THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES IN SOCIOLOGY

V SEMESTER

CORE COURSE

BA SOCIOLOGY

(2011 Admission)

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut university P.O, Malappuram Kerala, India 673 635.

283

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

Core Course

BA SOCIOLOGY

V Semester

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES IN SOCIOLOGY

Prepared by: *Smt. Rakhi.N.*
Assistant Professor&Head of the Department,
Dept. of Sociology, Z.G.College,
Kozhikode.(Module I & III)

Dr. Sr. Licy.A.D.
Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Sociology,Carmel College,
Mala.(Module II & IV)

Scrutinized by: *Dr. N. P Hafiz Mohamad,*
'Manasam', Harithapuram,
Chevayoor, Calicut.

Layout: *Computer Section, SDE*

Contents   *Page No.*

MODULE I

DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

Definition

A Theory is a set of interrelated concepts used to describe, explain, and predict how society and its parts are related to each other. Theories are sets of inter-related concepts and ideas that have been scientifically tested and combined to clarify, and expand our understanding of people, their behaviors, and their societies. Without theories, science would be a futile exercise. A theory is a set of propositions that provide an explanation by means of a deductive or inductive system. The three major functions of theory are description, explanation and prediction.

Nature and Characteristics of Theory

A theory is a proposed relationship between two or more concepts. In other words, a theory is explanation for why a phenomenon occurs. Without theories to explain the relationship between concepts, we would not be able to understand cause and effect relationships in social life.

The major characteristics of theory are given below.

- Time boundedness: Scientific theories always seek to transcend the particular and the time bound. Scientific theories are therefore about the generic, the fundamental, the timeless, and the universal.

- Objectivity: Another characteristic of scientific theories is that they are stated more formally than ordinary language. Theory is stated in neutral, objective, and unambiguous terms so that the theory means the same thing to all who examine it.

- Reliability and Verifiability: A final characteristic of scientific theories is that they are designed to be systematically tested with replicable methods against the facts of particular empirical settings.

Elements of theory: Concepts, Variables, Statements and Formats

Theory is a mental activity revolving around the process of developing ideas that explain how and why events occur. Theory is constructed with the following basic elements or building blocks: (1) concepts, (2) variables, (3) statements, and (4) formats. Though there are different types of theory, the basic elements are common to all.

Concepts

Theories are built from concepts. Generally, concepts denote phenomena. A concept embraces the aspects of the social world that are considered essential for a particular purpose. Concepts are constructed from definitions. A *definition* is a system of terms that inform investigators as to the phenomenon denoted by a concept. A definition allows visualising the phenomenon that is denoted by the concept. It enables all investigators to see the same thing and to understand what it is that is being studied. Thus, concepts that are useful in building theory have a special characteristic: they strive to communicate a uniform meaning to all those who use them. However, since concepts are frequently expressed with the words of everyday language, it is difficult to avoid words that connote varied meanings—and hence point to different phenomena—for varying groups of scientists. It is for this reason that many concepts in science are expressed in technical or more neutral languages, such as the symbols of mathematics. In sociology, expression of concepts in such special languages is sometimes not only impossible but also undesirable. Hence the verbal symbols used to develop a concept must be defined as precisely as possible so that they point to the same phenomenon for all investigators. Although perfect consensus may never be attained with conventional language, a body of theory rests on the premise that scholars will do their best to define concepts unambiguously.

The concepts of theory reveal a special characteristic: *abstractness*. Some concepts pertain to concrete phenomena at specific times and locations. Other, more abstract, concepts point to phenomena that are not related to concrete times or locations. For example, in the context of small-group research, *concrete concepts* would refer to the persistent interactions of particular individuals, whereas an *abstract* conceptualization of such phenomena would refer to those general properties of face-to-face groups that are not tied to particular individuals interacting at a specified time and location. Whereas abstract concepts are not tied to a specific context, concrete concepts are.

Although it is essential that some of the concepts of theory transcend specific times and places, it is equally critical that there be procedures for making these abstract concepts relevant to observable situations and occurrences. The utility of an abstract concept can be demonstrated only when the concept is brought to analyse some specific empirical problem encountered by investigators; otherwise, concepts remain detached from the very processes they are supposed to help investigators understand. Some argue for very formal procedures for attaching concepts to empirical events. Those of this view believe that abstract concepts should be accompanied by a series of statements known as *operational definitions,* which are sets of procedural instructions telling investigators how to go about discerning phenomena in the real world that are denoted by an abstract concept.

Others argue, however, that the nature of our concepts in sociology precludes such formalistic exercises. At best, concepts can be only devices that must change with the

changes in society, and so we can only intuitively and provisionally apply abstract concepts to the actual analysis.

Variables

Once the measurement system has been specified by the operational definition, different values of the concept can be observed. The concept can now be referred to as a variable, since it can respond to differences in the "real world" by taking on varying values, as specified in the operational definition.

When used to build theory, two general types of concepts can be distinguished: (1) those that simply label phenomena and (2) those that refer to phenomena that differ in degree. Concepts that merely label phenomena would include such common terms like group, social class etc. Concepts that denote properties as size, weight, density, velocity etc. refer to differences in degree among phenomena. Some concepts of scientific theory should denote the variable features of the world. To understand events it is necessary to analyse how variation in one phenomenon is related to variation in another.

Statements and Formats

To be useful, the concepts of theory must be connected to one another. Such connections among concepts constitute theoretical statements. These statements specify the way in which events denoted by concepts are interrelated, and at the same time, they provide an interpretation of how and why events should be connected. When these theoretical statements are grouped together, they constitute a theoretical format. Concepts are constructed from definitions; theoretical statements link concepts together; and statements are organized into five basic types of formats. There are five basic approaches in sociological theory for generating theoretical statements and formats: (1) meta-theoretical schemes, (2) analytical schemes, (3) discursive schemes, (4) propositional schemes, and (5) modeling schemes.

Meta-theoretical schemes deal with the basic issues that a theory must address. In many sociological circles, meta-theory is considered an essential prerequisite to adequate theory building. The philosophical debates like idealism versus materialism, induction versus deduction, causation versus association, subjectivism versus objectivism, and so on are re-evoked and analyzed with respect to social reality.

Analytical Scheme is a classification scheme that denotes the key properties, and interrelations among these properties, in the social universe. There are many different varieties of analytical schemes, but they share an emphasis on classifying basic properties

of the social world. Explanation of an empirical event comes whenever a place in the classificatory scheme can be found for an empirical event.

There are two basic types of analytical schemes: (1) *naturalistic schemes,* which try to develop a tightly woven system of categories that is presumed to capture the way in which the invariant properties of the universe are ordered and (2) *sensitizing schemes,* which are more loosely assembled congeries of concepts intended only to sensitize and orient researchers and theorists to certain critical processes.

Discursive Schemes are typically easier to understand than those that are more formal, but the weakness is that the variables and forces highlighted and the dynamic relations among them are vague and imprecise. Even with a certain vagueness in language, it is still possible to recognise the basic theoretical argument and convert it into a more formal format like an analytical model or propositions scheme.

Propositional Scheme is a theoretical statement that specifies the connection between two or more variables. It tells us how variation in one concept is accounted for by variation in another. Propositional Schemes vary perhaps the most of all theoretical approaches. They vary primarily along two dimensions: (1) the level of abstraction and (2) the way propositions are organized into formats. Some are highly abstract and contain concepts that do not denote any particular case but all cases of a type.

By using these two dimensions, several different types of propositional schemes can be isolated: (a) axiomatic formats, (b) formal formats, and (c) empirical formats.

An axiomatic organization of theoretical statements involves a set of concepts some of which are concepts are highly abstract; others, more concrete. Second, there is always a set of existence statements that describe those types and classes of situations in which the concepts and the propositions that incorporate them apply. Third, propositional statements are stated in a hierarchical order. At the top of the hierarchy are axioms, or highly abstract statements, from which all other theoretical statements are logically derived. The axioms should be consistent with one another, although they do not have to be logically interrelated. The axioms should be highly abstract; they should state relationships among abstract concepts. These relationships should be law-like in that the more concrete theorems derived from them have not been disproved by empirical investigation.

Formal theories are loose versions of axiomatic schemes. The idea is to develop highly abstract propositions that are used to explain some empirical event. Some highly abstract propositions are seen as higher-order laws, and the goal of explanation is to visualize empirical events as instances of this covering law. Deductions from the laws are

made, but they are much looser, rarely conforming to the strict rules of axiomatic theory. Moreover, there is recognition that extraneous variables cannot always be excluded, and so the propositions have a condition that if other forces do not impinge, then the relationship among concepts in the proposition should hold true.

Empirical Formats consist of generalizations from specific events, in particular empirical contexts. They are too tied to empirical contexts, times, and places. In fact, they are generalizations that are in need of a theory to explain them. There are other kinds of empirical generalizations also. These are often termed middle-range theories, because they are more abstract than a research finding and because their empirical content pertains to variables that are also found in other domains of social reality.

Analytical Modeling Scheme is a diagrammatic representation of social events. The diagrammatic elements of any model include: (1) concepts that denote and highlight certain features of the universe; (2) the arrangement of these concepts in visual space so as to reflect the ordering of events in the universe; and (3) symbols that mark the connections among concepts, such as lines, arrows, vectors, and so on. The elements of a model may be weighted in some way, or they may be sequentially organized to express events over time, or they may represent complex patterns of relations and other potential ways in which properties of the universe affect one another.

In sociology, most diagrammatic models are constructed to emphasize the causal connections among properties of the universe. That is, they are designed to show how changes in the values of one set of variables are related to changes in the values of other variables. Sociologists generally construct two different types of models, which can be termed analytical models and causal models. Analytical models are more abstract: they highlight more generic properties of the universe, and they portray a complex set of connections among variables. In contrast, causal models are more empirically grounded. They provide a more detailed interpretation of an empirical generalization.

I.2 Definition and Characteristics of Sociological theory

The social world consists of the behaviors, interactions, and patterns of social organization among human beings. Sociological theory tends to focus on interaction and organization more than behavior as such, but interactions are interpersonal behaviors, and patterns of social organization are ultimately built from interactions among individuals. Sociological theory is a set of assumptions, assertions, and propositions, organized in the form of an explanation or interpretation, of the nature, form, or content of social action. Sociological theory is defined as a set of interrelated ideas that allow for the systematisation of knowledge of the social world. This knowledge is then used to explain the social world and make predictions about the future of the social world.

The important characteristics of sociological theory are as follows.

1. Sociological theories are abstract generalisations.

2. Sociological theories are logical prepositions.

3. Sociological theories are conceptulisations regarding social phenomena.

4. Sociological theories are empirical generalisations.

5. Sociological theories are factual based.

6. Sociological theories are provisional in nature.

7. Sociological theories are verifiable

Types of Sociological Theory-

Speculative Theories Vs. Grounded Theories

Speculative theories are abstract, impressionistic and rooted in a philosophical system. The encyclopedic minds of Comte and Spencer have synthesized the findings of a variety of disciplines to formulate a formidable array of theoretical statements to explain social processes and organisations. These are essentially theories generated by logical deduction from a priori assumptions. They are based on certain methodological and philosophical assumptions and generated theoretical entities and conceptual schemes.

Grounded theories, on the other hand, are based on the findings of empirical research and they are suited to their specific uses. They produce specific sociological laws, principles and empirical generalizations. Grounded theory is part theoretical framework and part research methodology. It combines theory and research and serves as a guide for many social science researchers in their projects. Grounded theory is an attempt to develop theories from an analysis of the patterns, themes, and common categories discovered in observational research. It emphasizes research procedures when developing theories.

Grand Theory Vs. Miniature Theory

A grand theory is a broad conceptual scheme with systems of interrelated propositions that provide a general frame of reference for the study of social processes and institutions. However, it is different from speculative theory. The grand theory is rooted in the empirical world - however loosely whereas speculative theories are based on philosophical systems. The difference between them, of course, is only a matter of degree, not kind. The grand theory is a comprehensive formulation. It provides a master scheme of general sociological orientations. Grand theories are full of jargon and intuitive statements. Parson's system theory and Sorkin's theory of socio-cultural dynamics are examples of grand theories.

Miniature theories are what Merton called as Middle range theories: Theories intermediate to the minor working hypotheses evolved during the day-to-day routines of research, and the all inclusive speculations comprising a master speculative scheme from which it is hoped to derive a very large number of empirically observed uniformities of social behaviour. The miniature theories are partial, more specific and their frame of reference is considerably limited. They are less pretensions than the grand theories. Merton's theory of reference groups is an example of such a theory.

