

## 1: Social Change - Sociology - Oxford Bibliographies

*Social Change and Development is the first study that compares the strengths and weaknesses of the three schools of development in a thorough, comprehensive manner. It will be of great interest to students and professionals in urban studies, development studies, political science and comparative politics.*

It means absence of real definition. Strong belief in what the notion is supposed to bring about. Development as a Fuzzword The meaning of Development like a bubble. Keeps changing and depends upon perspective, time and space. Development like a story of six blind men and an elephant. Like an abstract art. Human species have never satisfied, constantly seeking and striving and progress is their key to success. Sidney Pollard states that the world today believes in progress, because the only possible alternative to the belief in progress would be total despair. Roots of the Idea of Progress: Direction of progress was imposed from above. This is also considered as secularized version of Christian belief. Progress is constant and gradual advancement of knowledge. It holds that progress is measured by comparing the contemporary with the ideal. The diversity in the world is due to different stages of progress that different societies have reached. Primitive societies represent earlier stage of progress and more civilized societies represent later stages of progress. In this period progress is taken as common sense. Comte focused in progress of mind through change in typical thought styles: Theological, Metaphysical and Positive. Spencer subsumed growth and progress in nature as well as society. Weber noticed tendency of social life and social organization toward rationalization efficiency and impersonalization of bureaucracy. He raised the first warnings against the side-effects of development. In this way, gradually, the concept of progress became highly complex and multidimensional and attained its contemporary meaning. Progress defined Model of directional transformation, with some version of developmentalism: Progress is the idea that mankind has slowly, gradually and continuously advanced from the original condition of cultural deprivation, ignorance and insecurity to constantly higher levels of civilization. Progress is always relative to the values which are taken into account. The same progress may be conceived as progressive or non-progressive depending on the assumed value preferences. We must always ask: But progress relatively is not absolute and complete. In some area measures of progress on which most people would probably agree. But in some areas criteria of progress become highly contestable. Progress in one area may often occur only at the cost of regress in another. Emergence of entrepreneurship and free market good may produce unemployment, poverty, crime, ungovernmentality etc bad. Urbanization, industrialization, modernization good produce overpopulation, crowded airports, jammed highways etc bad. Supernatural Domain Sacralization of Agency: Natural Domain Secularization of agency: Progress is natural unfolding of potentialities. Human domain Humanization of agency: Progress can be achieved, constructed, implemented and therefore requires creative effort. Idea of progress is replaced by idea of chronic crisis. Then, is Progress dead? Progress as an ideal 2. Progress as betterment 3. Progress as a process itself progress is not the achievement but achieving, not the attainment but striving, not the finding but quest New theoretical orientation of post-developmentalism suggests a new approach to social progress: Progress needs a directional change: Analytical Definition August Comte illustrates 6 traits of modernity new social order:

## 2: Social Change Defined

*Social change, in sociology, the alteration of mechanisms within the social structure, characterized by changes in cultural symbols, rules of behaviour, social organizations, or value systems. Throughout the historical development of their discipline, sociologists have borrowed models of social change from other academic fields.*

The five theories of social change are as follows: Economic Mandan Theory of Social Change 4. A variety of reasons have been offered throughout history to explain why social change occurs. The problem of explaining social change was central to nineteenth century sociology. Many earlier theories of society that claimed to be scientific were in fact theories of change. They sought to explain the present in terms of the past. Many different theories were propounded to define and explain social change. Broadly, theories of nineteenth century may be divided into theories of social evolution Saint-Simon, Comte, Spencer, Durkheim etc. All these we have discussed in the previous section. Theories of social change can be divided into two groups: Various types of evolutionary theories, and cyclical theory. Despite the wide variety in the possible directions change may take, various generalisations have been set forth. Because the lot of mankind generally has improved over the long term, by far the most numerous classes of theories of the direction of change comprise various cumulative or evolutionary trends. The notion of evolution came into social sciences from the theories of biological evolution. With the advent of Darwinian Theory of biological evolution, society and culture began to be regarded as undergoing the same changes and demonstrating the same trends. It was conceived that society and culture were subject to the same general laws of biological and organism growth. Some thinkers even identified evolution with progress and proceeded to project into the future more and more perfect and better-adapted social and cultural forms. Charles Darwin , the British biologist, who propounded the theory of biological evolution, showed that species of organisms have evolved from simpler organisms to the more complicated organisms through the processes of variations and natural selection. The basic assumption of this theory is that change is the characteristic feature of human society. The present observed condition of the society is presumed to be the result of change in the past. It was assumed that the change is basically the result of operation of forces within the society or culture. Underlying all theories of evolution, there exists a belief of infinite improvement in the next stage over the preceding one. All these assumptions can be summarised as under: That change is inevitable and natural. That change is gradual and continuous. That change is sequential and in certain stages. That all successive stages of change are higher over preceding stage, i. That stages of change are non-reversible. That forces of change are inherent in the object. That the direction of change is from simple to complex, from homogeneity to heterogeneity, from undifferentiated to the differentiated in form and function. That all societies pass through same stages of development. All thinking of early sociologists was dominated by a conception of man and society as seen progressing up definite steps of evolution leading through every greater complexity to some final stage of perfection. The notion of evolutionary principles was extremely popular with British anthropologists and sociologists of nineteenth century. Such as Morgan , Tyler , Spencer and Hobhouse Although evolutionary theory in sociology is attributed to Herbert Spencer, it is clear that it was taken for granted by writers as diverse as Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and V. The conception of evolution was applied not only to the development of societies but also to art, literature, music, philosophy, sciences, religion, economic and political life state and almost every other achievement of the mind of man. Both Spencer and Durkheim employed the concept of structural differentiation to indicate that as society develops more functions, it becomes structurally more complex. This perspective has been elaborated more recently by Talcott Parsons. The general evolutionary model of society is represented by a large number of specific theories. Saint-Simon, one of the earliest founders of sociology, along with Auguste Comte, for example, put an evolutionary idea of social development, as a sequential progression of organic societies representing increasing levels of advancement. Comte linked developments in human knowledge, culture and society and delineated the following three great stages through which all societies must goâ€”those of conquest, defense and industry. Societies passed through three stagesâ€”the primitive, the intermediary and the scientific, which corresponded

