of our lives so that we perform roles for one status at one time and place and carry out roles connected to another status in a completely different setting. A familiar example of this idea is deciding to "leave the job at work" before heading home to the family.

Values

Values are culturally defined standards that people use to decide what is desirable, good, and beautiful and that serve as broad guidelines for social living. People who share a culture use values to make choices about how to live. Values are broad principles that support **beliefs**, specific thoughts or ideas that people hold to be true. In other words, values are abstract standards of goodness, and beliefs are particular matters that individuals consider true or false.

Norms

Most people in the United States are eager to gossip about "who's hot" and "who's not." Members of American Indian societies, however, typically condemn such behavior as rude and divisive. Both patterns illustrate the operation of **norms**, rules and expectations by which a society guides the behaviour of its members. In everyday life, people respond to each other with sanctions, rewards or punishments that encourage conformity to cultural norms.

Mores and Folkways

William Graham Sumner, an early U.S. sociologist, recognized that some norms are more important to our lives than others. Sumner coined the term **mores** (pronounced "MORE-ayz") to refer to norms that are widely observed and have great moral significance. Mores,

which include taboos, are the norms in our society that insist, for example, that adults not walk around in public without wearing clothes. People pay less attention to **folkways**, norms for routine or casual interaction. Examples include ideas about appropriate greetings and proper dress. In short, mores distinguish between right and wrong, and folkways draw a line between right and rude. A man who does not wear a tie to a formal dinner party may raise eyebrows for violating folkways. If, however, he were to arrive at the party wearing only a tie, he would violate cultural mores and invite a more serious response. Mores and folkways are the basic rules of everyday life. Although we sometimes resist pressure to conform, we can see that norms make our dealings with others more orderly and predictable. Observing or breaking the rules of social life prompts a response from others in the form of either reward or punishment. Sanctions—whether an approving smile or a raised eyebrow—operate as a system of **social control**, attempts by society to regulate people's thoughts and behavior. As we learn cultural norms, we gain the capacity to evaluate our own behavior. Doing wrong (say, downloading a term paper from the Internet) can cause both shame (the painful sense that others disapprove of our actions) and guilt (a negative judgment we make of ourselves). Of all living things, only cultural creatures can experience shame and guilt. This is probably what Mark Twain had in mind when he remarked that people "are the only animals that blush—or need to."

UNIT-IV

SOCIAL PROCESSES

Socialization

Sociologists use the term socialization to refer to the lifelong social experience by which people develop their human potential and learn culture. Unlike other living species, whose behavior is mostly or entirely set by biology, humans need social experience to learn their culture and to survive. Social experience is also the foundation of personality; a person's fairly consistent patterns of acting, thinking, and feeling. We build a personality by internalizing—taking in—our surroundings. But without social experience, personality hardly develops at all. Socialization is a determinant of human behaviour, a social input. Sociology looks at socialization in context of understanding problems of social continuity, understanding the process of social control and in terms of human personality.

Process of Socialization

Process involves the following four factors in the process of learning

(a) **Imitation**: It refers to the conscious or subconscious, spontaneous or deliberate, perceptual or ideational copying by an individual of the actions of others. A child acquires language and pronunciation largely by imitation.

(b) **Suggestion**: This is a process of communicating information which has no logical or self-evident basis. It is devoid of rational persuasion. Propaganda and advertising are based on the fundamental psychological principle so f suggestion

(c) **Identification:** In infancy, the human child cannot discriminate between his being and the environment. Later, the objects of his attention, his toys or his mother, become the object of his identification. With age, the speed and area of his identification increases.

(d) **Language**: This is the medium of social interaction and cultural transmission. Language is important in moulding the personality of the individual from infancy onwards.

Agencies of Socialization

The process of socialization operates not only in childhood, but continues throughout an individual's life. The following are the chief agencies of socialization

(a) **Family:** The parents or family are the first to socialize the child. The child learns speech and language and societal morality from the parents. The family continues to exercise its influence throughout the individual's life.

(b) **School:** The child's education is crucial in the attitudes and ideas he forms, enabling him to become a good citizen later on.

(c) **Peer Groups or Friends:** The playmates teach the child mutual understanding, sympathy and cooperation. They also introduce him to the informal aspects of culture, as fashion and fads.

(d) **Religious Institutions:** Family religious practices help influence individual morality and the way of life of a person.

Social Change

Change is a part of both the individual and the social life and when changes occur in the modes of living of individuals which influence social relations; such changes are called social changes. Changes in social values, institutions, property relations, economic pursuits, personnel and role distribution may be cited as examples of social change in modern society. In fact social change is always relative in terms of time, space and context.

Maciver: “Social change is the change in relationship”.

