

UNIT 1

THINKING SOCIOLOGICALLY*

Structure

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Sociological Methods
- 1.3 Sociology in Everyday Life
- 1.4 Sociology and other Disciplines
 - 1.4.1 Mills: Types of Practicality and the Bureaucratic Ethos
 - 1.4.2 Mills: Uses of History
- 1.5 In What Way Sociological Looks at Reality
 - 1.5 1 Mills: The Human Variety
- 1. 6 Observe, Interpret and Validate Sociological Perspectives
 - 1.6.1 Bauman: The Sociological Eye
 - 1.6.2 Mills: Philosophies of Science
- 1. 7 Let Us Sum Up
- 1.8 References

1.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you will be able to understand:

- Sociological methods as they are used to observe, interpret and validate data about society;
- Sociological way of looking at reality of everyday life;
- Major concepts of Sociology; and
- Sociology and other disciplines.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will understand what is meant as a sociological perspective. How do sociologists observe and interpret the realities of everyday life, for as sociologists, this is our main concern. Various scholars have given their opinion about the way sociological perspective shapes our understanding of how social relations are formed and perpetuated.

Scholars like Zygmunt Bauman view power as the key driver of social relationships. The various human categories and the actions performed by them, what is otherwise understood as status and role in society, is informed by values that are both created and maintained by those who have power and the resources to propagate these values. The meanings acquired by objects and things are informed by these power hierarchies.

C. W. Mills studied American society and shown the society as self- contained. He shows how values and history shape our views. According to Mills, each society has its own way of imagining itself like the Americans think of themselves

* This Unit is contributed by Prof. (Retd) Subhdra Channa, Delhi University and Vani Xaxa, Research Scholar, JMI

as the world yet they also change under impact of sudden social changes. The sociological imagination helps in contextualizing historical aspects and gives meaning to the internal and external attributes of individual how individual's daily experiences attributes a false consciousness of their social standing. In other words, what people imagine their society to be or themselves as its members, is shaped through a long historical process that creates certain kinds of values that then get embedded in the collective consciousness.

These two scholars can be viewed as examples of how a sociological perspective is in itself subject to a variety of scholarly understandings. There is no one marked way of saying that this is a sociological perspective. Some people like Bauman may emphasize the role played by power in shaping the understanding of how people shape their cognition of what constitutes relationships and social positions and others like Mills may look towards a historical shaping of cognition, where values about society and its relationships are shaped by history and the development of a socially constructed imagination. Thus while Bauman is grounded in empirical reality, Mills is more abstract in his reasoning.

1.2 SOCIOLOGICAL METHODS

Mills (1959) concept of "abstracted empiricism" posits that empirical studies mostly follow a set pattern of collecting data with conventional styles of collecting them, which then are codified. This is a much accepted style which is ritualistically adopted by almost everyone: the set rules of collecting data, analyzing them, codifying them, scaling them, and above all the manner in which these data are manipulated is done in an unquestioningly set pattern. For example, most studies involving the collection and analysis of public opinion, look into the aspect of how public opinion are mapped and collected as data, but they ignore the process of getting the data or the process by which public opinion is formed. There is also an effort to mislead what is to be studied in the whole game of methods. However Mill's work is limited by being confined to the United States only.

His work attributes a certain character to the 'Public' that may be true only for America and remains western centric. Certain key problems like class-consciousness, false consciousness, of conceptions of status, of class, have not been translated, adding to the problem of studying generalizing issues rather than looking into specific areas of studies. Thus sociology has created a repertoire of concepts and methods that remain regional and preclude generalization especially to non-western societies. Thus studies of World War II will discuss and describe social processes that do not include origin and causes.

What is important is that in the abstracted empirical style, what is needed to be studied has not been given consideration, and the emphasis has been on method rather than content of study and also its relevance for being studied.

The Abstracted empiricist is more concerned with the philosophy of science, the Scientific Method, rather than what he studies is all about. Thus the sociologist, who should be concerned with society and its issues becomes more involved with the methods to be used and what can be studied by these methods, in other words the method becomes a limitations. At the same time there is an

effort to extend the sociological method to other fields. Experts in method are not only specialist in social philosophy, but also try to further the specialization within the social science through methodological inhibition, which is in accordance with the institute where this method is put into practice. Paul F. Lazarsfeld has explained how abstracted empiricism can be used as a style of work and regards the “sociologist as the methodologist of all social sciences”.

Thus empiricism becomes the hallmark of sociology as compared to philosophy or epistemology. Rather than thinking about why things happen, sociologists try to focus on what is happening and how it is happening.

Sociology uses its expertise to talk about a particular topic by the use of the sociological method and thus converts knowledge into empirical language. This is done by moving from “history of institutions and ideas to concrete behavior of peoples”. It is also done in terms of relating the study to other areas. Another approach is to study certain social situations, which are repeated. And lastly to give emphasis to contemporary social events.

Emile Durkheim, in his classic work, the Rules of the Sociological Method had said that social facts should be explained by other social facts thus putting the psychological and philosophical as beyond the scope of the sociological method.

Thus sociology remains empirical, tied to specific situations and largely precluding generalizations. Abstracted empiricism tries to overcome the issue of too much specificity and lends a more scientific character to sociology.

1.3 SOCIOLOGY IN EVERYDAY LIFE

Mills' (1959) concept of “The Promise” relates to the trap that people find themselves unable to get rid-off life circumstances. People are caught in the vicious circle of mundane ordinary everyday living which are affected by circumstances beyond their control but which they fail to comprehend. By the concept of ‘trap’, Mills is referring to the social changes that occur which affect the ordinary man — certain external influences which transcend the internal human spaces, and both are inter-related. But it is unfortunate that social beings do not relate the two. They are unable to decipher that happenings in the world outside have a direct effect on the everyday and make them what they are. Thus people in the rural areas of the world were unable to comprehend the changes that were brought about in their lives by the World Wars just as in recent times people do not understand how conflict in a remote part of the world may affect their lives.