to the forms of human knowledge thought. He conceived these stages as progressing from the theological through the metaphysical to arrive ultimately at the perfection of positive reasoning. He argued all mankind inevitably passed through these stages as it developed, suggesting both unilinear direction and progress. Spencer also displayed a linear concept of evolutionary stages. He argued that the trend of human societies was from simple, undifferentiated wholes to complex and heterogeneous ones, where the parts of the whole become more specialised but remained integrated. Morgan, who sought to prove that all societies went through fixed stages of development each succeeding the other, from savagery through barbarism to civilisation. Marx and Engels maintained that each stage of civilisation, such as feudalism, prepared the ground for the next. On this basis they concluded that the next stage in social evolution after the stage of capitalism could be attained only by violent revolution. All these theories are referred to as unilinear theories of social evolution. He believed that there was a historical trend, or evolution, from a low to a high degree of specialisation. Durkheim distinguished two main types of society on the basis of this division of labour—the first based on mechanical solidarity and the second on organic solidarity. Durkheim believed that this second type always evolved from and succeeded the first as the degree of specialisation, the division of labour, increased. Numerous other scholars put forth similar ideas. He regards changes in adaptation as a major driving force of social evolution. Types of Evolutionary Theory: There are three main types of evolutionary theory: It postulates the straight-line, ordered or progressive nature of social change. According to this theory, change always proceeds toward a predestined goal in a unilinear fashion. There is no place of repetition of the same stage in this theory. The pace of this change may be swift or slow. In brief, linear hypothesis states that all aspects of society change continually in a certain direction, never faltering, never repeating themselves. Theories of Saint-Simon, Comte, Morgan, Marx and Engels, and many other anthropologists and sociologists come under the category of unilinear theories of social evolution because they are based on the assumption that each society does, indeed must, pass through a fixed and limited numbers of stages in a given sequence. Such theories long dominated the sociological scene. It is a little bit variant form of unilinear evolution which states that every society does not necessarily go through the same fixed stages of development. It argues, rather, that the culture of mankind, taken as a whole, has followed a definite line of evolution. The anthropologist Leslie White has been a leading exponent of this conception. Similar ideas were greatly elaborated by William Ogburn, who stressed the role of invention in social change. This brand of evolutionism has more recently developed and is more realistic than the unilinear and universal brand of evolutionary change. Multilinear evolution is a concept, which attempts to account for diversity. It essentially means identification of different sequential patterns for different culture or types of cultures. This theory holds that change can occur in several ways and that it does not inevitably lead in the same direction. Theorists of this persuasion recognise that human culture has evolved along a number of lines. Those who share this perspective, such as Julian Steward, attempt to explain neither the straight-line evolution of each society, nor the progress of mankind as a whole, but rather concentrate on much more limited sequences of development. It does identify some social trends as merely universal: This theory is related to what is known as episodic approach, which stresses the importance of accidents and unique historical, social and environmental circumstances that help to explain a particular course of social change. Later on, the views of Leslie White and Julian Steward were named as neo-evolutionism. Criticism of Evolutionary Theory: Evolutionary scheme gradual and continuous development in stages of any kind fell under both theoretical and empirical attack in the last century. It was criticised heavily on many grounds but mainly for its sweeping or over-generalisation about historical sequences, uniform stages of development and evolutionary rate of change. The biological evolution, from which the main ideas of social evolution were borrowed, provided somewhat clumsy and unsatisfactory answers. Such explanations came under attack for lack of evidence. Evolutionary scales were also questioned from a somewhat different, but more empirical source. The easy assumption that societies evolved from simple to complex forms, was mainly based on a scale of predominant productive technology turned out to be unwarranted. Most of the classical evolutionary schools tended to point out general causes of change economic, technological or spiritual etc. Very often they confused such general tendencies with the causes of change or assumed that the general tendencies explain concrete instances of change. Because of the

above shortcomings, the evolutionary theory is less popular today. A leading modern theorist Anthony Giddens has consistently attacked on evolutionism and functionalism of any brand. It is said that growth may create social problems rather than social progress. Modern sociology has tended to neglect or even to reject this theory, mainly because it was too uncritically applied by an earlier generation of sociologists. The recent tentative revival in an evolutionary perspective is closely related to growing interest in historical and comparative studies. Cyclical change is a variation on unilinear theory which was developed by Oswald Spengler *Decline of the West*, and Arnold J. Toynbee *A Study of History*. They argued that societies and civilisations change according to cycles of rise, decline and fall just as individual persons are born, mature, grow old, and die. According to German thinker Spengler, every society has a predetermined life cycle—birth, growth, maturity and decline. Society, after passing through all these stages of life cycle, returns to the original stage and thus the cycle begins again. On the basis of his analysis of Egyptian, Greek Roman and many other civilisations, he concluded that the Western civilisation is now on its decline. The world renowned British historian Toynbee has also upheld this theory. They have all come and gone, repeating a recurrent cycle of birth, growth, breakdown and decay.