Macro Theories Vs. Micro Theories

Macro theories are broader in scope and encompass in array of laws while micro theories have a narrower frame of reference. Macro theories are concerned with total societal patterns. Theories of society culture and institutions constitute the tradition of macro-sociology. Micro sociology is concerned with interactions among the atoms of society. Small group theories represent the micro tradition in contemporary sociology. The distinction between the two types of theories is based on the size of the unit of analysis rather than the level of analysis. Macro theories deal with society as a whole. Micro theories deal with the sub-systems that make up the whole. Parsons System theory is macro whereas Ho-man's exchange theory is molecular. Macro theories belong to grand theory category; Micro theories come under miniature theories.

Major schools of sociological thought

Functionalism

Functionalism is a sociological theory that originally attempted to explain social institutions as collective means to meet individual biological needs. Later it came to focus on the ways social institutions meet social needs

The central concern of functionalism is the explanation of the apparent stability and internal cohesion of societies necessary to ensure their continued existence over time. Many functionalists argue that social institutions are functionally integrated to form a stable system and that a change in one institution will precipitate a change in other institutions. Societies are seen as coherent, bounded and fundamentally relational constructs that function like organisms, with their various parts or social institutions working together to maintain and reproduce them. The various parts of society are assumed to work for the overall social equilibrium. All social and cultural phenomena are therefore seen as being functional in the sense of working together to achieve this state. These components are then primarily analysed in terms of the function they play. A function is the contribution made by a phenomenon to a larger system of which the phenomenon is a part.

Functionalism addresses society as a whole in terms of the function of its constituent elements; namely norms, customs, traditions and institutions. Important sociologists associated with this approach include Auguste Comte, Emile Durkheim, Herbert Spencer, Talcott Parsons, and Robert K. Merton. A common analogy, popularized by Herbert Spencer, presents these parts of society as "organs" that work toward the proper functioning of the "body" as a whole

Structuralism

Structuralism is a theory of humankind in which all elements of human culture, including literature, are thought to be parts of a system of signs. Structuralism was heavily influenced by linguistics, especially by the pioneering work of Ferdinand de Saussure. Later the contributions of Levi-Strauss also contributed to the school of thought.

The major propositions of Structuralism are listed below.

The first is that the underlying elements of the structure remain constant, and it is the varying relationships between them that produce different languages, systems of ideas, and types of society.

Secondly, there is the implication that what appears to us as solid, normal, or natural, is in fact the end result of a process of production from some form of underlying structure.

Thirdly, structuralism transforms our commonsense notion of individuals: they too are seen as the product of relationships, rather than as the authors of social reality.

Finally, structuralism holds the view that history is discontinuous and marked by radical changes.

Conflict theory

Conflict theory is used to understand war, wealth and poverty, the haves and the have nots, revolutions, exploitation and such conflict-related social phenomena. Conflict Theory claims that society is in a state of perpetual conflict and competition for limited resources. Marx and Weber were the major proponents of conflict theory.

Conflict Theory assumes that those who have wealth perpetually try to increase their wealth at the expense and suffering of those who have not. It is a power struggle which is most often won by wealthy elite and lost by the common person of common means. Power is the ability to get what one wants even in the presence of opposition. Authority is the institutionalized legitimate power. The Bourgeoisie, or wealthy elite have the most power. Bourgeoisie exploit the Proletariats to maximize their profit. The Proletariats are the common working class, lower class, and poor members of society.

The following are three primary assumptions of conflict theory:

- Competition over scarce resources is at the heart of all social relationships. Competition rather than consensus is characteristic of human relationships.

- Inequalities in power and reward are built into all social structures. Individuals and groups that benefit from any particular structure strive to see it maintained.

- Change occurs as a result of conflict between competing interests rather than through adaptation. Change is often abrupt and revolutionary rather than evolutionary.

Interactionism

Interactionism is a theoretical perspective that derives social processes (such as conflict, cooperation, identity formation) from human interaction. It is the study of how individuals act within society. Interactionist theory has grown in the latter half of the twentieth century and has become one of the dominant sociological perspectives in the world today. Interactionism was first linked to the work of James Parker. George Herbert Mead, as an advocate of pragmatism and the subjectivity of social reality is considered a leader in the development of interactionism. Herbert Blumer expanded on Mead's work and coined the term "symbolic interactionism".

Symbolic Interactionism is a theoretical approach to understand the relationship between humans and society. The basic notion of symbolic interactionism is that human action and interaction are understandable only through the exchange of meaningful communication or symbols. In this approach, humans are portrayed as acting as opposed to being acted upon. The main principles of symbolic interactionism are:

1. human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that things have for them

2. these meanings arise from social interaction

3. social action results from a fitting together of individual lines of action

It focuses on the concrete details of what goes on among individuals in everyday life. Interactionists study how we use and interpret symbols not only to communicate with each other, but also to create and maintain impressions of ourselves, to create a sense of self, and to create and sustain what we experience as the reality of a particular social situation. From this perspective, social life consists largely of a complex fabric woven of countless interactions through which life takes on shape and meaning.

MODULE II

FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVE

Origin and development of Functionalism

The functionalist perspective, also called functionalism, is one of the major theoretical perspectives in sociology. It has its origins in the works of Emile Durkheim, who was especially interested in how social order is possible or how society remains relatively stable. Functionalism interprets each part of society in terms of how it contributes to the stability of the whole society. Society is more than the sum of its parts; rather, each part of society is functional for the stability of the whole society. The different parts are primarily the institutions of society, each of which is organized to fill different needs and each of which has particular consequences for the form and shape of society. The parts all depend on each other.

Functionalism sees social structure or the organisation of society as more important than the individual. Functionalism is a top down theory. Individuals are born into society and become the product of all the social influences around them as they are socialised by various institutions such as the family, education, media and religion.

Functionalism sees society as a system; a set of interconnected parts which together form a whole. There is a relationship between all these parts and agents of socialisation and together they all contribute to the maintenance of society as a whole.

Social consensus, order and integration are key beliefs of functionalism as this allows society to continue and progress because there are shared norms and values that mean all individuals have a common goal and have a vested interest in conforming and thus conflict is minimal.

For example, the government, or state, provides education for the children of the family, which in turn pays taxes on which the state depends to keep itself running. The family is dependent upon the school to help children grow up to have good jobs so that they can raise and support their own families. In the process, the children become law-abiding, taxpaying citizens, who in turn support the state. If all goes well, the parts of society produce order, stability, and productivity. If all does not go well, the parts of society then must adapt to recapture a new order, stability, and productivity.

Functionalism emphasizes the consensus and order that exist in society, focusing on social stability and shared public values. From this perspective, disorganization in the

system, such as deviant behavior, leads to change because societal components must adjust to achieve stability. When one part of the system is not working or is dysfunctional, it affects all other parts and creates social problems, which leads to social change.

According to the functionalist perspective of sociology, each aspect of society is interdependent and contributes to society's stability and functioning as a whole. For example, the government provides education for the children of the family, which in turn pays taxes on which the state depends to keep itself running. That is, the family is dependent upon the school to help children grow up to have good jobs so that they can raise and support their own families. In the process, the children become law-abiding, taxpaying citizens, who in turn support the state.

If all goes well, the parts of society produce order, stability, and productivity. If all does not go well, the parts of society then must adapt to recapture a new order, stability, and productivity. For example, during a financial recession with its high rates of unemployment and inflation, social programs are trimmed or cut. Schools offer fewer programs. Families tighten their budgets. And a new social order, stability, and productivity occur.

Functionalists believe that society is held together by social consensus, in which members of the society agree upon, and work together to achieve, what is best for society as a whole. This stands apart from the other two main sociological perspectives

Modern sociological theory has been profoundly influenced by functional analysis which became enormously popular at the turn of the century. During the last two generations, functional analysis has become the principal paradigm of contemporary sociology with more adherents than any other mode of sociological analysis or school of thought. It emerged and established itself at the most apt time. It emerged in the tradition of great sociological theories consciously orienting it to them and continually developing them.

Functional analysis is not new; it has a long history in both natural and social sciences. Thus functionalism is simply a view of society as a self- regulating system of interrelated elements with structured social relationships and observed regularities. Functionalism manifests itself in a great variety of approaches.

The history of functionalism may be traced to Comte's 'consensus universalis ' , Spencer's Organic Analogy, Pareto's conception of society as a system in equilibrium and Durkheim's causal functional analysis. Comte viewed society as a functionally organized system, its components in harmony. Durkheim insisted on the primary of the system over elements and maintained that social facts the proper subject matter of sociology are

individual will and imposed upon him from without. He elaborate the logic of functionalism by systematically explaining the causes and consequences of social facts and established functionalism as a viable methodological and theoretical tool for sociological analysis. Radcliffe- Brown and Malinowski, elaborated and codified functionalism as the basis of anthropological and sociological thinking.

Malinowski's functionalism is often termed as individualistic functionalism because of its treatment of social and cultural systems as collective responses to fundamental biological needs of individuals modified by cultural values. Radcliffe- Brown rejected Malinowski's individualistic functionalism and following the Durkheim on tradition, emphasized structured social relationships. Radcliffe-Brown focused primarily on the function of each element in the maintenance and development of a total structure, and largely overlooked functional consequences of specific elements for differentiated parts of the whole and for the individual components. He defined that function is the contribution which a partial activity makes to the total activity of which it is a part. The function of a particular social usage is the contribution it makes to the total social life as the functioning of the total social system. A social system has a certain kinds of unity, which we may speak of as a functional unity.

From the 1930s, structural functionalism was the dominant theoretical approach in American sociology. Functionalists coined pivotal concepts, such as 'role', 'norms', and 'social systems' that came to form the basic building blocks of contemporary sociology. Moreover, a few functionalists concepts, such as 'role model' and 'self –fulfilling prophecy', have entered our colloquial vocabulary as well. Structural functionalism is most well known not for the specific concepts that it introduced but rather for the meta theoretical framework on which it is based. Structural functionalism envisions society as a system of interrelated parts, and they emphasize how the different parts work together for the good of the system. The classic structural functionalist image of society is as an organism such as body, with different parts working together an interdependent way.

In addition, structural functionalism emphasizes 'system within systems'. For instance, while each family can be considered its own self contained 'system' or unit, it is also a component of society as a whole. Other major components of society, include the economy- the system for providing goods and services to members of that society; the government- the system for determining the rules for that society and the distribution of power, and the religious system- the system that provides individuals with core values and a sense of meaning. In short, for structural functionalists, just as the body is a system with specific parts(e.g. Arms, legs, liver) that ensure its overall functioning, so, too, society is a system with specific parts (family, govt, economy, religion etc.) necessary for its vary survival. Structural functionalists typically emphasize how the various systems and sub systems work together.

TALCOTT PARSONS [1902-1979]

Talcott Parsons, an American thinker, was born in 1902 in Colorado Springs. He was the 5th and last child of his parents. Talcott Parsons acknowledged that his parents' values influenced him considerably. Theirs was a liberal household, in which morality, modern industrial system, economic individualism and exploitation of labor were topic of concern. He studied the natural sciences, particularly biology, as well as philosophy and social sciences. He graduated from London school of economics in the year 1924. In 1927 he got his doctorate from Hiedelberg University. He began his teaching at Harvard University. His important works include

1. Structure of social action

2. Theory of social and economic organizations

3. Essays in sociological theory

4. The social system and towards a general theory of social action

Another in support of Functionalism is **Talcott Parsons**. Parsons claims that society is the way it is as social structures are interconnected and dependant on each other. Functionalists therefore see change as evolutionary – change in one part of society will eventually occur in another. Social ills e.g. crime and deviance, have disabling effects on society and gradually effect other parts. They recognize interconnections between various parts of society occur due to a value consensus. Parsons believes that as society changes, it develops and the pattern variables within it will become more complex. Change, therefore, trickles throughout society. Parsons summed this up as the 'Organic Analogy'.

Functionalists believe that sociological matters should be explained with scientific facts. This is otherwise known as Positivism. The founder of Positivism, Angste Comte, describes it as a method of study based primary facts, objectively measured, from which makes it possible to identify issues in society that effect individuals and leaves room for innovation in law and establishing new legislation. An example of this would be statistics. Positivists believe that sociology should adopt the methodology of the natural sciences and focus only on directly observable social facts and correlate them with other observable social facts.