Mills gave agency to history as it shapes human beings and their destiny. Thus human agency is limited by where we are born and what happens outside of our immediate social context. Thus the sociological imagination is constructed out of historical circumstances and values that are received. Thus the Americans remain unaware of how they impact other societies. When people come in touch with other societies their ability or willingness is conditioned by information received and not actual circumstances. Thus reason is often overridden by values in the sociology of everyday life.

The social sciences introduce reason through the comparative method. The analyst is one who can see the link between the two, history and the individual. They enable the individual to understand his/her experiences in that particular period and calculate their chances in life by looking at other individual in similar circumstances. Individual's lives are connected to generations and they have a biography within a historical context. And a social person very much contributes to that society in which he or she lives, though every person is being made and formed by the society and this events that shape it. Thus sociological perspective is able to see the widening aspects of these historical limits.

There are certain questions that social analysts ask with regard to society, its components and their inter-relations, their difference in the social order, how the society gets affected by the historical events, the social contexts of the different time periods and how men and women are living in this period. The special ability of the sociologists is to connect the personal to the larger context both historically and in the present circumstances. The work of the sociologist is to provide an explanation for the personal, like a particular social issue like dowry to the larger context, historical and circumstantial that creates and maintains it and by the same analysis the sociologist should be able to predict transformation as well. Thus sociology links personal the structural and beyond.

Bauman (1990) writes on his concept of “Oneself with Others in Everyday Life”— the experiences of being free or unfree are something that we all wish to solve as it continues to remain an enigma to almost all. The aspect of choices attached to the experience of being free or unfree links one to the ability to decide.

As humans we are always part of a group and the tension between the individual and the collective is an ongoing sociological concern.

Sociological Concepts

1) Group

Individuals cannot function outside of the group as they are born in one and are a social human because of it. The very process of being human is provided by the group that gives both identity and the means of existence through socialization. However the individual also has a degree of discomfort as the group is also restraining. Thus a social group is both an enabler and a constrainer. All social knowledge is acquired from the group and goes into the formation of the individual with received values and conditions.

2) Socialization

The group socializes the self so as to be capable of living in society. It helps the individual to cope up with pressures and behave. The primary socializing agents enables the individual to develop the self's intentions and expectations to choose the significant others from the many who come his/her way. It also means that the individual is also excluding some while selecting the other. It also means that the group to which the individual aligns to from the many such groups that exist — the reference group; towing the line of the group. The normative reference groups are those

whom a social person follows and they are there to rectify errors. But they are there effective only if a person gives any relevance to their pressures. There are also comparative reference groups that form the periphery of social existence.

In the secondary socialization, which is later phases of socialization that occur in the life of the individual — it would be a partial shift from what the individual used to be to acquiring new skills and knowledge to keep oneself update with the new changes that have come about in the life of the individual. However the core of personality is usually formed by the primary socialization and remains more or less stable during a lifetime.

3) **In-Group and out-Group**

An individual is the product of contribution many people, known and unknown whose influence go in the making of the person. With some people we interact, communicate with whom we share a bond, an intimacy, but there are others with whom we rarely meet. With the latter we have a functional relations and anything more than that with them would be an intrusion into private space. Thus the introduction of maintaining distance emerges—one with whom a person is close, known and the other with whom a person has only have a specific functional relation.

Even in the groups it depends as to the range of proximity — mental and physical. The sense of fellow feeling depends on individuals to perceive others like themselves who have their own respective objectives and goals. This we-feeling come with empathy and commiseration which brings fellow-humans together. What then can bring the distinct difference in the we-feeling? The difference in the attitude between ‘us’ and ‘them-’, ‘we’ and ‘they’.

In-group and Out-Group

What comes first to mind when we talk of in-group is the family — solidarity, mutual confidence and common bind is something that comes to our mind when we utter the word. All these attributes are characteristics of every member of the family. What follow is mutual help, protection and friendship which brings about a ‘we’ feeling, a community feeling which is home. It could be possible of not having pleasantness all the time but it is that finally by the end of the day, we are together and it gives a feeling of security.

The in-group is small, face-to-face and often a source of primary identity. It is characterized by generalized reciprocity or exchange where there is no measurement of what is given; for example parents do not put a value on what they do for their children and vice-versa. Apart from family, other examples of In-group is of friendship, colleagues at work and a small village community.

There is a distinct line between in-group-out-group in terms of the boundaries that demarcate those who belong from those who do not. Social groups find it important to make their boundaries compact so that society can easily define people and classify them. Thus groups often define themselves on class, gender and ethnic lines and the strong in-group feelings also create the divisive forces in society, keeping people away from each other. This may lead to antagonism

between different groups that may also intersect with axes of inequality. Thus in the West exclusive clubs meant for white and upper class men, excluded the coloured people, the poor and even sometimes women.

Stranger

The stranger is nothing but an unfamiliar person, but who happen to be in the world we live. The stranger is a person who belongs to no known category or group. In more open spaces the concept of the stranger becomes less well defined as in the city. The city is marked by a breakdown of familiar relationships and groups that may also lead to a situation of anomie and moral vacuum. Thus groups maintain social values and norms in spite of also being instrumental in creating differences. Differences themselves may not be wrong as long as diversity is accepted and not made a matter of inequality or stigma.

Together and Apart

Social groups that are functional in maintaining social unity and stability are of the kind that we call a community. A community provides a secure place for the individual which is often also the locus of identity and social well-being. Loss of community leads to a feeling of being rootless that is often the cause of mental anxiety and even anti-social behavior. Yet very strong communities also create a barrier between people. Thus social groups are conducive to both keeping people together and also to keep them apart.

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Discuss the sociology in everyday life.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) Explain the sociological concept of group and socialisation.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.4 SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER DISCIPLINES

1.4.1 Mills: Types of Practicality and the Bureaucratic Ethos

The main problem in social sciences is one of objectivity and perspective. The very choice of a social problem to study is one that involves choice that itself may be dictated by a bias. What may seem important to one person may not

hold that much importance for another. This was the reason that post-colonial theory began talking about gender bias and other forms of bias. Moreover it is also important that the manner of approaching a problem may also be different depending upon the internalized values of the analyst and as is often demonstrated, the analysis itself is never fully objective.

Social issues become really pertinent to be studied only when they are studied without any ‘‘conflict of values’’, a position that is almost impossible to achieve as most people carry unconscious biases that they themselves may not be aware of. Instead of solutions to problems one may be led into intellectual power jostles.