## 3: Essay on Social Change: Meaning, Characteristics and other details

*Social Change. The term social change is used to indicate the changes that take place in human interactions and interrelations. Society is a web of social relationships and hence social change means change in the system of social relationships.*

The study of development has been one of the fundamental aspects of sociology since the beginnings of the discipline. Analyzing the causes and consequences of development has been the spur that produced the development of Parsonsian functionalism, as well as Neo-Marxist and world-systems based challenges to systems models. Considering the inter-relation between economic development and personal life has stimulated many of our models of demography, notably those of changes in fertility and mortality. Models of migration have been consistently rooted in development dynamics. Analyses of historical transformations of gender roles and gender ideology consistently invoke the dialectical interplay between the forces of economic development, female labor force participation, power within the family and gendered culture. Political sociology has consistently engaged with the role of the state in producing economic development and the role of economic change in redistributing power among social actors. Economic sociology consistently turns to economic development as the natural setting for tests of its theories. Development Sociology investigates the practices and processes of social change. In this sense the sociology of development addresses pressing intellectual challenges: Hong Kong Skyline Development is at the center of the sociological enterprise. There is a healthy debate over the relative importance of the material and cultural foundations of development and with it, society. Weber debate on the origins of capitalism stimulated subsequent generations of sociologists to develop their own statement on the material vs. Weberians have looked for the functional equivalents of Protestantism elsewhere in the world. Mann argues that capitalism emerged from the interstices of structures created by actors with social power. Lachmann , in a comparative study of early capitalist development in Western Europe, finds capitalist development was at first an inadvertent result of conflicts among feudal elites. Wallerstein , Arrighi , Chase-Dunn and Hall emphasize international relations of domination either through market mechanisms or the coercive force associated with empire. In important works, Tilly and Mann offer a reminder of the profound relationship of capitalist development to state formation and war-making. Sociologists looking at late capitalism would make similar arguments, linking development to extraction of surplus value from the global south, and the use of military Keynesianism to support capital accumulation in the core. Weberians have responded to the challenge of developing transnational models by introducing the concepts of globalization and global culture, forces capable of constraining nations and states Meyer et al. Throughout the debate on globalization, which now pervades sociology as a discipline, an emphasis on development remains a central concern. The sociology of development has been essential component of the sociological study of stratification and inequality. Development sociologists also address spatial inequality internal to nation-states Hechter ; Logan and Molotch ; Massey and Denton Using both quantitative and qualitative methods, this body of work highlights spatial variation in patterns of inequality and power differences Lobao, Hooks and Tickamyer [eds. Development has been central to microsociological debates as well. The relevance of development to demographic dynamics is well known and is epitomized in the journal the Population and Development Review. Feminist theorists, have turned their attention to the question of gender and development, addressing questions of low wage female labor, the rise of gendered labor regimes and migration within female sex-typed occupation. Beneria and Feldman , Tiano , Moghadam The empirical material of development has been so rich that it has been a staple for sociologists working at virtually every level of analysis.

### 4: Social change - Conclusion | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*PROGRESS Sktompka [The Sociology of Social Change] on idea of progress writes Progress has its permanent tension between what people have and what they would like to have; what they are and what they would like to be.*

Social structure refers to persistent networks of social relationships where interaction between people or groups has become routine and repetitive. Sociology began in the late 19th century as an attempt to understand the emergence of the modern world. The earliest sociological thinkers—August Comte, Herbert Spencer, Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, and Max Weber—all tried to understand the human implications of two great transformations that produced the modern world: They shared a vision that the study of human societies and change could be understood in a general way, rather than as the accumulation of the accidents of history. Like other foci of study in sociology, the study of social change has macro and micro components, and they have waxed and waned in popularity over the course of the 20th century. More recently, there has been considerable movement toward reconciling agency and structure in explanations of social change. General Overviews To a great extent the classical founders of sociology Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and others were students of social change. This bibliography focuses on classic 20th-century works that have shaped the study of social change and have broad influence. This is also at best a partial list. Ogburn represents pre-World War II American thinking on the relationship between social structure and culture in producing social change. Olson and Tilly address reasons why social change via collective action is difficult and unpredictable, even in the face of obvious injustice and oppression. Lenski provides a comprehensive, theoretical synthesis of the development and maintenance of social stratification. *The coming of post-industrial society: A venture in social forecasting.* The relative rosy picture has been transcended by other analyses, but the basic premise that industrial production as the primary economic engine of the developed world was ending was prophetic. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Predates and foresees many of the crises of inequality, opportunity, and participation that would manifest themselves in the 1970s and beyond. *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of World order.* A theory of social stratification. Lenski lays out a social evolutionary theory of the development of the division of labor and modern social stratification systems. *Social change with respect to culture and original nature.* While the idea has been much debated especially among scholars of contemporary families the idea that cultural practices change much more slowly than technology and organizations has become a key starting observation for students of social change. *The logic of collective action.* The free rider problem is one of several keys for understanding why protest and rebellion are not more widespread in the face of injustice and discrimination. *Theory of collective behavior.* One of the first early attempts to explain collective behavior from a primarily functionalist perspective. Describes social change as resulting from the culmination of social contradictions addressed by social movements in a value-added fashion. *From mobilization to revolution.* Tilly attempts to explain every type of collective action from political protests to revolutions, and the book contains an extensive data analysis of strikes in Western countries. Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. [How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online](#) is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative [click here](#).