Theory of social action

Perhaps Parsons's single most important idea is that action must not be viewed in isolation. Parsons is known as the chief exponent of theory of social action. His ideas are available in his "structure of social action". For him society embraced the entire social

field of man. Society, he believes is an element in the complete whole of human social life. The society also affected by environments, heredity and culture on the one hand and religious, metaphysical and political systems on the other. Society is so complex that it covers and touches all relationships of man with man. Society comprises of only complex of social relationship. He characterized society as sum total of all human relationship. Action must be understood as a proof in time or as a system. As parsons explicitly state that "actions are not empirically discrete but occur in constellations we call systems". He defined "social action by saying that it is a process in the actor situation system which has motivational significance to the individual actor or in the case of collectivity, its component individuals". In other words, all social actions proceed from mechanism. Social actions are concerned with organism; actor's relations with other persons and social institutions. Parsons used the term "<u>Unit act</u>" to refer to a hypothetical actor in a hypothetical situation bounded by an array of parameters and conditions (required effort, ends or goals, situation, norms). Instead of constructing action in terms of something concrete (such as business or an individual). Parsons conceptualized action systems as a means for analyzing social phenomena. Parsons has defined social action by saying that "it is a process in the actor- situation system which has motivational significance to the individual actor or in the case of collectivity its component individuals". Social actions are concerned with organism, actor's relations with other persons and social institutions.

Talcott Parsons saw social action as composed of four basic elements that distinguish it from isolated, individual behavior,

- ✓ It is oriented toward attainment of ends or goals.

- ✓ It takes place in situations consisting of the physical and social objects to which the actor relates

- ✓ It is normatively regulated (that is, by norms that guide the orientation of actions)

- ✓ It involves expenditure of effort or energy

Parsons (1937) and Parsons and Shils further maintain that actions are organized into three modes or realms: social systems, personality systems and cultural systems. These systems are analytically rather than empirically distinct. That is these systems are not physically separate entities but rather a simplified model of society that Parsons and Shils use to explain the organization of action. Put in another way, social systems, personality systems and cultural systems undergind all action and all social life.

Social system

Parsons' ideas about social systems are available to us in his volume entitled 'social system'. According to him there are five elements of social systems namely individual actors, interaction of actors, motivation of the interactions; situations and environments connected with interactions and cultural relations. All these elements are closely connected and inter-linked with each other and in fact, social system is network of interpretative relationship.

Parsons is of the view that social systems have both negative and positive aspects. These develop as a result of situations and interaction between various individuals. As a result of interaction actors are motivated to do certain things with the result that a particular system develops. It is known as positive aspect of social system. On the other hand in societies there are certain activities which people wish to avoid, which usually are as a result of some sort of interaction. Such as aspect is known as negative aspect of social system. He said that destructive forces exist in every society.

Social controls can best be observed when such measures which are against these systems are fully well checked. This will help in maintaining equilibrium; for this it is essential that certain institutional priorities should be fixed; an institution being understood as a well established norm of behaviour. The institutions can be relational, regulative, culture and relational-regulative. Relational institutions come to stay because of certain situations and interactions due to which certain relations emerge, which give birth to certain institutions. In such institutions there are certain offices and statuses which also divide the actors. Regulative institutions regulate and guide the actions of individuals. In case there is no proper regulation, there is every possibility that social structure may come under heavy strains and interests of weaker sections of society may be ignored. Thus institutions which regulate social behaviour are called regulative institutions.

There are certain institutions which are responsible for our cultural pattern and help promoting as well as accelerating our cultural behaviour. These help in maintaining our non- values and behaviour and are called cultural institutions. Relational-regulative institutions perform the functions of establishing relationship and regulating behaviors.

According to parsons structural components of social system are kinship, stratification, and power system and religion and value integration. Every social system recognizes blood relationship. In the social system role of kinship assumes significance because it makes the task of socialization easy. It also regulates some of our social behaviors.

Then comes stratification. It is also useful. As we know that there is no society in which there is no hierarchy. It is with the help of stratification that the place of each individual in the social hierarchy is decided, which in turn helps in knowing the job of stratification that we come to know who is performing what quality of job and to what extent the job needs rewards and incentives. The rewards can be economic, aesthetic *i.e.* which can provide one recreation and also satisfy his ego.

In the study of social system then comes the role of power system. Such a system becomes essential for checking and controlling the behaviour of both the individuals as well as the groups. This system also helps checking social disorganizations, which otherwise would create many social problems. This however does not include physical power. In social system, religion plays a bog role. It is religion which helps preserving social values and norms and upholds such moral values which keep the people closer and together. Religion and social values also bring the people closer and nearer to each other. Religion and values even govern internal attitudes and make the whole system dynamic. It also helps in ensuring that norms and values do not get disintegrated.

From the ideas of parsons, it appears that he was an original thinker. His ideas about social system and social control were quite unique and new. These provided a sort of mechanism by which society could remain organized and disorganization which otherwise would have come in it could be checked. He drew the attention of the sociologists to the fact that each society was always under heavy strains and if it was desired that there should be smooth working, these strains should be checked. Similarly his views about social action were also quite original. In fact by his views and ideas his very mush made the society think in new direction. His view was thus very useful in the field of social thought.

Pattern variables

In toward a general theory of action (1951), parsons and shils develop a set of concepts called the pattern variables. The pattern variables are a set of five 'choices that akin to the collective level AGIL scheme, apply not only to the individual level but to the collective level but to the collective level as well. They refer at once to the variant normative priorities of social system, the dominant modes of orientation in personality systems, and the patterns of values in cultural systems.

Though, both ends of each pattern variables dichotomy are readily apparent in contemporary society at all three levels (social, cultural and personality). The pattern variables are an extension of a renowned dichotomy first formulated by the German theorist Ferdinand Tonnies (1963/1935). Tonnies's distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (purposive association) was later reformulated by Emile

Durkheim in his conceptualization of "mechanical" versus "organic solidarity". According to these classic dichotomies, modern societies are based on individualistic "purposiveness" and functional interdependence. While traditional societies are rooted in collectivistic "sameness" (or community) and an intense feeling of community. The relation between Parsons' pattern variables.

PATTERN VARIABLE: A dichotomy that describes alternatives of action between which each person (and group) has to choose in every situation. The actions are shaped by the three systems: personality, cultural, and social.

1. Affectivity/ Affective-Neutrality

Affectivity: Emotional impulses are gratified. For example, a child is allowed to show "love" for parent.

Affective-neutrality: Emotional impulses are in an organization (such as the DMV) or a teacher grading papers is expected to be emotionally "neutral".

2. *Self*-orientation/Collectivity-orientation

Self-orientation: Action is based on the actor's own interests, needs, and goals. For example, a student decides what to study in college based on his or her own interests.

Collectivity-orientation: Action is based on what is best for the "collectivity". For example, a child quits school to support her family.

3. Universalism/Particularism

Universalism: Action is based on "general standards" or universal laws and moral rules. For example, the supreme court decides cases according to ruler valid for the whole community.

Particularism: Action is based on the priority and attachment actors place on relationships and situations. For example, you give support to a friend without considering whether his or her actions were right or wrong.

4. Ascription/Achievement

Ascription: Action based on given attributes (race, sex, age). For example, being eligible for the draft or allowed to buy alcohol or vote because you are a specified age.

Achievement: Action based on performance. For example, graduation from college based on completion of requirements for graduation.

5. Specificity/Diffuseness

Specificity: Action based on specific criteria/roles. For example, clerk/customer role. Teacher/student role- there is narrowly and clearly defined criteria for interaction.

Diffuseness: Open guidelines for action. For example, becoming friends with a teacher, going beyond the clear boundaries of teacher/student relation.

As for parson's pattern variables, affectivity means that the emotions are considered legitimate in action ("gratification of impulse" in parson's terms), while *affective-neutrality* means that emotions are closed out of action. For instance, in contemporary societies it is normative to display affectivity in personal relationships but not in bureaucratic relationships: you might kiss or hug a close friend upon greeting him on the street (affectivity), but you won't do the same to the next client in line in your job as a clerk at the Department of Motor vehicles (affective-neutrality) indeed. Parsons maintained that affective-neutrality was generally more pervasive in modern Western societies than in traditional societies-which parallels the shift noted by Tonnies as well as Weber from a more religiously oriented (non rationalistic) society to a more rationalistic, scientifically oriented society.

This shift is particularly apparent when considering the contrast between traditional and modern scientific medicine. Modern medicine typically involves tests and procedures performed by a myriad of specialists who are often strangers to the patient. The relationship between patient and medical specialist (or medical technician) is typically marked by professionalism and affective-neutrality rather than affectivity and emotional involvement. In a traditional society such as the kamba, together shaman and patient might invoke a drug-induced state in order to complete a thorough spiritual and physical "cleansing' of the aggrieved soul. In this case, rather than being excluded from medical treatment, emotions are integral to the healing process.

Self –orientation means that the individual actor prioritizes the needs and goals of the "self". While conversely, the *collectivity-orientation* denotes the prioritization of the needs and goals of the collectivity or group as a whole. Parsons suggested that "self-orientation" is considered more legitimate in modern and postmodern than in traditional societies, while in traditional societies, the reverse is true. In contemporary American society, college students typically choose their major based on their own interests and goals. Most Americans choose their own marriage partner, a choice that is based primarily

(if not strictly) on personal issues, in many traditional societies, marriages are not so much an individual but rather, a collective concern. In such societies, marriages are often arranged by elders, who focus on the economic and social benefits of the prospective new kinship formation (a collective consideration) rather than strictly the needs and wants of the bride and groom (who may or may not even know each other):

Universalism means that an action is based on impersonal, universal standards or general rules, such as queuing up, filling out a standardized job application, or having each person's vote count equally in an election. Conversely, *particularism* refers to actions that are guided by the uniqueness of that particular relationship, for instance, inviting only "really good friends" to your party. For example, if you stand by your sister even though she acted badly (for illegally), you are prioritizing the particular relationship you have with her over her action (even though you find it offensive). By contrast, if you turn your sister in to the police because what she did was illegal, you would be applying a universal standard. In this case, your particular relationship is not the central concern.

Ascription means that evaluations or interactions are guided by given personal attributes (e.g., race, gender, age),while achievement (performance) means that evalutions or interactions are based on an actor's performance with regard to established standards (e.g., college entrance examinations, physical endurance tests for firefighter trainees).Parsons maintained that the achievement orientation was increasingly important in modern Western societies, whereas in traditional societies, ascribed charateristics (e.g., clan, gender, age) were generally given greater priority.Thus, for instance, an individual's tenure and successin her in her career is determined more by her peformance than by inheritance or privilege.In all of the pattern variables, the distinctions between traditional and modern society must not be takentoo far.Obviously, upper-class children still inherit significant privilages, making class position one of the most vital attributes in today's world ; and race and gender are, to a extent, ascribed rather than achieved as well.Indeed, although his pattern variables explicitly follow Tonnies's dichotomy between traditional and modern societies, in fact, Parsons fully recognized that each pole of each pattern variable exists in both types of society.

The multivocality of the pattern variables is most readily apparent in Parsons's notion of *subsystems* or systems, because this means that the pattern-variable continuum is always apparent in fullat another level. Although affective –neutrality is generally considered more legitimate than affectivity in modern societies, as evidenced in economic relationships, affectivity is generally considered a more legitimate basis of action in the context of the family.Similarly, although achievement is generally prioritized in the public sector and ascription is prioritized in the family, even within one system (the family, the economy, the legal system).each dimension of the pattern variable invariably

appears.Parents might base a child's privileges on both achievement (e.g., grades, behaviour) and ascription.Ascription and achievement are both readily apparent in the legal system.Traditional societies have a parallel continuum,too,in that there are explicit contests or competitions for particular social roles and rewards (achievement), but in order to participate you must possess specific ascribed traits.Finally,*diffuseness* means means nothing is "closed out" in making a particular choice or undertaking a particular action, while *specificity* means that action is based on a *specific* criterion.For instance, in urban, bureaucratic societies, we are often expected to act within narrowly defined role in order to maximize efficiency.Impersonal mechanisms, such as queuing up or taking a number, are intended to be based solely on one criterion (e.g.,who got their first),thereby displaying affective-neutrality and universality (i.e., fairness) rather than emotion or favoritism.By contrast, in similar, slower-paced, rural, traditional communities in which speed and efficiencyare not of such paramount importance, the criteria for action may be more diffuse ; less is excluded from the interaction.