As Hume famously remarked that ‘‘we cannot deduce how we ought to act from what we believe is’’ and nor ‘‘can we deduce how anyone else ought to act from how we believe we ought to act’’. Openness to accepting a multitude of opinions may also be seen as an aspect of the sociological mode of thinking.

The social scientist works within the given framework of their context, accepting the society as it is. The social scientist is also a member of a society and is socialized into set of norms and values that may be difficult to transcend but which may be possible to recognize. It is only by recognizing these inherent values that one may hope to transcend them, gender bias is one obvious example.

These days’ studies are mostly undertaken to please the power holders and those who control the resources for the conduct of research—military, social workers, big corporations and the prison, and the market for such research is also increasing. There is also research done for ideological reasons, such as to prove or disprove a particular political standpoint, feminism or environmentalism for example.

Thus, it is important for social scientist to be aware of the political meanings of the work. There is an explicit demand for ideological justifications as newer institutions have come about and older ones have lost their power mongering. The social scientist is, if not knowingly, working for the bureaucratic setup of for the upholding of ideological justification. Both types are finally meant to legitimize the institutions as a whole.

The political meanings and administrative uses of social sciences have seen a shift and have been overshadowed by new manipulative methods that can be termed as bureaucratic social science. Such research work may involve funds being provided and facilities made available only to prove something that privileges the funding institution or agency. For example a state bent upon making a dam may sponsor research to prove that the dam has very little negative impact upon the environment. Thus social research may be used as a political and economic tool to legitimize a particular profitable enterprise.

Applied sociologists are concerned about only what specific clients want to know — a shift from public to specific. Thus the use of abstracted empirical research can be made of use if it is under an institution and which has funds to process it. For as the work proceeds, there would be ‘corporate control over the division of labour’. There is a huge set-up of people involved in this — from intellectual administrator to research promoters, to young recruits.

Thus institutions with power can train sociologists with the tools and techniques to do research without the philosophical grounding that makes for ethical and moral evaluation. With all deprivation of the sociological imagination, it becomes all the more important that the need for questioning policies. The issue is that social science should be a 'publicly responsible enterprise' for there are all chances of it being expropriated. There are chances that researchers lose their individuality while working in a bureaucratic setup.

The role of the academic clique introduces works and also maintains its flow of criticism. Reputations are created by the help of the cliques who ensure their appearance in social circle. Hence, cliques determine strategies.

The utilization of social scientist for the enhancement of bureaucratic purposes has limited the intellectual and philosophical scope of the discipline.

The control that the bureaucracy has on the values and ideas of precisely anything that can be thought of is also contributive to a control of history. The use of language is also curtailed and prescribed. The bureaucratic control over sociological research is thus counter-productive of intellectual growth as well as against social justice.

1.4.2 Mills: Uses of History

The sociological involvement with history is in looking at the social transformations over time and into the history of social institutions for example a sociologist in India would be interested in the evolution and past of an institution like caste. There is also interest in studying the social life in particular historical epochs, like for example in Victorian England or seventeenth century France. There is no doubt that there are problems in the method used. The task is to keep the records right, though there might be possible that changes brought about are based on biases of certain interests. And so saying that history can be distorted is not wrong. Thus the correctness of historical facts is important. The task of historian is of utmost importance.

The work of the historians are important as it contains all aspects of social sciences, for in all social studies one needs to have an historical viewpoint of the problem or the area. There is always an assumption when historian from one world goes to study another area, there is possible that he begins to compare. But there is need of historical materials even if we are not doing comparative studies. History adds the required depth to sociological analysis and provides a back drop to the current social situations

1.5 IN WHAT WAY SOCIOLOGY LOOKS AT REALITY

1.5.2 Mills: The Human Variety

The historical realities tell us that there is a variety of social systems and social structures and the first and foremost task in comparing them is to keep an unbiased attitude. A sociological perspective puts all societies on the same scale in terms of values and only grades them in structural terms like complexity and demography.

Social scientist has been concerned more about economic and political institutions historically, and these have given helpful insights into the working of society and its institutions. Social structure can be defined differently but the basic understanding it is the “combination of institutions classified according to the functions each performs”. In contemporary terms social structure is seen as a political state. The nation-state dominates the world and life of every man. Contemporary sociology cannot extricate itself from the study of the nation state and how the power of the nation state permeates society.

In studying society, the sociologists also concur with the social anthropologist whose task is also to study society. Economists too study social relationships and contemporary economists are deeply embedded in the social relations and norms and values of society and thus have similar interests as sociologists. The political scientists also study society and its power relationships and in contemporary times there is a lot of convergence between sociology and political science.

It is understood that the variety in social life has enabled the social scientist to divide the work. There is mutuality in disciplines though there might be disagreements, as well as a respect that all disciplines have originated in their own way. Even though there is an increasing acceptance of disciplines overriding each other. There is also an acceptance that disciplines have influences each other.

Bauman: Values and Action

Values originate from culture and the received wisdom of generations. They may change to some extent with wider social interaction but some core values always remain. The shift in values may affect the way in which a person aspires for certain goals; for example one may grow up with putting a high value on education but later in life it may shift towards a higher value towards acquisition of wealth. Some actions are justified automatically by the internalized values and do not involve any attempt at making a choice. Others may be debated as one comes under outside influence.

A person is more likely to be affected and undergo a change in values by someone having more authority, either person or institution; for example a teacher in school or a political institution. The more legitimacy a source has, the greater influence it is likely to have. Legitimacy is bestowed by society.

Traditional values hold a legitimation, which is time-tested. Traditions have a historical context and a text. The acceptance of such values hold more authority than the recent ones who have to prove themselves, and in times of changes the former hold ground firmly. What is at stake is the defense required for new values to make place amidst the traditional values. Persons with charisma can only forge ahead with new values in comparison with ordinary people initiating something new and getting it accepted. The legitimate sources can change over time such as the change from religious preachers to television personalities. Thus Max Weber has identified three types of authorities, the traditional the charismatic and the legal-rational.