## 5: Social Change, Sociology Guide

*According to M.E. Jones, "Social change is a term used to describe variations in or modifications of any aspect of social processes, social patterns, social interaction or social organisation". No doubt change identifies a wide canvas or contour for development, progress transformation, growth, mobilisation and soon.*

Definition[ edit ] Social change may refer to the notion of social progress or sociocultural evolution , the philosophical idea that society moves forward by evolutionary means. It may refer to a paradigmatic change in the socio-economic structure, for instance a shift away from feudalism and towards capitalism. Social change may be driven by cultural, religious, economic, scientific or technological forces [2]. This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. August Learn how and when to remove this template message Change comes from two sources. One source is random or unique factors such as climate, weather, or the presence of specific groups of people. Another source is systematic factors. For example, successful development has the same general requirements, such as a stable and flexible government, enough free and available resources, and a diverse social organization of society. On the whole, social change is usually a combination of systematic factors along with some random or unique factors. Generally, a theory of change should include elements such as structural aspects of change like population shifts , processes and mechanisms of social change, and directions of change. The classic Hegelian dialectic model of change is based on the interaction of opposing forces. Starting from a point of momentary stasis, Thesis countered by Antithesis first yields conflict, then it subsequently results in a new Synthesis. The philosopher of science , Thomas Kuhn argues in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* with respect to the Copernican Revolution that people are likely to continue utilizing an apparently unworkable paradigm until a better paradigm is commonly accepted. The Greek philosopher Heraclitus used the metaphor of a river to speak of change thus, "On those stepping into rivers staying the same other and other waters flow" DK22B What Heraclitus seems to be suggesting here, later interpretations notwithstanding, is that, in order for the river to remain the river, change must constantly be taking place. Thus one may think of the Heraclitan model as parallel to that of a living organism, which, in order to remain alive, must constantly be changing. Water, although soft and yielding, will eventually wear away stone. Change in this model is to be natural, harmonious and steady, albeit imperceptible. Current social changes[ edit ] Main article: Demographics of the world One of the most obvious changes currently occurring is the change in the relative global population distribution between countries. China and India continue to be the largest countries, followed by the US as a distant third. However, population growth throughout the world is slowing. Population growth among developed countries has been slowing since the s, and is now at 0. Population growth among the less developed countries excluding the least developed has also been slowing, since , and is now at 1. Population growth among the least developed countries has slowed relatively little, and is the highest at 2. Both men and women are considered to be great contributors [6] to social change worldwide.

## 6: Program on Global Social Change (PGSC) | Sociology | Johns Hopkins University

*In sociology, social change refers to a change of mechanisms within a social structure. Social change is characterized by changes such as rules of behavior, values, social organizations and cultural symbols. The term "social change" describes a significant alteration that sociologists describe as.*

They transcend local boundaries and touches lives of everyone. Evolution of mankind can be seen in terms of technological evolution as well. Invention of fire and wheel changed the face of mankind. Various historical epochs - hunter-gatherers, agrarian society and industrialist society are distinguished from each other in term of technological advancement. The technological factors represent the conditions created by men that have a profound influence on his life. Technology is product of civilization. According to Karl Marx even the formation of social relations and mental conceptions and attitudes are dependent upon technology. Veblen has regarded technology as the sole explanation of social change. F Ogburn says technology changes society by changing our environments to which we in turn adapt. This change is usually in the material environment and the adjustment that we make with these changes often modifies customs and social institutions. Technology has contributed to the growth of industries or to the process of industrialization. Industrialization is a term covering in general terms the growth in a society hitherto mainly agrarian of modern industry with all its circumstances and problems, economic and social. It describes in general term the growth of a society in which a major role is played by manufacturing industry. The Industrial Revolution of 18th century led to the unprecedented growth of industries. Industrialization is associated with the factory system of production. The family has lost its economic importance. The factories have brought down the prices of commodities, improved their quality and maximized their output. The whole process of production is mechanized. Consequently the traditional skills have declined and good number of artisans has lost their work. Huge factories could provide employment opportunities to thousands of people. Hence men have become workers in a very large number. The process of industrialization has affected the nature, character and the growth of economy. It has contributed to the growth of cities or to the process of urbanization. In many countries the growth of industries has contributed to the growth of cities. Urbanization denotes a diffusion of the influence of urban centers to a rural hinterland. Urbanization can be described as a process of becoming urban moving to cities changing from agriculture to other pursuits common to cities and corresponding change of behavior patterns. Hence only when a large proportion of inhabitants in an area come to cities urbanization is said to occur. Urbanization has become a world phenomenon today. An unprecedented growth has taken place not only in the number of great cities but also in their size. As a result of industrialization people have started moving towards the industrial areas in search of employment. Due to this the industrial areas developed into towns and cities. Modernization is a process that indicates the adoption of the modern ways of life and values. It refers to an attempt on the part of the people particularly those who are custom-bound to adapt themselves to the present-time, conditions, needs, styles and ways in general. People in the process of getting modernized give more importance to science and technology. The scientific and technological inventions have modernized societies in various countries. They have brought about remarkable changes in the whole system of social relationship and installed new ideologies in the place of traditional ones. Development of the means of transport and communication: Development of transport and communication has led to the national and international trade on a large scale. The road transport, the train service, the ships and the airplanes have eased the movement of men and material goods. Post and telegraph, radio and television, newspapers and magazines, telephone and wireless and the like have developed a great deal. The space research and the launching of the satellites for communication purposes have further added to these developments. They have helped the people belonging to different corners of the nation or the world to have regular contacts. Transformation in the economy and the evolution of the new social classes: The introduction of the factory system of production has turned the agricultural economy into industrial economy. The industrial or the capitalist economy has divided the social organization into two predominant classes-the capitalist class and the working class. These two classes are always at conflict due to mutually opposite interest. In the course of time

an intermediary class called the middle class has evolved. The problem of unemployment is a concomitant feature of the rapid technological advancement. Machines not only provide employment opportunities for men but they also take away the jobs of men through labor saving devices. This results in technological unemployment. The dangerous effect of technology is evident through the modern mode of warfare. The weaponry has brought fears and anxieties to the mankind. They can easily destroy the entire human race reveal how technology could be misused. Thus greater the technological advancement the more risk for the mankind.