Functionalism of Merton- Functionalist Paradigm

Robert K. Merton is one of Talcott Parson's Harward University student who carved out a riche in sociology by introducing the "middle range theory" in the discipline. He was educated with prominent socialists like Sorokin, Harold. Garfinkel and others in the Harvard University under the tutelage of Talcott Persons. Sorkin, Emile Durkhein & George simmer also cast an influence on Robert K. Merton's theory. Merton argued that using Emile Durkhein's conception of religion he has developed social cohesion, an important element of functionalism specially the latent functions. R.K. Merton wrote some important books of which the social theory and social structure and the sociology of science are particularly useful. Merton also developed some concepts like self fulfilling prophesy, role model, deviant behavior and focus groups.

Merton's Manifest & Latent Functions

Merton distinguished the functions of society between manifest and latent. The former represents those functions as expected or intended by the members of the society. They know that these functions would take place and so were prepared for them. They would only be surprised if these did not take place; whereas the latent function are un – intended functions which can take place only as a consequence of the former for which they were not prepared. Merton argued that it is the job of the sociologist to trying uncover the latent functions of social activities and institution.

Functional Alternatives

Merton has also devised alternative functions known as the substitutes which could instead deliver the sort of functions advocated by Talcot parson's in the form of functional pre requisites'. Merton argued that use of religion as a therapeutic device could be substituted effectively by the alternative therapeutic devises like counseling and reasoning which can make then understand the values of normal life in society. Secondly people in their predicament could be educated in the vocational field and trained as skilled and useful workers of society. Education can liberate the minds from religious superstitions. It can also motivate them to become work-oriented. Independent and self reliant which would help them recover from depression, obsession and frustration. Merton argued that functionalist approach should take guard of the fact that any part of society may be functional, dysfunctional or non functional.

Merton Relation with Early Functionalism

As a functionalist, Merton criticised Talcot Parson's functional perspective as erroneous. He argued that his postulations could not be defended scientifically, Merton's middle range theory is more compatible with empirical research than the macro the theories of Talcot parsons. Sociogist. Paul Lazarsfeld also helped Merton in his effort to develop the 'niddle Range Theor' using couantitative Methdology.'

Merton's Paradigm for Functional Analysis

Merton saw functional theorizing as potentially embracing 3 questionable postulates:

1. The functional unity of social systems:

Merton, to begin analysis with the postulate of functional unity' or integration of social whole can divert attention away from not only these questions but also from not only these questions but also from the varies and "disparate consequences of a given social or cultural item for diverse social groups and for individual members of these groups." Merton begins to direct function analysis away from concern with total system toward an emphasis on how different pattern of social organization with in more inclusive social systems are created, maintained, and changed not only by the requisites of the total system but also by interaction among socio-cultural items within systematic wholes.

2. The functional Universality of social items. :

Merton, if an examination of empirical systems is undertaken, it is clear that there is wider range of empirical possibilities. Merton proposes the analysis of diverse

consequences or functions of socio- cultural items-whether positive or negative, manifest or latent- "for individuals, for subgroups, and for the more inclusive social structure and culture. In this way, Merton visualizes contemporary functional thought as compensating for the excesses of earlier forms of analysis by focusing on the crucial types of consequences of socio-cultural items for each other and if the facts dictate, for the social whole.

3. **The indispensability of functional items for social systems**:

The facts leads Merton to postulate the importance in functional analysis of concern with various types of "functional alternatives,' or functional equivalents," and "functional substitutes" with in social systems. In this way, functional analysis would not view as indispensable the social items of a system trap of assuming that items must exist to as assure the continued existence of a system.

Rather, functional analysis must specify (1) Social patterns under consideration, whether a systematic whole or some subpart; (2) the various types of consequences of these patterns for empirically established survival requisites; and (3) the processes whereby some patterns rather than others come to exist and have the various consequences for each other and for systematic wholes.

A Protocol for Executing functional Analysis

To ascertain the causes and consequences of particular structures and processes, Merton insists that functional analysis begins with "sheer description" of individual and group activities. In describing the patterns of interaction and activity among units under investigation, it will be possible to discern clearly the social items to be subjected to functional analysis. Such descriptions can also provide a major due to the functions performed by such patterned activity.

The first of these steps is for investigators to indicate the principal alternatives that are excluded by the dominance of a particular pattern. The second analytical step beyond sheer description involves an assessment of the meaning, or mental and emotional significance, of the activity for group members.

Illustrating Merton's Functional Strategy

Merton paradigm and protocol for constructing functional theories the middle range are remarkably free of statement about individual and system needs or requisites. In his protocol statements Merton approaches the questions of the needs and requisites fulfilled by a particular item only after description of (1) the item in question, (2) the structural context in which the item survives, and its meaning for the individuals involved

with this information, it is then possible to establish both the manifest and latent functions of an item, as well as the net balance of functions and dysfunctions of the item for varied segments of a social system. Unfortunately, it implied sequencing of functional analysis is not always performed by Merton, presumably for at least two reasons.

For at least these reasons, then, execution of Merton's strategy is difficult. Much like that of his anthropological strew men, such as Radcliffe- Brown and Malinowski, Merton's need to analyses separately the causes and functions of structural item is not as evident in the actual account of empirical evidence.

MODULE III

CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE

Origin of Conflict theory

Marx Contributions to conflict theory

Of the classical founders of social science, conflict theory is most commonly associated with Karl Marx (1818–1883). Based on a dialectical materialist account of history, Marxism proposed that capitalism, like previous socioeconomic systems, would inevitably produce internal tensions leading to its own destruction. Marx ushered in radical change, advocating proletarian revolution and freedom from the ruling classes. At the same time, Karl Marx was aware that most of the people living in capitalist societies did not see how the system shaped the entire operation of society. Just like how we see private property, or the right to pass that property on to our children as natural, many of members in capitalistic societies see the rich as having earned their wealth through hard work and education, while seeing the poor as lacking in skill and initiative. Marx rejected this type of thinking and termed it false consciousness, explanations of social problems as the shortcomings of individuals rather than the flaws of society. Marx wanted to replace this kind of thinking with something Engels termed class consciousness, workers' recognition of themselves as a class unified in opposition to capitalist and ultimately to the capitalist system itself. In general, Marx wanted the proletarians to rise up against the capitalist and overthrow the capitalist system.

In the social productions of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces, these relations turn into their fetters. Then an era of social revolution begins. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense

superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society. Mankind thus inevitably sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the course of formation. In broad outline, the Asiatic, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as epochs marking progress in the economic development of society. The bourgeois mode of production is the last antagonistic form of the social process of production – antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism but of an antagonism that emanates from the individuals' social conditions of existence – but the productive forces developing within bourgeois society create also the material conditions for a solution of this antagonism. The prehistory of human society accordingly closes with this social formation.

Simmel's Contributions to conflict theory

Georg Simmel (1858-1918) is best known as a microsociologist who played a significant role in the development of small-group research. Simmel's basic approach can be described as "methodological relationism," because he operates on the principle that everything interacts in some way with everything else. His essay on fashion, for example, notes that fashion is a form of social relationship that allows those who wish to conform to do so while also providing the norm from which individualistic people can deviate. Within the fashion process, people take on a variety of social roles that play off the decisions and actions of others. On a more general level, people are influenced by both objective culture (the things that people produce) and individual culture (the capacity of individuals to produce, absorb, and control elements of objective culture). Simmel believed that people possess creative capacities that enable them to produce objective culture that transcends them. But objective culture comes to stand in irreconcilable opposition to the creative forces that have produced it in the first place.

Primary Concerns

Simmel's interest in creativity is manifest in his discussions of the diverse forms of social interaction, the ability of actors to create social structures, and the disastrous effects those structures have on the creativity of individuals. All of Simmel's discussions of the forms of interaction imply that actors must be consciously oriented to one another. Simmel also has a sense of individual conscience and of the fact that the norms and values of society become internalized in individual consciousness. In addition, Simmel has a conception of people's ability to confront themselves mentally, to set themselves apart from their own actions, which is very similar to the views of George Herbert Mead.

Simmel is best known in contemporary sociology for his contributions to our understanding of patterns or forms of social interaction. Simmel made clear that one of his primary interests was association among conscious actors and that his intent was to look at a wide range of interactions that may seem trivial at some times but crucially important at others. One of Simmel's dominant concerns was the form rather than the content of social interaction. From Simmel's point of view, the sociologist's task is to impose a limited number of forms on social reality, extracting commonalities that are found in a wide array of specific interactions.

Along these lines, Simmel attempts to develop a geometry of social relations. The crucial difference between the dyad (two-person group) and triad (three-person group) is that a triad presents a greater threat to the individuality of group members. In a larger society, however, an individual is likely to be involved in a number of groups, each of which controls only a small portion of his or her personality. Distance also determines the form of social interaction. For example, the value of an object is a function of its distance from an actor. Simmel considered a wide range of social forms, including exchange, conflict, prostitution, and sociability.

One of the main focuses of Simmel's historical and philosophical sociology is the cultural level of social reality, which he called objective culture. In Simmel's view, people produce culture, but because of their ability to reify social reality, the cultural world and the social world come to have lives of their own and increasingly dominate the actors who created them. Simmel identified a number of components of objective culture, including tools, transportation, technology, the arts, language, the intellectual sphere, conventional wisdom, religious dogma, philosophical systems, legal systems, moral codes, and ideals. The absolute size of objective culture increases with modernization. The number of different components of the cultural realm also grows. What worried Simmel most was the threat to individual culture posed by the growth of objective culture.

The Philosophy of Money

In *The Philosophy of Money*, Simmel assesses the impact of the money economy on the inner world of actors and the objective culture as a whole. Simmel saw money as linked with social phenomena such as exchange, ownership, greed, extravagance, cynicism, individual freedom, style of life, culture, and the value of personality. In general, he argued that people create value by making objects, separating themselves from those objects, and then seeking to overcome distance, obstacles, and difficulties. Money serves both to create distance from objects and to provide the means to overcome it. Money provides the means by which the market, the economy, and ultimately society, acquire a life of their own that is external to and coercive of the actor. Simmel saw the significance of the individual declining as money transactions became an increasingly important part of society. A society in which money becomes an end in itself can cause individuals to become increasingly cynical and to have a blasé attitude.

Objective Culture

The increasing division of labor in modern societies leads to an improved ability to create the various components of the cultural world. But at the same time, the highly specialized individual loses a sense of the total culture and loses the ability to control it. As objective culture grows, individual culture atrophies. The massive expansion of objective culture has had a dramatic effect on the rhythm of life. For example, our means of communication are more efficient, meaning that slow and unpredictable communication has been replaced with readily available mail, telephone, and e-mail service. On the positive side, people have much more freedom because they are less restricted by the natural rhythm of life. On the negative side, problems arise because the growth of objective culture generates cultural malaise, cultural ambivalence and, ultimately, a tragedy of culture.

Criticisms

Simmel is most frequently criticized for the fragmentary character of his work. He did not devise a systematic sociology on a par with Marx, Durkheim, or Weber. Marxists criticize Simmel for not seeing a way out of the tragedy of culture-an analytic equivalent to Marx's concept of alienation.

Coser: Functions of Conflict

Coser argues that conflict is instinctual for us, so we find it everywhere in human society. There is the conflict of war, but there is also the conflict that we find in our daily lives and relationships. But Coser also argues that conflict is different for humans than for

other animals in that our conflicts can be goal related. There is generally something that we are trying to achieve through conflict, and there are different possible ways of reaching our goal. The existence of the possibility of different paths opens up opportunities for negotiation and different types and levels of conflict. Because Coser sees conflict as a normal and functional part of human life, he can talk about its variation in ways that others missed, such as the level of violence and functional consequences.

Coser makes the case for two kinds of functional consequences of conflict: conflict that occurs within a group and conflict that occurs outside the group. An example of internal conflict is the tension that can exist between indigenous populations or first nations and the national government. Notice that this internal conflict is actually between or among groups that function within the same social system. Examples of external group conflicts are the wars in which a nation may involve itself. When considering the consequences for internal group conflict, Coser is concerned with low-level and more frequent conflict. When explaining the consequences for external conflict, he is thinking about more violent conflict.

Internal Conflict

Internal conflict in the larger social system creates norms for dealing with conflict, and develops lines of authority and judiciary systems. Coser sees conflict as instinctual for humans. Thus, a society must always contend with the psychological need of individuals to engage in conflict. Coser appears to argue that this need can build up over time and become explosive. Low-level, frequent conflict tends to release hostilities and thus keep conflict from building and becoming disintegrative for the system.