The third type – the legal-rational one are those who have the legal rights and a rational and legitimate source to deliver their authority. For example a person

has to prove his or her ability to become a judge in a legal court. But once appointed the opinion of a judge has final authority.

These three types are only analytical constructs and in actual situations may easily overlap producing different kinds of effect.

1.6 OBSERVE, INTERPRET AND VALIDATE SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

1.6.1 Bauman: The Sociological Eye

The sociological eye is the proposition put forward by Bauman about developing a sense of analyzing what is going around us with a more critical and evaluative perspective. Once we develop a sociological perspective we tend to get a more rational view of things that happen around us. Thus supposing there are riots, then a sociological perspective would enable us to get to the root causes rather than assigning blame arbitrarily based on our biases; like we will be able to identify causes such as economy and class rather than simply talk in terms of ethnic or racial characters. Thus a sociological perspective enables us to get nearer to the truth.

It can be surmised that sociology teaches us the art of life. It enables us to be rational as well as predictive to some extent. The study of sociology is expected to be scientific as the activities and the products are basically useful to all. It also helps in complete understanding of the object under study.

1.6.2 Mills: Philosophies of Science

There is a confusion regarding the relationship between science and social sciences as the former is supposed to be objective and rigid in its procedure and the latter is supposed to be more open and liberal in its application. However social analysts, using the sociological imagination in the work has avoided any rigid procedures. ‘Method’ has to do, first of all, with how to ask and answer questions with some assurance that the answers are more or less durable. ‘Theory’ has to do, above all, with paying close attention to the words one is using, especially their degree of generality and their logical relations.

One who has mastered method and theory becomes a self-conscious thinker. For a classical social scientist, “methods are methods and theories are theories”; they are not autonomous domain. First hand information about the problem and situation is what makes a scientist a working social scientist. Scientist does reflect on the theory and method used into eh studies. There can be no short-cut understanding of methods or methodology — a sense of the problem and the desire to solve is what is required. There are also efforts in knowing advance methods and scope of close interaction between method and work.

When we talk of empirical verification, one has to talk fact and how to get ideas and facts put together. More important is to know what is it that needs verification and how it is to be done. When compared with grand theory and abstracted empiricism, the former uses the deductive verification method, while for the latter what to verify is not a serious issue. Classical researches uses detailed expositions and macroscopic conceptions by designing small empirical studies.

Social studies have distinct methods of approach and it involves many people in creating, them. Classical social sciences do not need microscopic studies or deduced concepts. It is in the process of study that deduction as well as re-formulation is done.

The problems addressed rests upon the methods, theories and values. And it is a known fact that there are no ready answers to the questions. What is required is an understanding more than a solution. For a effective sociological approach, the problems addressed should include various public issues and should bring out the causal connections between the issue and the social structure. The values that are challenged and the issue at stake, etc. should be taken into consideration. It is at time very unfortunate that there are certain values, which are assumed as imperiled, are not the real ones.

Check Your Progress 2

1) Discuss why sociology as a discipline is scientific.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) How does sociology look at reality? Discuss.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3) How do we observe, interpret and validate sociological perspectives.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.7 LET US SUM UP

In this unit, we have discussed how we see things through sociological angle. In this regard we have focused the contribution of two prominent sociologists Zygmunt Bauman and C. Wright Mills to understand the various perspectives. We have also discussed various concepts of sociology in everyday life and how we observe, interpret and validate sociological perspectives through sociological methods.

1.8 REFERENCES

- Adam, B. (1995). *Time Watch: The Social Analysis of Time*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, Mass: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (1989). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage).
- Berger, P.L. and Kellner, H. (1982). *Sociology Reinterpreted: An Essay on Method and Vocation*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Burkitt, I. (1999). *Bodies of Thought: Embodiment, Identity and Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Calhoun, C. (1997). *Nationalism. (Buckingham and Minneapolis, Minnesota.: Open University Press and Minnesota Press.*
- Delanty, G. (2000). *Citizenship in a Global Age*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Delphy, C. and Leonard, D. (1992). *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1994). *The Ethics of Ambiguity*. New York: Citadel; originally published in 1948.
- Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. translated by R. Hurley, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gerth, H. and Mills, C.W. (eds) (1970). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociology*, fourth edn Cambridge: Polity.
- Gilroy, P. (2000). *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- Hochschild, A.E. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, California. University of California Press.
- Jamieson, L. (1998). *Intimacy: Personal Relationships in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.

Lyon, D. (2001). *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

May, T. (2001). *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process, (3rd edn)*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mills, C.W. (1970). *The Sociological Imagination*. Harmondsworth: Penguin; originally published in 1959.

May, T. (1996). *Situating Social Theory*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Nettleton, S. (1995). *The Sociology of Health and Illness*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity.

Segal, L. (1999). *Why Feminism? Gender, Psychology, Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Slevin, J. (2000). *The Internet and Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity.

Sennett, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. London: W.W. Norton.

Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. London and New York: Routledge.

Williams, M. (2000). *Science and Social Science: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.

Young, J. (1999). *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

UNIT 2 EMERGENCE OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY*

Structure

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Emergence of Sociology
 - 2.2.1 The Enlightenment Period
 - 2.2.2 The Scientific Revolution
- 2.3 Social and Economic Changes that Swept 19th Century European Society
 - 2.3.1 French Revolution
 - 2.3.2 Industrial Revolution
- 2.4 The Rise of Sociological Theory
- 2.5 Emergence of Social Anthropology
 - 2.5.1 First Phase of Development
 - 2.5.2 Second Phase of Development
- 2.6 Emergence of Modern Social Anthropology
- 2.7 Pioneers of Social Anthropology
- 2.8 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.9 Check Your Progress
- 2.10 References

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you will be able to understand:

- Emergence of Sociology;
- Factors for the emergence of Sociology;
- Rise of Sociological Theories;
- Emergence of Social Anthropology;
- Phases of the development of Social Anthropology;
- Pioneers of Social Anthropology; and
- Emergence of Modern Social Anthropology.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Sociology and social anthropology are closely related in many aspects. In fact, social anthropology is the closest discipline of sociology. Sometimes, it is rather difficult to differentiate sociology from social anthropology in some areas of enquiry and methodology. Both the disciplines are relatively young even within the social sciences. Despite similarities, the emergence of sociology and social anthropology has diverse historical roots. Although, social anthropology is said to have emerged somewhat earlier than sociology, from the very beginning it

* The Unit is contributed by R. Vashum, IGNOU and Anusha Batra, Research Scholar, IGNOU

was very difficult to differentiate between the subject matters of the two disciplines. While the emergence of sociology is relatively easier to trace, the emergence of social anthropology (or for that matter 'Integrated Anthropology' including physical anthropology) is more complex. Both the disciplines trace back to several centuries ago; however, both emerged only in the 19th century as an academic discipline. As we go through the Unit, we shall find the varying historical developments of the emergence of the two disciplines.