Simelser: “Social change as the alterations of the way societies are organized”.

Moris Ginsberg: “Social change as change in social structure, e.g. the size of society, composition or balance of its parts or types of its organizations”.

Change is undoubtedly the ubiquitous fact in social life. It is inevitable in all societies. Though its speed and direction may vary but change is treated as a fact with its own independent existence, and as a value which refers to a socially prescribed standard of desirability and so is continuity. Change and continuity go hand in hand. Without continuity change is inconceivable because there is no such thing as complete change. Thus as change is a fact so also continuity and it is also treated as a value as most sociologist impute value to order, stability or persistence, though they did acknowledge change, Thus, both continuity and change are viewed as fact as well as value. Instead of defining social change most sociologists describe its characteristics and factors. Social change mainly influences three aspects of society and any process of social change brings change in all these three aspects.

1. Change in the behaviour of group.
2. Change in social structure
3. Change in cultural characteristics.

Characteristics

1. The concept of time is associated with change
2. As a process change continuously goes on, sometimes it is slow and sometimes it is rapid.
3. Change may also be abrupt. Earthquakes, wars and political revolutions bring such changes.
4. The concept of transition is also associated with change. When society moves from one stage to another, the time taken by society in reaching the other stage is called the period of transition.

Factors of Social Change

There are various factors which determine the direction and rate of social change. Sociologists have divided the factors of social change into the following:

1. Environmental Factors
2. Biological Factors

3. Economic Factors
4. Technological Factors
5. Cultural Factors
6. Psychological Factors

Social Conflict

Conflict is a universal phenomenon in human societies. It is personalized and when it is non-violent it is ideological conflict.

Gillin and Gillin: "Conflict is a social process in which individuals or groups seek their own ends by directly challenging the antagonists by violence or threat of violence".

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

Maciver: "Conflict is a form of struggle in which men contend against one another for any objective".

Types of Social conflict

Maciver has given two fundamental types of social conflict:

1. **Direct Conflict**: When individuals and groups thwart, restrain or destroy one another in the effort to attain some goal, direct conflict occurs.
2. **Indirect Conflict**: When individuals or groups do not actually impede the efforts of one another but nevertheless seek to attain their ends in ways which obstruct the attainment of same end by others leads to indirect conflict.

According to Coser there are two types of conflict:

1. **Internal**: It occurs within the group and so far it does not question the basic value it is functional.
2. **Externa**l: It occurs outside the group, cements internal unity.

Conflicts are variously classified. It may be personal, overt (manifest), covert (latent). It may be religious, cultural, ideological, political, corporate, and social or class type. But conflict is not a permanent social phenomenon.

Causes

1. Individual incompatibility

2. Culture incompatibility
3. Economic interest
4. Opposition of political interest or the struggle for great authority

Social Control

Social control refers to the control of society over the individual. It refers to a system of device through which society controls the activities of individual members. E. A. Ross was the first American sociologist to deal with this concept in his book "social control" published in 1901. In fact, it was he who first used the concept of 'social control' in sociological discussion. Ross has stressed upon the roles of public opinion, law, belief, suggestion, religion, ideals, ceremony etc. in establishing the social control.

E. A. Ross: "Social control refers to the system of devices whereby society brings its members into conformity with the accepted standards of behaviour".

Manheim: "Social control is the sum of those methods by which a society tries to influence human behaviour to maintain a given order".

Nature of social control

1. Social control denotes some kind of influence.
2. The influence is exerted essentially by the society or community.
3. The influence is exercised for promoting the welfare of all individuals or of the group as a whole.
4. The influence of the society has been there since times immemorial.
5. The influence is universal.

Purposes of social control

1. Social conformity
2. Social solidarity
3. Continuity of society.

Types of Social Control

Formal: The state makes use of law, legislation, military force, police force, administrative devices etc. for the purpose of social control. Similarly different political, religious, economic, cultural and other associations and institutions also institute formal control over the behaviour of the members. Formal control is deliberately created. Various rules are laid

down to make it specific. Violators of the formal control are given punishments depending upon the nature and type of violation. In brief, every association has its own norms to control the behaviour of the members. All these come under formal control.

Informal control: It included gossip, slander, resentment, public opinion, sympathy, sense of justice, folkways, mores, customs, religion, morality and such other agents. These are not purposefully created. They arise in their own way and in course of time gain currency and popularity. They become deep rooted with people in their practices. No specific punishment would be given to the violators of the informal control but they are more effective than the formal control

Agencies of social control

1. Law
2. Education
3. Public Opinion
4. Propaganda
5. Coercion
6. Customs
7. Folkways and Mores
8. Religion
9. Morality
10. Sanctions