This kind of conflict also creates pressures for society to produce norms governing conflict. Frequent, low-level conflict creates moral and social structures that facilitate social integration. Coser also notes that not every internal conflict will be functional. It depends on the types of conflict and social structure that are involved.

In Coser's theory, there are two basic types of internal conflict: those that threaten or contradict the fundamental assumptions of the group relationship and those that don't. Every group is based on certain beliefs regarding what the group is about. The group structure will also help determine whether or not a conflict is functional. As Coser explains,"social structures differ in the way in which they allow expression to antagonistic claims". Groups whose members interact frequently over long periods of time and have high levels of personal and personality involvement have high network density. Such groups will tend to suppress or discourage conflict. If conflict does erupt in such a group, it will tend to be very intense for two reasons. First, the group will likely have built up unresolved grievances and unreleased hostilities. Second, the kind of total personal

involvement these groups have makes the mobilization of all emotions that much easier. On the other hand, groups whose members interact less frequently and that demand less involvement will be more likely to experience the functional benefits of conflict.

External Conflict

The different groups involved in conflict also experience functional results, especially when the conflict is more violent. As a group experiences external conflict, the boundaries surrounding the group become stronger, the members of the group experience greater solidarity, power is exercised more efficiently, and the group tends to form coalitions with other groups. The more violent the conflict is, the more intensified are these effects. In order for any group to exist, it must include some people and exclude others. This inclusion/exclusion process involves producing and regulating different behaviors, ways of feeling and thinking, cultural symbols, and so forth. These differences constitute a group boundary that clearly demarcates those who belong from those who do not. As a group experiences conflict, the boundaries surrounding the group become stronger and better guarded.

Along with stronger external boundaries, conflict enables the group to also experience higher levels of internal solidarity. When a group engages in conflict, the members will tend to feel a greater sense of camaraderie than during peaceful times. They will see themselves as more alike, more part of the same family, existing for the same reason. Group-specific behaviors and symbols will be more closely guarded and celebrated. Group rituals will be engaged in more often and with greater fervency, thus producing greater emotional ties between members and creating a sense of sacredness about the group.

In addition, a group experiencing conflict will tend to produce a more centralized power structure. A centralized government is more efficient in terms of response time to danger, regulating internal stresses and needs, negotiating external relations, and so on. Violent conflict also tends to produce coalitions with previously neutral parties.

Dahrendorf: ICA's

Like Coser, Dahrendorf sees conflict as universally present in all human relations. But Dahrendorf doesn't see the inevitability of conflict as part of human nature; he sees it, rather, as a normal part of how we structure society and create social order. Dahrendorf argues that it is power that both defines and enforces the guiding principles of society. Dahrendorf also follows Coser in talking about the level of violence and its effects, but Dahrendorf adds a further variable: conflict intensity.

Dahrendorf's most influential work on social inequality is Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, which was published in 1959. This book presents his first detailed account of the problem of inequality in modern, or postcapitalist, societies. Dahrendorf's central argument is that neither structural functionalism nor Marxism alone provides an acceptable perspective on advanced society. He claims that structural functionalists pay too little attention to the realities of social conflict and that Marx defined class too narrowly and in a historically-specific context. This historic context that Marx was writing in was one where wealth was the determining factor in power. The wealthy ruled and there was no way for the poor to gain any power or increase their position in society. Dahrendorf, however points out the changes that have occurred in society that come with democracy like voting for political parties, and increased mobility. He believes that the struggle for authority creates conflict. Furthermore, he believes that traditional Marxism ignores consensus and integration in modern social structures. Dahrendorf's theory defined class not in terms of wealth like Marx, but by levels of authority. Dahrendorf combines elements from both of these perspectives to develop his own theory about class conflict in postcapitalist society.

Dahrendorf recognizes two approaches to society, which he calls the Utopian and the Rationalist. The first emphasizes equilibrium of values, consensus, and stability; the second revolves around dissension and conflict, the latter being the mover of structural change. Both are social perspectives; neither is completely false, but each views a separate face of society. Unfortunately, he feels, the consensus view has dominated contemporary sociology and he sets out to create some balance between the two views by developing and illustrating the theoretical power of a class-conflict perspective.

He sees Marx's defining characteristic of class as a special case of a more general authoritative relationship. Society grants the holders of social positions power to exercise coercive control over others. And property ownership, the legitimate right to coercively exclude others from one's property, is such power. This control is a matter of authority, which Dahrendorf defines, according to Weber, as the probability that a command with specific content will be obeyed by certain people. Authority is associated with a role or position and differs from power, which Dahrendorf claims is individual. Authority is a matter of formal legitimacy backed by sanctions. It is a relation existing between people in imperatively coordinated groups, thus originating in social structure.

Authority, however, is dichotomous; there is always an authoritative hierarchy on one side and those who are excluded on the other. Within any imperative group are those who are superordinate and those who are subordinate. There is an arrangement of social roles comprising expectations of domination or subjugation. Those who assume opposing roles have structurally generated contradictory interests, to preserve or to change the status quo. Incumbents of authoritative roles benefit from the status-quo, which grants

them their power. Those toward whom this authoritative power is exercised, and who suffer from it, however, are naturally opposed to this state of affairs.

Superordinates and subordinates thus form separate quasi-groups of shared latent interests. On the surface, members of these groups and their behavior may vary considerably, but they form a pool from which conflict groups can recruit members. With leadership, ideology, and the political and social conditions of organization being present, latent interests become manifested through political organizations and conflict. Dahrendorf defines social classes as latent or manifest conflict groups arising from the authority structure of imperative coordinated organizations. Class conflict then arises from and is related to this structure. The structural source of group conflict lies in authoritative domination and subjugation; the object of such conflict is the status quo; and the consequence is to change social structure. It should be stressed that Dahrendorf's theory is not limited to "capitalist" societies. Since authoritative roles are the differential between classes, classes and class conflict also exist in communist or socialist societies. Classes exist insofar as there are those who dominate by virtue of legitimate positions and those who are habitually in subordinate positions.

Dahrendorf lays out four basic assumptions of conflict:

1. social change is ubiquitous

2. conflict exists between the different elements of society

3. all elements contribute to conflict in one way or another

4. society and social order is possible because some members of society are able to constrain others.

Dahrendorf states that capitalism has undergone major changes since Marx initially developed his theory on class conflict. This new system of capitalism, which he identifies as postcapitalism, is characterized by diverse class structure and a fluid system of power relations. Thus, it involves a much more complex system of inequality. Dahrendorf contends that postcapitalist society that has institutionalized class conflict into state and economic spheres.For example, class conflict has been habituated through unions, collective bargaining, the court system, and legislative debate. In effect, the severe class strife typical of Marx's time is not longer relevant. Dahrendorf's theory often took the opposite view of functionalists. Conflict theory said that "every society at every point is subject to process of change". He believes that there is "dissension and conflict at every point in the social system" and "many societal elements as contributing to disintegration and change" They believe order comes from coercion from those at the top. They believe that power is an important factor in social order. Dahrendorf believes that both conflict theory and consensus theory are necessary because they reflect the two parts of society.

Consensus theory focuses on the value integration into society, while conflict theory focuses on conflicts of interest and the force that holds society together despite these stresses Dahrendorf wanted to understand how conflict works. He did not believe the two theories could be combined and focused on developing the conflict theory. Dahrendorf's thesis was "the differential distribution of authority invariably becomes the determining factor of systematic social conflicts"

Dahrendorf believed that Marx's theory could be updated to reflect modern society and Roman society. He rejects Marx's two class system as too simplistic and overly focused on property ownership. Due to the rise of the joint stock company, ownership does not necessarily reflect control of economic production in modern society. Instead of describing the fundamental differences of class in terms of property, Dahrendorf claims that we must "replace the possession, or nonpossesion, of effective private property by the exercise of, or exclusion from, authority as the criterion of class formation". A crucial component to Dahrendorf's conflict theory is the idea of authority. Although it initially appears to be an individual issue and psychological, Dahrendorf argues that authority is related to positions not individuals. In this way, subordination and authority are products of expectation specified by society, and if those roles are not adhered to, sanctions are imposed. Dahrendorf expands on this idea with the notion that roles of authority may conflict when in different positions that call for different things. According to Dahrendorf, these different defined areas of society where people's roles may be different are called imperatively coordinated associations. The groups of society in different associations are drawn together by their common interests. Dahrendorf explains that latent interests are natural interests that arise unconsciously in conflict between superordinates and subordinates. He defines manifest interests as latent interests when they are realized. Dahrendorf believed that the basis of class conflict was the division of three groups of society: quasi groups, interest groups, and conflict groups. Thus, society can be split up into the "command class" and the "obey class" and class conflict should refer to situations of struggle between those with authority and those without. Quasi groups are "aggregates of incumbents of positions with identical role interests". Interest groups are derived from the quasi groups and they are organized with members, an organization, and a program or goal. The main difference between quasi groups and interest groups are that interest groups are able to organize and have a sense of "belonging" or identity. Darhendorf acknowledged that other conditions like politics, adequate personnel, and recruitment would play a role along with the groups. Unlike Marx, however, he did not believe that random recruitment into the quasi group, it would not start a conflict group. In contrast to Lewis Coser's ideas that functions of conflict maintained the status quo, Dahrendorf believed that that conflict also leads to change (in social structure) and development. His belief in a changing society separated Dahrendorf's ideas from Marx who supported the concept of a utopia.

MODULE IV

INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE

Symbolic interactionism is a major sociological perspective that is influential in many areas of the discipline. It is particularly important in microsociology and social psychology. Symbolic interactionism is derived from American pragmatism and particularly from the work of George Herbert Mead, who argued that people's selves are social products, but that these selves are also purposive and creative. Herbert Blumer, a student and interpreter of Mead, coined the term "symbolic interactionism" and put forward an influential summary of the perspective: people act toward things based on the meaning those things have for them; and these meanings are derived from social interaction and modified through interpretation. Sociologists working in this tradition have researched a wide range of topics using a variety of research methods. However, the majority of interactionist research uses qualitative research methods, like participant observation, to study aspects of (1) social interaction and/or (2) individuals' selves. The symbolic interaction theory is about communication and interaction of people expressed either verbally or by body language. The symbolic interaction sociology is formed from many diverse influences left by people like John Millar, Adam Smith, Charles Darwin, and pragmatist Philosopher, John Dewey and others. The main concern with the symbolic interaction is not its intrinsic 'meaning' but meaning perceived by people in day to day communication which vary from one person to another. People look at things from various angles of vision and convey them to people portraying meanings different from the situations they have encountered. They from meaning and partial attitudes about them; they make sense on the pattern of behaviour and shape up meaning to follow in course of time.

All these put together constitute the symbolic meaning of certain, things and even of human being. Thus symbolic interaction is a process of developing one's conception and perception of objects, issues, situation and other matter and with their meaning to shape their environment in the way they like. It is an active, creative and conscious characteristics of the individuals. The concept is fundamentally based on the meanings people make of things around them and express through their language. Mead argue that language allows us to see ourselves more clearly and consciously and to form images of ourselves as well as of others. Objects and environment in the society. Mead argued that once we need no to see the elephant again what it was like because the image of elephant was in our mind.

The Historical Roots of Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism, especially the work of **George Herbert Mead (1863-1931)**, traces its roots to two intellectual traditions: pragmatism and psychological behaviorism. Mead adopted from the pragmatists three important themes: (1) a focus on the interaction between actors and the social world, (2) a view of both actors and the social world as dynamic processes, and (3) the centrality of actors' ability to interpret the social world. In sum, both pragmatism and symbolic interactionism view thinking as a process. Mead recognized the importance of overt, observable behavior, but expanded the understanding of mental capacities of most psychological behaviorists by stressing the importance of covert behavior. Unlike the radical behaviorists, Mead believed that there were significant differences between human beings and animals, particularly the human capacity to use language and dynamically created social reality.