2.2 EMERGENCE OF SOCIOLOGY

In order to understand the emergence of sociology as a social science discipline, it is imperative to understand the socio-economic, political and scientific factors.

Western Europe, in the 18th-19th centuries witnessed rapid and profound changes. This led to a paradigm shift to the understanding of society and also of the individual's place in it. Considerable advances were taking place in terms of scientific discovery and scientific methodology. Natural sciences, though still in nascent stages, began developing 'systematic' methods for study of the physical world. The question that occupied the minds of early sociologists like Comte and Durkheim was, could a similar scientific and systematic approach be applied to the study of the human social world?

Scientific and technological advances led to the transformation from a traditional rural agrarian society to a modern urban industrial society. Due to new inventions as we will study later, the scale of production changed from small home-based to large-scale factory like enterprises. Alongside such developments there were also widespread social, economic and political changes that had a profound effect on West European societies, including major political upheavals.

These extensive changes, though central to the process of industrialisation and modernisation, rather created a paradoxical situation. Paradoxical because it was marked by hope and despair simultaneously. Hope because of the transformation of social, economic, cultural and political aspects of life from an erstwhile traditional society towards what was viewed as rational and enlightened philosophy, especially with reference to the rule of the Church in the Dark Ages. Yet, this 'modern' society that fostered human creativity and rationality was in a perpetual state of disarray and chaos as the earlier stable orders were being replaced by new ones. Sociology, as a distinct discipline emerged in the background of these intellectual and material/social changes taking place in the latter half of the 19th century. We shall discuss some of the factors which contributed to the emergence of sociology as an academic discipline.

2.2.1 The Enlightenment Period

The Enlightenment or the 'Age of Reason' was a period of intellectual development which brought about significant changes in philosophical thought in Europe in the 18th century. Many existing ideas and beliefs, relating to social life, were overthrown and replaced during this period. The most prominent thinkers associated with the Enlightenment were the French philosophers Charles Montesquieu and Jean Jacques Rousseau.

This period marked a radical change from the then existing philosophies of feudal Europe. The social and moral orders were no longer considered as divinely ordained and sacrosanct. Individuals became increasingly rational and critical. Departing from the age old Divine Right Theory of the Ruler, now nothing was considered sacrosanct - from the church to the state to the authority of the monarch, nothing was now infallible.

The roots of such ideas, as the belief that both nature and society can be studied empirically, that human beings are essentially rational and that such a society built on rational principles will make human beings realize their infinite potentials, was seen as a result of the Industrial and Scientific Revolutions, which got firmly established during the period which witnessed the French and the American Revolutions.

2.2.2 The Scientific Revolution

Europe produced a 'scientific revolution' in the Renaissance period of fourteenth to sixteenth century which was marked by **a new attitude towards man and nature**. Natural objects became the subject of close observation and experiment. The impact of this revolution was crucial therefore, not just in changing material life, but also the ideas which people held about Nature and Society.

Some major developments of this Scientific Revolution were Copernican Revolution and the movement towards a heliocentric theory from the previous geocentric one; the ushering of the age of experiments scientists like Galileo Galilei, Johannes Kepler and Isaac Newton that revolutionised science and led to a growing desire of sociologists to build a science of society modelled on the scientific method. Also, Darwin's evolutionary theory posed a radical critique of the Biblical theory of Genesis. Herbert Spencer had introduced the notion of evolution prior to Darwin and the French philosophers like Comte had described the evolution of society, but Darwin provided legitimate scientific proof for human biological evolution. This led to development of evolutionary theory of society wherein, not just organisms, but societies were seen as constantly evolving or developing from a lower to a higher stage.

The dissection of human body, which began to be performed only Post-Renaissance, helped people better understand the functioning of the human body.

All this led to challenging of the old ideas and suggestion of alternatives. These alternatives, however, were only accepted if they could be proved and repeatedly verified, else new solutions were sought. Scientific method, therefore, became regarded as an accurate and objective method.

2.3 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES THAT SWEPT 19TH CENTURY EUROPEAN SOCIETY

2.3.1 French Revolution

The French Revolution of 1789 marked a turning point in the history of human struggle for 'liberty, fraternity and equality'. It put an end to the age of feudalism and ushered in a new order of society. An important contribution of this revolution

was the far reaching changes that it brought, not only French society, but in societies throughout Europe. Even distant countries in other continents such as, India, were influenced by the ideas generated during this revolution. Ideas like liberty, fraternity and equality, which now form a part of the preamble to the Constitution of India, owe their origin to the French Revolution.

France, like other European countries during the eighteenth century, had entered the age of reason and rationalism. Major philosophers, whose ideas influenced the French people, were rationalists who believed that 'all true things could be proved by reason'. Some of these thinkers were, Montesquieu (1689-1755), Locke (1632-1704), Voltaire (1694-1778), and Rousseau (1712-1778). The ferment created by these ideas along with the prevailing social conditions in the French society led to the French Revolution which marked an end of despotic monarchy. It changed the political structure of European society and replaced the age of feudalism by heralding the arrival of liberal democracy.

The long series of political revolutions that were ushered in by the French Revolution in 1789 and carried over through the nineteenth century was the most immediate factor in the rise of sociological theorizing. The impact of these revolutions on many societies was enormous, and led to many positive changes. However, what attracted the attention of many early theorists were not the positive consequences but the negative effects of such radical changes.