Changes in social institutions: Technology has profoundly altered our modes of life. Technology has not spared the social institutions of its effects. The institutions of family, religion, morality, marriage, state, property have been altered. Modern technology in taking away industry from the household has radically changed the family organization. Many functions of the family have been taken away by other agencies. Marriage is losing its sanctity. It is treated as a civil contract than a sacred bond. Marriages are becoming more and more unstable. Instances of divorce, desertion and separation are increasing. Technology has elevated the status of women but it has also contributed to the stresses and strains in the relations between men and women at home. Religion is losing hold over the members. People are becoming more secular, rational and scientific but less religious in their outlook. Inventions and discoveries in science have shaken the foundations of religion. The function of the state or the field of state activity has been widened. Modern technology has made the states to perform such functions as -the protection of the aged, the weaker section and the minorities making provision for education, health care etc. Transportation and communication inventions are leading to a shift of functions from local government to the central government of the whole state. The modern inventions have also strengthened nationalism. The modern governments that rule through the bureaucracy have further impersonalized the human relations. The most striking change in modern times is the change in economic organization. Industry has been taken away from the household and new type of economic organizations have been set up such as factories, stores, banks, corporations etc.

## 7: Tecnology and Society, Impact of Technology Change in Society

*Social scientists have underlined social change in terms of a change in relationships, organisation, culture, institution, structure and functioning of the social system. By social change, Kingsley Davis meant only such alterations that affect the organisation, structure and functions of society.*

The changing social order Social change in the broadest sense is any change in social relations. Viewed this way, social change is an ever-present phenomenon in any society. A distinction is sometimes made then between processes of change within the social structure, which serve in part to maintain the structure, and processes that modify the structure societal change. The specific meaning of social change depends first on the social entity considered. Changes in a small group may be important on the level of that group itself but negligible on the level of the larger society. Similarly, the observation of social change depends on the time span studied; most short-term changes are negligible when examined in the long run. Small-scale and short-term changes are characteristic of human societies, because customs and norms change, new techniques and technologies are invented, environmental changes spur new adaptations, and conflicts result in redistributions of power. This universal human potential for social change has a biological basis. It is rooted in the flexibility and adaptability of the human species—the near absence of biologically fixed action patterns instincts on the one hand and the enormous capacity for learning, symbolizing, and creating on the other hand. The human constitution makes possible changes that are not biologically that is to say, genetically determined. Social change, in other words, is possible only by virtue of biological characteristics of the human species, but the nature of the actual changes cannot be reduced to these species traits. Historical background Several ideas of social change have been developed in various cultures and historical periods. Three may be distinguished as the most basic: These three ideas were already prominent in Greek and Roman antiquity and have characterized Western social thought since that time. The concept of progress, however, has become the most influential idea, especially since the Enlightenment movement of the 17th and 18th centuries. Social thinkers such as Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot and the marquis de Condorcet in France and Adam Smith and John Millar in Scotland advanced theories on the progress of human knowledge and technology. Progress was also the key idea in 19th-century theories of social evolution, and evolutionism was the common core shared by the most influential social theories of that century. This line of thought has since been disputed and disproved. The most encompassing theory of social evolution was developed by Herbert Spencer, who, unlike Comte, linked social evolution to biological evolution. According to Spencer, biological organisms and human societies follow the same universal, natural evolutionary law: Evolutionary thought also dominated the new field of social and cultural anthropology in the second half of the 19th century. Tylor postulated an evolution of religious ideas from animism through polytheism to monotheism. He assumed that monogamy was preceded by polygamy and patrilineal descent by matrilineal descent. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels too were highly influenced by evolutionary ideas. The Marxian distinctions between primitive communism, the Asiatic mode of production, ancient slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and future socialism may be interpreted as a list of stages in one evolutionary development although the Asiatic mode does not fit well in this scheme. The originality of the Marxian theory of social development lay in its combination of dialectics and gradualism. Underlying this discontinuous development was the more gradual development of the forces of production technology and organization of labour. Marx was also influenced by the countercurrent of Romanticism, which was opposed to the idea of progress. He distinguished between the community *Gemeinschaft*, in which people were bound together by common traditions and ties of affection and solidarity, and the society *Gesellschaft*, in which social relations had become contractual, rational, and nonemotional. Weber rejected evolutionism by arguing that the development of Western society was quite different from that of other civilizations and therefore historically unique. The work of Durkheim, Weber, and other social theorists around the turn of the century marked a transition from evolutionism toward more static theories. Evolutionary theories were criticized on empirical grounds—they could be refuted by a growing mass of research findings—and because of their determinism and Western-centred optimism. Theories of cyclic

change that denied long-term progress gained popularity in the first half of the 20th century. Although the interest in long-term social change never disappeared, it faded into the background, especially when, from the 1920s until the 1950s, functionalism, emphasizing an interdependent social system, became the dominant paradigm both in anthropology and in sociology. Neoevolutionist theories were proclaimed by several anthropologists, including Ralph Linton, Leslie A. White, Julian H. Steward, Marshall D. Sahlins, and Elman Rogers Service. These authors held to the idea of social evolution as a long-term development that is both patterned and cumulative. Unlike 19th-century evolutionism, neoevolutionism does not assume that all societies go through the same stages of development. Instead, much attention is paid to variations between societies as well as to relations of influence among them. The latter concept has come to be known by the term acculturation. In addition, social evolution is not regarded as predetermined or inevitable but is understood in terms of probabilities. Finally, evolutionary development is not equated with progress. Revived interest in long-term social change was sparked by attempts to explain the gaps between rich and poor countries. Some modernization theories have been criticized, however, for implying that poor countries could and should develop "or modernize" in the manner of Western societies. Modernization theories have also been criticized for their lack of attention to international power relations, in which the richer countries dominate the poorer ones. His world systems theory, however, has been attacked for empirical reasons and for its failure to account for the collapse of Soviet regimes and their subsequent movement toward capitalism and democracy.