Symbolic Interactionism originated with two key theorists, George Herbert Mead and Charles Horton Cooley. Mead's influence on Symbolic Interactionism was said to be so powerful that other sociologists regard him as the one "true founder" of symbolic interactionism tradition. People act toward things based on the meaning those things have for them; and these meanings are derived from social interaction and modified through interpretation. Blumer was a social constructionist,and was influenced by Dewey as such this theory is very phenomenologically based. The term "symbolic interactionism" has come into use as a label for a relatively distinctive approach to the study of human life and human conduct (Blumer, 1939). With Symbolic interactionism, reality is seen as social, developed interaction with others. Most symbolic interactionists believe a physical reality does indeed exist by an individual's social definitions, and that social definitions do develop in part or relation to something "real." People thus do not respond to this reality directly, but rather to the social understanding of reality. Humans therefore exist in three realities: a physical objective reality, a social reality, and a unique reality.

The Basic Principles of Symbolic Interactionism

The basic principles of symbolic interactionism include the following: (1) human beings possess the capacity for thought, which is shaped by social interaction; (2) people learn meanings and symbols through social interaction; and (3) people are able to modify or alter the meanings and symbols they use in interactions by interpreting the situations they are engaged in.

Socialization is one way individuals learn to think, interact with one another, and understand how to use meanings and symbols. Defining the situation is another way that individuals actively engage in creating the social world. Finally, developing a "looking-glass" self helps individuals to perceive and judge the impressions we make on others we interact with.

Criticisms of Symbolic Interactionism and Its New Directions

Symbolic interactionism has been criticized for relying too much on qualitative methodology and for failing to incorporate quantitative methodology into its research program. It has also been criticized for being too vague on the conceptual front and for downplaying large-scale social structures. Given its micro-level focus, some have argued that symbolic interactionism is not microscopic enough, because it tends to ignore psychological factors.

Symbolic interactionists are currently trying to answer some of these criticisms by integrating micro- and macro-level theories and synthesizing their approach across other fields of study. For example, some scholars are redefining Mead's theory to show that it accounts for both micro- and macro-level phenomena. Others are using role theory as a way to integrate structure and meaning. Some symbolic interactionists are focusing more attention on culture and are working within cultural studies to examine the role communication technologies play in producing and representing social reality.

Symbolic interactionism has changed considerably since its inception. According to one symbolic interactionist, Gary Fine, the field has fragmented, resulting in greater diversity. It has expanded beyond its concerns with micro-level relations, incorporated ideas from other theoretical perspectives, and been adopted by sociologists who would not define themselves as symbolic interactionists

Pragmatism

Pragmatism is a philosophical tradition that began in the United States around 1870. Pragmatism is a rejection of the idea that the function of thought is to describe, represent, or mirror reality. Instead, pragmatists develop their philosophy around the idea that the function of thought is as an instrument or tool for prediction, action, and problem solving. Pragmatists contend that most philosophical topics--such as the nature of knowledge, language, concepts, meaning, belief, and science--are all best viewed in terms of their practical uses and successes rather than in terms of representative accuracy. Pragmatism pointed out that the meaning of object or social interaction is rooted in action in everyday practical conduct not in one or another element intrinsic to the object or event in questions.

A few of the various but interrelated positions often characteristic of philosophers working from a pragmatist approach include:

- Anti-representationalism; any view in philosophy of language that rejects analyzing the semantic meaning of propositions, mental states, and statements in

terms of a correspondence or representational relationship and instead analyzes semantic meaning in terms of notions like dispositions to action, inferential relationships, and/or functional roles (e.g. behaviorism and inferentialism). Not to be confused with pragmatics, a sub-field of linguistics with no relation to philosophical pragmatism.

- Coherentist theory of justification; a rejection of the epistemological claim that all knowledge and justified belief rest ultimately on a foundation of non inferential knowledge or justified belief. Coherentists hold that justification is solely a function of some relationship between beliefs, none of which are privileged beliefs in the way maintained by foundationalists theories of justification.

- Deflationary or pragmatist theories of truth; the former is the epistemological claim that assertions that predicate truth of a statement do not attribute a property called truth to such a statement while the later is the epistemological claim that assertions that predicate truth of a statement attribute the property of useful-to-believe to such a statement.

- Empiricism; the broad epistemological assertion that knowledge comes only or primarily from sensory experience; contrary to rationalism.

- Fallibilism; the epistemological principle that human beings could be wrong about their beliefs, expectations, or their understanding of the world, and yet still be justified in holding their incorrect beliefs.

- Instrumentalism; the view in the philosophy of science that a scientific concept or theory should be evaluated by how effectively it explains and predicts phenomena, as opposed to how accurately it describes objective reality.

- Pluralism; a view in metaphysics and epistemology that there is more than one sound way to conceptualize the world and its content.

- Verificationism; the view that a statement or question is only legitimate if there is some way to determine whether the statement is true or false, or what the answer to the question is.

Pragmatism as a philosophical movement began in the United States in the 1870s. Its direction was determined by the Metaphysical Club members Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and Chauncey Wright, as well as John Dewey and George Herbert Mead. The first use in print of the name *pragmatism* was in 1898 by James, who credited Peirce with coining the term during the early 1870s.

Charles Sanders Peirce (and his pragmatic maxim) deserves much of the credit for pragmatism, along with later twentieth century contributors, William James and John Dewey. The word *pragmatism* derives from Greek πρᾶγμα (*pragma*), "deed, act",which comes from πράσσω (*prassō*), "to pass over, to practise, to achieve". The word "Pragmatism" as a piece of technical terminology in philosophy refers to a specific set of associated philosophical views originating in the late twentieth-century. However, the phrase is often confused with "pragmatism" in the context of politics (which refers to politics or diplomacy based primarily on practical considerations, rather than ideological notions.) and with a non- technical use of "pragmatism" in ordinary contexts referring to dealing with matters in one's life realistically and in a way that is based on practical rather than abstract considerations.

Although, such a position may not appear to be particularly controversial, it is based on a host of assumption regarding the nature of the individual and his relationship to the external world. Particularly important in this regard is the indebtedness of Mead to german idealism and philosophy of Immaual Kant and George Hegal. Equally important from Kantian view, there is no reality seperable from the perceiving subject. Instead, the conscious apprehension of them. The world is thus not something out there to be experienced by the subject but rather it is a task to be accomplished. Moreover, consciousness itself cannot be said to exist unless there is some object in the external world that one notes or becomes aware of. The act of knowing (subject) and the known (object) are thus intimately connected.

BEHAVIORISM

In psychology the theory of Behaviorism was propounded by Watson. According to him all behavior, whether animal or human; was fundamentally of stimulus response pattern. The fear of man is a response to stimulus of explosion. According to Watson, the social actions are response to various social stimuli. Behaviorism reduced all actions to stimulus responses pattern. The view of parson is different. According to parson while animal behavior can explained in this manner, in human behavior many factors other than stimulus and response play their part in different psychological situations, a man acts differently. The same stimulus may produced different responses in two persons. Thus it is clear that parson theory of social action is quite different from that of behaviorism.

The Pragmatist view of consciousness and its importance for guiding our actions is not without its detractors. The behaviorist branch of psychology in response to which Mead fashioned his own theoretical framework that he labeled " social behaviourism". Psychological behaviorism is a resolutely empirical branch of psychology that focuses solely on observable actions. Indeed, its proponents argue that only overt behaviours are

open to scientific investigation. From this it follows that because states of mind, feelings, desires and thinking cannot be observed, they cannot be studied scientifically. As a result behaviourism is confined to studying the links between the visible stimuli and the learned responses that are associated with them.

MEANING OF BEHAVIORISM

Mead was influenced by psychological behaviorism (J. Baldwin, 1986, 1988a, 1988b), a perspective which also led him in a realist and an empirical direction. In fact, mead called his basic concern social behaviorism to differentiate it from the radical behaviorism of John B. Watson. Mead recognized the importance of observable behavior, but he also felt that there were covert aspects of behavior that radical behaviorists had ignored. But because he accepted the empiricism that was basic to behaviorism.

Mead and the radical behaviorists also differed in their views on the relationship between human and animal behavior, Mead argued that there was a significant, qualitative difference. The key to this difference was seen as the human possession of mental capacities that allowed people to use language between stimulus and response in order to decide how to response. Mead simultaneously demonstrated his debt to watsonian behaviorism and dissociated himself from it.

BEHAVIORISM IN STRUCTURAL PERSPECTIVES

The most vexing problem in contemporary sociological theory concerned the relationship between individual and society. Theoretical orientations that conceptualize this relationship may be classified. Under four categories

1. NOMINALISM

The nominalist view, the oldest and the most extreme position, is that the group is not a real entity but merely a term used to refer to an assemblage of individual. In this perspective, the individual is the only read entity; general concepts such us society, group culture and values are not regarded as careful in the study of human behavior. The only thing that needs to be or can be explained is the behavior of the individual.

2. INTERACTIONALISM

This perspective rejects the individual group dichotomy and stresses , instead, the indivisibility of the two neither the group not the individual is real except in term of the other and other fore, interaction becomes the major concern. The interactionist doctrine combines biological, cultural, personal and social explanations and emphasizes the multiplicity of causative factors in the explanation of phenomena.

3. NEO-NOMINALISM

This is reductionist perspective which accepts the existence of the group as an objective reality. But claim that the individual is the more fundamental unit. Since society is made up of persons and of processes which have their locus and immediate origin in the person, social phenomena can be explained in terms of individual phenomena.

4. SOCIAL BEHAVIORISM

The behaviorism that mead espoused, which he called "social behaviorism", differed from John B. Watson's more radical form in that mead included within the legitimate bounds of scientific investigation. Not only observable overt behavior but also convert behavior knowable only through introspection. In this respect he was in agreement with other social theorists, such as cooley and weber, who considered introspection a valid technique for understanding human behavior because it could be made objective by the consensus of scientific investigators.

According to mead the evolutionary process led to the development of the human brain so that it is qualitatively different from that of other animals. The crucial difference is the human ability to use vocal gestures or symbols. Mead maintained that this uniquently human phenomenon. Animal use signals that are either genetic in origin or conditioned responses to specific stimuli. For example, a dog may bark under certain circumstance, but before it starts to bark it does not think about the effect barking wil have on another dog or person. In contrast, human behavior involves the prediction of response: before using a symbol person can predict the probable response of other persons.

Influence of pragmatism in social sciences

Symbolic interactionism, a major perspective within sociological social psychology, was derived from pragmatism in the early twentieth century, especially the work of George Herbert Mead and Charles Cooley, as well as that of Peirce and William James. Increasing attention is being given to pragmatist epistemology in other branches of the social sciences, which have struggled with divisive debates over the status of social scientific knowledge. Enthusiasts suggest that pragmatism offers an approach which is both pluralist and practical.

Influence of pragmatism in public administration

The classical pragmatism of John Dewey, William James, and Charles Sanders Peirce has influenced research in the field of Public Administration. Scholars claim classical pragmatism had a profound influence on the origin of the field of public

administration.[24][25] At the most basic level, public administrators are responsible for making programs "work" in a pluralistic, problems-oriented environment. Public administrators are also responsible for the day-to-day work with citizens. Dewey's participatory democracy can be applied in this environment. Dewey and James' notion of theory as a tool, helps administrators craft theories to resolve policy and administrative problems. Further, the birth of American public administration coincides closely with the period of greatest influence of the classical pragmatists. Which pragmatism (classical pragmatism or neo-pragmatism) makes the most sense in public administration has been the source of debate.

The health sector's administrators' use of pragmatism, has been criticized as incomplete in its pragmatism, however.[47] According to the classical pragmatists, knowledge is always shaped by human interests, and the administrator's focus on 'outcomes' simply advances their own interest, but that this focus on outcomes often undermines their citizen's interests, which often are more concerned with process. On the other hand, David Brendel argues that pragmatism's ability to bridge dualisms, focus on practical problems, include multiple perspectives, incorporate participation from interested parties (patient, family, health team), and provisional nature makes it well suited to address problems in this area.

Criticisms

Arthur Oncken Lovejoy criticized pragmatism in his 1908 essay "The Thirteen Pragmatisms"[56] where he identifies thirteen different philosophical positions that were each labeled pragmatism. Lovejoy argues that there is significant ambiguity in the notion of the consequences of the *truth* of a proposition and those of *belief* in a proposition in order to highlight that many pragmatists had failed to recognize that distinction.

Neopragmatism as represented by Richard Rorty has been criticized as relativistic both by neoclassical pragmatists such as Susan Haack (Haack 1997) and by many analytic philosophers (Dennett 1998). Rorty's early analytical work, however, differs notably from his later work which some, including Rorty, consider to be closer to literary criticism than to philosophy, and which, attracts the brunt of criticism from his detractors.