These writers were particularly disturbed by the resulting chaos and disorder, especially in France and wanted to restore order in the society. Some of the more extreme thinkers of this period literally wanted a return to the peaceful and relatively orderly days of the Middle Ages. The more rational thinkers recognized that social change had made such a return impossible. Thus they sought instead to find new bases of order in societies that had been overturned by the political revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This interest in the issue of social order was one of the major concerns of classical sociological theorists, especially Comte, Durkheim, and Parsons.

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

2.3.2 Industrial Revolution

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

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

This led to a change in economy from a feudal to a capitalist system of production. Subsequently, a new class of capitalists emerged who controlled this new system of production. Due to this revolution society moved from the old age of hand-made goods to the new age of machine-made goods. This shift heralded the emergence of Industrial Revolution.

Impact of the Industrial Revolution on Society

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

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

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

Thus important themes of the Industrial Revolution, which concerned the early sociologists were the condition of the labour, transformation of property, urbanization and technology.

2.4 THE RISE OF SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

As we saw in the beginning, at the time when sociology was shaping up as a subject, intellectual ferment was being witnessed in Europe in the form of Enlightenment. This was a period of remarkable intellectual development and change in philosophical thought.

Out of the consensus arrived at by the Enlightenment thinkers about the changes taking place in the society, the chief intellectual precursors that led to the emergence of Sociology were firstly, the Philosophy of History, that is, recognition of the fact that society progress in stages (patterns) and that because of the presence of this pattern, laws to understand society too can be formulated in a scientific and systematic manner, on the lines of natural sciences. Secondly,

the emergence of the quantitative method of Social Survey. As a method of sociological inquiry, social survey came to be recognised as a tool that could be used to understand the social problems prevailing in the society and thus find solutions for social reform.

Conservative Reaction to Enlightenment

However, the influence of the Enlightenment on sociological theory, was not so much direct and positive, as it was indirect and negative. In fact, Conservative Reactionists to the Enlightenment like Louis de Bonald (1754-1840) and Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) contributed as much to the development of sociology as did scholars who were influenced by the Enlightenment.

De Bonald was deeply perturbed by the profound and revolutionary changes that led to the establishment of a highly impersonal urban city life, completely devoid of any community bonding and advocated a return to the peace and stability of the previous times.

To that extent, sociology with its emphasis on society as a unit of analysis, rather than the individual; the recognition of the various parts of the society as inter-related and inter-dependent; and, stress on ultimate harmony and stability in the society- can be said to be influenced by the Conservative Reaction.

In fact, it would be appropriate to say that while the goals of sociology have been influenced by the Conservative thought (harmony, stability and unity), the methods have been influenced by the Enlightenment thinkers who realised that though one can't go back to the past, but can create a better society using a new knowledge of the society (Scientific Method).

Thus, Enlightenment and Conservative thought combined to create the science of Sociology. Also, these intellectual stirrings were not isolated from the social milieu prevailing in 18-19th century Western Europe.

2.5 EMERGENCE OF SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The subject matter of anthropology and its academic profession began as an intersection of natural science and humanities. Social anthropology being part of anthropology, its emergence has been historically linked with the development of other components of anthropology. The emergence of social anthropology has also been closely linked with other disciplines of the social sciences, such as sociology, philosophy, ethno-history, history, psychology (social psychology), political science, and economics. But the closest discipline of social anthropology is sociology.

In view of the highly differentiated subject matter of anthropology, it is rather difficult to comprehensively locate the strands of intellectual development and the emergence of the discipline. Like sociology, the emergence and development of anthropology is said to be directly linked to the scientific development in the western world. If one considers the existence of the term 'anthropology' many centuries ago, then, "anthropology is a very old subject. Anthropology is a word which the ancient Greeks had also used. To them *Anthropologia* occurs in 1595. Immanuel Kant published a book in 1798 entitled *Anthropologie in Pragmatischer Hinsicht*" (Sarana 1983:3). In the 15th and 16th centuries the

Portuguese and Spaniards wrote chronicles of their conquests of parts of Africa and the New World. These are important anthropological source material. Besides these, the writings of travelers and others, and Rousseau's speculations concerning the noble savage, indicate the change in the intellectual climate. (ibid.). The foundation of anthropology has also been dated back to the Greco-Roman renaissance period, particularly beginning with the writings of Herodotus of Halicarnassus (484-425 B.C.). According to Voget (1975:7), Herodotus "has been even cited as a likely forerunner, if not the "father," of ethnography". In fact, Herodotus is mainly remembered for his history of the Persian Wars" and the writings of detailed travel narratives from various parts of western Asia and Egypt, the Scythians on the northern coast of the Black Sea, the Ethiopians, and the peoples of the Indus valley (cf. Erikson 2001:2). The Greek philosophers of the time, particularly, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle also influenced on the study of man and society. Later, the Roman philosopher Marcus Tullius Cicero also significantly contributed to the understanding of human society. After a gap of several centuries some philosophers began to take interest in the study of society and the state, particularly in the 16th century A.D. Some of these scholars include Thomas Hobbes and Machiavelli. Prior to this, mention may be made of the significant contribution of Ibn Khaldun in the 14th century A.D. on the moral-historical philosophy and structural-functional analysis of social phenomena.

2.5.1 First Phase of Development

By 18th century A.D. after the experience and influence of the renaissance in Europe, there were many eminent philosophers who have made immense contributions to the understanding of society, including Rousseau, Vico, Baron de Montesquieu and John Locke who dealt with the social phenomena of the time. These earlier works certainly laid the philosophical foundation for the development of the social sciences and the science of human society including sociology and anthropology. The contribution of the earlier philosophers and scholars has certainly contributed to the emergence and development of anthropology although they cannot be called anthropology per se. The development of anthropology and social science which makes departure to the earlier philosophical and historical studies came in two phases. The first phase (1725- 1840) "philosopher scientists succeeded in separating the study of man, society, and civilization from history and thereby formulated a general social science" (Voget, 1975:41). However, Hoebel (1958) is of the view that "anthropology stems primarily from natural science and carries a greater measure of the natural science tradition" (p.9) and not from history or philosophy. The problem of its earlier association and the nature of anthropology are such that E.E. Evans-Pritchard even in the mid-20th century had to grapple with the situation in British Anthropology (particularly social anthropology). On the nature of social anthropology, he states that "there is a broad division of opinion between those who regard social anthropology as a natural science and those, like myself [Evans-Pritchard], who regards it as one of the humanities. This division is perhaps at its sharpest when relations between anthropology and history are being discussed" (Evans-Pritchard, 1951:7).