**Patterns of social change** Theories of social change, both old and new, commonly assume that the course of social change is not arbitrary but is, to a certain degree, regular or patterned. The three traditional ideas of social change—decline, cyclic change, and progress—have unquestionably influenced modern theories. Yet because these theories are not scientifically determined, they fail to make an explicit distinction between decline and progress. In fact, the qualities of decline and progress cannot be derived scientifically that is, from empirical observations alone but are instead identified by normative evaluations and value judgments. If the study of social change is to be conducted on scientific and nonnormative terms, then, only two basic patterns of social change can be considered: Often the time span of the change determines which pattern is observed.

**Cyclic change** Much of ordinary social life is organized in cyclic changes: These short-term cyclic changes may be regarded as conditions necessary for structural stability. Other changes that have a more or less cyclic pattern are less predictable. One example is the business cycle, a recurrent phenomenon of capitalism, which seems somewhat patterned yet is hard to predict. A prominent theory of the business cycle is that of the Soviet economist Nikolay D. Kondratyev, who tried to show the recurrence of long waves of economic boom and recession on an international scale. He charted the waves from the end of the 18th century, with each complete wave comprising a period of about 50 years. Subsequent research has shown, however, that the patterns in different countries have been far from identical. Long-term cyclic changes are addressed in theories on the birth, growth, flourishing, decline, and death of civilizations. Toynbee conceived world history in this way in the first volumes of *A Study of History* (1939), as did Spengler in his *Decline of the West* (1918). These theories have been criticized for conceiving of civilizations as natural entities with sharp boundaries, thinking that neglects the interrelations between civilizations.

**One-directional change** This type of change continues more or less in the same direction. Such change is usually cumulative and implies growth or increase, such as that of population density, the size of organizations, or the level of production. The direction of the change could, however, be one of decrease or a combination of growth and decrease. Yet another change may be a shift from one pole to the other of a continuum—from religious to secular ways of thinking, for example. Such a change may be defined as either growth of scientific knowledge or decline of religion. The simplest type of one-directional change is linear, occurring when the degree of social change is constant over time. Another type of social change is that of exponential growth, in which the percentage of growth is constant over time and the change accelerates correspondingly. Population growth and production growth are known to follow this pattern over certain time frames. A pattern of long-term growth may also conform to a three-stage S curve. In the first phase the change is slow enough as to be almost imperceptible. Next the change accelerates. In the third phase the rate of change slackens until it approaches a supposed upper limit. The model of the demographic transition in industrializing countries exhibits this pattern. In the first premodern or preindustrial

stage both the birth rate and the mortality rate are high, and, consequently, the population grows very slowly; then mortality decreases, and the population grows much faster; in the third stage both the birth rate and the mortality rate have become low, and population growth approaches zero. The same model has been suggested, more hypothetically, for the rates of technological and scientific change. Combined patterns of change Cyclic and one-directional changes may be observed simultaneously. This occurs in part because short-term change tends to be cyclic while long-term change tends to follow one direction. For example, production rates of industrializing countries exhibit the pattern of short-term business cycles occurring within long-term economic development. These patterns cannot be applied simply and easily to social reality. At best, they are approximations of social reality. Comparing the model with reality is not always possible, because reliable data are not always available. Moreover, and more important, many social processes do not lend themselves to precise quantitative measurement. Processes such as bureaucratization or secularization, for example, can be defined through changes in a certain direction, but it is hard to reach agreement on the dimensions to be measured. It remains to be seen whether long-term social change in a certain direction will be maintained. The transformation of medieval society into the Western nations of the 20th century may be conceived in terms of several interconnected long-term one-directional changes. Some of the more important of these changes include commercialization, increasing division of labour, growth of production, formation of nation-states, bureaucratization, growth of technology and science, secularization, urbanization, spread of literacy, increasing geographic and social mobility, and growth of organizations. Many of these changes have also occurred in non-Western societies. Most changes did not originate in the West, but some important changes did, such as the Industrial Revolution and the rise of capitalism. These changes subsequently had a strong impact on non-Western societies. Additionally, groups of people outside western Europe have been drawn into a global division of labour, with Western nation-states gaining dominance both politically and economically. The extent to which these changes are part of a global long-term social development is the central question of social evolution. Although knowledge concerning this question is far from complete, some general trends may be hypothesized. One trend is seen in the technological innovations and advances in scientific knowledge that have harnessed natural forces for the satisfaction of human needs. Among these innovations were the use of fire, the cultivation of plants, the domestication of animals dating from about bce, the use of metals, and the process of industrialization.

### 8: Social change - Wikipedia

*Social change refers to any significant alteration over time in behavior patterns and cultural values and norms. By "significant" alteration, sociologists mean changes yielding profound social consequences.*