CONCLUSION

Social action is then seen as symbolic behavior, and interaction is based on shared symbolic meanings. These meaning are learned during the process of socialization, a process to which mead devoted considerable attention. It is though socialization that the explained the development of the self and the integration of the individual into society. Pragmatism and behaviorism, especially in the theories of Dewey and Mead, were transmitted to many graduate students at the University of Chicago.

William James

It is proposed here that William Jame's contribution to Symbolic Interaction (SI), while acknowledged, is underutilized. James's contribution has been largely ignored by contemporary interactionists who present the canon in textbooks. It is argued here that the concept that James developed are richer and more numerous than has been previously presented, and that the most significant symbolic interaction tenet, that people respond to objects on the basis of the meaning that they have for them, is to be found first in James.

William James tried to show the meaningfulness of (some kinds of) spirituality but, like other pragmatists, did not see religion as the basis of meaning or morality. William James' contribution to ethics, as laid out in his essay *The Will to Believe* has often been misunderstood as a plea for relativism or irrationality. On its own terms it argues that ethics always involves a certain degree of trust or faith and that we cannot always wait for adequate proof when making moral decisions. One of the reasons for the inadequate treatment may be that many interactionists have not examined James's work.

Definition

"The interactionist perspective is one of the major theoretical perspectives within sociology. It focuses on the concrete details of what goes on among individuals in everyday life. Interactionist study how we use and interpret symbols not only to communicate with each other, but also to create and maintain impressions of ourselves, to create a sense of self and to create and sustain what we experience as the reality of a particular social situation. From this perspective, social life consists largely of a complex fabric woven of countless interactions though which life takes on shape and meaning."

Contributions of William James

According to Larson the real attempts to build on his interaction frame of reference (Larson,C.J., 1986,P. 93) were evident in James's analysis of self-conciousness. That is the case because, the most significant contribution to sociology James made was his conception of self as "the crucial concept of interactionist research .As a result of this conception James more than Dewey established interactionism as a social-psychological and sociological theory. This contribution is in the end more significant than his conception of radical empiricism. However, radical empiricism appears in the late stage of development of James's philosophy. It is paradoxical that James had already contributed more to sociology in his "pre-pragmatist" period. It was in this period that he edited his masterpiece.

But this was originally James,s idea, for whom the total Self of me must have two aspects discriminated in it, of which for shortness we may call one the Me and the other the I.For James these discriminated aspects are not separate beings. His conception three constitutents –the material Me, the social Me and spiritual Me. The central position is occupied by the social Me, which is the source of the Mead's final notion of Me. We must state from the start that in spite of certain terminological identities between the occupations of James and Mead, there are some essential differences in the content of their respective concepts. The "Me,, of Mead is not identical to the "Me,, of James, though both are very close in contact

In our opinion, the idea of an active human being followed from Jamesian relativistic conception of the stream of conciousness, which was the fundamental idea of his psychology. Joas has correctly noted that James "did not take action (emphasis added) as his starting point ,but instead the pure stream of concious experience, His early psychological works served to mediate between the philosophy of the time and the emergence of interactionist sociology.

Conclusion

James's contribution to the crystallization of interactionist sociology, The contribution William James as one of the founders of pragmatism to the origin of interactionist sociology. Along with the general recognition of special role of James among sociologists, we sometimes encounter a certain underestimation of his influence. This recognition of the general contribution of pragmatism to the emergence of early interactionism as one of the most influential schools in American sociology of the 20th century can serve as an additional argument for the timeliness of theme.The real contribution of William James, as one of the founder of pragmatism.However, his work is a good example of the impact of philosophy on the origin and subsequent development of one of the eminent schools in modern sociology.

John Dewey

One of the classical pragmatists, **John Dewey** wrote most extensively about morality and democracy. In his classic article *Three Independent Factors in Morals* (Dewey 1930), he tried to integrate three basic philosophical perspectives on morality: the right, the virtuous and the good. He held that while all three provide meaningful ways to think about moral questions, the possibility of conflict among the three elements cannot always be easily solved. Dewey also criticized the dichotomy between **means and ends** which he saw as responsible for the degradation of our everyday working lives and education, both conceived as merely a means to an end. He stressed the need for meaningful labor and a conception of education that viewed it not as a preparation for life but as life itself.

Dewey was opposed to other ethical philosophies of his time, notably the emotivism of Alfred Ayer. Dewey envisioned the possibility of ethics as an experimental discipline, and thought values could best be characterized not as feelings or imperatives, but as hypotheses about what actions will lead to satisfactory results or what he termed *consummatory experience*. A recent pragmatist contribution to meta-ethics is Todd Lekan's "Making Morality" (Lekan 2003). Lekan argues that morality is a fallible but rational practice and that it has traditionally been misconceived as based on theory or principles. Instead, he argues, theory and rules arise as tools to make practice more intelligent.

John Dewey was an American philosopher, psychologist, and educational reformer whose ideas have been influential in education and social reform. Dewey is one of the primary figures associated with philosophy of pragmatism and is considered one of the founders of functional psychology. A well-known public intellectual, he was also a major voice of progressive education and liberalism. Although Dewey is known best for his publications concerning education, he also wrote about many other topics, including epistemology, metaphysics, aesthetics, art, logic, social theory, and ethics. Dewey considered two fundamental elements—schools and civil society—as being major topics needing attention and reconstruction to encourage experimental intelligence and plurality. Dewey asserted that complete democracy was to be obtained not just by extending voting rights but also by ensuring that there exists a fully formed public opinion, accomplished by effective communication among citizens, experts, and politicians, with the latter being accountable for the policies they adopt. Dewey was born in Burlington, Vermont, to a family of modest means. In 1894 Dewey joined the newly founded University of Chicago (1894–1904) where he developed his belief in Empiricism, becoming associated with the newly emerging Pragmatic philosophy. His time at the University of Chicago resulted in four essays collectively entitled *Thought and its Subject-Matter*, which was published with collected works from his colleagues at Chicago under the collective title *Studies in Logical Theory* (1903). The United States Postal Service honored Dewey with a Prominent Americans series 30¢ postage stamp.

Looking Glass self theory- C H Cooley

Self and society, wrote Cooley," are twin- born" This emphasis on the organic link and the indissoluble connection between self and society is the theme of most of Cooley' writings and remains the crucial contribution he made to modern social psychology and sociology. The objects of the social world, Cooley taught, are constitutive parts of the subject's mind and the self. Cooley wished to remove the conceptual barrier that Cartesian thought had erected between the individual and his society and to stress, instead, their interpenetration Cooley argued that a person's commerce with others. "The social origin of his life comes by the path way of intercourse with other persons."The self, to Cooley, is

not first individual and then social; it arises dialectically trough communication one's consciousness of himself is a reflection of the ideas about himself that the attributes to other minds; thus, there can be no isolated selves. "There is no sense of 'I' …. without its correlative sense of you, or he, or he, or they in his attempt to illustrate the reflected character of the self, Cooley compared it to a looking glass:

Each to each a looking – glass reflects the other that doth pass. "As we see our face, figure and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be, so in imagination we perceive in another's mini some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and are variously affected by it." The notion of looking – glass self is composed of three principal elements: "The imagination of our appearance to the other person, the imagination of his judgment of that appearance and some sort of self- feeling, such as pride or mortification."The self arises in a social process of communicative interchange as it is reflected in a person's consciousness.

Sympathetic Introspection

According to Cooley, "Know ledge requires both observation and interpretation. Neither being more scientific than the other. And each branch of science must be worked out in its own way which is mainly to be found in the actual search for truth rather than a priori methodology."Thus the most valuable exploration of sociological method is the motivation in human behavior which makes for all the difference between the man and the animal.

This is sympathetic introspection. It is the process of putting self in touch with other persons and trying to imagine how the world appears to them and then recollecting and describing. Critics of the use of introspection method in sociology do not understand that sociological investigation is not possible without some subjective effort. Human behavior is fundamentally subjective. Therefore, sympathetic introspection is a useful method sociology. Cooley used the concepts of the looking glass self and the primary group as tools in the analysis through sympathetic introspection. He said," In general the insights of sociology are imaginative reconstruction of life whose truth depends upon the competence of the mind that makes them to embrace the chief factors of the process studied and are produced or anticipate their operation."

Task of sociology

According to Cooley the fund mental task of sociology is to understand the organic nature of society as it evolves through the individual's perceptions of others and of

themselves. The sociologist should concentrate upon the mental activities of the individuals making the society. He should focus his attention upon the complex relationship between the individual and the society. There cannot be an isolated person nor there be a non-individual society.

Definition of society

Cooley accepts the organic theory of society propounded by Herbert Spencer which affirms the indispensable reciprocity between the individual and the society. Explaining this idea, Cooley wrote, "If we say that society is an organism, we mean that it is a complex of forms of processes of which in living and growing by interaction with the others, the whole being so unified that what take a place in one part affects all the rest. It is a vast tissue of reciprocal activity." Concerned with the deeper understanding of the individual in a particular psycho – social and historical social atmosphere, unlike Herbert Spencer Cooley wrote, "our life is all one human whole, and if we are to have any real knowledge of it we must see it as such. If we cut it up it dies in the process. Therefore, "the imaginations people have of one another are the solid facts of society…..society is a relation among personal ideas." The sociologist should perceive each individual as a fresh organization of life." He constitutes a two fold emergent reality of genetic heredity and social past. Social transmissions include language, interaction and education for each person in his time and culture. Explaining and defining society, Cooley wrote, "society is an interweaving and inter working of mental selves. I imagine your mind, and especially what your mind thinks about my mind, and what your mind thinks about your mind."

Concept of self

Explaining his concept of self as the looking-glass self Cooley wrote," As we see our face, figures and dress in the glass, and are interested in because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be, so in imagination we perceive in another's a mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aim deeds, character, friends and so on, and are variously affected by it." The concept of looking glass self is made of three dimensions: (1) How we imagine our appearance to other (2) How we imagine other's judgment. To explain these dimensions Cooley gives a simple example of an encounter between lice, Who has a new that, and Angela, who just bought a new dress. Now, between these two the sequence of perceptions is as follows: "(1) the real A lice, know only to the maker,(2)Her idea of herself, e.g.; 1 (Alice) look well in this hat.(3) Her idea of Angela idea of her, e.g.; Angela thinks she thinks of hear self, e.g.; Angela thinks I am proud of my looks in this hat."(4) Her idea of what Angela thinks she thinks of herself, e.g.; Angela thinks I am proud of my looks in the hat'(5) Angela's idea of what Alice thinks of herself, e.g.; Alice thinks she is

stunning in that hat'. And of course six analogous phases of Angela and her dress. " Thus, the imaginations people have of one another are the solid facts of society. The institutions are constitute the facts of society. Institutions are constituted of organization and crystallization of thought around the forms of customs, symbols, beliefs and lasting sentiments. Thus, the individual is a creation and hot only an effect of the social structure. Social institutions are the mental creations of the individuals, sustained by habits and familiarity. In his first book, Hum an nature and the social order, Cooley started with the analysis of the meaning of the 'I' as observed in daily thought of speech. This 'I' is what he calls the looking glass self. It is the empirical self definition of mind.

Explaining the social institution as a quality of mental habit Cooley defined mind as follows: " who mind is n organic up of cooperating individualistic in somewhat the same way that the music of an orchestra is made up of divergent but related sounds. No one would think it necessary or unreasonable to divide that music into two kinds that made by the whole and that of particular instruments and no more are these two kinds of mind, the social mind and the individual mind".

Conclusion

Cooley argued that a person's self develops through contact and interaction with others. By identifying a sense of self, individuals are able to view themselves the same way they do any other social object Cooley stated that there can be no isolated selves. "There is no sense of 'I'………..without its correlative sense of you, or he, or they." Individuals again a sense of self when they reserve consistent message from others. Actors are most interested in and value ,most, the reactions of significant others, especially primary – group members. Cooley is best known for introducing sociologists to the concepts primary groups and looking – glass self.

Cooley has tried to prove the inseparability of the individual and society. This principles has not only theoretical value but has practical importance also. All one-sided theories regarding individual and society lead to friction and strike in social relationship. If society is given preponderant value and importance the freedom of the individual is infringed and the growth of human personality is impeded. On the other hand, if the individual is given exaggerated importance, anarchy is liable to result. Cooley has avoided both extremes and presented a balanced point of view.