2.5.2 Second Phase of Development

In the second phase (1840-1890) there was "transition in the natural sciences from a static equilibrium model to a dynamic model. Its culmination came with

the introduction of thermodynamic and Darwinian evolutionary theory” (Voget, 1975:42). With such a diverse field as anthropology, an attempt was made in the 1860s for integrating into a general anthropological discipline that would engage on the early history of man. By 1870 onward, “a distinctive character of anthropology began to manifest itself” by unifying physical anthropology, prehistory and ethnology (cf. *ibid.*). This period marks the emergence of anthropology into an academic discipline. It is through the inspiration of the “triumphs of the scientific method in the physical and organic domain, nineteenth-century anthropologists believed that socio-cultural phenomena were discoverable lawful principles. This conviction joined their interests with the aspiration of a still earlier period, extending back before the social sciences had been named, to the epochal stirrings of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and the vision of a universal history of mankind” (Harris 1979:1). However, it emerged as an academic discipline only in the nineteenth century. The significant factors for the emergence of the discipline is however attributed to the various intellectual and socio-political changes taking place in the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe. Some of the important influences include the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution in Europe.

Fred W. Voget situates the emergence of social/cultural anthropology from the route of the emergence of social science. He states:

“[T]here can be little doubt that eighteenth-century progressivists laid the foundations for a new discipline— a generalized social science. The fact that their general outline for a natural history of mankind was expanded and refined during the nineteenth century, and served as a model for an anthropological science of culture, testifies to the remarkable breakthrough achieved by progressivist social philosopher-scientists and historians” (1975:88).

Voget, however, points out the caveat that after considering the eminence of the eighteenth century progressivists as the forerunners of anthropology (social/cultural anthropology), the progressivists themselves ignored the “collection of specialized facts”, but “elevated themselves to the rank of social and cultural theorists. In consequence, they did not have any direct connection with developments that would lead into prehistory, physical anthropology, linguistics, and other anthropological specialties. Yet it was the convergence of these specializations that generated the differentiation of anthropology from the general social science base... Historic and evolutionary processes had been at work in the emergence of the anthropological scientific institution” (Voget 1975:89). Marvin Harris, a historian of anthropological development, also views that anthropology “began as the science of history” (1979:1).

2.6 EMERGENCE OF MODERN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The emergence of modern social anthropology emerged mainly with the contribution of Bronislaw Malinowski and A.R. Radcliff-Brown. Marcel Mauss is also generally considered as the pioneer of modern social anthropology in France. Bronislaw Malinowski is one of the most well-known social anthropologists. In fact, he is generally regarded as the founder of modern social anthropology. His main contributions to modern social anthropology was the

introduction of ethnographic method with participant method and/or technique, and founding of the theory of functionalism departing from the earlier approaches, particularly, evolutionary and historical approaches. His significant works include *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922), *Crime and Custom in Savage Society* (1926), *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays* (1944). A.R. Radcliff-Brown is also one of the founders of modern anthropology along with Bronislaw Malinowski. He is well-known for his theoretical approach, generally called structural-functionalism. His theory was developed with the conceptual ideas of Emile Durkheim and his ethnographic field data and experience. His significant works include *The Andaman Islanders: A study in Social Anthropology* (1922), and *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (1952). Marcel Mauss is regarded as both sociologist and anthropologist. He is well-known for his comparative study of the relation between forms of exchange and social structure. This is how he is also considered as the founder of modern social anthropology in France. His most significant work is *The Gift* (1922). Along these pioneers in social anthropology in varied areas, one can include Levi Strauss into the list for founding the theory of structuralism and structural anthropology. He is also regarded as one of the most influential thinkers of the 20th century on the subjects of myth, culture, religion, and social organization. His significant works include *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (1949), *Tristes Tropiques* (1955), and *Structural Anthropology* (1963). There are also many anthropologists who contributed to the development of modern social anthropology, but they come either later or of lower stature.

The emergence of anthropology (social anthropology) as a discipline can also be reckoned through the formation of professional associations. The aborigines Protection Society formed in 1837 was the first anthropological association to be established (cf. Sarana 1983:4). The American Anthropological Association was established in 1902 (ibid: 4). The American Association for the Advancement of Science recognized ethnology in 1851 and assigned a separate section for anthropology in 1882. Anthropology was recognized by the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1846 and was accorded a separate department in 1884. The Anthropological Society of London came into being in 1863. This and other the Ethnological Society of London were merged to form the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland in 1871... In India, the Asiatic Society of Bengal was founded in the latter half of the 18th century [1774]. The Anthropological Society of Bombay was established in 1886 (ibid: 5). In the Indian context, there is no consensus that the emergence of anthropology (including social anthropology) coincides with the formation of Asiatic Society of Bengal as some would claim. Sarana is of the view that Indian anthropology did not emerge in the 18th century. He opines that the establishment of Associations and writings till the mid-19th century “were only stray attempts. The generally recognized anthropological works in India were written by the British administrators like Blunt, Crook, Dalton, Grierson, Ibbetson, Mills, Nesfield, O’Malley, Risley, Russel, Senart and Thurston and the administrator-turned academician, J.H. Hutton, in the latter half of the 19th century... In this century [20th century], Sarat Chandra Roy added to this corpus of anthropological material [with] his monographs on the tribes of Chotanagpur” (Sarana 1983: 6-7; brackets are mine). Nevertheless, the formation of these associations indicates an emergent situation of anthropology (including social anthropology) in different countries and at different periods.

2.7 PIONEERS OF SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The pioneers of social anthropology among others include **Lewis Henry Morgan** (1818-1881), **John Ferguson McLennan** (1827-1881), Adolf Bastian (1826-1905), and **Sir Edward Burnett Tylor** (1832-1917). They were soon followed by anthropologists such as, **Franz Boas** (1858-1942), Sir James George Frazer (1854-1941) and W.H.R. Rivers (1864-1922). There are also many other anthropologists who had made significant contributions to the founding and development of anthropology, particularly social anthropology.