According to MacIver and Page, social change is a change in social relationship. It is a process responsive to many types of changes, to changes in man-made conditions of living, to changes in attitudes and beliefs of men and to changes that go beyond human control to the biological and physical nature of things. No doubt change identifies a wide canvas or contour for development, progress transformation, growth, mobilisation and soon. There are many perspectives that are used to explain social change. These are mentioned in brief as follows: Comte argues, human intellect passing through three historical phases of sophistication the theological, the metaphysical and the positive. The conflict perspective can best be understood in terms of tension and conflict between groups and individuals and here change is viewed as an intrinsic process in society. To Karl Marx, social changes take place based on the antagonistic class relations based on ownership of the means of production; between the haves and the have-nots and that this class struggle culminates into a revolutionary change in society with its progression from ancient to feudal and finally from feudal to capitalist stage of development in society. According to Coser, conflict is an inevitable part of the socialisation process and no social groups can be completely harmonious as individuals have a predisposition for love as well as hate. Thus conflict acts as a creative force that stimulates change in society, constructive or destructive. While Karl Marx has identified class and class conflict based on unequal distribution of material resources, Dahrendorf has identified the same in terms of unequal distribution of authority. This conflict on unequal distribution of authority leads to change in society. To structural-functional theorists, society consists of interrelated parts that work together for the purpose of maintaining internal balance. It perceives roles as locating individuals in social positions, and providing them with articulated sets of expectations specifying the rights and duties of occupants. This perspective is oriented towards order and stability and preservation of the status quo. Durkheim has observed change in terms of change in the nature of division of labour in society. He believed that the change in labour from traditional society to modern society was the cause for social change. According to Talcott Parsons, society is a system surrounded by three other systems " personality, the organism and culture. There is social equilibrium when the boundaries of the three systems are maintained and social change results from boundary breaking. To him all aspects of culture, i. This creates the phenomenon of cultural lag that ultimately leads to change in society. These theories posit that activities of people constitute the essence of change in society and modifications in the behaviour can facilitate change and play an essential role in social development. Max Weber thought that modernity was replacing traditional views with a rational way of thinking. In pre-industrial societies traditional views obstructed change, things were the way they were because that is what everyone believed and no one questioned it. In modern societies, things were questioned and answers were calculated. David McClelland focused his study on what he called need for achievement, symbolised by V achievement. Consequently, there is certain behaviour characteristics exhibited by people with this V factor, such as individualism, energetic innovative activity, drive for success and so on. In simple words, individual economic achievement produces economic growth.

### 9: Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective - Philip McMichael - Google Books

*Social change is the significant alteration of social structure and cultural patterns through time. Social structure refers to persistent networks of social relationships where interaction between people or groups has become routine and repetitive.*

Understand the changes that accompany modernization. Discuss the functionalist and conflict perspectives on social change. Social change refers to the transformation of culture, behavior, social institutions, and social structure over time. In looking at all of these societies, we have seen how they differ in such dimensions as size, technology, economy, inequality, and gender roles. In short, we have seen some of the ways in which societies change over time. Another way of saying this is that we have seen some of the ways in which societies change as they become more modern. To understand social change, then, we need to begin to understand what it means for a society to become more modern. Modernization Modernization refers to the process and impact of becoming more modern. The terms modern and modernization have positive connotations; it sounds good to modernize and to be modern. Modernization implies that progress has been made and is continuing to be made, and who would not want progress? Yet modernization also has a downside, as we will see in this section and in the later discussion of the environment. A related problem with the terms and concepts of modern and modernization is that many people think of Western nations when considering the most modern nations in the world today. This implies that Western society is the ideal to which other societies should aspire. While there are many good things about Western societies, it is important to avoid the ethnocentrism of assuming that Western societies are better because they are more modern. These caveats notwithstanding, societies have become much more modern over time, to put it mildly. We thus cannot fully understand society and social life without appreciating how societies have changed as they have become more modern. We can draw on their efforts and related work by later sociologists and by anthropologists to develop an idea of the differences modernization has made for societies and individuals. First, as societies evolve, they become much larger and more heterogeneous. This means that people are more different from each other than when societies were much smaller, and it also means that they ordinarily cannot know each other nearly as well. Larger, more modern societies thus typically have weaker social bonds and a weaker sense of community than small societies and place more of an emphasis on the needs of the individual. As societies become more modern, they begin to differ from nonmodern societies in several ways. In particular, they become larger and more heterogeneous, they lose their traditional ways of thinking, and they gain in individual freedom and autonomy. We can begin to appreciate the differences between smaller and larger societies when we contrast a small college of 1, students with a large university of 40, students. Perhaps you had this contrast in mind when you were applying to college and had a preference for either a small or a large institution. In a small college, classes might average no more than 20 students; these students get to know each other well and often have a lot of interaction with the professor. In a large university, classes might hold students or more, and everything is more impersonal. Large universities do have many advantages, but they probably do not have as strong a sense of community as is found at small colleges. A second aspect of modernization is a loss of traditional ways of thinking. This allows a society to be more creative and to abandon old ways that may no longer be appropriate. However, it also means a weakening or even ending of the traditions that helped define the society and gave it a sense of identity. A third aspect of modernization is the growth of individual freedom and autonomy. As societies grow, become more impersonal, and lose their traditions and sense of community, their norms become weaker, and individuals thus become freer to think for themselves and to behave in new ways. If we want a society that values individual freedom, Durkheim said, we automatically must have a society with deviance. Is modernization good or bad? This is a simplistic question about a very complex concept, but a quick answer is that it is both good and bad. The hallmarks of modernization, he thought, are rationalization, a loss of tradition, and the rise of impersonal bureaucracy. He despaired over the impersonal quality of rational thinking and bureaucratization, as he thought it was a dehumanizing influence. He certainly appreciated the social bonds and community feeling, which he called

mechanical solidarity, characteristic of small, traditional societies. However, he also thought that these societies stifled individual freedom and that social solidarity still exists in modern societies. This solidarity, which he termed organic solidarity, stems from the division of labor, in which everyone has to depend on everyone else to perform their jobs. This interdependence of roles, Durkheim said, creates a solidarity that retains much of the bonding and sense of community found in premodern societies. We have already commented on important benefits of modernization that are generally recognized: These developments in turn usually mean that a society becomes more tolerant of beliefs and behaviors that it formerly would have disapproved and even condemned. Modern societies, then, generally feature more tolerance than older societies. Many people, undoubtedly including most sociologists, regard greater tolerance as a good thing, but others regard it as a bad thing because they favor traditional beliefs and behaviors. Beyond these abstract concepts of social bonding, sense of community, and tolerance, modern societies are certainly a force for both good and bad in other ways. They have produced scientific discoveries that have saved lives, extended life spans, and made human existence much easier than imaginable in the distant past and even in the recent past. But they have also polluted the environment, engaged in wars that have killed tens of millions, and built up nuclear arsenals that, even with the end of the Cold War, still threaten the planet. Modernization, then, is a double-edged sword. It has given us benefits too numerous to count, but it also has made human existence very precarious.