George Herbert Mead

Mind, Self, and Society

Mead's most widely read work, *Mind, Self and Society*, gives priority to society over the mind and highlights the idea that the social leads to the development of mental states. To Mead, the mind is a process, not a thing, and is found in social phenomena rather than within individuals. The *act* is the fundamental union in Mead's theory, and it is represented by four stages: impulse, perception, manipulation, and consummation. The basic mechanism of the social act, according to Mead, is the gesture. Mead pays particular attention to one kind of gesture, significant symbols, which make it possible for humans to think, to communicate, and to be stimulators of their own actions.

The self occupies a central place in Mead's theory. Mead defines the self as the ability to take oneself as an object and identifies the basic mechanism of the development of the self as reflexivity - the ability to put ourselves into the place of others and act as they act. Mead makes it clear that a self can arise only through social experiences, and he traces its development to two stages in childhood: the play stage and the game stage. During the play stage, children learn how to take the attitude of particular others to themselves, but it is only during the game stage that children learn how to take the roles of many others and the attitude of the generalized other. Mead also discussed the difference between the "I" and the "me" in his theory of the self. The "I" is the immediate response of an individual to the other; it is the unpredictable and creative aspect of the self. The "me" is the organized set of attitude of others that an individual assumes; it is how society dominates the individual and is a source of social control.

The self is not so much a substance as a process in which the conversation of gestures has been internalized within an organic form. This process does not exist for itself, but is simply a phase of the whole social organization of which the individual is a part. The organization of the social act has been imported into the organism and becomes then the mind of the individual. It still includes the attitudes of others, but now highly organized, so that they become what we call social attitudes rather than roles of separate individuals. This process of relating one's own organism to the others in the interactions that are going on, in so far as it is imported into the conduct of the individual with the conversation of the "I" and the "me," constitutes the self. The value of this importation of the conversation of gestures into the conduct of the individual lies in the superior co-ordination gained for society as a whole, and in the increased efficiency of the individual as a member of the group. It is the difference between the process which can take place in a group of rats or ants or bees, and that which can take place in a human community. The

social process with its various implications is actually taken up into the experience of the individual so that that which is going on takes place more effectively, because in a certain sense it has been rehearsed in the individual. He not only plays his part better under those conditions but he also reacts back on the organization of which he is a part.

The very nature of this conversation of gestures requires that the attitude of the other is changed through the attitude of the individual to the other's stimulus. In the conversation of gestures of the lower forms the play back and forth is noticeable, since the individual not only adjusts himself to the attitude of others, but also changes the attitudes of the others. The reaction of the individual in this conversation of gestures is one that in some degree is continually modifying the social process itself. It is this modification of the process which is of greatest interest in the experience of the individual. He takes the attitude of the other toward his own stimulus, and in taking that he finds it modified in that his response becomes a different one, and leads in turn to further changes

Fundamental attitudes are presumably those that are only changed gradually, and no one individual can reorganize the whole society; but one is continually affecting society by his own attitude because he does bring up the attitude of the group toward himself, responds to it, and through that response changes the attitude of the group. This is, of course, what we are constantly doing in our imagination, in our thought; we are utilizing our own attitude to bring about a different situation in the community of which we are a part; we are exerting ourselves, bringing forward our own opinion, criticizing the attitudes of others, and approving or disapproving. But we can do that only in so far as we can call out in ourselves the response of the community; we only have ideas in so far as we are able to take the attitude of the community and then respond to it.

Mind as the Individual Importation of the Social Process

Mead has been presenting the self and the mind in terms of a social process, as the importation of the conversation of gestures into the conduct of the individual organism, so that the individual organism takes these organized attitudes of the others called out by its own attitude, in the form of its gestures, and in reacting to the response calls out other organized attitudes in the others in the community to which the individual belongs. This process can be characterized in a certain sense in terms of the "I" and the "me,"the "me" being that group of organized attitudes to which the individual responds as an "I."

He want particularly to emphasize is the temporal and logical pre-existence of the social process to the self-conscious individual that arises in it. The conversation of gestures is a part of the social process which is going on. It is not something that the individual alone makes possible. What the development of language, especially the significant symbol, has rendered possible is just the taking over of this external social

situation into the conduct of the individual himself. There follows from this the enormous development which belongs to human society, the possibility of the prevision of what is going to take place in the response of other individuals, and preliminary adjustment to this by the individual. These, in turn, produce a different social situation which is again reflected in what I have termed the "me," so that the individual himself takes a different attitude.

Consider a politician or a statesman putting through some project tin which he has the attitude of the community in himself. He knows how the community reacts to this proposal. He reacts to this expression of the community in his own experience--he feels with it. He has a set of organized attitudes which are those of the community. His own contribution, the "I" in this case, is a project of reorganization, a project which he brings forward to the community as it is reflected in himself. He himself changes, of course, in so far as he brings this project forward and makes it a political issue. There has now arisen a new social situation as a result of the project which he is presenting. The whole procedure takes place in his own experience as well as in the general experience of the community. He is successful to the degree that the final "me"reflects the attitude of all in the community. What I am pointing out is that what occurs takes place not simply in his own mind, but rather that his mind is the expression in his own conduct of this social situation, this great co-operative community process which is going on.

He want to avoid the implication that the individual is taking something that is objective and making it subjective. There is an actual process of living together on the part of all members of the community which takes place by means of gestures. The gestures are certain stages in the co-operative activities which mediate the whole process. Now, all that has taken place in the appearance of the mind is that this process has been in some degree taken over into the conduct of the particular individual. There is a certain symbol, such as the policeman uses when he directs traffic. That is something that is out there. It does not become subjective when the engineer, who is engaged by the city to examine its traffic regulations, takes the same attitude the policeman takes with reference to traffic, and takes the attitude also of the drivers of machines. We do imply that he has the driver's organization; he knows that stopping means slowing down, putting on the brakes. There is a definite set of parts of his organism so trained that under certain circumstances he brings the machine to a stop. The raising of the policeman's hand is the gesture which calls out the various acts by means of which the machine is checked. Those various acts are in the expert's own organization; he can take the attitude of both the policeman and the driver. Only in this sense has the social process been made" subjective." If the expert just did it as a child does, it would be play; but if it is done for the actual regulation of traffic, the there is the operation of what we term mind. Mind is nothing but the importation of this external process into the conduct of the individual so as to meet the problems that arise.

This peculiar organization arises out of a social process that is logically its antecedent. A community within which the organism acts in such a co-operative fashion that the action of one is the stimulus to the other to respond, and so on, is the antecedent of the peculiar type of organization we term a mind, or a self. Take the simple family relation, where there is the male and the female and the child which has to be cared for. Here is a process which can only go on through interactions within this group. It cannot be said that the individuals come first and the community later, for the individuals arise in the very process itself, just as much as the human body or any multi-cellular form is one in which differentiated cells arise. There has to be a life-process going on in order to have the differentiated cells; in the same way there has to be a social process going on in order that there may be individuals. It is just as true in society as it is in the physiological situation that there could not be the individual if there was not the process of which he is a part. Given such a social process, there is the possibility of human intelligence when this social process, in terms of the conversation of gestures, is taken over into the conduct of the individual--and then there arises, of course, a different type of individual in terms of the responses now possible. There might conceivably be an individual who simply plays as the child does, without getting into a social game; but the human individual is possible because there is a social process in which it can function responsibly. The attitudes are parts of the social reaction; the cries would not maintain themselves as vocal gestures unless they did call out certain responses in the others; the attitude itself could only exist as such in this interplay of gestures.

The mind is simply the interplay of such gestures in the form of significant symbols. We must remember that the gesture is there only in its relationship to the response, to the attitude. One would not have words unless there were such responses. Language would never have arisen as a set of bare arbitrary terms which were attached to certain stimuli. Words have arisen out of a social interrelationship. One of Gulliver's tales was of a community in which a machine was created into which the letters of the alphabet could be mechanically fed in an endless number of combinations, and then the members of the community gathered around to see how the letters arranged after each rotation, on the theory that they might come in the form of an Iliador one of Shakespeare's plays, or some other great work. The assumption back of this would be that symbols are entirely independent of what we term their meaning. The assumption is baseless: there cannot be symbols unless there are responses. There would not be a call for assistance if there was not a tendency to respond to the cry of distress. It is such significant symbols, in the sense of a sub-set of social stimuli initiating a co-operative response, that do in a certain sense constitute our mind, provided that not only the symbol but also the responses are in our own nature. What the human being has succeeded in doing is in organizing the response to a certain symbol which is a part of the social act, so that he takes the attitude of the other person who co-operates with him. It is that which gives him a mind.

The sentinel of a herd is that member of the herd which is more sensitive to odor or sound than the others. At the approach of danger, he starts to run earlier than the others, who then follow along, in virtue of a herding tendency to run together. There is a social stimulus, a gesture, if you like, to which the other forms respond. The first form gets the odor earlier and starts to run, and its starting to run is a stimulus to the others to run also. It is all external; there is no mental process involved. The sentinel does not regard itself as the individual who is to give a signal; it just runs at a certain moment and so starts the others to run. But with a mind, the animal that gives the signal also takes the attitude of the others who respond to it. He knows what his signal means. A man who calls "fire" would be able to call out in himself the reaction he calls out in the other. In so far as the man can take the attitude of the other--his attitude of response to fire, his sense of terror-- that response to his own cry is something that makes of his conduct a mental affair, as over against the conduct of the others.[3] But the only thing that has happened here is that what takes place externally in the herd has been imported into the conduct of the man. There is the same signal and the same tendency to respond, but the man not only can give the signal but also can arouse in himself the attitude of the terrified escape, and through calling that out he can come back upon his own tendency to call out and can check it. He can react upon himself in taking the organized attitude of the whole group in trying to escape from danger. There is nothing more subjective about it than that the response to his own stimulus can be found in his own conduct, and that he can utilize the conversation of gestures that takes place to determine his own conduct. If he can so act, he can set up a rational control, and thus make possible a far more highly organized society than otherwise. The process is one which does not utilize a man endowed with a consciousness where there was no consciousness before, but rather an individual who takes over the whole social process into his own conduct. That ability, of course, is dependent first of all on the symbol being one to which he can respond; and so far as we know, the vocal gesture has been the condition for the development of that type of symbol. Whether it can develop without the vocal gesture he cannot tell.

Mead sure that we see that the content put into the mind is only a development and product of social interaction. It is a development which is of enormous importance, and which leads to complexities and complications of society which go almost beyond our power to trace, but originally it is nothing but the taking over of the attitude of the other. To the extent that the animal can take the attitude of the other and utilize that attitude for the control of his own conduct, we have what is termed mind; and that is the only apparatus involved in the appearance of the mind.

Mead know that no way in which intelligence or mind could arise or could have arisen, other than through the internalization by the individual of social processes of experience and behavior, that is, through this internalization of the conversation of significant gestures, as made possible by the individual's taking the attitudes of other

individuals toward himself and toward what is being thought about. And if mind or thought has arisen in this way, then the neither can be nor could have been any mind or thought without language; and the early stages of the development of language must have been prior to the development of mind or thought.

In short, his ideas we can summarize as follows;

1. According to this view, conscious communication develops out of unconscious communication within the social process, conversation in terms of significant gestures out of conversation in terms of non-significant gestures; and the development in such fashion of conscious communication is coincident with the development of minds and selves within the social process.

2. The relation of mind and body is that lying between the organization of the self in its behavior as a member of a rational community and the bodily organism as a physical thing.

The rational attitude which characterizes the human being is the relationship of the whole process in which the individual is engaged to himself as reflected in his assumption of the organized roles of the others in stimulating himself to his response. This self as distinguished from the others lies within the field of communication, and they lie also within this field. What may be indicated to others or one's self and does not respond to such gestures of indication is, in the field of perception, what we call a physical thing. The human body is, especially in its analysis, regarded as a physical thing.

The line of demarcation between the self and the body is found, then, first of all in the social organization of the act within which the self arises, in its contrast with the activity of the physiological organism (MS).

The legitimate basis of distinction between mind and body is between the social patterns and the patterns of the organism itself. Education must bring the two closely together. We have, as yet, no comprehending category. This does not mean to say that there is anything logically against it; it is merely a lack of our apparatus or knowledge (1927) .

3. Language as made up of significant symbols is what we mean by mind. The content of our minds is (1) inner conversation, the importation of conversation from the social group to the individual(2) . . . . imagery. Imagery should be regarded in relation to the behavior in which it functions (1931). Imagery plays just the part in the act that hunger does in the food process (1912).

&&&&&&