The important contributions of Henry Lewis Morgan to the development of social anthropology are among others his study on kinship system from which he developed the evolutionary stages of society. His important works include *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (1871) and *Ancient Society* (1877). These two works also greatly influenced Karl Marx to develop his theory of class and historical materialism. **Ferguson McLennan, a Scottish ethnologist main contribution to the development of social anthropology was the study of customs based on marriage systems in the pre-literate societies. His book *Primitive Marriage* (1865) was a significant contribution to the understanding of marriage in the pre-literate societies.**

John Ferguson McLennan, a Scottish ethnologist, among others made a significant contribution to the understanding of ‘primitive’ marriage systems, law, totemism, and kinship. His main anthropological works are *Primitive Marriage: An Enquiry into the Origin of the Form of Capture in Marriage Ceremonies* (1865), in which he also introduced new terms such as ‘exogamy’ and ‘endogamy’, *The Patriarchal Theory* (1885), and *Studies in Ancient History* (1896). Adolf Bastian, a medical-turned ethnologist (also anthropologist) is regarded as the “Father of German anthropology”. His well-known book appeared as a “three-volume treatise, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (1860 ‘Manin History’) which promoted views on human psychology and cultural history that shared little common ground with the evolutionists, who studied a universal movement and ignored the concrete events of cultural history (Eriksen et al 2001: 27-28; cf. Koepping 1983). He opposed the idea of biologically distinct races and formulated the principle of the *psychic unity of mankind* (ibid: 28).

Sir Edward Burnett Tylor who is generally regarded as the “Founder” or ‘Father of Cultural Anthropology’ is mainly concerned with theories of cultural evolution and diffusion, origins of religion and magic. His conceptual definition of ‘culture’ and ‘cultural survivals’ are still reckoned till today. He stands out as the most eminent anthropologist among the pioneers of social/cultural anthropology. Some of his main works include, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization* (1865), *Primitive Culture* (1871), and *Anthropology: An Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilization* (1881).

Franz Boas who is regarded as the “Father of American Anthropology” (particularly cultural anthropology) and also of the founder of “Modern American Anthropology”. Some of his main contributions to anthropology were — the rejection of the evolutionary approach to the understanding of culture which was very popular of the time, the postulation of the concept of “cultural relativism” and his empirical methods for collecting data and analysis. His significant works include *The Mind of Primitive Man* (1911),

and *Race, Language, and Culture* (1940). James George Frazer greatly contributed to the understanding of magic and religion. His most significant work was *The Golden Bough: A Study in Comparative Religion* (1891). W.H.R. Rivers also contributed to the development of the emerging social anthropology. His contribution is mainly concerned with kinship and social organization studies. His most significant works were *The Todas* (1906) and *History of Melanesian Society* (1914).

2.8 LET US SUM UP

The historical development in which they were evolved also had convergence and divergence in its thrust areas of enquiry, particularly in the scope, interest areas, theories, methodology, and practice. This is due to the fact that both sociology and social anthropology study human society and largely share their theoretical problems and interests. This is also the reason why social anthropology is considered by many scholars to be part of sociology or a branch of sociology. Anthropology and sociology were founded with the significant elements from the natural sciences in one way or the other although the subject matter of anthropology (integrated anthropology), particularly due to the components of physical anthropology and archaeological anthropology exceeds sociology in terms of its linkage with the physical sciences. In terms of emergence, social anthropology is said to have emerged somewhat earlier than sociology. While the immediate factor for the emergence of sociology is attributed to the various factors, particularly the industrial, socio-political and intellectual movements in Europe, the emergence of social anthropology can be mainly attributed to the intellectual quest for understanding 'the other' exotic societies outside Europe and other developed societies. However, the difference between sociology and social anthropology even from the early years of is more on the application level and setting priority of studies rather than at the level of the scope, concept, and method.

2.9 CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- 1) Discuss the emergence of sociology.
- 2) How did French Revolution of 1789 contribute to the Emergence of Sociology?
- 3) Examine the trends of the emergence of social anthropology.
- 4) Discuss the phases of the emergence of social anthropology.
- 5) Examine the differences of the emergence of sociology with social anthropology.

2.10 REFERENCES

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

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

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

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

Boas, Franz [edited byHelen Codere]. (1966). *Kwakiutl Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1926). *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1944). *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. Chapel Hill, N. Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.

Mauss, Marcel. [1925] (1990). *The Gift: forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*. London: Routledge.

McGee, R. J. and Warms, R. L. (2012). *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History* (5th edition). USA: McGraw-Hill.

McLennan, John Ferguson. [1865] (1970). *Primitive Marriage*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McLennan, John Ferguson. (1876). *Studies in Ancient History*. London: Bernhard Quaritch.

McLennan, John Ferguson. [1885] (2006). *The Patriarchal Theory*. Adamant Media Corporation.

Morgan, Lewis H. (1871). *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*. New York: Smithsonian Institution.

Morgan, Lewis H. (1877). *Ancient Society*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. (1922). *The Andaman Islanders: A study in Social Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. (1952). *Structure and Function in Primitive Society: Essays and Addresses*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. (1958). *Method in Social Anthropology*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Ritzer, G. (2016). *Classical Sociological Theory*. New Delhi: McGraw Hill Education (India).

Rivers, W.H.R. (1906). *The Todas*. New York and London: Macmillan.

Rivers, W.H.R. (1914). *History of Melanesian Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sarana, Gopala. (1983). *Sociology and Anthropology and Other Essays*. Calcutta: Institute of Social Research & Applied Anthropology.

Sjoberg, G. & Nett, R. (1968). 'Basic Orientations towards the Scientific Method.' In *A Methodology for Social Research*. New York: Harper & Row.

Tylor, Edward Burnett. (1865). *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization*. London: John Murray.

Tylor, Edward Burnett. (1871). *Primitive Culture*. London: John Murray.

Tylor, Edward Burnett. (1881). *Anthropology an Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilization*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Voget, Fred W. (1975). *A History of Ethnology*. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.