### Sociological Perspectives on Social Change

Sociological perspectives on social change fall into the functionalist and conflict approaches. As usual, both views together offer a more complete understanding of social change than either view by itself.

#### Vago, Gradual change is necessary and desirable and typically stems from such things as population growth, technological advances, and interaction with other societies that brings new ways of thinking and acting. However, sudden social change is undesirable because it disrupts this equilibrium. To prevent this from happening, other parts of society must make appropriate adjustments if one part of society sees too sudden a change.

#### Conflict theory

Because the status quo is characterized by social inequality and other problems, sudden social change in the form of protest or revolution is both desirable and necessary to reduce or eliminate social inequality and to address other social ills.

#### The Functionalist Understanding

The functionalist understanding of social change is based on insights developed by different generations of sociologists. Early sociologists likened change in society to change in biological organisms. Taking a cue from the work of Charles Darwin, they said that societies evolved just as organisms do, from tiny, simple forms to much larger and more complex structures. When societies are small and simple, there are few roles to perform, and just about everyone can perform all of these roles. As societies grow and evolve, many new roles develop, and not everyone has the time or skill to perform every role. People thus start to specialize their roles and a division of labor begins. Several decades ago, Talcott Parsons, the leading 20th-century figure in functionalist theory, presented an equilibrium model of social change. Parsons said that society is always in a natural state of equilibrium, defined as a state of equal balance among opposing forces. Gradual change is both necessary and desirable and typically stems from such things as population growth, technological advances, and interaction with other societies that brings new ways of thinking and acting. However, any sudden social change disrupts this equilibrium. Functionalist theory assumes that sudden social change, as by the protest depicted here, is highly undesirable, whereas conflict theory assumes that sudden social change may be needed to correct inequality and other deficiencies in the status quo. The functionalist perspective has been criticized on a few grounds. The perspective generally assumes that the change from simple to complex societies has been very positive, when in fact, as we have seen, this change has also proven costly in many ways. It might well have weakened social bonds, and it has certainly imperiled human existence. Functionalist theory also assumes that sudden social change is highly undesirable, when such change may in fact be needed to correct inequality and other deficiencies in the status quo.

#### Conflict Theory

Whereas functional theory assumes the status quo is generally good and sudden social change is undesirable, conflict theory assumes the status quo is generally bad. It thus views sudden social change in the form of protest or revolution as both desirable and necessary to reduce or eliminate social inequality and to address other social ills. Another difference between the two approaches concerns industrialization, which functional theory views as a positive development that helped make modern society

possible. In contrast, conflict theory, following the views of Karl Marx, says that industrialization exploited workers and thus increased social inequality. In one other difference between the two approaches, functionalist sociologists view social change as the result of certain natural forces, which we will discuss shortly. In this sense, social change is unplanned even though it happens anyway. Conflict theorists, however, recognize that social change often stems from efforts by social movements to bring about fundamental changes in the social, economic, and political systems. Its Marxian version also erred in predicting that capitalist societies would inevitably undergo a socialist-communist revolution. Key Takeaways As societies become more modern, they become larger and more heterogeneous. Traditional ways of thinking decline, and individual freedom and autonomy increase. Functionalist theory favors slow, incremental social change, while conflict theory favors fast, far-reaching social change to correct what it views as social inequalities and other problems in the status quo. For Your Review If you had to do it over again, would you go to a large university, a small college, or something in between? How does your response relate to some of the differences between smaller, traditional societies and larger, modern societies? The division of labor in society. Original work published The rules of sociological method S. An introduction to macrosociology 11th ed. Evolutionary and comparative perspectives. Social change 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: An outline of interpretive sociology G. University of California Press.

Shisa nyama business plan Moving to a new house The myth of American individualism Advertising and entry deterrence The ethics of religious conformity [Pub. in the Internat. Jour. of Ethics, April, 1896] Six months at the Cape Gender and the politics of possibilities 3.1.1 Definition of Soil Erodibility factor, K Interview with the vampire ebook The persuasive person Australian-Japanese business transactions Criminal anthropology : the atavistic brain The Compleat Spell Caster Delias How to Cook National legislation Berber Government Prayers for Mealtime (Hand Prayer Books) V. 2. Portable personal possessions Home Health Administration Manual Afetrword and End Notes A History of twentieth-century African literatures Gln 50 c manual Best device to 2014 WordPerfect 8 for Windows for dummies Index (soundex to the population schedules of the tenth census of the United States, 1880, [Vermont] Multiple goals for gang control programs and policies The Biology of Animal Stress Rare benign neoplasms of melanocytes The food industry wars Using Computer-Based and Electronic Library Materials Teach Yourself Gaelic Dictionary (Teach Yourself) Best offline standing er Jane Austen Her Life And Letters A Family Record Talk Now! Burmese An evaluation of physics and chemistry instruction in Connecticut public secondary schools. The 2007-2012 Outlook for Drafting Services in the United States The essentials of good teaching Financial institutions markets and money 12th edition Div.2, v.1-3. The internal condition of Palestine, and of the Jewish people, in the time of Jesus Christ. By schism rent asunder